# 2022-03-08 Technical WG Agenda and Notes

**Date**

08 Mar 2022

**Attendees**

- Tom Creighton, Bertrand Caron, Mark Phillips, Curtis Miri, Karen Hanson, Roxana Maurer, Greg Janée

**Goals**

Selection of chair/vice-chair, RFC update, new spec transition plan

**Discussion items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td>texas conference moving ahead, no publicity yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for papers, submission deadlines, upcoming meetings: Calendar of events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any news items we should blog about?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of chair and vice-chair (see Feb 25 email request from new Advisory Group chair).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update on preliminary discussion with the RFC Independent Stream Editor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- BCP (Best Current Practice) 190 (RFC 8820)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conflict with reserving path &quot;prefix&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conflict with reserving query string</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 04.03.22 06:56, Independent Submissions Editor (Eliot Lear) wrote:

_The question really is... is an web server or client supposed to behave in any special way when they see ark: somewhere buried in a URL? This is precisely what .well-known was meant to protect against._

I want to go into more detail here. _The point of BCP 190 is to preserve namespaces to the owner of an origin. That is- you don't get to structure them if you are not the owner. That includes queries. The exception we have for that is .well-known. This is why I am very concerned about the current state of your draft._

Some initial thoughts (jak's). This means that the IETF might not allow example.org /ark:12345/67890 and the ?info inflection unless they were expressed as something like

```
example.org/.well-known/ark/12345/67890 and
example.org/.well-known/ark-info/12345/67890
```

I (jak) don't think it means that one site, eg, n2t.net, couldn't recommend publishing as

```
n2t.net/ark:12345/67890
```

and letting it redirect to local services that use the .well-known/ark... convention.

kh: about the feedback: would it help to separate the resolver piece from the syntax spec?

 gj: can see the value in separating, along lines of how handle and doi did it,
   eg, 1. syntax and structure, 2. resolution, 3. metadata
 tc: yes

gj: doi's and handles are uri compliant and have structure -- how do they do it?
jk: because they're rooted at one domain (one origin), as opposed to suggesting a path convention for all origins to do it

tc: maybe it could be modeled on how n2t does it, as long as it's not mandated

rm: if we in Luxembourg don't want to use n2t, do we have to use .well-known?
jk: possibly, if the ARK spec continues to require a path convention

kh: I second the idea to have a spec describing specifically what n2t.net does

cm: two documents is less convenient, but maybe necessary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New spec transition planning</th>
<th>jk: ok to separate RFC from spec transition?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>New spec blog post draft</strong> – go ahead anyway, or talk about new spec transition independent of the RFC process?</td>
<td>tc: seems prudent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rm: yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action items**

•