ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Welcome to the SSAC Evolution of the Resolution Work Party meeting for April 20th. Barry, over to you.

BARRY LEIBA: So, first thing, and I'll repeat this at the end if anybody else comes on, we are indeed going to, starting next week, move this meeting an hour earlier, so it will be at 20:00 UTC rather than the current 2100 UTC. And I will also send this to the mailing list to confirm that we are doing that. So next week, the 27th will be an hour earlier, having heard no objections to that plan.

So, for today, we need to finish going through section four, which we only got through about the first, well, the first two very small paragraphs. So, let's start with that. And a teaser that Andrew came up with another finding that we're going to go to next when we're done with that. So, we have a Finding 6 to review after that. So, let's start off by having a look at section four. Andrew, is there anything you want to say or should we just start babbling?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I think you can start babbling away. This is the entirety of section four right here.

BARRY LEIBA: So, I will give people time to peruse as you think about what to say.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

RUSS HOUSLEY: In the third paragraph at the top, do you want to call it .ALT as opposed to it changing?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: You mean this paragraph?

RUSS HOUSLEY: It starts off the ALT Special use and then everywhere else it's .ALT, correct?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah, it's tricky because this is the actual name of the document. I didn't know what else to call it. I'm assuming by the time we get published, this will be RFC something.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Warren hopes so.

BARRY LEIBA: But it'll still have a name. So, the name goes there.

WARREN KUMARI: I would just put quotes around it for now in contrast.

BARRY LEIBA: I would think you should do that. And also, when you talk about it as a TLD with a dot on it, it ought to be in lowercase because that's generally how we rendered those.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: You mean like here?

BARRY LEIBA: So the places where you say .ALT, I would use lowercase .ALT. So, there are a couple of those.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: We use uppercase in other places, like when we say dot onion.

BARRY LEIBA: Well, then maybe I'm wrong. Maybe we should make that change.

WARREN KUMARI: It does stick out better if it's all uppercase.

BARRY LEIBA: That's certainly true.

WARREN KUMARI: I don't know if that's a good thing.

BARRY LEIBA: Let's leave it at uppercase. It doesn't really matter. When it actually goes in the DNS, it'll be in lowercase, but that doesn't make any difference in the document.

WARREN KUMARI: Also, that one should never go in the DNS. But I understand.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes, but you know what I mean.

WARREN KUMARI: I know what you meant.

BARRY LEIBA: So, are we good with this section? There seemed to be some discussion last week on the first couple of paragraphs.

WARREN KUMARI: I actually must have got side cracked fixing my shell configs. I would reword that as the first proposal is blah, blah, blah. And the second proposal is that the tiny editing things.

BARRY LEIBA: Like here?

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah.

BARRY LEIBA: That sounds good.

WARREN KUMARI: And then both of these propose setting aside portions of namespace for blah, blah, blah. Hopefully by the time this is published, actually, I don't know if hopefully by the time this is published or not, but hopefully the string will be selected and then we can put that string in for the .internal one. And I don't know whether I want this published soon, but I also want the string to be chosen soon.

BARRY LEIBA: It's arguable whether we will get this done before or after the ICANN process for choosing the string is done.

WARREN KUMARI: I remember when this working group was started and we said it should be fairly short.

BARRY LEIBA: I was surprised when it became a year old. I thought we would get it done in less than a year's time. And it looks like it's closer to a year and a half. But I do hope we can get this done before our year and a half birthday.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Are we done with this section?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think I said that two weeks ago when I said let's be done in the fall.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes, that would be about right.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'm going to move on to this new Finding 6. …….

BARRY LEIBA: Finding 6.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'll put all the findings on the screen. This came out of a list of two. Do you want to speak to it, Barry? I can speak to it.

BARRY LEIBA: No, I just said it's convenient that they fit on the screen. Go ahead and you talk.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: This new finding came out of our discussions that we've been having. And also that presentation from Russ and Audrey where Audrey's

research found that it's really easy to block alternative naming or I should say proxies and whatnot for systems that are only used for illegitimate uses. Users don't really care if you block their access to things which are only used for illegitimate purposes, but they really start caring if you block their access to things which are used for legitimate purposes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Or a mixed use.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Or a mixed use. Exactly. I recognize that this isn't written very well, especially that last clause there, but I think it's important to say that things that don't get big don't matter. It really comes down to how much momentum and how many users you can kind of get to coalesce around your alternative naming system for it to matter to anyone really.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think you're trying to say the network applies to naming systems, too.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: You mean like Metcalfe's law?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Exactly. If there aren't enough neighbors, who cares?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Pretty much. And even for people outside of the network, even for people that aren't using the network, like ICANN and its care for DNS.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But the more people connected to the network, the more people care, even those who aren't connected because they wish they were, applies to the naming system is what you're trying to say.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: And it also becomes a competitor.

BARRY LEIBA: I guess there are two things about this is, do we agree with what it says and does it say it the way we want to say it?

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, I don't agree with what it says, and I'm not sure it's the right way of saying it in any case. You see, most folk, when they try and tinker with the name system, try and make the change highly compatible to the DNS to the point where the use of the alternate naming system is as close as possible to seamless. That doesn't mean it is seamless, but the whole effort is to make it look as if it is. The more distant you make it from the DNS, the more minute its chances of ever going anywhere.

So Finding 6 is if you're divorced from the DNS and have no mapping system, you're dead. But that's not really a finding. I think that's a truism. The real issue around most of these alternate name systems is

that they actually attempt to snuggle themselves close enough to the DNS that their use is kind of natural to the point where such incursions into the DNS are oddly enough damaging. This whole issue of ambiguity.

WARREN KUMARI: I think in addition to that, it's not only technical harm or sort of impact, like the amount of wasted time, drama, confusion, et cetera, that has been caused by GNU or ENS or those crypto people, I think is somewhat harmful. I get a lot of email about the whole unstoppable domains and dot crypto stuff. I don't know if that's the end of the world, but it matters to me that I keep getting that annoyance.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So those effects that you're both mentioning are not necessarily relative to the amount of users using these systems. Those effects are there regardless. Even though there aren't that many users, they're still rather damaging.

GEOFF HUSTON: So let me head off into an analogy. Here's a dictionary, Andrew. It's a perfectly good dictionary. It has about 200,000 entries, 10 are wrong. Which I'm not going to tell you which, exactly. Whereas I give you another dictionary and say, thoroughly researched, we don't think any of these have been deliberately falsified. It's true, it's complete, blah, blah, blah. Well, obviously you go for one that's true and complete. Almost no matter how big the incursion, once you start to corrupt a

system and you cannot identify cleanly where the corruption is occurring, the system itself degrades quite quickly in its utility because you can't trust it.

WARREN KUMARI: Although, like playing double, what this says is, will never matter in the big picture. And if you go for a dictionary with 200,000 names in it, 20,000 names in it.

GEOFF HUSTON: A bunch of words.

WARREN KUMARI: And only 10 of them are wrong. The chances of me hitting one of those words probably is not that big in the big picture. In fact, many, almost all maps and many dictionaries do actually contain intentionally made-up words or incorrect entries so that dictionary writers get to claim that it is not purely a collection of whatever work and they then have some copyright.

GEOFF HUSTON: I understand that and if you didn't have a choice, that's an acceptable risk. But if you had a choice between a corrupted thing that is only slightly corrupted, very small I think is what the terms used here, versus one that does not, obviously you're going to prefer the one that does not.

WARREN KUMARI: This is true. Do we actually believe this finding or should we just remove it?

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, I was arguing against the finding because in some ways I think almost irrespective of the scale, if the alternate system manages to seamlessly integrate itself with the larger system, the fact that it's a corruption degrades the larger system almost irrespective of its size because of that problem.

WARREN KUMARI: Yes. I mean, yes and no. Within my house, I have, because I think that they're a bunch of bastards, I have my local recursive server map APNIC to 127.0.0.1. I have dinkled with the DNS, but it's only within my house. Does that corrupt the larger system? Possibly. Is it a less bad corruption than for example, China's Great Firewall?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Do you have open WiFi in your house? If so, the answer is yes.

WARREN KUMARI: I still think that the number of people who walk past my house and are affected by not being able to reach APNIC.net is five. The number of people -- Wait the number of people in China who are unable to reach Facebook is in the number of billions. So there is some scaling factor as

well. And yes, obviously it's way better if nobody like screws up the system at all, but there is some scale. I think we should just avoid it.

GEOFF HUSTON: I think it's the damage caused by unknown corruption. We have the same problem with certificates. We have the same problem in many other places where you say, odds are this is good. On the whole, just fine. It may be bad and we don't know where. Now if you have such a system and you also have a system, if you will, that's competing with it that says, no we don't do that. Investors prefer the one that doesn't have the chance of corruption, even if that chance is low. And that's why I argue that it's not even a scale problem. It's always going to be an issue one way or another. And so I'm not sure Finding 6 actually is a finding.

WARREN KUMARI: I think we should remove it. But again, sort of supporting Andrew, what it says is matter in the big picture, which is very hand wavy.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It is. I'm fine with removing it. It was kind of a test case. It was something I was thinking about. I'm certainly not married to it. So I think I'll just reject it. Going once, going twice, rejected. Well, that was fast. Barry, I believe the next thing we were going to talk about was alternative naming systems. So this was going to be, I think Geoff called it at some point, all the animals in the zoo. I like that. I like that

description. It's just going to be a collection of these alternative naming systems. We have three listed here at the top.

WARREN KUMARI: We're missing the biggest one.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Tor?

WARREN KUMARI: Actually that as well, .onion. The biggest one in terms of having some money and being annoying, which is unstoppable domains/UNS, the unstoppable naming system. And I think that they actually, the D they have as uppercase. I think it's even a trademark or something. And whether they're actually widely deployed is secondary to the fact that they have like many millions of dollars of VC funding. I'm putting up billboards and stuff and advertising. I think it's much more.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: We'll include them. I had a question about things like Windows naming, mDNS. Are the alternative naming systems, are they not to be included in the zoo?

WARREN KUMARI: It depends on how we define a naming system. And the reason I'm sounding sad is because this has been an ongoing thing of a rose by any

other name would still smell as sweet. What do we mean by a naming system?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Well, we could include them and then just talk about that difficulty of necessarily including them in the set.

GEOFF HUSTON: I think you're taking a very liberal view of the word 'alternative' here, Andrew. There are many labeling taxonomies out there almost an infinite number. IDs, Dewey decimal book numbers, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. And in some ways this kind of taxonomy of labeling shit is everywhere. And I think just for sanity and sanity alone, we really are scoping this into the context of the DNS and yes. So your definition of any naming system is probably a bit too broad on the screen there.

WARREN KUMARI: This is something I've been fighting for a long time, specifically the what do we mean by naming system. My coffee cup or Barry or Geoff. Those are all naming systems. Maybe we should say any naming system used for the resolution of, there's no good answer here. Basically, this is sort of like Potter's law of we know it when we see it, but I think that it's largely a naming system that maps from a computer service to a resource. And that's also a shitty definition because C:/Windows is a naming system that's used by a computer to map to the Windows directory on my local machine. Well but used on the internet.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: That excludes mDNS and Windows naming.

WARREN KUMARI: Do we want to be excluding mDNS and Windows naming? I personally think that they should fall within our scope because they are definitely within evolution of internet name resolution. At least they're within evolution of name resolution. It's a massive change. We do talk about it in other places in here, I believe.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It does have the form of a domain name, which was one of our big criteria. But in the form of a domain name.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: But that includes both mDNS and Windows naming.

WARREN KUMARI: I think Windows naming is included, but maybe it is any naming system used by computers to map from a name to a IP address. I think it's probably the closest scoping that we can get that's not just completely crazy pants.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Does mDNS always give you an IP address or does it sometimes give you a MAC address?

WARREN KUMARI: I believe that mDNS always gives you either an IP address or a name that can be followed. Well, it does give you an IP address. It might give you other stuff as well.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: DNS gives you other stuff too.

WARREN KUMARI: That's true. Like SRV records are. So the regular DNS gives you stuff as well. But one of the things that mDNS does generally give you is an IP address and that's, I think, its primary.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Do we want to say anything about the syntax? I think all of the naming systems that we've discussed so far do follow the format of domain names.

WARREN KUMARI: Yes, but so do many, many, many other things. Have I shown my...

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: No, but that's okay. But with this, we've already kind of narrowed it down here. And do we want to add something like use...

WARREN KUMARI: So for example, like I'm actually looking at my list of, can I just quickly share my window? Could you give me a screen sharing? I promise not.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: As long as you give it back.

WARREN KUMARI: I believe you can force it back, can't you?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'll make you a co-host.

WARREN KUMARI: So here we go, share screen. Here is my mDNS stuff within my local network. And I can't think of any reason, any way that you could badly abuse that. So almost all of these names that it is advertising are not actually of the format DNS names because they are fairly much all underscore something or other dot underscore something or other. They happen to eventually map through something that has often a bunch of spaces to an IP address. But our statement of they generally follow DNS format names isn't really true.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'm not up on the latest ITF...

GEOFF HUSTON: Why not, Warren? I see labels and dots.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: There's an IANA thing for names.

WARREN KUMARI: Generally, DNS names are of the format LDH.

GEOFF HUSTON: These are not LDH, agreed. It's not LDH, OIDs are not LDH. But in terms of borrowing the syntax, they just dispensed with the LDH bit and said, a string of labels with dots.

WARREN KUMARI: Sure. But there are many things that are a string of labels with dots. For example...

GEOFF HUSTON: How convenient.

WARREN KUMARI: For example, if you go to a library, the Dewey Decimal System is string of labels with dots. What three words is string of labels with dots? There are an almost infinite number of things that happen to use periods between things. What the hell is bose-clock? Good Lord. mDNS is awful.

GEOFF HUSTON: It hasn't got a battery.

WARREN KUMARI: What is this thing? Oh my God. So much...

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So are these all under -- So is the actual name _SSH _TCP.local? _

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah, so they're actually -- So the domain is local. So actually give me one second. Ping_ Let me quickly just do a TCP dump and I will capture. Rename, Wireshark. Here we go. You can all follow along with my inability to use Wireshark. And I'm sure that this is going to expose a whole bunch of private stuff. Port 5353. So here is -- Let's find a good example. Here is my iPhone. So my iPhone just announced itself as -- What's the DNS response?

Answers. Services. So it's announced a bunch of services and an example name of a service it's announced is _services, _blah, blah, blah, blah.local. This might be in a bad example. _RD link dot underscore TCP.local. So it announced that it is that. And then it also announced this is my IP address, 192.168.0.138. So it just sits there and like continues to announce itself as these are the things that I am.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: The argument here is that these are not following LDH, so therefore they don't follow the syntax of domain names.

WARREN KUMARI: No, I think that the statement of they are DNS names because they're something.something.something, which was Geoff's statement, is...

GEOFF HUSTON: That was where I was heading. You think I'm on thin ice?

WARREN KUMARI: I think that you're on very thin ice because -- One second.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that's the way most people think about it, though.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. One second. Let me just make sure that I have actually shown this slide deck before because -- You've seen this -- New share window. You've seen this presentation, right?

GEOFF HUSTON: I think I have.

WARREN KUMARI: Printer.local follows our format of something dot something. I believe that that's within the DNS namespace. srv-23.corp within the DNS namespace. Blah, blah, blah, blah.onion. I think probably within the DNS namespace. wkmari.eth. Actually, let me just do the slideshow instead. Is this still presenting or no?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yes, we're seeing it.

WARREN KUMARI: So daring.habit.potato. Would you say that that's in the DNS namespace or an alternative naming thing? What it actually is, is this is what three words, which is the bizarre. What three words has taken every two foot by two foot point on the Earth's surface and and assigned it three words, so daring.habit.potato happens to be 221B Baker Street, London, UK. It is not resolvable in the DNS.

GEOFF HUSTON: It could be.

WARREN KUMARI: Yep, but it isn't.

RUSS HOUSLEY: But I bet you can find one that is

GEOFF HUSTON: All you need to do is just wildcard it and off you go.

WARREN KUMARI: Yep. But that's my point of anything. There were three dots; command.com, is that in the DNS namespace? Or is it the Microsoft Windows command interpreter?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I bet it's both.

WARREN KUMARI: It is in fact, both. It's also 3M command adhesive, right? Is that the DNS namespace? I don't know. 212.555.1212; this is actually one of the ISO standards for writing out a phone number. Is that ISO or is it -- it does say one of the well-known international standards. Is that in the DNS namespace? Yes, no, maybe? It that follows LDH syntax. But there's also things like 192.168.1.1, three labels separated by dots. Is it in the DNS namespace? I don't know. That's a phone number. That's an IP address. Both of them follow the format of names but they also mean something in their own thing and you're supposed to guess at context.

William, that's someone's name. However, will.i.am is this dude. Actually, will.i.am is actually the name in the Armenian ccTLD. Am is in Armenia. But it's also that dude, the rapper from the Black Eyed Peas is will.i.am. And then that's the artist formerly known as Prince, that was just a throwaway giggle one.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Can you turn that into a punycode?

WARREN KUMARI: Into punycode? I don't know, but I believe that there is actually an emoji, which covers it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Which would mean yes, you could.

WARREN KUMARI: Probably. I was a little unsure about that, because there had been a lawsuit where Prince claimed that he owned that as his trademark. I think that the emoji is slightly different because reasons, or something. I don't know what we mean when we say a name that maps from something to an IP address. Like a naming system other than the global DNS used by computers to map from a name to an IP address. Daring.fireball.potato is used by computers to map from a name, eventually; I guess it actually maps to a physical address.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Should we talk about what 3 words here? Should that be in the zoo?

WARREN KUMARI: I don't know. I mean, I don't think so. Because I don't think that there are things that we mean when we talk about alternative names, but I don't know why not. Like, why don't we include 212.555.1212? Why don't we include will.i.am? We don't have a good definition of alternative naming system.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Maybe we could skip the definition for now and go back to the section where we just list the different things and we can argue over whether this or that should or should not be included in the set.

WARREN KUMARI: Okay. I think mDNS was another one which I thought we should do. Windows, it's a hugely popular naming system. It's used all over the place.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: And they have good documentation on how to interoperate with DNS.

WARREN KUMARI: Yes. The problem is Windows naming is -- there's Windows Active Directory, which technically are DNS names. Microsoft Windows Active Directory uses the DNS protocol to do all its resolution. But then there's also things like mycomputer.workgroup, which is the old Windows WINS, Windows Internet Naming System.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Or NetBuoy.

WARREN KUMARI: I think NetBuoy is actually the protocol, which is used once the name is resolved, I think. These are all of the current sort of well-known ones. But there are also a bunch of other ones like Yellow Pages used to be a well-known naming system.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: You're not talking about the book?

WARREN KUMARI: No. DNS Yellow Pages. NIS, here we go.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: NIS and NIS+ from Sun, I had to work with that once.

WARREN KUMARI: It was originally before it was coordinated, it was called Yellow Pages. But then they got sued by British Telecom who owned Yellow Pages then.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Because you brought up Active Directory as well, there's a distinction to be made between these naming systems and things that are like LDAP.

WARREN KUMARI: Yes, LDAP is a really good example.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Well, I think this NIS and NIS+, if I'm remembering correctly, and granted, it was like 25 years ago when I used it, it was more like an LDAP or an X.500 type thing, and it was like a DNS type thing.

WARREN KUMARI: No, it would also map. There's this file on a Linux machine called NS Switch. That specifies when a Unix system gets a name to be resolved, NS Switch is consulted to figure out in what order it should ask your DNS, NIS, the hosts file, and LDAP. Because LDAP actually also can map from machines to IP addresses, and in some places, it's a relatively…

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: This gets really messy then. I was hoping to draw a distinction between LDAP like things in DNS like things.

WARREN KUMARI: You were hoping to make it less awful, not more.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: But then, you're right, NS Switch can have NIS and LDAP in there.

WARREN KUMARI: Yes. And then there's also things like --

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Is that something that belongs in a zoo, LDAP?

GEOFF HUSTON: Well, when I'm writing this kind of stuff, I gracefully skate around the problem by simply saying, “The boundaries are very fuzzy. Here are

some examples. Some of them appear to be more aligned to the DNS, some appear to be less aligned to what we understand of the DNS, there are probably many more instances that we've given examples here. Moving on."

RUSS HOUSLEY: And also, LDAP doesn't use domain names.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yeah, but you're never going to enumerate this. It's not worth trying, as far as I can see.

BARRY LEIBA: Well, the reason for this list wasn't to make an exhaustive list, it was to put down some examples that we know and decide which ones we really want to talk about in this document.

WARREN KUMARI: True.

BARRY LEIBA: [CROSSTALK] is figure out what set of these we want to focus on in this document, and then stick a paragraph somewhere that says there are others and we're just not going to talk about everything.

WARREN KUMARI: I mean, I guess we could say, we have listed some of the more popular and well-known ones.

RUSS HOUSLEY: LDAP is problematic in that it uses something other than a domain name, and that's why the main component was named or created so that they could force fit it. But if you use, you know, country equals US, other X.500 things, it doesn't quite fit.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It sounds like LDAP and X.500 are not making the cut, which I'm quite happy about.

BARRY LEIBA: I think I am too, yeah.

WARREN KUMARI: I mean, we're all gonna have to work on our definition again, because it's still very hand wavy.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Are there any that aren't listed here that you really want to see here?

BARRY LEIBA: I think that's too many.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I agree.

WARREN KUMARI: Well, it kind of depends on -- I mean, I think yes, maybe it is, maybe it's not. I guess it's just how we refer to them. If we say, there are alternative naming systems, including… and just list some, or if we try and go down the path of explaining what each one is. The advantage just listing a bunch is, it potentially helps prevent people -- like Ethereum being like, "You didn't mention us, and we're really important, and your entire document sucks because of it." Whereas if we just tossed them in somewhere, maybe that takes some of their wind out of there.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Well, you know, if I'm only writing like a paragraph on each, it's really not too bad. And maybe that's what I do. I don't really go into how they work. I just write a quick paragraph overview of each one, and then maybe there's a couple that we want to do a deep dive on.

BARRY LEIBA: That sounds like an appropriate path.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It's also easier to do.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes. Because I'm hoping that the point of this document isn't going to be to really focus on a particular scheme, it's going to be to talk about them more generally so that we can support the findings that we come up with, and the recommendations we make, if any.

WARREN KUMARI: I was just trying to think which ones are going to be where there might be things where if we forget to name the naming system, we might look as though we weren't paying attention or silly. Does DOI map ever to a machine? Or does POIs only map to documents or resources?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, it maps to a URL. So part of it is a domain name.

WARREN KUMARI: It maps to a URI.

RUSS HOUSLEY: It gives you a URL to pull up the document.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah? I will have to just nod an agree because every time I read the DOI stuff, my head explodes.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Well, that's because you read the handles, too, right? If you go to like Mr. Somebody who does DOI assignments and clicked on one of them, it'll take you there to the document.

WARREN KUMARI: He does? I think that the URL is just a service which maps from the DOI number to the URL, kind of like Bitly or something similar. But the actual DOI itself, I don't know, I should sometime read this instead of pontificating because…

RUSS HOUSLEY: The point is just a way to get to the document. That's why academics like it.

WARREN KUMARI: We have DOIs for all of our RFCs.

RUSS HOUSLEY: RFCs have DOIs. That is correct.

WARREN KUMARI: They also have ISSN numbers. I think I was somehow conflating the two of those together as well. And I believe that those are completely different, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: They are completely different systems.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Different naming authorities, different systems.

WARREN KUMARI: And now I have gone down the rathole of trying to figure out what a DOI is again.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay, let's hope the rest of us don't follow you.

WARREN KUMARI: Thank you.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So I think when we were originally scoping out this section, we had intended a bit of a discussion on DOH, DOT, or at least perhaps just a refresher on SAC 109. I don't have the idea now that we want to do that. This really is, is going to be an introductory paragraph, and then a paragraph on each one of these with a lot of footnotes. And maybe some of them will be like three paragraphs, but most of them will just be one paragraph. That's my thinking now for this section. Does that sound good?

BARRY LEIBA: Sounds good to me.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay.

WARREN KUMARI: Sounds good to me a whole bunch, because I still think that DOT and DOH are just different transports. They're not different naming systems or resolution things.

GEOFF HUSTON: I love it too.

WARREN KUMARI: Great. So maybe we will be done by Autumn or whenever?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Well, I have my homework for next week. I won't be here next week, Steve Sheng will be, but I'll get some stuff written so you guys can talk to Steve about it. Send all of your complaints about my writing to Steve Sheng.

BARRY LEIBA: Does that wrap us up for this week, then?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I think so.

BARRY LEIBA: Andrew, are you going to make sure that Kathy changes the time, or do I need to or what?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: No, I've already reached out to her. She's off today, but she'll be back tomorrow.

BARRY LEIBA: And I didn't mention on our admin call an hour ago that redoing the calendar did fix the password problem.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Oh, good.

BARRY LEIBA: I did not have to enter a password.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: And we'll ask Kathy to redo it yet again.

BARRY LEIBA: Well, I think she just can change the time on it and doesn't have to delete it.

WARREN KUMARI: Wasn't it that ICANN really wanted there to be passwords or something, which I thought was really stupid?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: We were having a separate issue with the call before this one where the password was in the URL, but it still didn't work.

WARREN KUMARI: Okay, cool.

BARRY LEIBA: Okay, so thanks everybody for coming. Our small group, and nevertheless a great discussion.

WARREN KUMARI: Thank you, Andrew, for writing this, and Barry and whoever else is in charge of this; I think Russ for dealing with all of this drama. [CROSSTALK] I believe.

RUSS HOUSLEY: We'll meet on the train, Warren.

GEOFF HUSTON: Yep.

BARRY LEIBA: And anybody who isn't completely immersed in RIPE, is welcome to join this call.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: RIPE isn't until the week of the 22nd of May, so we'll see each before that.

GEOFF HUSTON: That's right.

WARREN KUMARI: I got a couple of other trips before that. But I mean, I am looking forward to seeing people in person.

BARRY LEIBA: Whatever it was next week. I don't know. Anyway, nevermind.

WARREN KUMARI: There is something next week, isn't there?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah.

BARRY LEIBA: Okay, bye-bye.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you, all.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]