[[[ My apologies -- this is part of an in-depth review I had been doing last ear but interrupted and didn't get back to. It covers up to section 4.5.2.1. Many of these comments apply to the later registries as well. ]]]

Global question:

In Section 1 and throughout the document there is use of the term "area" (e.g., "registry area"). This doesn't seem to be a defined IANA term and doesn't seem to be used elsewhere. In my experience, what you mean has most often been referred to as registries or top-level registries and sub-registries; i.e., creating a new registry into which all existing registries related to emergency services are to be moved as sub-registries. Please consider using the term "registry" or "top-level registry" instead of "area" and state that existing and new registries are to be sub-registries within it (e.g., change <<establish a new registry area called "Emergency" and to create a set of registries within that area>> to <<establish a new registry called "Emergency" and to create a set of sub-registries within that registry>>). I did note that RFC 8126 (Section 2.1) mentions that the terminology has been inconsistent:

Unfortunately, we have been inconsistent in how we refer to these  
entities. The group names, as they are referred to here, have been  
variously called "protocol category groups", "groups", "top-level  
registries", or just "registries". The registries under them have  
been called "registries" or "sub-registries".

References to Area have been changed to Registries as requested.

<brian>See email I send. Area should be Registry Group (as in Emergency Registry Group) and the individual sections are Registries

Changed to Registry Group

Text change requests:

(1) Abstract, first sentence:

I suggest changing "developing standards" to "developing specifications".

Done

(2) Same place:

I suggest changing "emergency call standards and other IETF protocols" to emergency call and other IETF protocols"

Done

(3) Abstract, second sentence:

I think a comma would be good following "common registries".

ok

(4) The Abstract uses "worldwide" while Section 1 uses "world-wide".

ok

(5) In Section 1, I think a comma would go well after "handling emergency calls".

ok

(6) In Section 1, penultimate sentence, I suggest changing "describe initial contents" to "provide initial contents".

ok

(7) Section 1.1 seems redundant with Section 3, I suggest deleting Section 1.1.

Instead deleted section 1.1.

(8) At the end of Section 3, consider adding "and similar programs in other regions" or similar wording at the end of the last sentence.

Done

(9) Section 4.1.5, second sentence, I suggest adding "Although" in front of "most" (and downcasing "Most").

There is no 4.1.5 in my draft; I think you mean 4.2.5. I have done

(10) Same place, I suggest deleting "used" in "used within".

Same, done

(11) Also in 4.1.5, I recommend enclosing the URN snippets in double quotes (change <<in urn:nena will be replaced by identifiers in urn:emergency>> with <<in "urn:nena" will be replaced by identifiers in "urn:emergency">>).

Same, done

(12) Please expand "nid" in its first use, which is in this section.

Done

(13) Consider replacing all instanced of "nid" in lower case with "NID" in upper case, as RFC 6061 and others do

Done

(14) Also in 4.1.5, I suggest changing "like NENA" to "such as NENA".

Decline

(15) Also in 4.1.5, there's a missing "be" in "primarily specified".

Done

(16) Section 4.1.6, the syntax ":<:extended>" looks like it will produce double colons. Perhaps delete the colon following the opening angle bracket? Or perhaps you want to use ABNF or another syntax notation to indicate zero or more occurrences of ":<extended>"?

This was a typo and the second colon has been removed.

(17) In 4.1.6, you might consider changing "non-case sensitive" to "case insensitive".

ok

(18) In 4.1.7, I think it would read better to change "are defined in the document" to "are as specified in the document" (it avoid two instances of "define" right next to each other).

ok

(19) Typo in 4.1.8: "consierations" should be "considerations".

ok

(20) Also in 4.1.8, consider changing "Each top level class, in its defining document MUST" to be "The document defining a top level class MUST".

(21) In 4.1.8, would "Encryption of the communications that contain the identifier in classes defined in this document is REQUIRED" be more clearly expressed as "When identifiers defined in this document are conveyed in protocol exchanges, such exchanges MUST be encrypted" or perhaps "When identifiers defined in this document are conveyed in protocol exchanges, such exchanges MUST be done using encrypted transport"?

Decline; author feels it reads more clearly as is.

(22) Same place, I assume the document is mandating encryption during transport and not in storage; otherwise, please state this.

Have added “Encryption in transport” to the beginning of the sentence

Not thrilled with “in” transport, but I can live with it. “Transport encryption” would be better

as would “encryption on the wire” or “encryption while transporting”

Changed to transport encryption

(23) Same place, should the document permit fail-back to unencrypted? Either way, this should be stated for clarity.

Added: Specifications implementing classes in this document MAY allow exceptions to this encryption requirement if justified.

(24) Same place, since the statement is restricted to "identifiers defined in this document", there should be text clarifying any requirement for identifiers defined in other documents. Perhaps "The document defining a top level class MUST state if transport encryption is required when conveying the identifiers it defines."

Added: Where a document defines top level class(es), it MUST state if encryption in transport is required when conveying any indentifiers it defines.

Same comment. Spelling error in identifiers

Corrected

(25) Same place, some explanatory text as to why encryption is a normative requirement when conveying URNs would be helpful. The URNs themselves, being published in an IANA registry, are obviously not secret.

Absent contributing text, authors will not make a change.

(26) Same place, I'm not sure exactly what "TLS or an equally secure protocol" means or how that could be tested for compliance. Since this is a normative requirement, it should be clarified, dropped, or softened.

Authors decline to change as the requirement seems clear (e.g. a successor to TLS). Todo: check with Brian

I am okay with the current text.

Ok

(27) In 4.1.9, please enclose <urn:emergency> and <urn:nena> in double quotes.

Ok

(28) Also in 4.1.9, consider rewording:

NENA STA-010.3-2021 is the primary document that has this backwards compatibility requirement, as it defined most of the identifiers in urn:nena.

To:

NENA STA-010.3-2021 is the document that defined and uses most of the identifiers in “urn:nena”; a future revision is expected to address backwards compatibility requirements between “urn:emergency” and “urn:nena”.

Ok

(29) Also in 4.1.9, consider changing “as identifiers” to “to identifiers” (making the construction “similar to” rather than “similar as”).

Ok

(30) Typo in 4.2: “subregistrues” instead of “subregistries”.

Ok

(31) Section 4.2 should be moved to 4.1, since it establishes the master registry (or registry grouping) into which the various subregistries are placed.

Accepted

(32) Also section 4.2, consider rewording “that promulgates emergency services standards” to “in which emergency services are in scope”.

Ok

(33) Same place, consider adding “in which emergency services are in scope” following “is a recognized standards organization” (making the text “that the organization defining the registry is a recognized standards organization in which emergency services are in scope”).

Ok

(34) Section 4.2, second paragraph, consider changing “These registries are required to implement” to “These registries are needed in order to implement” (to clarify that the documents need the registries rather than the registries being required to implement the documents).

Ok

(35) Consider adding a new paragraph to 4.2 to clarify if registries are identifiable as being within the “Emergency” area or not (e.g., if a registry that starts with the letters “Emergency” is assumed to be part of this master registry or if that’s just current convenience).

Decline to change

Agree. We don’t need rules

Ok

(36) Consider adding a new subsection of 4.3 that removes the “Data About” column of the “Emergency Call Data Types” registry, e.g.,

This document updates RFC 7852 to remove the “Data About” column of the “Emergency Call Data Types” registry. IANA is requested to add a reference to THIS DOCUMENT this registry, and to delete this column.

No answer; Check with Brian

I don’t recall any discussion of this. I think ecrit would have to agree.

Will leave as is.

(37) Section 4.4.3, I think you need an "and" before "if the registering organization is not the IETF", but more broadly, the criteria is confusing when written as single sentence (e.g., as written, one might think verification that the "purpose adequately describes the new class" is only required for non-IETF documents). I suggest rewriting the criteria as a set of bullet points, e.g.,:

The expert must confirm:

* the requested class is appropriate for emergency services
* if the registering organization is not the IETF, that it is an appropriate organization to define the class
* that the purpose adequately describes the new class
* the reference leads to a document that clearly describes the use of the class

ok

(38) In 4.4.5, what's the reason for emergency services SDOs other than NENA to define entries in "urn:nena"? ("IETF and emergency service standards organizations MAY define subregistries of urn:nena.")

This almost definitely meant urn:emergency. Urn:nena is out of scope of this document. It has been changed to urn:emergency. Todo: check with Brian

Brian agrees. No use for urn:nena anymore

Ok

(39) Typo in 4.4.5.1: "Esternal" instead of "External"

Ok

(40) Please consider adding "to or" before "within" in the first sentence of the second paragraph of 4.4.5.1 (i.e., from "routed within" to "routed to or within")

Ok

(41) In 4.4.5.1.3, please revise the duties of the expert as for comment (36) for Section 4.4.3.

Ok

(42) In 4.4.5.2, an "an" is missing in "and entry" (should be "and an entry").

Author cannot find this error in the draft

(43) In 4.4.5.2.3, please revise the duties of the expert as for comment (36) for Section 4.4.3.

Ok

(44) In 4.4.5.3, consider adding "from outside an ESInet" and changing "directed" to "routed" in "Test calls are directed to". i.e., change:

Test calls are directed to "urn:service:test.sos"

To:

Test calls from outside an ESInet are routed using "urn:service:test.sos"

ok

(45) Also in 4.4.5.3, I suggest changing "similar" to "corresponding" to show that the levels and identifiers should be the same .

Ok

(46) In 4.4.5.4, it might be more clear to change "other contexts" to "contexts besides routing where LoST queries are used".

Decline to change

(47) In 4.4.5.5.3, it might be helpful to clarify or explain how the expert should go about trying to minimize the number of entries.

Decline to change

(48) In 4.4.5.6, this sentence doesn't seem to make sense:

This is distinct from the parent subregistry, "police.federal", is the police.federal subregistry includes the names for specific federal agencies, as opposed to the "responder.police" subregistry which indicated the agency TYPE (police).

Edited for readability

(49) In 4.4.5.6.2, please clarify what "short and long forms" means, e.g., change "Short and long forms of the entry" to something such as "A short form of the agency name (often an abbreviation) and the full agency name".

Ok. Added “The short form of the entry is often an abbreviation, while the long form is the official full agency name.”

(50) Typo in 4.4.5.6.3: missing "each" in "that entry" ("that each entry").

Error is propagated throughout the doc and has been corrected

(51) In 4.4.5.6.4, should the registry have a column that specifies one or more language subtags for each name? Should there be a column listing one or more country codes per name indicating where the name is in use?

Decline to change; this RFC implements the registries as envisioned in i3 which does not contemplate this field. i3 could then not populate its values as it does not have this field

Brian Agrees

Ok

(52) In 4.4.5.7, I suggest changing "has similar purposes" to "has a similar purpose".

ok

(53) Also in 4.4.5.7, I suggest changing "except for types of fire response agencies" to "differentiating among types of fire response agencies."

ok

(54) Typo in 4.4.5.7.3: "varies" should be "vary" in "The names used for various kinds of fire departments varies from country to country."

Ok

(55) Also in 4.4.5.7.3, same request as in (46).

Decline to change

(56) In 4.4.5.7.4, same questions as in (50).

Blanket change already made

(57) In 4.4.5.8, same issue as (52).

ok

(58) In 4.4.5.8.3, same issue as (46).

Blanket change declined

(59) In 4.4.5.8.4, same questions as (50).

Blanket change declined

(60) In 4.4.5.9, I suggest rewording:

The ESInet will connect to many services and public safety  
agencies. A directory ("white pages" and "yellow pages") of  
agencies, together with key information about the service or  
agency, is the function of the Service/Agency Locator.

To:

Agencies connected to an ESInet need to connect to various  
services and public safety agencies. A service called the  
Service/Agency Locator provides a directory ("white pages") of  
agencies, together with key information about the service or  
agency.

Ok

(61) In the last sentence of 4.4.5.9, I suggest changing "urns" to "URNs".

Ok

(62) I suggest fixing the typo in 4.4.5.9 and also change “with” to “in”: “witha” should be “in a”.

Ok

(63) Also in 4.4.5.9, consider changing “that service” to “a service” or “a specific service”.

Ok

(64) In 4.4.5.9.3, should this be restricted to a NENA specification, or a specification published by an SDO with responsibility for emergency services?

Decline to change. Authors defer to the expert’s judgment

Brian is okay with that answer

Ok

(65) Same place, should the expert verify that the entry has a 1:1 mapping with a Service/Agency Locator service/agency?

Unsure; todo: check with Brain

Brian is not sure what this means. That the name maps to a Service as in ServiceNames? Not sure we need to be that restrictive

Ok; that leaves us with no change to the document

(66) Same place, typo: missing “the” in “that entry” (should be “that the entry”).

(67) In 4.4.5.10, I suggest changing “knowing what type of identifier is helpful” to “knowing the type of an identifier is helpful”.

Ok

(68) Same place, change “uid” to “UID”.

Ok

(69) Should 4.4.5.10.2 say "the document" rather than "a document" (can there be multiple documents specifying a value)?

Ok; change made throughout the document (20 or more instances)

(70) 4.4.5.10.3 is missing "the" in front of "entry".

Blanket correction

(71) Same place, should it be the document that specifies the structure?

Corrected here and other places

(72) In 4.4.5.11, is it true that media features with limited use are not appropriate in the SIP Media Feature Tag Registry? There's a risk of duplication or unawareness when the values are split between registries. Other registries have a way to indicate if a value is for general or limited use (e.g., MIME media types).

The RFC as written reflects what was envisioned for i3; todo: check with Brian

I think we have sufficient justification for a separate registry. The problem is that we have to create that registry following RFC2506.

We would need sipcore to add a way a SIP media feature tag could be designated for limited use.

Ok, no change to document

(73) In 4.4.5.11.3, typo "that entry" should be "that the entry".

Corrected

(74) Same place, "and specifies how it is used" should be "and that the referenced specification adequately describes how it is used".

Blanket change has been made

(75) Typo in 4.5: "/>" appears in text.

Does not appear in author’s draft

(76) I suggest replacing the text in 4.5.1 with something such as the following:

A variety of services are used during the processing of emergency  
calls. These services are deployed within an ESInet and are  
discoverable using the LoST [RFC5222] protocol or a discovery  
service known as the Service/Agency Locator (SAL). Standardized  
query terms are needed for both discovery mechanisms to work.  
When querying LoST, the service URNs in section 4.4.5.1.  
"urn:emergency:service" Subregistry are used. When querying the  
SAL, service names from the registry defined in this section are  
used. IANA is requested to create the ServiceNames subregistry in  
the Emergency registry.

No objection, text adopted

(77) In 4.5.1.3, typo "that entry" should be "that the entry".

Blanket change made

(78) Same place, suggestion: the expert should verify "that the entry is for a new service that is defined in a standard produced by an SDO with emergency services expertise".

Same as previous comment, decline to change and defer to the expert as to the appropriateness of the SDO

(79) In 4.5.1.4, I suggest making the columns/fields more explicitly named:

* An ASCII "Short Service Name" of the service (e.g., "ADR")
* An ASCII "Long Service Name" of the service (e.g., "Additional Data Repository")
* A "Reference", a URI to the document that defines the service.

(80) In 4.5.2.1, I think the name should be "serviceState" or "serviceStates" (plural), not "serviceNames".

It says ServiceState in current author draft

--Randall