                   Resolution of Uniform Resource Identifiers
                        using the Domain Name System

Status of this Memo
====================

Abstract:
=========

   Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) are the foundation of the World Wide
   Web, and are a vital Internet technology. However, they have proven
   to be brittle in practice. The basic problem is that URLs typically
   identify a particular path to a file on a particular host. There is
   no graceful way of changing the path or host once the URL has been
   assigned. Neither is there a graceful way of replicating the resource
   located by the URL to achieve better network utilization and/or fault
   tolerance. Uniform Resource Names (URNs) have been hypothesized as a
   adjunct to URLs that would overcome such problems. URNs and URLs are
   both instances of a broader class of identifiers known as Uniform
   Resource Identifiers (URIs).

   The requirements document for URN resolution systems[15] defines the
   concept of a "resolver discovery service". This document describes
   the first, experimental, RDS. It is implemented by a new DNS Resource
   Record, NAPTR (Naming Authority PoinTeR), that provides rules for
   mapping parts of URIs to domain names. By changing the mapping
   rules, we can change the host that is contacted to resolve a URI.
   This will allow a more graceful handling of URLs over long time
   periods, and forms the foundation for a new proposal for Uniform
   Resource Names.

In addition to locating resolvers, the NAPTR provides for other
naming systems to be grandfathered into the URN world, provides
independence between the name assignment system and the resolution
protocol system, and allows multiple services (Name to Location, Name
to Description, Name to Resource, ...) to be offered. In conjunction
with the SRV RR, the NAPTR record allows those services to be
replicated for the purposes of fault tolerance and load balancing.

Introduction:
=============

Uniform Resource Locators have been a significant advance in
retrieving Internet-accessible resources. However, their brittle
nature over time has been recognized for several years. The Uniform
Resource Identifier working group proposed the development of Uniform
Resource Names to serve as persistent, location-independent
identifiers for Internet resources in order to overcome most of the
problems with URLs. RFC-1737 [1] sets forth requirements on URNs.

During the lifetime of the URI-WG, a number of URN proposals were
generated. The developers of several of those proposals met in a
series of meetings, resulting in a compromise known as the Knoxville
framework. The major principle behind the Knoxville framework is
that the resolution system must be separate from the way names are
assigned. This is in marked contrast to most URLs, which identify the
host to contact and the protocol to use. Readers are referred to [2]
for background on the Knoxville framework and for additional
information on the context and purpose of this proposal.

Separating the way names are resolved from the way they are
constructed provides several benefits. It allows multiple naming
approaches and resolution approaches to compete, as it allows
different protocols and resolvers to be used. There is just one
problem with such a separation - how do we resolve a name when it
can't give us directions to its resolver?

For the short term, DNS is the obvious candidate for the resolution
framework, since it is widely deployed and understood. However, it is
not appropriate to use DNS to maintain information on a per-resource
basis. First of all, DNS was never intended to handle that many
records. Second, the limited record size is inappropriate for catalog
information. Third, domain names are not appropriate as URNs.

Therefore our approach is to use DNS to locate "resolvers" that can
provide information on individual resources, potentially including
the resource itself. To accomplish this, we "rewrite" the URI into a
domain name following the rules provided in NAPTR records. Rewrite
rules provide considerable power, which is important when trying to

meet the goals listed above. However, collections of rules can become difficult to understand. To lessen this problem, the NAPTR rules are *always* applied to the original URI, *never* to the output of previous rules.

Locating a resolver through the rewrite procedure may take multiple steps, but the beginning is always the same. The start of the URI is scanned to extract its colon-delimited prefix. (For URNs, the prefix is always "urn:" and we extract the following colon-delimited namespace identifier [3]). NAPTR resolution begins by taking the extracted string, appending the well-known suffix ".urn.net", and querying the DNS for NAPTR records at that domain name. Based on the results of this query, zero or more additional DNS queries may be needed to locate resolvers for the URI. The details of the conversation between the client and the resolver thus located are outside the bounds of this draft. Three brief examples of this procedure are given in the next section.

The NAPTR RR provides the level of indirection needed to keep the naming system independent of the resolution system, its protocols, and services. Coupled with the new SRV resource record proposal[4] there is also the potential for replicating the resolver on multiple hosts, overcoming some of the most significant problems of URLs. This is an important and subtle point. Not only do the NAPTR and SRV records allow us to replicate the resource, we can replicate the resolvers that know about the replicated resource. Preventing a single point of failure at the resolver level is a significant benefit. Separating the resolution procedure from the way names are constructed has additional benefits. Different resolution procedures can be used over time, and resolution procedures that are determined to be useful can be extended to deal with additional namespaces.

Caveats
=======

The NAPTR proposal is the first resolution procedure to be considered by the URN-WG. There are several concerns about the proposal which have motivated the group to recommend it for publication as an Experimental rather than a standards-track RFC.

First, URN resolution is new to the IETF and we wish to gain operational experience before recommending any procedure for the standards track. Second, the NAPTR proposal is based on DNS and consequently inherits concerns about security and administration. The recent advancement of the DNSSEC and secure update drafts to Proposed Standard reduce these concerns, but we wish to experiment with those new capabilities in the context of URN administration. A third area of concern is the potential for a noticeable impact on the DNS. We

believe that the proposal makes appropriate use of caching and
additional information, but it is best to go slow where the potential
for impact on a core system like the DNS is concerned. Fourth, the
rewrite rules in the NAPTR proposal are based on regular expressions.
Since regular expressions are difficult for humans to construct
correctly, concerns exist about the usability and maintainability of
the rules. This is especially true where international character sets
are concerned. Finally, the URN-WG is developing a requirements
document for URN Resolution Services[15], but that document is not
complete. That document needs to precede any resolution service
proposals on the standards track.

Terminology
===========

"Must" or "Shall" - Software that does not behave in the manner that
                 this document says it must is not conformant to this
                 document.
"Should" - Software that does not follow the behavior that this
                 document says it should may still be conformant, but is
                 probably broken in some fundamental way.
"May" -   Implementations may or may not provide the described
                 behavior, while still remaining conformant to this
                 document.

Brief overview and examples of the NAPTR RR:
==

A detailed description of the NAPTR RR will be given later, but to
give a flavor for the proposal we first give a simple description of
the record and three examples of its use.

The key fields in the NAPTR RR are order, preference, service, flags,
regexp, and replacement:

* The order field specifies the order in which records MUST be
  processed when multiple NAPTR records are returned in response to a
  single query. A naming authority may have delegated a portion of
  its namespace to another agency. Evaluating the NAPTR records in
  the correct order is necessary for delegation to work properly.

* The preference field specifies the order in which records SHOULD be
  processed when multiple NAPTR records have the same value of
  "order". This field lets a service provider specify the order in
  which resolvers are contacted, so that more capable machines are
  contacted in preference to less capable ones.

  * The service field specifies the resolution protocol and resolution
    service(s) that will be available if the rewrite specified by the
    regexp or replacement fields is applied. Resolution protocols are
    the protocols used to talk with a resolver. They will be specified
    in other documents, such as [5]. Resolution services are operations
    such as N2R (URN to Resource), N2L (URN to URL), N2C (URN to URC),
    etc. These will be discussed in the URN Resolution Services
    document[6], and their behavior in a particular resolution protocol
    will be given in the specification for that protocol (see [5] for a
    concrete example).

  * The flags field contains modifiers that affect what happens in the
    next DNS lookup, typically for optimizing the process. Flags may
    also affect the interpretation of the other fields in the record,
    therefore, clients MUST skip NAPTR records which contain an unknown
    flag value.

  * The regexp field is one of two fields used for the rewrite rules,
    and is the core concept of the NAPTR record. The regexp field is a
    String containing a sed-like substitution expression. (The actual
    grammar for the substitution expressions is given later in this
    draft). The substitution expression is applied to the original URN
    to determine the next domain name to be queried. The regexp field
    should be used when the domain name to be generated is conditional
    on information in the URI. If the next domain name is always known,
    which is anticipated to be a common occurrence, the replacement
    field should be used instead.

  * The replacement field is the other field that may be used for the
    rewrite rule. It is an optimization of the rewrite process for the
    case where the next domain name is fixed instead of being
    conditional on the content of the URI. The replacement field is a
    domain name (subject to compression if a DNS sender knows that a
    given recipient is able to decompress names in this RR type's RDATA
    field). If the rewrite is more complex than a simple substitution
    of a domain name, the replacement field should be set to . and the
    regexp field used.

Note that the client applies all the substitutions and performs all
lookups, they are not performed in the DNS servers. Note also that it
is the belief of the developers of this document that regexps should
rarely be used. The replacement field seems adequate for the vast
majority of situations. Regexps are only necessary when portions of a
namespace are to be delegated to different resolvers. Finally, note
that the regexp and replacement fields are, at present, mutually
exclusive. However, developers of client software should be aware
that a new flag might be defined which requires values in both
fields.

Example 1

Consider a URN that uses the hypothetical DUNS namespace. DUNS
numbers are identifiers for approximately 30 million registered
businesses around the world, assigned and maintained by Dunn and
Bradstreet. The URN might look like:

                  urn:duns:002372413:annual-report-1997

The first step in the resolution process is to find out about the
DUNS namespace. The namespace identifier, "duns", is extracted from
the URN, prepended to urn.net, and the NAPTRs for duns.urn.net looked
up. It might return records of the form:

```
duns.urn.net
;;        order pref flags service          regexp          replacement
 IN NAPTR 100   10  "s" "dunslink+N2L+N2C" ""   dunslink.udp.isi.dandb.com
 IN NAPTR 100   20  "s" "rcds+N2C"         ""   rcds.udp.isi.dandb.com
 IN NAPTR 100   30  "s" "http+N2L+N2C+N2R" ""   http.tcp.isi.dandb.com
```

The order field contains equal values, indicating that no name
delegation order has to be followed. The preference field indicates
that the provider would like clients to use the special dunslink
protocol, followed by the RCDS protocol, and that HTTP is offered as
a last resort. All the records specify the "s" flag, which will be
explained momentarily. The service fields say that if we speak
dunslink, we will be able to issue either the N2L or N2C requests to
obtain a URL or a URC (description) of the resource. The Resource
Cataloging and Distribution Service (RCDS)[7] could be used to get a
URC for the resource, while HTTP could be used to get a URL, URC, or
the resource itself. All the records supply the next domain name to
query, none of them need to be rewritten with the aid of regular
expressions.

The general case might require multiple NAPTR rewrites to locate a resolver, but eventually we will come to the "terminal NAPTR". Once we have the terminal NAPTR, our next probe into the DNS will be for a SRV or A record instead of another NAPTR. Rather than probing for a non-existent NAPTR record to terminate the loop, the flags field is used to indicate a terminal lookup. If it has a value of "s", the next lookup should be for SRV RRs, "a" denotes that A records should sought. A "p" flag is also provided to indicate that the next action is Protocol-specific, but that looking up another NAPTR will not be part of it.

Since our example RR specified the "s" flag, it was terminal. Assuming our client does not know the dunslink protocol, our next action is to lookup SRV RRs for rcds.udp.isi.dandb.com, which will tell us hosts that can provide the necessary resolution service. That lookup might return:

```
 ;;                        Pref Weight Port Target
 rcds.udp.isi.dandb.com IN SRV 0    0     1000 defduns.isi.dandb.com
                        IN SRV 0    0     1000 dbmirror.com.au
                        IN SRV 0    0     1000 ukmirror.com.uk
```

telling us three hosts that could actually do the resolution, and giving us the port we should use to talk to their RCDS server. (The reader is referred to the SRV proposal [4] for the interpretation of the fields above).

There is opportunity for significant optimization here. We can return the SRV records as additional information for terminal NAPTRs (and the A records as additional information for those SRVs). While this recursive provision of additional information is not explicitly blessed in the DNS specifications, it is not forbidden, and BIND does take advantage of it [8]. This is a significant optimization. In conjunction with a long TTL for *.urn.net records, the average number of probes to DNS for resolving DUNS URNs would approach one. Therefore, DNS server implementors SHOULD provide additional information with NAPTR responses. The additional information will be either SRV or A records. If SRV records are available, their A records should be provided as recursive additional information.

Note that the example NAPTR records above are intended to represent the reply the client will see. They are not quite identical to what the domain administrator would put into the zone files. For one thing, the administrator should supply the trailing '.' character on any FQDNs.

Example 2

    Consider a URN namespace based on MIME Content-Ids. The URN might
    look like this:

                 urn:cid:199606121851.1@mordred.gatech.edu

    (Note that this example is chosen for pedagogical purposes, and does
    not conform to the recently-approved CID URL scheme.)

    The first step in the resolution process is to find out about the CID
    namespace. The namespace identifier, cid, is extracted from the URN,
    prepended to urn.net, and the NAPTR for cid.urn.net looked up. It
    might return records of the form:

```
 cid.urn.net
  ;;       order pref flags service        regexp          replacement
   IN NAPTR 100   10    ""   ""   "/urn:cid:.+@([^\.]+\.)(.*)$/\2/i"     .
```

    We have only one NAPTR response, so ordering the responses is not a
    problem. The replacement field is empty, so we check the regexp
    field and use the pattern provided there. We apply that regexp to the
    entire URN to see if it matches, which it does. The \2 part of the
    substitution expression returns the string "gatech.edu". Since the
    flags field does not contain "s" or "a", the lookup is not terminal
    and our next probe to DNS is for more NAPTR records:
    lookup(query=NAPTR, "gatech.edu").

    Note that the rule does not extract the full domain name from the
    CID, instead it assumes the CID comes from a host and extracts its
    domain. While all hosts, such as mordred, could have their very own
    NAPTR, maintaining those records for all the machines at a site as
    large as Georgia Tech would be an intolerable burden. Wildcards are
    not appropriate here since they only return results when there is no
    exactly matching names already in the system.

    The record returned from the query on "gatech.edu" might look like:

```
gatech.edu IN NAPTR
;;         order pref flags service           regexp  replacement
   IN NAPTR 100   50   "s"  "z3950+N2L+N2C"     ""    z3950.tcp.gatech.edu
   IN NAPTR 100   50   "s"  "rcds+N2C"          ""    rcds.udp.gatech.edu
   IN NAPTR 100   50   "s"  "http+N2L+N2C+N2R"  ""    http.tcp.gatech.edu
```

Continuing with our example, we note that the values of the order and
preference fields are equal in all records, so the client is free to
pick any record. The flags field tells us that these are the last
NAPTR patterns we should see, and after the rewrite (a simple
replacement in this case) we should look up SRV records to get
information on the hosts that can provide the necessary service.

Assuming we prefer the Z39.50 protocol, our lookup might return:

```
;;                      Pref Weight   Port Target
z3950.tcp.gatech.edu IN SRV 0    0    1000 z3950.gatech.edu
                     IN SRV 0    0    1000 z3950.cc.gatech.edu
                     IN SRV 0    0    1000 z3950.uga.edu
```

telling us three hosts that could actually do the resolution, and
giving us the port we should use to talk to their Z39.50 server.

Recall that the regular expression used \2 to extract a domain name
from the CID, and \. for matching the literal '.' characters
seperating the domain name components. Since '\' is the escape
character, literal occurances of a backslash must be escaped by
another backslash. For the case of the cid.urn.net record above, the
regular expression entered into the zone file should be
"/urn:cid:.+@([^\\.]+\\.)(.*)$/\\2/i". When the client code actually
receives the record, the pattern will have been converted to
"/urn:cid:.+@([^.]+\.)(.*)$/\2/i".

Example 3

Even if URN systems were in place now, there would still be a
tremendous number of URLs. It should be possible to develop a URN
resolution system that can also provide location independence for
those URLs. This is related to the requirement in [1] to be able to
grandfather in names from other naming systems, such as ISO Formal
Public Identifiers, Library of Congress Call Numbers, ISBNs, ISSNs,
etc.

The NAPTR RR could also be used for URLs that have already been
assigned. Assume we have the URL for a very popular piece of
software that the publisher wishes to mirror at multiple sites around
the world:

    http://www.foo.com/software/latest-beta.exe

We extract the prefix, "http", and lookup NAPTR records for
http.urn.net. This might return a record of the form

```
http.urn.net IN NAPTR
;;  order    pref flags service      regexp              replacement
     100      90   ""       ""    "!http://([^/:]+)!\1!i"         .
```

This expression returns everything after the first double slash and
before the next slash or colon. (We use the '!' character to delimit
the parts of the substitution expression. Otherwise we would have to
use backslashes to escape the forward slashes, and would have a
regexp in the zone file that looked like
"/http:\\/\\/([^\\/:]+)/\\1/i".).

Applying this pattern to the URL extracts "www.foo.com". Looking up
NAPTR records for that might return:

```
www.foo.com
;;         order pref flags   service  regexp    replacement
 IN NAPTR 100  100  "s"    "http+L2R"   ""     http.tcp.foo.com
 IN NAPTR 100  100  "s"    "ftp+L2R"    ""     ftp.tcp.foo.com
```

Looking up SRV records for http.tcp.foo.com would return information
on the hosts that foo.com has designated to be its mirror sites. The
client can then pick one for the user.

NAPTR RR Format
===============

The format of the NAPTR RR is given below. The DNS type code for
NAPTR is 35.

    Domain TTL Class Order Preference Flags Service Regexp
    Replacement

where:

Domain
        The domain name this resource record refers to.
TTL
        Standard DNS Time To Live field
Class
        Standard DNS meaning

Order
    A 16-bit integer specifying the order in which the NAPTR
    records MUST be processed to ensure correct delegation of
    portions of the namespace over time. Low numbers are processed
    before high numbers, and once a NAPTR is found that "matches"
    a URN, the client MUST NOT consider any NAPTRs with a higher
    value for order.

Preference
    A 16-bit integer which specifies the order in which NAPTR
    records with equal "order" values SHOULD be processed, low
    numbers being processed before high numbers. This is similar
    to the preference field in an MX record, and is used so domain
    administrators can direct clients towards more capable hosts
    or lighter weight protocols.

Flags
    A String giving flags to control aspects of the rewriting and
    interpretation of the fields in the record. Flags are single
    characters from the set [A-Z0-9]. The case of the alphabetic
    characters is not significant.

    At this time only three flags, "S", "A", and "P", are defined.
    "S" means that the next lookup should be for SRV records
    instead of NAPTR records. "A" means that the next lookup
    should be for A records. The "P" flag says that the remainder
    of the resolution shall be carried out in a Protocol-specific
    fashion, and we should not do any more DNS queries.

    The remaining alphabetic flags are reserved. The numeric flags
    may be used for local experimentation. The S, A, and P flags
    are all mutually exclusive, and resolution libraries MAY
    signal an error if more than one is given. (Experimental code
    and code for assisting in the creation of NAPTRs would be more
    likely to signal such an error than a client such as a
    browser). We anticipate that multiple flags will be allowed in
    the future, so implementers MUST NOT assume that the flags
    field can only contain 0 or 1 characters. Finally, if a client
    encounters a record with an unknown flag, it MUST ignore it
    and move to the next record. This test takes precedence even
    over the "order" field. Since flags can control the
    interpretation placed on fields, a novel flag might change the
    interpretation of the regexp and/or replacement fields such
    that it is impossible to determine if a record matched a URN.

   Service
           Specifies the resolution service(s) available down this
           rewrite path. It may also specify the particular protocol that
           is used to talk with a resolver. A protocol MUST be specified
           if the flags field states that the NAPTR is terminal. If a
           protocol is specified, but the flags field does not state that
           the NAPTR is terminal, the next lookup MUST be for a NAPTR.
           The client MAY choose not to perform the next lookup if the
           protocol is unknown, but that behavior MUST NOT be relied
           upon.

           The service field may take any of the values below (using the
           Augmented BNF of RFC 822[9]):

            service_field = [[protocol] *("+" rs)]
            protocol   = ALPHA *31ALPHANUM
            rs   = ALPHA *31ALPHANUM
        // The protocol and rs fields are limited to 32
        // characters and must start with an alphabetic.
        // The current set of "known" strings are:
        // protocol   = "rcds" / "thttp" / "hdl" / "rwhois" / "z3950"
        // rs   = "N2L" / "N2Ls" / "N2R" / "N2Rs" / "N2C"
        //   / "N2Ns" / "L2R" / "L2Ns" / "L2Ls" / "L2C"

           i.e. an optional protocol specification followed by 0 or more
           resolution services. Each resolution service is indicated by
           an initial '+' character.

           Note that the empty string is also a valid service field. This
           will typically be seen at the top levels of a namespace, when
           it is impossible to know what services and protocols will be
           offered by a particular publisher within that name space.

           At this time the known protocols are rcds[7], hdl[10] (binary,
           UDP-based protocols), thttp[5] (a textual, TCP-based
           protocol), rwhois[11] (textual, UDP or TCP based), and
           Z39.50[12] (binary, TCP-based). More will be allowed later.
           The names of the protocols must be formed from the characters
           [a-Z0-9]. Case of the characters is not significant.

           The service requests currently allowed will be described in
           more detail in [6], but in brief they are:
                   N2L - Given a URN, return a URL
                   N2Ls - Given a URN, return a set of URLs
                   N2R - Given a URN, return an instance of the resource.
                   N2Rs - Given a URN, return multiple instances of the
                          resource, typically encoded using
                          multipart/alternative.

                    N2C - Given a URN, return a collection of meta-
                           information on the named resource. The format of
                           this response is the subject of another document.
                    N2Ns - Given a URN, return all URNs that are also
                           identifers for the resource.
                    L2R - Given a URL, return the resource.
                    L2Ns - Given a URL, return all the URNs that are
                           identifiers for the resource.
                    L2Ls - Given a URL, return all the URLs for instances of
                           of the same resource.
                    L2C - Given a URL, return a description of the
                           resource.

          The actual format of the service request and response will be
          determined by the resolution protocol, and is the subject for
          other documents (e.g. [5]). Protocols need not offer all
          services. The labels for service requests shall be formed from
          the set of characters [A-Z0-9]. The case of the alphabetic
          characters is not significant.

     Regexp
          A STRING containing a substitution expression that is applied
          to the original URI in order to construct the next domain name
          to lookup. The grammar of the substitution expression is given
          in the next section.

     Replacement
          The next NAME to query for NAPTR, SRV, or A records depending
          on the value of the flags field. As mentioned above, this may
          be compressed.

Substitution Expression Grammar:
================================

     The content of the regexp field is a substitution expression. True
     sed(1) substitution expressions are not appropriate for use in this
     application for a variety of reasons, therefore the contents of the
     regexp field MUST follow the grammar below:

subst_expr   = delim-char ere delim-char repl delim-char *flags
delim-char   = "/" / "!" / ... (Any non-digit or non-flag character other
               than backslash '\'. All occurances of a delim_char in a
               subst_expr must be the same character.)
ere   = POSIX Extended Regular Expression (see [13], section
               2.8.4)
repl   = dns_str / backref / repl dns_str / repl backref
dns_str   = 1*DNS_CHAR
backref   = "\" 1POS_DIGIT

```
flags         = "i"
DNS_CHAR      = "-" / "0" / ... / "9" / "a" / ... / "z" / "A" / ... / "Z"
POS_DIGIT     = "1" / "2" / ... / "9"  ; 0 is not an allowed backref
```
value domain name (see RFC-1123 [14]).

   The result of applying the substitution expression to the original
   URI MUST result in a string that obeys the syntax for DNS host names
   [14]. Since it is possible for the regexp field to be improperly
   specified, such that a non-conforming host name can be constructed,
   client software SHOULD verify that the result is a legal host name
   before making queries on it.

   Backref expressions in the repl portion of the substitution
   expression are replaced by the (possibly empty) string of characters
   enclosed by '(' and ')' in the ERE portion of the substitution
   expression. N is a single digit from 1 through 9, inclusive. It
   specifies the N'th backref expression, the one that begins with the
   N'th '(' and continues to the matching ')'. For example, the ERE
                     (A(B(C)DE)(F)G)
   has backref expressions:
                     \1 = ABCDEFG
                     \2 = BCDE
                     \3 = C
                     \4 = F
                 \5..\9 = error - no matching subexpression

   The "i" flag indicates that the ERE matching SHALL be performed in a
   case-insensitive fashion. Furthermore, any backref replacements MAY
   be normalized to lower case when the "i" flag is given.

   The first character in the substitution expression shall be used as
   the character that delimits the components of the substitution
   expression. There must be exactly three non-escaped occurrences of
   the delimiter character in a substitution expression. Since escaped
   occurrences of the delimiter character will be interpreted as
   occurrences of that character, digits MUST NOT be used as delimiters.
   Backrefs would be confused with literal digits were this allowed.
   Similarly, if flags are specified in the substitution expression, the
   delimiter character must not also be a flag character.

Advice to domain administrators:
================================

    Beware of regular expressions. Not only are they a pain to get
    correct on their own, but there is the previously mentioned
    interaction with DNS. Any backslashes in a regexp must be entered
    twice in a zone file in order to appear once in a query response.
    More seriously, the need for double backslashes has probably not been
    tested by all implementors of DNS servers. We anticipate that urn.net
    will be the heaviest user of regexps. Only when delegating portions
    of namespaces should the typical domain administrator need to use
    regexps.

    On a related note, beware of interactions with the shell when
    manipulating regexps from the command line. Since '\' is a common
    escape character in shells, there is a good chance that when you
    think you are saying "\\" you are actually saying "\". Similar
    caveats apply to characters such as

    The "a" flag allows the next lookup to be for A records rather than
    SRV records. Since there is no place for a port specification in the
    NAPTR record, when the "A" flag is used the specified protocol must
    be running on its default port.

    The URN Sytnax draft defines a canonical form for each URN, which
    requires %encoding characters outside a limited repertoire. The
    regular expressions MUST be written to operate on that canonical
    form. Since international character sets will end up with extensive
    use of %encoded characters, regular expressions operating on them
    will be essentially impossible to read or write by hand.

Usage
=====

    For the edification of implementers, pseudocode for a client routine
    using NAPTRs is given below. This code is provided merely as a
    convience, it does not have any weight as a standard way to process
    NAPTR records. Also, as is the case with pseudocode, it has never
    been executed and may contain logical errors. You have been warned.

```
  //
  // findResolver(URN)
  // Given a URN, find a host that can resolve it.
  //
  findResolver(string URN) {
    // prepend prefix to urn.net
    sprintf(key, "%s.urn.net", extractNS(URN));
    do {
```

```
      rewrite_flag = false;
      terminal = false;
      if (key has been seen) {
        quit with a loop detected error
      }
      add key to list of "seens"
      records = lookup(type=NAPTR, key); // get all NAPTR RRs for 'key'

      discard any records with an unknown value in the "flags" field.
      sort NAPTR records by "order" field and "preference" field
          (with "order" being more significant than "preference").
      n_naptrs = number of NAPTR records in response.
      curr_order = records[0].order;
      max_order = records[n_naptrs-1].order;

      // Process current batch of NAPTRs according to "order" field.
      for (j=0; j < n_naptrs && records[j].order <= max_order; j++) {
        if (unknown_flag) // skip this record and go to next one
          continue;
        newkey = rewrite(URN, naptr[j].replacement, naptr[j].regexp);
        if (!newkey) // Skip to next record if the rewrite didn't
          match continue;
        // We did do a rewrite, shrink max_order to current value
        // so that delegation works properly
        max_order = naptr[j].order;
        // Will we know what to do with the protocol and services
        // specified in the NAPTR? If not, try next record.
        if(!isKnownProto(naptr[j].services)) {
          continue;
        }
        if(!isKnownService(naptr[j].services)) {
          continue;
        }

        // At this point we have a successful rewrite and we will
        // know how to speak the protocol and request a known
        // resolution service. Before we do the next lookup, check
        // some optimization possibilities.

        if (strcasecmp(flags, "S")
         || strcasecmp(flags, "P"))
         || strcasecmp(flags, "A")) {
          terminal = true;
          services = naptr[j].services;
          addnl = any SRV and/or A records returned as additional
                  info for naptr[j].
        }
        key = newkey;
```

```
          rewriteflag = true;
          break;
      }
    } while (rewriteflag && !terminal);

    // Did we not find our way to a resolver?
    if (!rewrite_flag) {
      report an error
      return NULL;
    }


    // Leave rest to another protocol?
    if (strcasecmp(flags, "P")) {
      return key as host to talk to;
    }

    // If not, keep plugging
    if (!addnl) { // No SRVs came in as additional info, look them up
      srvs = lookup(type=SRV, key);
    }

    sort SRV records by preference, weight, ...
    foreach (SRV record) { // in order of preference
      try contacting srv[j].target using the protocol and one of the
          resolution service requests from the "services" field of the
          last NAPTR record.
      if (successful)
        return (target, protocol, service);
        // Actually we would probably return a result, but this
        // code was supposed to just tell us a good host to talk to.
    }
    die with an "unable to find a host" error;
  }
```

Notes:
======

   - A client MUST process multiple NAPTR records in the order
      specified by the "order" field, it MUST NOT simply use the first
      record that provides a known protocol and service combination.

- If a record at a particular order matches the URI, but the
  client doesn't know the specified protocol and service, the
  client SHOULD continue to examine records that have the same
  order. The client MUST NOT consider records with a higher value
  of order. This is necessary to make delegation of portions of
  the namespace work. The order field is what lets site
  administrators say "all requests for URIs matching pattern x go
  to server 1, all others go to server 2".
  (A match is defined as:
    1) The NAPTR provides a replacement domain name
    or
    2) The regular expression matches the URN
)

- When multiple RRs have the same "order", the client should use
  the value of the preference field to select the next NAPTR to
  consider. However, because of preferred protocols or services,
  estimates of network distance and bandwidth, etc. clients may
  use different criteria to sort the records.
- If the lookup after a rewrite fails, clients are strongly
  encouraged to report a failure, rather than backing up to pursue
  other rewrite paths.
- When a namespace is to be delegated among a set of resolvers,
  regexps must be used. Each regexp appears in a separate NAPTR
  RR. Administrators should do as little delegation as possible,
  because of limitations on the size of DNS responses.
- Note that SRV RRs impose additional requirements on clients.

Acknowledgments:
=================

   The editors would like to thank Keith Moore for all his consultations
   during the development of this draft. We would also like to thank
   Paul Vixie for his assistance in debugging our implementation, and
   his answers on our questions. Finally, we would like to acknowledge
   our enormous intellectual debt to the participants in the Knoxville
   series of meetings, as well as to the participants in the URI and URN
   working groups.

References:
===========

   [1]   Sollins, Karen and Larry Masinter, "Functional Requirements
         for Uniform Resource Names", RFC-1737, Dec. 1994.

   [2]   The URN Implementors, Uniform Resource Names: A Progress Report,
         http://www.dlib.org/dlib/february96/02arms.html, D-Lib Magazine,
         February 1996.

[3] Moats, Ryan, "URN Syntax", RFC-2141, May 1997.

[4] Gulbrandsen, A. and P. Vixie, "A DNS RR for specifying
     the location of services (DNS SRV)", RFC-2052, October 1996.

[5] Daniel, Jr., Ron, "A Trivial Convention for using HTTP in URN
     Resolution", RFC-2169, June 1997.

[6] URN-WG, "URN Resolution Services", Work in Progress.

[7] Moore, Keith, Shirley Browne, Jason Cox, and Jonathan Gettler,
     Resource Cataloging and Distribution System, Technical Report
     CS-97-346, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, December 1996

[8] Paul Vixie, personal communication.

[9] Crocker, Dave H. "Standard for the Format of ARPA Internet Text
     Messages", RFC-822, August 1982.

[10] Orth, Charles and Bill Arms; Handle Resolution Protocol
     Specification, http://www.handle.net/docs/client_spec.html

[11] Williamson, S., M. Kosters, D. Blacka, J. Singh, K. Zeilstra,
     "Referral Whois Protocol (RWhois)", RFC-2167, June 1997.

[12] Information Retrieval (Z39.50): Application Service Definition
     and Protocol Specification, ANSI/NISO Z39.50-1995, July 1995.

[13] IEEE Standard for Information Technology - Portable Operating
     System Interface (POSIX) - Part 2: Shell and Utilities (Vol. 1);
     IEEE Std 1003.2-1992; The Institute of Electrical and
     Electronics Engineers; New York; 1993. ISBN:1-55937-255-9

[14] Braden, R., "Requirements for Internet Hosts - Application and
     and Support", RFC-1123, Oct. 1989.

[15] Sollins, Karen, "Requirements and a Framework for URN Resolution
     Systems", November 1996, Work in Progress.

Security Considerations
=======================

    The use of "urn.net" as the registry for URN namespaces is subject to
    denial of service attacks, as well as other DNS spoofing attacks. The
    interactions with DNSSEC are currently being studied. It is expected
    that NAPTR records will be signed with SIG records once the DNSSEC
    work is deployed.

    The rewrite rules make identifiers from other namespaces subject to
    the same attacks as normal domain names. Since they have not been
    easily resolvable before, this may or may not be considered a
    problem.

    Regular expressions should be checked for sanity, not blindly passed
    to something like PERL.

    This document has discussed a way of locating a resolver, but has not
    discussed any detail of how the communication with the resolver takes
    place. There are significant security considerations attached to the
    communication with a resolver. Those considerations are outside the
    scope of this document, and must be addressed by the specifications
    for particular resolver communication protocols.

Author Contact Information:
==========================

    Ron Daniel
    Los Alamos National Laboratory
    MS B287
    Los Alamos, NM, USA, 87545
    voice: +1 505 665 0597
    fax: +1 505 665 4939
    email: rdaniel@lanl.gov

    Michael Mealling
    Network Solutions
    505 Huntmar Park Drive
    Herndon, VA 22070
    voice: (703) 742-0400
    fax: (703) 742-9552
    email: michaelm@internic.net
    URL: http://www.netsol.com/