

Current DID Spec PRs and Issues

1st August 2019 - markus@danubetech.com

PR	PROPOSED ACTION FOR FCGS
	NOTE: The actions in this column were discussed and decided during the 2019-08-01 DID Spec and DID Resolution Spec Weekly Meeting)
PR #55 : Allow DID methods without Update and Delete	MERGE (resolve conflicts)
PR #110 : make DID document deterministic	DONT MERGE/NEW PR (Manu added a Do Not Merge note)
PR #168 : Refactor ABNF rules for DIDs and DID References.	REVIEW/CLOSE (maybe superseded by #189 ABNF PR)
PR #179 : Update abstract to build bigger tent / weaken "decentralization" requirement	REPLACE WITH NEW PR BASED ON WG CHARTER LANGUAGE, THEN MERGE
PR #185 : Cleanup terms around "DID scheme"	CLOSE (maybe superseded by #189 ABNF PR)
PR #191 : Add "service-type" DID URL matrix parameter.	DONT MERGE See Generic Matrix Parameters Recommendation
PR #192 : Add "key" DID URL matrix parameter.	DONT MERGE See Generic Matrix Parameters Recommendation

PR #193 : Add "key-type" DID URL matrix parameter.	DONT MERGE See Generic Matrix Parameters Recommendation
PR #194 : Add "version-id" and "version-time" DID URL matrix parameters.	MERGE See Generic Matrix Parameters Recommendation
PR #195 : Add "content-type" and "content-id" DID URL matrix parameters.	DONT MERGE See Generic Matrix Parameters Recommendation
PR #196 : Add "hl" DID URL matrix parameter.	MERGE See Generic Matrix Parameters Recommendation
PR #204 : Implement browser support.	CLOSE
PR #206 : Added 'id' attribute of the 'service' definition for DID doc example	MERGE (maybe Markus raise new separate issue about 'id' attribute)
PR #208 : Add link to spec for discovering DIDs from DNS.	MERGE
PR #209 : Capitalize specification requirements.	MERGE (normative requirements)
PR #210 : Remove untestable requirements.	MERGE (normative requirements)
PR #230 : Add correct Identity Hub ServiceEndpoint format	MERGE AND INCLUDE THIS FIX
PR #232 : Remove NPM packaging support.	MERGE
PR #234 : added section on interop	NOT MERGE (NEEDS ANOTHER PASS)

	(came out of WG Charter work)
PR #237 : Fix delegates section link.	DONT MERGE (maybe remove that line)
PR #239 : moved list from charter to spec	MERGE (came out of WG Charter work)
PR #240 : per issue #238, add note about immutability	MERGE
PR #242 : Add `controller` pattern example (also replaces Guardianship).	MERGE

ISSUE	PROPOSED ACTION FOR FCGS
ISSUE #17 : Proposal: Define DDO as "DID Descriptor Object" that can bootstrap into EDO "Entity Descriptor Object"	
ISSUE #29 : Need a way to specify multi-factor key/proof relationships	
ISSUE #37 : Leverage existing RFC7517 to specify cryptographic key	CLOSE (elsewhere: LD Cryptographic Suites)
ISSUE #38 : Leverage RFC7518 to specify cryptographic algorithms	CLOSE (elsewhere: LD Cryptographic Suites)
ISSUE #39 : Replace RsaSignature2017 by a standard JWA signature	CLOSE (elsewhere: LD Cryptographic Suites)
ISSUE #60 : Explain RsaSignature2018	CLOSE (elsewhere: LD Cryptographic Suites)
ISSUE #64 : DID Document versioning	DISCUSS
ISSUE #80 : What happens when you feed a did: URL to a URL resolver?	(move to DID Resolution?)
ISSUE #82 : Fragment identifier semantics are independent of URI scheme	DISCUSS
ISSUE #83 : DID Method discovery mechanism requirement	CLOSE

	(move to DID Resolution?)
ISSUE #84 : Allow DID documents to be retrieved using any URI scheme	(move to DID Resolution?)
ISSUE #96 : Standardize the key revocation list	?
ISSUE #97 : need rationale in spec for fully qualified DID references as the value of "id" fields	
ISSUE #104 : Are service endpoints transport layer or application layer specific?	CLOSE
ISSUE #105 : Definition of a valid value property of a public key is vague.	CLOSE (fixed by https://github.com/w3c-ccg/did-spec/pull/202)
ISSUE #112 : Introduction incorrectly states requirements for DID documents	
ISSUE #115 : [Abstract] The term "DID subject" is used extensively throughout this key paragraph without being defined/introduced	
ISSUE #119 : [Overview] "Because DIDs reside on a distributed ledger" - not true?	
ISSUE #121 : [PURPOSE OF THE SPECIFICATION] Is this draft specification trying to address too many topics when there should be more than 1 spec	
ISSUE #122 : [Motivation for DIDs] should read "how to register, resolve, update, or revoke a DID Entity/DID Document (the latter being the JSON-LD serialization of the former)"	
ISSUE #123 : [Design Goals] all references to *identifier* management etc. should be changed to *DID Entity* management, etc.	
ISSUE #131 : [The Generic DID Scheme] The language in this section contradicts the previous language in the Terminology section	

ISSUE #133 : [Specific DID Method Schemes] Very, very confusing non-recommendation for central registries needs to be removed	
ISSUE #140 : [DID Documents]: Opening sentence is confusing	
ISSUE #143 : [Public Keys] re: referenced keys: Is multiple level recursion allowed?	
ISSUE #147 : [DID Operations] "all the operations required of a CKMS" are not specified on the body of this section	
ISSUE #148 : [Authentication] Is Authentication the correct mechanism for specifying the ownership of a Thing?	
ISSUE #152 : publicKeyJwk, publicKeyHex, publicKeyBase64, publicKeyBase58 missing from context.	CREATE PR
ISSUE #153 : Support "controller" at the top-level of a DID Document	DISCUSS
ISSUE #157 : [Introduction] Is the Purpose of the Draft DID spec clear and correct? Is there a defined Target Audience for the document...	(editorial)
ISSUE #166 : make publicKey section more explicit for understanding of DIDs reliance on public keys	CLOSE
ISSUE #169 : Does the did-spec need to be specific about which parts of the URI RFC it is conformant with?	CLOSE
ISSUE #172 : (Partially) Encrypting DID Documents	DISCUSS
ISSUE #176 : [Validating the draft DID] Which version of the ABNF specification are we claiming conformance with?	CLOSE
ISSUE #182 : Cheap DIDs and the option to migrate DIDs between ledgers using standard DID Deprecation Registries	

ISSUE #198 : Should DID syntax allow an empty "method-specific-id"?	REVIEW / CREATE PR (came out of ABNF work)
ISSUE #199 : Use colon separator or kebab-case for method-specific DID parameter names?	REVIEW / CREATE PR (came out of ABNF work)
ISSUE #200 : Details on the use of method-specific DID parameters	REVIEW / CREATE PR (came out of ABNF work)
ISSUE #205 : Add "DID controller" to "Terminology" section.	CREATE PR
ISSUE #211 : [Abstract] Not sure of the intended meaning of the following sentence...	(editorial)
ISSUE #212 : [Abstract] Not sure of the intended meaning of this sentence...	(editorial)
ISSUE #213 : [Abstract] "proof purposes" is a new term but is not defined anywhere in the document	(editorial)
ISSUE #214 : [Abstract] Rewording...	(editorial)
ISSUE #215 : [Abstract] Clarification...	(editorial)
ISSUE #216 : [Introduction] Clarification...	(editorial)
ISSUE #217 : [Introduction] Rewording...	(editorial)
ISSUE #218 : [Introduction] Clarify...	(editorial)
ISSUE #219 : [Introduction] Rewording...	(editorial)
ISSUE #220 : [Introduction] Doesn't read well...	(editorial)
ISSUE #221 : [Examples] JSON doesn't support comments => most of the Examples are not valid JSON	CREATE PR

ISSUE #222 : [EXAMPLES] DID examples are needed for the following sections...	CLOSE
ISSUE #223 : Is method-specific-id supposed to be equivalent to param-char?	
ISSUE #224 : It would be useful to have `services` as a mapping instead of an `array`	CLARIFY / CLOSE
ISSUE #228 : DID Test Suite and untestable normative statements	(normative requirements)
ISSUE #231 : From DID WG Charter: Highlight points of complexity	PR #239 WILL FIX THIS (came out of WG Charter work)
ISSUE #241 : Update @context URI	PR #246 fixes