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) -> DONE**
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~~PR [#168](#): Refactor ABNF rules for DIDs and DID References.~~	~~REVIEW/CLOSE (maybe superseded by [#189](#) ABNF PR)~~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 -> DONE** (maybe superseded by [#189](#) ABNF PR)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 -> DONE** 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 -> DONE** 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 -> DONE** (maybe Markus raise new separate issue about 'id' attribute)
PR #208: Add link to spec for discovering DIDs from DNS.	**MERGE -> DONE**
PR #209: Capitalize specification requirements.	**MERGE -> DONE** (normative requirements)
PR #210: Remove untestable requirements.	**MERGE -> DONE** (normative requirements)
PR #230: Add correct Identity Hub ServiceEndpoint format	**MERGE AND INCLUDE THIS FIX -> DONE**
~~PR #232: Remove NPM packaging support.~~	~~MERGE~~
PR #234: added section on interop	**DONT 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 -> DONE** (came out of WG Charter work)
PR #240: per issue #238, add note about immutability	**MERGE -> DONE**
PR #242: Add `controller` pattern example (also replaces Guardianship).	**MERGE -> DONE**

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 confuding 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: [Absract] "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 **-> DONE** (came out of WG Charter work)
ISSUE #241: Update @context URI	PR #246 fixes