

## Main document changes and comments

| Page  | Comment         | Author          | Timestamp            |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Page 1:   | Comment [skw1]  | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 15:44:00 |
| <p>This phrase continues to give problems. Link is the problem word here because I believe it is intended in the sense of a reference or association or named relationship made between resources. Whereas some have taken in it in the sense of a (physical) communications link between resources.</p>  |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 1:   | Comment [skw2]  | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 15:49:00 |
| <p>Identification in the sense of naming( Pat Hayes D sense)... or identification in the sense of an operational method for retrieving representations (C sense)? I read it in the sense of naming objects in the information space but I don't know whether that is strongly (D) or (C).</p>   |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 4:   | Comment [skw3]  | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 16:13:00 |
| <p>Up front I'd like to add the "...anything can be a resource" statement - if that is a concensus. I am minde by <a href="#">Pat Hayes comments</a> "So you might want to say that the real definition of "resource" ought to be anything that can be uniquely *described* using URIs. Then just being directly identified by a URI is like the ground case of a potentially very large recursion."</p>  |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 4:   | Comment [skw4]  | Stuart Williams | 24-Jun-2004 11:33:00 |
| <p>Well... the in line examples go outside the bounds of the travel scenario. I don't think it is used throughtout.</p>   |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 4:   | Comment [skw5]  | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 16:16:00 |
| <p>Nadia seems to be inferring information a bout a resource from its name!</p>   |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 5:   | Comment [skw6]  | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 16:15:00 |
| <p>(C) or (D) sense? I can read both.</p>   |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 5:   | Comment [skw7]  | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 16:18:00 |
| <p>(C) sense</p>  |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 5:   | Comment [skw8]  | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 16:20:00 |
| <p>Representations of what? Resources? Resource State? (to some fidelity)</p>   |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 7:   | Comment [skw9]  | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 16:28:00 |
| <p>Hmmm... this does invite the response... "Oh no it doesn't!" on both counts ☺</p>  |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 8:   | Comment [skw10] | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 16:38:00 |
| <p>(C) and (D) sense problem again. In the (C) sense identification entails a scheme definition that give an operationalised account of how dereference the resource. In the (D) not such account is necessary,although it is useful if the URI c-identifies the thing it denotes (d-identifies).</p>   |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 8:   | Comment [skw11] | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 16:40:00 |
| <p>Give an example of such a change.</p>  |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 9:   | Comment [skw12] | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 16:43:00 |
| <p>I don't understand what this is trying to say.</p>   |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 10:  | Comment [skw13] | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 17:01:00 |
| <p>Informative reference to relevant informational RFC.</p>   |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 10:  | Comment [skw14] | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 17:03:00 |
| <p>Do we have any tame computational linguist (eg. Henry) who would endorse these terms or offer us terms that are generally used in the computational linguistic community?</p>  |                 |                 |                      |
| Page 11:  | Comment [skw15] | Stuart Williams | 23-Jun-2004 17:38:00 |
| <p>I don't think that I quite take this definition as is. Error Recovery involves that use of some strategy that is explicitly aware that an error has occurred. Ie. the continued processing in some sense is a contingency for a possible error condition that has been anticipated. It is not that the error is simply ignored and the agent continues. The continuation (in a recovery situation) is dealing with the fact that the error occurred.</p> |                 |                 |                      |

|  |                        |                             |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 11: Comment [skw16]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>23-Jun-2004 17:39:00</b> |
| Suggest replace "transparent" with "visible".  |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 11: Comment [skw17]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>23-Jun-2004 17:42:00</b> |
| ..with URI? (joke)   |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 11: Comment [skw18]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>23-Jun-2004 17:42:00</b> |
| s/message/status code/   |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 12: Comment [skw19]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>23-Jun-2004 17:44:00</b> |
| sequencing constraints   |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 12: Comment [skw20]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>23-Jun-2004 17:50:00</b> |
| I think I'd make the point that protocols promote interoperability while API's promote application/implementation portability. Both are important. The two become entangled when message content contains scripts or behaviours that the recipient is expected to execute. To be interoperable the script writer has to assume the existence of a run-time environment and may have to probe for the existence of API features in order to be fully interoperable. |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 12: Comment [skw21]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 10:28:00</b> |
| I'd delete this sentence entirely. It opens up big philosophical questions. "reasonable extent" is also very fuzzy.  |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 12: Inserted</b>   | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 10:28:00</b> |
| .  |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 12: Comment [skw22]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 10:36:00</b> |
| If this is a reference to URIs then it is a "single global system of identifiers". It is not clear to me that we have a "single global identification mechanism".  |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 12: Comment [skw23]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 10:37:00</b> |
| I'd amend this to "the more it is used consistently.   |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 12: Comment [skw24]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 10:38:00</b> |
| Avoid the 'mechanism' word.  |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 12: Comment [skw25]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 10:41:00</b> |
| Is the sense of 'link to' here the same as 'refer to'? Again possibly taking 'link' in a physical rather than a referring sense.   |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 13: Comment [skw26]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 10:49:00</b> |
| I feel uncomfortable with this phrasing. URI are the identifiers of the Web. A la Eng 90 it should be possible to refer to any (web) resource by URI. I don't understand how "agents provide". Somehow as association arises between an identifier and a thing. That may be through deployment or it may be denotational.  |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 13: Comment [skw27]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 10:51:00</b> |
| Expunge 'mechanisms'. Suggest "Other systems of identifiers..."  |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 13: Comment [skw28]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 10:55:00</b> |
| This makes sense only for Pat Hayes (C) sense of identifies ie. where the URI is used for resource retrieval/access.<br>Personally, I am also not sold on the context-freeness of URI usage.   |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 13: Comment [skw29]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 10:56:00</b> |
| I'm wondering if we can speak of an association between an identifier and a resource and avoid the tar-pit of assignment and authority?  |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 13: Comment [skw30]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 10:59:00</b> |
| This is flippant and dismissive - I'd delete it. I can speak of my paternal grandmother without naming her - but she is identified wrt to a named object (me).   |                        |                             |

**Page 14: Deleted** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:00:00**

they are using

**Page 14: Inserted** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:00:00**

used in making the reference

**Page 14: Deleted** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:04:00**

license applications to apply

**Page 14: Inserted** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:04:00**

specify equivalence

**Page 14: Deleted** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:06:00**

licenses applications

**Page 14: Inserted** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:06:00**

allows agents

**Page 14: Deleted** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:06:00**

licensed

**Page 14: Inserted** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:06:00**

specified

**Page 14: Comment [skw31]** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:08:00**

I find the notion of specificiations licensing... grates. I've lightly edited such that specifications specify.

**Page 14: Deleted** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:08:00**

parties

**Page 14: Inserted** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:08:00**

agents

**Page 14: Deleted** **Stuart Williams** **24-Jun-2004 11:09:00**

[assert that two URIs identify the same resource](#)

|                          |                        |                             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Inserted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:09:00</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

[conclude that two URIs identify the same resource](#)

|                         |                        |                             |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Deleted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:09:00</b> |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

assignment

|                          |                        |                             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Inserted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:09:00</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

association

|                         |                        |                             |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Deleted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:10:00</b> |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

for

|                          |                        |                             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Inserted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:10:00</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

with

|                         |                        |                             |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Deleted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:10:00</b> |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

produce

|                          |                        |                             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Inserted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:10:00</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

associate with

|                         |                        |                             |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Deleted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:10:00</b> |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

for

|                         |                        |                             |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Deleted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:12:00</b> |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

create

|                          |                        |                             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Inserted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:12:00</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

associate

|                         |                        |                             |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Deleted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:12:00</b> |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

for

|                          |                        |                             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Inserted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:12:00</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

with

|                                 |                        |                             |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 14: Comment [skw32]</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:15:00</b> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

I find myself wanting to say simply "Agents SHOULD not associate arbitrarily different URI with the same resource". Resources/URI 'owners' form associations through deployment. However, other URI users may form different associations. There is a (C)/(D) difference here.

|                                 |                        |                             |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 15: Comment [skw33]</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:16:00</b> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

Need to check with 2396bis too.

|                                 |                        |                             |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 15: Comment [skw34]</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:18:00</b> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

This is basically that agents that exchange URI should use URI they are given as given, character for character. Assignment is irrelevant to this GPN.

|                         |                        |                             |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 15: Deleted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:18:00</b> |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

connect

|                          |                        |                             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 15: Inserted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:18:00</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

associate

|                                 |                        |                             |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 15: Comment [skw35]</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:36:00</b> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

(C) or (D) sense? Is it the case that a given URI both c-identifies and d-identifies the same one thing? The possibility of URI overloading acknowledged here suggests that this is already not the case.

|                                 |                        |                             |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 15: Comment [skw36]</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:38:00</b> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

How?!!! Where is an agent to get such a definitive account? And how is it to get such a thing without using the URI in question?

|                                 |                        |                             |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 16: Comment [skw37]</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:41:00</b> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

What properties? Substantiate the claim!

|                                 |                        |                             |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 16: Comment [skw38]</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:43:00</b> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

How local? Local to what? Can there be global policies. Eg. a mailto: URI used as the object of foaf:mailbox statement (inverseFunctional).

|                         |                        |                             |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 16: Deleted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:40:00</b> |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

licensed

|                          |                        |                             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 16: Inserted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:40:00</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

specified

|                                 |                        |                             |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 16: Comment [skw39]</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:51:00</b> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

Ownership confers rights and obligations. I think we should address URI and Resource ownership from that POV. We may then find that we have a problem with concepts of ownership.

|                                 |                        |                             |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 16: Comment [skw40]</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:47:00</b> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

I think that 'create' here is a problem word. How do agents create URI. They use them. They associate them with things... but how do they 'create' them?

|   |                        |                             |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 16: Comment [skw41]</b>   | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:55:00</b> |
| I don't think any of the relevant specs. confer authority on anyone. There are RFCs about how register things with IANA, and some authority (somewhere) is conferred on IANA, presumably to make registrations. RFC2396 doesn't, the scheme specs don't... There is an element of social policy here that is orthogonal to the technology specifications. |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 16: Comment [skw42]</b>   | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:47:00</b> |
| What is a unique relationship? 1-1, 1-N, N-1?   |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 16: Comment [skw43]</b>   | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:47:00</b> |
| What is a social entity?  |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 16: Comment [skw44]</b>   | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 11:58:00</b> |
| You appear to be using ownership and authority nearly synonymously. I think we need to say that authority may be vested in a specification, and organisational entity or an individual person or agent.   |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 17: Comment [skw45]</b>   | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 12:02:00</b> |
| I don't understand what this is trying to say.  |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 17: Comment [skw46]</b>   | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 12:07:00</b> |
| "New URI schemes SHOULD NOT be introduced when an existing scheme provides the desired properties...." Or stated more positively "Use existing URI schemes whenever possible."  |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 18: Comment [skw47]</b>   | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 12:12:00</b> |
| Is this the right place for this comment. It seems more general to URI than to URI schemes.   |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 19: Deleted</b>   | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 12:13:00</b> |

licensed

|                          |                        |                             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 19: Inserted</b> | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 12:13:00</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|

allowed

|  |                        |                             |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Page 19: Comment [skw48]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 12:17:00</b> |
| I know this is picky and I keep returning to it. The language in the spec says that "mailto URI are used to designate internet mailboxes." It is not a closed defn, though it may have meant to have been. However it is not restrictive - its says that they are used to designate internet mailboxes. It does not say that they are not/may not be used to designate other things. |                        |                             |
| <b>Page 20: Comment [skw49]</b>  | <b>Stuart Williams</b> | <b>24-Jun-2004 12:26:00</b> |
| (D) sense of identify.   |                        |                             |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Header and footer changes</b>          |
| <b>Text Box changes</b>                   |
| <b>Header and footer text box changes</b> |
| <b>Footnote changes</b>                   |
| <b>Endnote changes</b>                    |