

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: August 27, 2021

J. Arkko  
Ericsson  
C. Jennings  
Cisco  
Z. Shelby  
ARM  
February 23, 2021

Uniform Resource Names for Device Identifiers  
draft-ietf-core-dev-urn-11

## Abstract

This document describes a new Uniform Resource Name (URN) namespace for hardware device identifiers. A general representation of device identity can be useful in many applications, such as in sensor data streams and storage, or equipment inventories. A URN-based representation can be passed along in applications that need the information.

## Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on August 27, 2021.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect

to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	2
2. Requirements language . . . . .	4
3. DEV URN Definition . . . . .	4
3.1. Purpose . . . . .	4
3.2. Syntax . . . . .	5
3.2.1. Character Case and URN-Equivalence . . . . .	6
3.3. Assignment . . . . .	7
3.4. Security and Privacy . . . . .	7
3.5. Interoperability . . . . .	7
3.6. Resolution . . . . .	7
3.7. Documentation . . . . .	7
3.8. Additional Information . . . . .	8
3.9. Revision Information . . . . .	8
4. DEV URN Subtypes . . . . .	8
4.1. MAC Addresses . . . . .	8
4.2. 1-Wire Device Identifiers . . . . .	8
4.3. Organization-Defined Identifiers . . . . .	9
4.4. Organization Serial Numbers . . . . .	9
4.5. Organization Product and Serial Numbers . . . . .	10
4.6. Future Subtypes . . . . .	10
5. Examples . . . . .	10
6. Security Considerations . . . . .	12
6.1. Privacy . . . . .	12
6.2. Validity . . . . .	12
7. IANA Considerations . . . . .	13
8. References . . . . .	13
8.1. Normative References . . . . .	13
8.2. Informative References . . . . .	14
Appendix A. Changes from Previous Versions . . . . .	16
Appendix B. Acknowledgments . . . . .	21
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	21

## 1. Introduction

This document describes a new Uniform Resource Name (URN) [[RFC8141](#)] namespace for hardware device identifiers. A general representation of device identity can be useful in many applications, such as in sensor data streams and storage [[RFC8428](#)], or equipment inventories [[RFC7252](#)], [[I-D.ietf-core-resource-directory](#)].

A URN-based representation can be passed along in applications that need the information. It fits particularly well for protocols mechanisms that are designed to carry URNs [RFC7230], [RFC7540], [RFC3261], [RFC7252]. Finally, URNs can also be easily carried and stored in formats such as XML [W3C.REC-xml-19980210], JSON [RFC8259] or SenML [RFC8428]. Using URNs in these formats is often preferable as they are universally recognized and self-describing, and therefore avoid the need for agreeing to interpret an octet string as a specific form of a MAC address, for instance. Passing URNs may consume additional bytes compared to, for instance, passing 4-byte binary IPv4 addresses, but offers some flexibility in return.

This document defines identifier URN types for situations where no such convenient type already exists. For instance, [RFC6920] defines cryptographic identifiers, [RFC7254] defines International Mobile station Equipment Identity (IMEI) identifiers for use with 3GPP cellular systems, and [RFC8464] defines Mobile Equipment Identity (MEID) identifiers for use with 3GPP2 cellular systems. Those URN types should be employed when such identifiers are transported; this document does not redefine these identifiers in any way.

Universally Unique Identifier (UUID) URNs [RFC4122] are another alternative way for representing device identifiers, and already support MAC addresses as one type of an identifier. However, UUIDs can be inconvenient in environments where it is important that the identifiers are as simple as possible and where additional requirements on stable storage, real-time clocks, and identifier length can be prohibitive. Often, UUID-based identifiers are preferred for general purpose uses instead of MAC-based device URNs defined in this document. The device URNs are recommended for constrained environments.

Future device identifier types can extend the device URN type defined here (see [Section 7](#)), or define their own URNs.

Note that long-term stable unique identifiers are problematic for privacy reasons and should be used with care as described in [RFC7721].

The rest of this document is organized as follows. [Section 3](#) defines the "DEV" URN type, and [Section 4](#) defines subtypes for IEEE MAC-48, EUI-48 and EUI-64 addresses and 1-Wire device identifiers. [Section 5](#) gives examples. [Section 6](#) discusses the security and privacy considerations of the new URN type. Finally, [Section 7](#) specifies the IANA registration for the new URN type and sets requirements for subtype allocations within this type.

## 2. Requirements language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 14 \[RFC2119\] \[RFC8174\]](#) when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

## 3. DEV URN Definition

Namespace Identifier: "dev" requested

Version: 1

Date: 2020-06-24

Registrant: IETF and the CORE working group. Should the working group cease to exist, discussion should be directed to the application area or general IETF discussion forums, or the IESG.

### 3.1. Purpose

Purpose: The DEV URNs identify devices with device-specific identifiers such as network card hardware addresses. DEV URNs are scoped to be globally applicable (see [\[RFC8141\] Section 6.4.1](#)) and, in general, enable systems to use these identifiers from multiple sources in an interoperable manner. Note that in some deployments, ensuring uniqueness requires care if manual or local assignment mechanisms are used, as discussed in [Section 3.3](#).

Some typical DEV URN applications include equipment inventories and smart object systems.

DEV URNs can be used in various ways in applications, software systems, and network components, in tasks ranging from discovery (for instance when discovering 1-Wire network devices or detecting MAC-addressable devices on a LAN) to intrusion detection systems and simple catalogues of system information.

While it is possible to implement resolution systems for specific applications or network locations, DEV URNs are typically not used in a way that requires resolution beyond direct observation of the relevant identifier fields in local link communication. However, it is often useful to be able to pass device identifier information in generic URN fields in databases or protocol fields, which makes the use of URNs for this purpose convenient.

The DEV URN name space complements existing name spaces such as those involving IMEI or UUID identifiers. DEV URNs are expected to be a part of the IETF-provided basic URN types, covering identifiers that have previously not been possible to use in URNs.

### 3.2. Syntax

Syntax: The identifier is expressed in ASCII characters and has a hierarchical structure as follows:

```
devurn = "urn:dev:" body componentpart
body = macbody / owbody / orgbody / osbody / opsboddy / otherbody
macbody = %s"mac:" hexstring
owbody = %s"ow:" hexstring
orgbody = %s"org:" posnumber "-" identifier *( ":" identifier )
osbody = %s"os:" posnumber "-" serial *( ":" identifier )
opsbody = %s"ops:" posnumber "-" product "-" serial *( ":" identifier )
otherbody = subtype ":" identifier *( ":" identifier )
subtype = LALPHA *(DIGIT / LALPHA)
identifier = 1*devunreserved
identifiernodash = 1*devunreservednodash
product = identifiernodash
serial = identifier
componentpart = *( "_" identifier )
devunreservednodash = ALPHA / DIGIT / "."
devunreserved = devunreservednodash / "-"
hexstring = 1*(hexdigit hexdigit)
hexdigit = DIGIT / "a" / "b" / "c" / "d" / "e" / "f"
posnumber = NZDIGIT *DIGIT
ALPHA = %x41-5A / %x61-7A
LALPHA = %x41-5A
NZDIGIT = %x31-39
DIGIT = %x30-39
```

The above syntax is represented in Augmented Backus-Naur Form (ABNF) form as defined in [\[RFC5234\]](#) and [\[RFC7405\]](#). The syntax also copies the DIGIT and ALPHA rules originally defined in [\[RFC5234\]](#), exactly as defined there.

The device identifier namespace includes five subtypes (see [Section 4](#), and more may be defined in the future as specified in [Section 7](#)).

The optional underscore-separated components at the end of the DEV URN depict individual aspects of a device. The specific strings and their semantics are up to the designers of the device, but could be used to refer to specific interfaces or functions within the device.

With the exception of the MAC-address and 1-Wire DEV URNs, each DEV URN may also contain optional colon-separated identifiers. These are provided for extensibility.

There are no special character encoding rules or considerations for conforming with the URN syntax, beyond those applicable for URNs in general [RFC8141], or the context where these URNs are carried (e.g., inside JSON [RFC8259] or SenML [RFC8428]). Due to the SenML RFC 8428 Section 4.5.1 rules, it is not desirable to use percent-encoding in DEV URNs, and the subtypes defined in this specification do not really benefit from percent-encoding. However, this specification does not deviate from the general syntax of URNs or their processing and normalization rules as specified in [RFC3986] and [RFC8141].

DEV URNs do not use r-, q-, or f-components as defined in [RFC8141].

Specific subtypes of DEV URNs may be validated through mechanisms discussed in Section 4.

The string representation of the device identifier URN is fully compatible with the URN syntax.

#### 3.2.1. Character Case and URN-Equivalence

The DEV URN syntax allows both upper and lower case characters. The URN-equivalence of the DEV URNs is defined per [RFC8141] Section 3.1, i.e., two URNs are URN-equivalent if their assigned-name portions are octet-by-octet equal after applying case normalization to the URI scheme ("urn") and namespace identifier ("dev"). The rest of the DEV URN is compared in a case sensitive manner. It should be noted that URN-equivalence matching merely quickly shows that two URNs are definitely the same for the purposes of caching and other similar uses. Two DEV URNs may still refer to the same entity, and not be found URN-equivalent according to the RFC 8141 definition. For instance, in ABNF, strings are case-insensitive (see [RFC5234] Section 2.3), and a MAC address could be represented either with uppercase or lowercase hexadecimal digits.

Character case is not otherwise significant for the DEV URN subtypes defined in this document. However, future subtypes might include identifiers that use encodings such as BASE64, which encode strings in a larger variety of characters, and might even encode binary data.

To facilitate equivalence checks, it is RECOMMENDED that implementations always use lower case letters where they have a choice in case, unless there is a reason otherwise. (Such a reason might be, for instance, the use of a subtype that requires the use of both upper case and lower case letters.)

### 3.3. Assignment

Assignment: The process for identifier assignment is dependent on the used subtype, and documented in the specific subsection under [Section 4](#).

Device identifiers are generally expected to identify a unique device, barring the accidental issue of multiple devices with the same identifiers. In many cases, device identifiers can also be changed by users, or sometimes assigned in an algorithmic or local fashion. Any potential conflicts arising from such assignments are not something that the DEV URNs as such manage; they simply are there to refer to a particular identifier. And of course, a single device may (and often does) have multiple identifiers, e.g., identifiers associated with different link technologies it supports.

The DEV URN type SHOULD only be used for hardware-based identifiers that are expected to be persistent (with some limits, as discussed above).

### 3.4. Security and Privacy

Security and Privacy: As discussed in [Section 6](#), care must be taken in the use of device-identifier-based identifiers due to their nature as long-term identifiers that are not normally changeable. Leakage of these identifiers outside systems where their use is justified should be controlled.

### 3.5. Interoperability

Interoperability: There are no specific interoperability concerns.

### 3.6. Resolution

Resolution: The device identifiers are not expected to be globally resolvable. No identifier resolution system is expected. Systems may perform local matching of identifiers to previously seen identifiers or configured information, however.

### 3.7. Documentation

See RFC NNNN (RFC Editor: Please replace NNNN by a reference to the RFC number of this document).

### 3.8. Additional Information

See [Section 1](#) for a discussion of related name spaces.

### 3.9. Revision Information

Revision Information: This is the first version of this registration.

## 4. DEV URN Subtypes

### 4.1. MAC Addresses

DEV URNs of the "mac" subtype are based on the EUI-64 identifier [[IEEE.EUI64](#)] derived from a device with a built-in 64-bit EUI-64. The EUI-64 is formed from 24 or 36 bits of organization identifier followed by 40 or 28 bits of device-specific extension identifier assigned by that organization.

In the DEV URN "mac" subtype the hexstring is simply the full EUI-64 identifier represented as a hexadecimal string. It is always exactly 16 characters long.

MAC-48 and EUI-48 identifiers are also supported by the same DEV URN subtype. To convert a MAC-48 address to an EUI-64 identifier, The OUI of the MAC-48 address (the first three octets) becomes the organization identifier of the EUI-64 (the first three octets). The fourth and fifth octets of the EUI are set to the fixed value 0xffff (hexadecimal). The last three octets of the MAC-48 address become the last three octets of the EUI-64. The same process is used to convert an EUI-48 identifier, but the fixed value 0xfffe is used instead.

Identifier assignment for all of these identifiers rests within the IEEE Registration Authority.

Note that where randomized MAC addresses are used, the resulting DEV URNs cannot be expected to have uniqueness, as discussed in [Section 3.3](#).

### 4.2. 1-Wire Device Identifiers

The 1-Wire\* system is a device communications bus system designed by Dallas Semiconductor Corporation. 1-Wire devices are identified by a 64-bit identifier that consists of 8 bit family code, 48 bit identifier unique within a family, and 8 bit CRC code [[OW](#)].

\*) 1-Wire is a registered trademark.



In DEV URNs with the "ow" subtype the hexstring is a representation of the full 64-bit identifier as a hexadecimal string. It is always exactly 16 characters long. Note that the last two characters represent the 8-bit CRC code. Implementations MAY check the validity of this code.

Family code and identifier assignment for all 1-Wire devices rests with the manufacturers.

#### 4.3. Organization-Defined Identifiers

Device identifiers that have only a meaning within an organization can also be used to represent vendor-specific or experimental identifiers or identifiers designed for use within the context of an organization.

Organizations are identified by their Private Enterprise Number (PEN) [RFC2578]. These numbers can be obtained from IANA. Current PEN assignments can be viewed at <https://www.iana.org/assignments/enterprise-numbers/enterprise-numbers> and new assignments requested at <https://pen.iana.org/pen/PenApplication.page>.

Note that when included in an "org" DEV URN, the number can not be zero or have leading zeroes, as the ABNF requires the number to start with a non-zero digit.

#### 4.4. Organization Serial Numbers

The "os" subtype specifies an organization and a serial number. Organizations are identified by their PEN. As with the organization-defined identifiers (Section 4.3), PEN number assignments are maintained by IANA, and assignments for new organizations can be made easily.

Historical note: The "os" subtype was originally been defined in the Open Mobile Alliance "Lightweight Machine to Machine" standard [LwM2M], but has been incorporated here to collect all syntax associated with DEV URNs in one place. At the same time, the syntax of this subtype was changed to avoid the possibility of characters that are not allowed in SenML Name field (see [RFC8428] Section 4.5.1).

Organization serial number DEV URNs consist of the PEN number and the serial number. As with other DEV URNs, for carrying additional information and extensibility, optional colon-separated identifiers and underscore-separated components may also be included. The serial numbers themselves are defined by the organization, and this specification does not specify how they are allocated.

Organizations are also encouraged to select serial number formats that avoid possibility for ambiguity, in the form of leading zeroes or otherwise.

#### 4.5. Organization Product and Serial Numbers

The DEV URN "ops" subtype has originally been defined in the LwM2M standard, but has been incorporated here to collect all syntax associated with DEV URNs in one place. The "ops" subtype specifies an organization, product class, and a serial number. Organizations are identified by their PEN. Again, as with the organization-defined identifiers ([Section 4.3](#)), PEN number assignments are maintained by IANA.

Historical note: As with the "os" subtype, the "ops" subtype has originally been defined in OMA.

Organization product and serial number DEV URNs consist of the PEN number, product class, and the serial number. As with other DEV URNs, for carrying additional information and extensibility, optional colon-separated identifiers and underscore-separated components may also be included. Both the product class and serial numbers themselves are defined by the organization, and this specification does not specify how they are allocated.

Organizations are also encouraged to select product and serial number formats that avoid possibility for ambiguity.

#### 4.6. Future Subtypes

Additional subtypes may be defined in other, future specifications. See [Section 7](#).

The DEV URN "example" subtype is reserved for use in examples. It has no specific requirements beyond those expressed by the ABNF in [Section 3.2](#).

### 5. Examples

The following provides some examples of DEV URNs:

urn:dev:mac:0024beffff804ff1	# The MAC-48 address of # 0024be804ff1, converted # to EUI-64 format
urn:dev:mac:0024beffffe804ff1	# The EUI-48 address of # 0024be804ff1, converted # to EUI-64 format
urn:dev:mac:acde48234567019f	# The EUI-64 address of # acde48234567019f
urn:dev:ow:10e2073a01080063	# A 1-Wire temperature # sensor
urn:dev:ow:264437f5000000ed_humidity	# The humidity # part of a multi-sensor # device
urn:dev:ow:264437f5000000ed_temperature	# The temperature # part of a multi-sensor # device
urn:dev:org:32473-foo	# An organization- # specific URN in # the <a href="#">RFC 5612</a> example # organization, 32473.
urn:dev:os:32473-123456	# Device 123456 in # the <a href="#">RFC 5612</a> example # organization
urn:dev:os:32473-12-34-56	# A serial number with # dashes in it
urn:dev:ops:32473-Refrigerator-5002	# Refrigerator serial # number 5002 in the # <a href="#">RFC 5612</a> example # organization
urn:dev:example:new-1-2-3_comp	# An example of something # that is not defined today, # and is not one of the # mac, ow, os, or ops # subtypes

The DEV URNs themselves can then appear in various contexts. A simple example of this is the use of DEV URNs in SenML data. For

example, this example from [\[RFC8428\]](#) shows a measurement from a 1-Wire temperature gauge encoded in the JSON syntax.

```
[
  { "n": "urn:dev:ow:10e2073a01080063", "u": "Cel", "v": 23.1 }
]
```

## 6. Security Considerations

On most devices, the user can display device identifiers. Depending on circumstances, device identifiers may or may not be modified or tampered with by the user. An implementation of the DEV URN MUST preserve such limitations and behaviors associated with the device identifiers. In particular, a device identifier that is intended to be immutable should not become mutable as a part of implementing the DEV URN type. More generally, nothing in this document should be construed to override what the relevant device specifications have already said about the identifiers.

### 6.1. Privacy

Other devices in the same network may or may not be able to identify the device. For instance, on an Ethernet network, the MAC address of a device is visible to all other devices.

DEV URNs often represent long-term stable unique identifiers for devices. Such identifiers may have privacy and security implications because they may enable correlating information about a specific device over a long period of time, location tracking, and device specific vulnerability exploitation [\[RFC7721\]](#). Also, in some systems there is no easy way to change the identifier. Therefore these identifiers need to be used with care and especially care should be taken to avoid leaking them outside of the system that is intended to use the identifiers.

### 6.2. Validity

Information about identifiers may have significant effects in some applications. For instance, in many sensor systems the identifier information is used for deciding how to use the data carried in a measurement report. On some other systems, identifiers may be used in policy decisions.

It is important that systems are designed to take into account the possibility of devices reporting incorrect identifiers (either accidentally or maliciously) and the manipulation of identifiers in communications by illegitimate entities. Integrity protection of

communications or data objects, the use of trusted devices, and various management practices can help address these issues.

The advice from [\[RFC4122\] Section 6](#) also applies: Do not assume that DEV URNs are hard to guess.

## 7. IANA Considerations

This document requests the registration of a new URN namespace for "DEV", as described in [Section 3](#).

IANA is asked to create a "DEV URN Subtypes" registry. The initial values in this registry are as follows:

Subtype	Description	Reference
mac	MAC Addresses	(THIS RFC) <a href="#">Section 4.1</a>
ow	1-Wire Device Identifiers	(THIS RFC) <a href="#">Section 4.2</a>
org	Organization-Defined Identifiers	(THIS RFC) <a href="#">Section 4.3</a>
os	Organization Serial Numbers	(THIS RFC) <a href="#">Section 4.4</a>
ops	Organization Product and Serial Numbers	(THIS RFC) <a href="#">Section 4.5</a>
example	Reserved for examples	(THIS RFC) <a href="#">Section 4.6</a>

Additional subtypes for DEV URNs can be defined through Specification Required or IESG Approval [\[RFC8126\]](#). These allocations are appropriate when there is a new namespace of some type of device identifiers, defined in stable fashion and with a publicly available specification.

Note that the organization ([Section 4.3](#)) device identifiers can also be used in some cases, at least as a temporary measure. It is preferable, however, that long-term usage of a broadly employed device identifier be registered with IETF rather than used through the organization device identifier type.

## 8. References

### 8.1. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.

- [RFC2578] McCloghrie, K., Ed., Perkins, D., Ed., and J. Schoenwaelder, Ed., "Structure of Management Information Version 2 (SMIv2)", STD 58, [RFC 2578](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2578, April 1999, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2578>>.
- [RFC3986] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and L. Masinter, "Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax", STD 66, [RFC 3986](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3986, January 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3986>>.
- [RFC5234] Crocker, D., Ed. and P. Overell, "Augmented BNF for Syntax Specifications: ABNF", STD 68, [RFC 5234](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5234, January 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5234>>.
- [RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 8126](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>>.
- [RFC8141] Saint-Andre, P. and J. Klensin, "Uniform Resource Names (URNs)", [RFC 8141](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8141, April 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8141>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.
- [IEEE.EUI64] IEEE, "Guidelines For 64-bit Global Identifier (EUI-64)", IEEE , unknown year, <<https://standards.ieee.org/content/dam/ieee-standards/standards/web/documents/tutorials/eui.pdf>>.
- [OW] Maxim, "Guide to 1-Wire Communication", MAXIM <https://www.maximintegrated.com/en/design/technical-documents/tutorials/1/1796.html>, June 2008, <<https://www.maximintegrated.com/en/design/technical-documents/tutorials/1/1796.html>>.

## 8.2. Informative References

- [RFC3261] Rosenberg, J., Schulzrinne, H., Camarillo, G., Johnston, A., Peterson, J., Sparks, R., Handley, M., and E. Schooler, "SIP: Session Initiation Protocol", [RFC 3261](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3261, June 2002, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3261>>.

- [RFC4122] Leach, P., Mealling, M., and R. Salz, "A Universally Unique IDentifier (UUID) URN Namespace", [RFC 4122](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4122, July 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4122>>.
- [RFC4648] Josefsson, S., "The Base16, Base32, and Base64 Data Encodings", [RFC 4648](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4648, October 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4648>>.
- [RFC7230] Fielding, R., Ed. and J. Reschke, Ed., "Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP/1.1): Message Syntax and Routing", [RFC 7230](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7230, June 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7230>>.
- [RFC7540] Belshe, M., Peon, R., and M. Thomson, Ed., "Hypertext Transfer Protocol Version 2 (HTTP/2)", [RFC 7540](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7540, May 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7540>>.
- [RFC7721] Cooper, A., Gont, F., and D. Thaler, "Security and Privacy Considerations for IPv6 Address Generation Mechanisms", [RFC 7721](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7721, March 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7721>>.
- [RFC8259] Bray, T., Ed., "The JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) Data Interchange Format", STD 90, [RFC 8259](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8259, December 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8259>>.
- [W3C.REC-xml-19980210]  
Sperberg-McQueen, C., Bray, T., and J. Paoli, "XML 1.0 Recommendation", World Wide Web Consortium FirstEdition REC-xml-19980210, February 1998, <<http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-xml-19980210>>.
- [OUI] IEEE, SA., "Registration Authority", IEEE-SA webpage, 2018, <<http://standards.ieee.org/develop/regauth/oui/>>.
- [RFC7252] Shelby, Z., Hartke, K., and C. Bormann, "The Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP)", [RFC 7252](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7252, June 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7252>>.
- [RFC8428] Jennings, C., Shelby, Z., Arkko, J., Keranen, A., and C. Bormann, "Sensor Measurement Lists (SenML)", [RFC 8428](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8428, August 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8428>>.

- [RFC6920] Farrell, S., Kutscher, D., Dannewitz, C., Ohlman, B., Keranen, A., and P. Hallam-Baker, "Naming Things with Hashes", [RFC 6920](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6920, April 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6920>>.
- [RFC7254] Montemurro, M., Ed., Allen, A., McDonald, D., and P. Gosden, "A Uniform Resource Name Namespace for the Global System for Mobile Communications Association (GSMA) and the International Mobile station Equipment Identity (IMEI)", [RFC 7254](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7254, May 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7254>>.
- [RFC7405] Kyzivat, P., "Case-Sensitive String Support in ABNF", [RFC 7405](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7405, December 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7405>>.
- [RFC8464] Atarius, R., "A URN Namespace for Device Identity and Mobile Equipment Identity (MEID)", [RFC 8464](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8464, September 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8464>>.
- [I-D.ietf-core-resource-directory]  
Amsuess, C., Shelby, Z., Koster, M., Bormann, C., and P. Stok, "CoRE Resource Directory", [draft-ietf-core-resource-directory-26](#) (work in progress), November 2020.
- [LwM2M] "OMA Lightweight Machine to Machine Requirements", OMA Standard Candidate Version 1.2, January 2019.

## [Appendix A](#). Changes from Previous Versions

Editor's note: Please remove this section before publication.

Version -11 was created to address non-blocking comments from the IESG review. This version made the following changes:

- o Removed space after the "%" in the ABNF [RFC 7405](#) syntax.
- o Softened and clarified the recommendation regarding UUIDs in [Section 1](#).
- o Added a paragraph about the impacts of using randomized MAC addresses.
- o Added advice regarding ease of guessing DEV URNs, in [Section 6.2](#).
- o Simplified and clarified the "illegitimate entities" statement in [Section 6.2](#).



- o Clarified the persistence statement in [Section 3.3](#).

Version -10 made the following changes:

- o Restricted the case of "mac", "ow", etc. any subtype to lower case. This required the adoption of [RFC 7405](#) syntax in the ABNF.
- o Added a reserved "example" subtype to be used in examples.
- o Clarified global applicability, particularly in cases with local or manual assignment mechanisms.
- o Corrected byte/bit counts in for 1-Wire identifiers in [Section 4.2](#).
- o Clarified that optional underscore-separated components come at the end of the DEV URN, not just "after the hexstring".
- o Changed the requirement to not use percent-encoding to a preference instead of a hard rule, based on the needs of SenML but not wishing to break rules of [RFC 8141](#).
- o Added a description of tradeoffs involving using URNs instead of some more compact but more specific formats, in [Section 1](#).
- o Several minor corrections to the names in the ABNF.
- o Added a reference for Base64 for clarity.
- o Made the history of the OS and OPS subtypes a part of the permanent text, rather than an editor's note.
- o Updated the 1-Wire reference URL.
- o Some editorial corrections.

Version -09 of the WG draft took into account IANA, SECDIR, Gen-ART, and OPSDIR reviews. The following changes were made:

- o Aligned the use of identifiers vs. identity terms.
- o Added a security considerations subsection on validity of claimed identifiers.
- o Focused on "care" in the [RFC 7721](#) reference, rather than "care and avoidance".

- o Renamed the "unreserved" ABNF terminal to avoid confusion with the general URN ABNF terminal with the same name.
- o Removed the mistakenly included text about MEID subtype.
- o Clarified URN syntax differences and normalization rules wrt the lack of percent-encoding in DEV URNs.
- o Required PEN numbers to start with non-zero digit in the ABNF and changed the associated language later in the draft.
- o Text about case-insensitivity in [RFC 5234](#) was clarified.
- o Text about uniqueness was clarified.
- o Text about global scope was clarified.
- o An example of DEV URN usage in SenML was added.
- o Editorial changes.

Version -08 of the WG draft took into account Barry Leiba's AD review comments. To address these comments, changes were made in

- o Further updates of the upper/lower case rules for the DEV URNs.
- o Further updates to the ABNF.
- o The use of HEXDIG from [RFC 5234](#).
- o IANA considerations for the creation of separate registry for the own parameters of DEV URNs.
- o Editorial improvements.

Version -07 of the WG draft took into account Carsten Bormann's feedback, primarily on character case issues and editorials.

Version -06 of the WG draft took into account Marco Tiloca's feedback before a second WGLC, primarily on further cleanup of references and editorial issues.

Version -05 of the WG draft made some updates based on WGLC input: examples for MAC-48 and EUI-48, clarification with regards to leading zeroes, new recommendation with the use of lower-case letters to avoid comparison problems, small update of the [RFC 8141](#) template usage, reference updates, and editorial corrections.

Version -04 of the WG draft cleaned up the ABNF:

- o Parts of the ANBF now allow for use cases for the component part that were not previously covered: the syntax now allows the character "." to appear, and serial numbers can have dashes in them.
- o The syntax was also extended to allow for extensibility by adding additional ":" separated parts for the org, op, ops, and other subtypes.
- o The ABNF was changed to include directly the ALPHA and DIGIT parts imported from [RFC 5234](#), instead of just having a verbal comment about it. (Note that the style in existing RFCs differs on this.)

In addition, in -04 the MAC example was corrected to use the inserted value ffff instead of fffe, required by [Section 4.1](#), the org example was corrected, the os: examples and otherbody examples were added. The IANA rules for allocating new subtypes was slightly relaxed in order to cover for new subtype cases that are brought up regularly, and often not from inside the IETF. Finally, the allocation of PEN numbers and the use of product classes and serial numbers was better explained.

Version -03 of the WG draft removed some unnecessary references, updated some other references, removed pct-encoding to ensure the DEV URNs fit [\[RFC8428\] Section 4.5.1](#) rules, and clarified that the original source of the "os" and "ops" subtypes.

Version -02 of the WG draft folded in the "ops" and "os" branches of the dev:urn syntax from LwM2M, as they seemed to match well what already existed in this document under the "org" branch. However, as a part of this three changes were incorporated:

- o The syntax for the "org:" changes to use "-" rather than ":" between the OUI and the rest of the URN.
- o The organizations for the "ops" and "os" branches have been changed to use PEN numbers rather than OUI numbers [\[OUI\]](#). The reason for this is that PEN numbers are allocated through a simpler and less costly process. However, this is a significant change to how LwM2M identifiers were specified before.
- o There were also changes to what general characters can be used in the otherbody branch of the ABNF.

The rationale for all these changes is that it would be helpful for the community collect and unify syntax between the different uses of

DEV URNs. If there is significant use of either the org:, os:, or ops: subtypes, then changes at this point may not be warranted, but otherwise unified syntax, as well as the use of PEN numbers would probably be beneficial. Comments on this topic are appreciated.

Version -01 of the WG draft converted the draft to use the new URN registration template from [\[RFC8141\]](#).

Version -00 of the WG draft renamed the file name and fixed the ABNF to correctly use "org:" rather than "dn:".

Version -05 made a change to the delimiter for parameters within a DEV URN. Given discussions on allowed character sets in SenML [\[RFC8428\]](#), we would like to suggest that the "\_" character be used instead of ";", to avoid the need to translate DEV URNs in SenML-formatted communications or files. However, this reverses the earlier decision to not use unreserved characters. This also means that device IDs cannot use "\_" characters, and have to employ other characters instead. Feedback on this decision is sought.

Version -05 also introduced local or organization-specific device identifiers. Organizations are identified by their PEN number (although we considered FQDNs as a potential alternative. The authors believe an organization-specific device identifier type will make experiments and local use easier, but feedback on this point and the choice of PEN numbers vs. other possible organization identifiers would be very welcome.

Version -05 also added some discussion of privacy concerns around long-term stable identifiers.

Finally, version -05 clarified the situations when new allocations within the registry of possible device identifier subtypes is appropriate.

Version -04 is a refresh, as the need and interest for this specification has re-emerged. And the editing author has emerged back to actual engineering from the depths of IETF administration.

Version -02 introduced several changes. The biggest change is that with the NI URNs [\[RFC6920\]](#), it was no longer necessary to define cryptographic identifiers in this specification. Another change was that we incorporated a more generic syntax for future extensions; non-hexstring identifiers can now also be supported, if some future device identifiers for some reason would, for instance, use some kind of encoding such as Base64 [\[RFC4648\]](#). As a part of this change, we also changed the component part separator character from '-' to ';'.

so that the general format of the rest of the URN can employ the unreserved characters [[RFC3986](#)].

Version -03 made several minor corrections to the ABNF as well as some editorial corrections.

## [Appendix B](#). Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Ari Keranen, Stephen Farrell, Christer Holmberg, Peter Saint-Andre, Wouter Cloetens, Jaime Jimenez, Joseph Knapp, Padmakumar Subramani, Mert Ocak, Hannes Tschofenig, Jim Schaad, Thomas Fossati, Carsten Bormann, Marco Tiloca, Barry Leiba, Amanda Baber, Juha Hakala, Dale Worley, Warren Kumari, Benjamin Kaduk, Brian Weis, John Klensin, Dave Thaler, Russ Housley, Dan Romascanu, Eric Vyncke, Roman Danyliw, and Ahmad Muhanna for feedback and interesting discussions in this problem space. We would also like to note prior documents that focused on specific device identifiers, such as [[RFC7254](#)] or [[RFC8464](#)].

### Authors' Addresses

Jari Arkko  
Ericsson  
Jorvas 02420  
Finland

Email: [jari.arkko@piuha.net](mailto:jari.arkko@piuha.net)

Cullen Jennings  
Cisco  
170 West Tasman Drive  
San Jose, CA 95134  
USA

Phone: +1 408 421-9990  
Email: [fluffy@cisco.com](mailto:fluffy@cisco.com)

Zach Shelby  
ARM  
Kidekuja 2  
Vuokatti 88600  
FINLAND

Phone: +358407796297  
Email: [Zach.Shelby@arm.com](mailto:Zach.Shelby@arm.com)