

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Obsoletes: [2048](#) (if approved)
Expires: April 19, 2004

N. Freed
Sun Microsystems
J. Klensin
October 20, 2003

**Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part Four: Registration
Procedures
draft-freed-mime-p4-04.txt**

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on April 19, 2004.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

This document specifies various IANA registration procedures for the following MIME facilities:

- o media types,
- o external body access types, and
- o content-transfer-encodings.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Conventions Used In This Document	5
3.	Media Type Registration	6
3.1	Registration Trees and Subtype Names	6
3.1.1	Standards Tree	6
3.1.2	Vendor Tree	6
3.1.3	Personal or Vanity Tree	7
3.1.4	Special x. Tree	7
3.1.5	Additional Registration Trees	8
3.2	Registration Requirements	8
3.2.1	Functionality Requirement	8
3.2.2	Naming Requirements	8
3.2.3	Parameter Requirements	9
3.2.4	Canonicalization and Format Requirements	10
3.2.5	Interchange Recommendations	10
3.2.6	Security Requirements	11
3.2.7	Requirements specific to XML media types	12
3.2.8	Usage and Implementation Non-requirements	12
3.2.9	Publication Requirements	12
3.2.10	Additional Information	13
3.3	Registration Procedure	14
3.3.1	Preliminary Community Review	14
3.3.2	IESG Approval	14
3.3.3	IANA Registration	14
3.3.4	Media Types Reviewer	15
3.4	Comments on Media Type Registrations	15
3.5	Location of Registered Media Type List	15
3.6	IANA Procedures for Registering Media Types	15
3.7	Change Procedures	16
3.8	Registration Template	17
4.	External Body Access Types	18
4.1	Registration Requirements	18
4.1.1	Naming Requirements	18
4.1.2	Mechanism Specification Requirements	18
4.1.3	Publication Requirements	18
4.1.4	Security Requirements	18
4.2	Registration Procedure	19
4.2.1	Present the Access Type to the Community	19
4.2.2	Access Type Reviewer	19
4.2.3	IANA Registration	19
4.3	Location of Registered Access Type List	19
4.4	IANA Procedures for Registering Access Types	19
5.	Transfer Encodings	21
5.1	Transfer Encoding Requirements	21
5.1.1	Naming Requirements	21
5.1.2	Algorithm Specification Requirements	21

5.1.3	Input Domain Requirements	22
5.1.4	Output Range Requirements	22
5.1.5	Data Integrity and Generality Requirements	22
5.1.6	New Functionality Requirements	22
5.1.7	Security Requirements	22
5.2	Transfer Encoding Definition Procedure	23
5.3	IANA Procedures for Transfer Encoding Registration	23
5.4	Location of Registered Transfer Encodings List	23
6.	Security Considerations	24
7.	IANA Considerations	25
8.	Acknowledgements	26
	Normative References	27
	Informative References	28
	Authors' Addresses	28
A.	Grandfathered Media Types	29
B.	Changes made since RFC 2048	30
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements	31

1. Introduction

Recent Internet protocols have been carefully designed to be easily extensible in certain areas. In particular, MIME [[RFC2045](#)] is an open-ended framework and can accommodate additional object types, charsets, and access methods without any changes to the basic protocol. A registration process is needed, however, to ensure that the set of such values is developed in an orderly, well-specified, and public manner.

This document defines registration procedures which use the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) as a central registry for such values. Of particular interest is the registration procedure for media types described in [Section 3.3](#).

Note

Registration of charsets for use in MIME is specified in [[RFC2798](#)] and is no longer addressed by this document.

Historical Note

The media types registration process was initially defined for the purpose of registering media types for use in the context of the asynchronous Internet mail environment. In this mail environment there is a need to limit the number of possible media types to increase the likelihood of interoperability when the capabilities of the remote mail system are not known. As media types are used in new environments, where the proliferation of media types is not a hindrance to interoperability, the original procedure was excessively restrictive and had to be generalized.

It may still be desirable to restrict for some environments besides mail. Such restrictions are not within the scope of this document. See [Section 3.2.8](#) for additional discussion.

2. Conventions Used In This Document

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [[RFC2119](#)].

3. Media Type Registration

Registration of a new media type or types starts with the construction of a registration proposal. Registration may occur in several different registration trees, which have different requirements as discussed below. In general, the new registration proposal is circulated and reviewed in a fashion appropriate to the tree involved. The media type is then registered if the proposal is acceptable. The following sections describe the requirements and procedures used for each of the different registration trees.

3.1 Registration Trees and Subtype Names

In order to increase the efficiency and flexibility of the registration process, different structures of subtype names may be registered to accomodate the different natural requirements for, e.g., a subtype that will be recommended for wide support and implementation by the Internet Community or a subtype that is used to move files associated with proprietary software. The following subsections define registration "trees", distinguished by the use of faceted names (e.g., names of the form "tree.subtree...subtype"). Note that some media types defined prior to this document do not conform to the naming conventions described below. See [Appendix A](#) for a discussion of them.

3.1.1 Standards Tree

The standards tree is intended for types of general interest to the Internet Community. Registrations in the standards tree **MUST** be approved by the IESG and **MUST** correspond to a formal publication by a recognized standards body. In the case of registrations for the IETF itself, the registration **MUST** be published as an RFC.

Media types in the standards tree are normally denoted by names that are not explicitly faceted, i.e., do not contain period (".", full stop) characters.

The "owner" of a media type registration in the standards tree is assumed to be the standards body itself. Modification or alteration of the specification requires the same level of processing (e.g., standards track) required for the initial registration.

3.1.2 Vendor Tree

The vendor tree is used for media types associated with commercially available products. "Vendor" or "producer" are construed as equivalent and very broadly in this context.

A registration may be placed in the vendor tree by anyone who has need to interchange files associated with the particular product. However, the registration formally belongs to the vendor or organization producing the software or file format. Changes to the specification will be made at their request, as discussed in subsequent sections.

Registrations in the vendor tree will be distinguished by the leading facet "vnd.". That may be followed, at the discretion of the registration, by either a media subtype name from a well-known producer (e.g., "vnd.mudpie") or by an IANA-approved designation of the producer's name which is then followed by a media type or product designation (e.g., vnd.bigcompany.funnypictures).

While public exposure and review of media types to be registered in the vendor tree is not required, using the ietf-types@iana.org mailing list for review is strongly encouraged to improve the quality of those specifications. Registrations in the vendor tree may be submitted directly to the IANA.

3.1.3 Personal or Vanity Tree

Registrations for media types created experimentally or as part of products that are not distributed commercially may be registered in the personal or vanity tree. The registrations are distinguished by the leading facet "prs.".

The owner of "personal" registrations and associated specifications is the person or entity making the registration, or one to whom responsibility has been transferred as described below.

While public exposure and review of media types to be registered in the personal tree is not required, using the [ietf-types](mailto:ietf-types@iana.org) list for review is strongly encouraged to improve the quality of those specifications. Registrations in the personal tree may be submitted directly to the IANA.

3.1.4 Special x. Tree

For convenience and symmetry with this registration scheme, subtype names with "x." as the first facet may be used for the same purposes for which names starting in "x-" are normally used. These types are unregistered, experimental, and should be used only with the active agreement of the parties exchanging them.

However, with the simplified registration procedures described above for vendor and personal trees, it should rarely, if ever, be necessary to use unregistered experimental types, and as such use of

both "x-" and "x." forms is discouraged.

Types in this tree MUST NOT be registered.

3.1.5 Additional Registration Trees

From time to time and as required by the community, the IANA may, by and with the advice and consent of the IESG, create new top-level registration trees. It is explicitly assumed that these trees may be created for external registration and management by well-known permanent bodies, such as scientific societies for media types specific to the sciences they cover. In general, the quality of review of specifications for one of these additional registration trees is expected to be equivalent to registrations in the standards tree. Establishment of these new trees will be announced through RFC publication approved by the IESG.

3.2 Registration Requirements

Media type registration proposals are all expected to conform to various requirements laid out in the following sections. Note that requirement specifics sometimes vary depending on the registration tree, again as detailed in the following sections.

3.2.1 Functionality Requirement

Media types MUST function as an actual media format: Registration of things that are better thought of as a transfer encoding, as a charset, or as a collection of separate entities of another type, is not allowed. For example, although applications exist to decode the base64 transfer encoding [[RFC2045](#)], base64 cannot be registered as a media type.

This requirement applies regardless of the registration tree involved.

3.2.2 Naming Requirements

All registered media types MUST be assigned MIME type and subtype names. The combination of these names then serves to uniquely identify the media type and the format of the subtype name identifies the registration tree.

Type and subtype names beginning with "X-" are reserved for experimental use and MUST NOT be registered.

The choice of top-level type name MUST take the nature of media type involved into account. For example, media normally used for

representing still images should be a subtype of the image content type, whereas media capable of representing audio information should be under the audio content type. See [\[RFC2046\]](#) for additional information on the basic set of top-level types and their characteristics.

New subtypes of top-level types MUST conform to the restrictions of the top-level type, if any. For example, all subtypes of the multipart content type MUST use the same encapsulation syntax.

In some cases a new media type may not "fit" under any currently defined top-level content type. Such cases are expected to be quite rare. However, if such a case does arise a new top-level type can be defined to accommodate it. Such a definition MUST be done via standards-track RFC; no other mechanism can be used to define additional top-level content types.

In accordance with the rules specified in [\[RFC3023\]](#), media subtypes that do not represent XML MIME entities MUST NOT be given a name that ends with the "+xml" suffix.

While it is possible for a given media type to be assigned additional names, the use of different names to identify the same media type is discouraged.

These requirements apply regardless of the registration tree involved.

[3.2.3](#) Parameter Requirements

Media types MAY elect to use one or more MIME content type parameters, or some parameters may be automatically made available to the media type by virtue of being a subtype of a content type that defines a set of parameters applicable to any of its subtypes. In either case, the names, values, and meanings of any parameters MUST be fully specified when a media type is registered in the standards tree, and SHOULD be specified as completely as possible when media types are registered in the vendor or personal trees.

New parameters SHOULD NOT be defined as a way to introduce new functionality in types registered in the standards tree, although new parameters MAY be added to convey additional information that does not otherwise change existing functionality. An example of this would be a "revision" parameter to indicate a revision level of an external specification such as JPEG. Similar behavior is encouraged for media types registered in the vendor or personal trees but is not required.

3.2.4 Canonicalization and Format Requirements

All registered media types **MUST** employ a single, canonical data format, regardless of registration tree.

A precise and openly available specification of the format of each media type **MUST** exist for all types registered in the standards tree and **MUST** at a minimum be referenced by, if it isn't actually included in, the media type registration proposal itself.

The specifications of format and processing particulars may or may not be publically available for media types registered in the vendor tree, and such registration proposals are explicitly permitted to limit specification to which software and version produce or process such media types. References to or inclusion of format specifications in registration proposals is encouraged but not required.

Format specifications are still required for registration in the personal tree, but may be either published as RFCs or otherwise deposited with the IANA. The deposited specifications will meet the same criteria as those required to register a well-known TCP port and, in particular, need not be made public.

Some media types involve the use of patented technology. The registration of media types involving patented technology is specifically permitted. However, the restrictions set forth in [\[RFC2026\]](#) on the use of patented technology in IETF standards-track protocols must be respected when the specification of a media type is part of a standards-track protocol. In addition, other standards bodies making use of the standards tree may have their own rules regarding intellectual property that must be observed in their registrations.

3.2.5 Interchange Recommendations

Media types **SHOULD** interoperate across as many systems and applications as possible. However, some media types will inevitably have problems interoperating across different platforms. Problems with different versions, byte ordering, and specifics of gateway handling can and will arise.

Universal interoperability of media types is not required, but known interoperability issues **SHOULD** be identified whenever possible. Publication of a media type does not require an exhaustive review of interoperability, and the interoperability considerations section is subject to continuing evaluation.

These recommendations apply regardless of the registration tree

involved.

3.2.6 Security Requirements

An analysis of security issues **MUST** be done for all types registered in the standards Tree. A similar analysis for media types registered in the vendor or personal trees is encouraged but not required. However, regardless of what security analysis has or has not been done, all descriptions of security issues **MUST** be as accurate as possible regardless of registration tree. In particular, a statement that there are "no security issues associated with this type" **MUST NOT** be confused with "the security issues associated with this type have not been assessed".

There is absolutely no requirement that media types registered in any tree be secure or completely free from risks. Nevertheless, all known security risks **MUST** be identified in the registration of a media type, again regardless of registration tree.

The security considerations section of all registrations is subject to continuing evaluation and modification, and in particular **MAY** be extended by use of the "comments on media types" mechanism described in [Section 3.4](#) below.

Some of the issues that should be looked at in a security analysis of a media type are:

- o Complex media types may include provisions for directives that institute actions on a recipient's files or other resources. In many cases provision is made for originators to specify arbitrary actions in an unrestricted fashion which may then have devastating effects. See the registration of the application/postscript media type in [[RFC2046](#)] for an example of such directives and how they should be described in a media type registration.
- o All registrations **MUST** state whether or not they employ such "active content", and if they do, they **MUST** state what steps have been taken to protect users of the media type from harm.
- o Complex media types may include provisions for directives that institute actions which, while not directly harmful to the recipient, may result in disclosure of information that either facilitates a subsequent attack or else violates a recipient's privacy in some way. Again, the registration of the application/postscript media type illustrates how such directives can be handled.
- o A media type which employs compression may provide an opportunity

for sending a small amount of data which, when received and evaluated, expands enormously to consume all of the recipient's resources. All media types SHOULD state whether or not they employ compression, and if they do they should discuss what steps need to be taken to avoid such attacks.

- o A media type might be targeted for applications that require some sort of security assurance but not provide the necessary security mechanisms themselves. For example, a media type could be defined for storage of confidential medical information which in turn requires an external confidentiality service, or which is designed for use only within a secure environment.

3.2.7 Requirements specific to XML media types

There are a number of additional requirements specific to the registration of XML media types. These requirements are specified in [\[RFC3023\]](#).

3.2.8 Usage and Implementation Non-requirements

In the asynchronous mail environment, where information on the capabilities of the remote mail agent is frequently not available to the sender, maximum interoperability is attained by restricting the number of media types used to those "common" formats expected to be widely implemented. This was asserted in the past as a reason to limit the number of possible media types and resulted in a registration process with a significant hurdle and delay for those registering media types.

However, the need for "common" media types does not require limiting the registration of new media types. If a limited set of media types is recommended for a particular application, that should be asserted by a separate applicability statement specific for the application and/or environment.

As such, universal support and implementation of a media type is NOT a requirement for registration. If, however, a media type is explicitly intended for limited use, this SHOULD be noted in its registration.

3.2.9 Publication Requirements

Proposals for media types registered in the standards tree by the IETF itself MUST be published as RFCs. RFC publication of vendor and personal media type proposals is encouraged but not required. In all cases the IANA will retain copies of all media type proposals and

"publish" them as part of the media types registration tree itself.

As stated previously, standards tree registrations for media types defined in documents produced by other standards bodies **MUST** be described by a formal standards specification produced by that body. Such specifications **MUST** contain an appropriate media type registration template. Additionally, the copyright on the registration template **MUST** allow the IANA to copy it into the IANA registry.

Other than IETF registrations in the standards tree, the registration of a data type does not imply endorsement, approval, or recommendation by the IANA or the IETF or even certification that the specification is adequate. To become Internet Standards, protocol, data objects, or whatever must go through the IETF standards process. This is too difficult and too lengthy a process for the convenient registration of media types.

The standards tree exists for media types that do require a substantive review and approval process in a recognized standards body. The vendor and personal trees exist for those media types that do not require such a process. It is expected that applicability statements for particular applications will be published from time to time in the IETF that recommend implementation of, and support for, media types that have proven particularly useful in those contexts.

As discussed above, registration of a top-level type requires standards-track processing in the IETF and, hence, RFC publication.

3.2.10 Additional Information

Various sorts of optional information **SHOULD** be included in the specification of a media type if it is available:

- o Magic number(s) (length, octet values). Magic numbers are byte sequences that are always present and thus can be used to identify entities as being of a given media type.
- o File extension(s) commonly used on one or more platforms to indicate that some file containing a given type of media.
- o Macintosh File Type code(s) (4 octets) used to label files containing a given type of media.
- o Information about how fragment/anchor identifiers [[RFC2396](#)] are constructed for use in conjunction with this media type.

In the case of a registration in the standards tree this additional

information MAY be provided in the formal specification of the media type. It is suggested that this be done by incorporating the IANA media type registration form into the specification itself.

3.3 Registration Procedure

The following procedure has been implemented by the IANA for review and approval of new media types. This is not a formal standards process, but rather an administrative procedure intended to allow community comment and sanity checking without excessive time delay.

The normal IETF processes should be followed for all IETF registrations in the standards tree, with the posting of an internet-draft being a necessary first step.

Proposed registrations in the standards tree by other standards bodies should be communicated to the IESG (at iesg@ietf.org).

Registrations in the vendor and personal tree should be submitted directly to the IANA.

3.3.1 Preliminary Community Review

In all cases notice of a potential media type registration MAY be sent to the "ietf-types@iana.org" mailing list for review. This mailing list has been established for the purpose of reviewing proposed media and access types.

The intent of the public posting is to solicit comments and feedback on the choice of type/subtype name, the unambiguity of the references with respect to versions and external profiling information, and a review of any interoperability or security considerations. The submitter may submit a revised registration, or abandon the registration completely, at any time.

3.3.2 IESG Approval

Media types registered in the standards tree MUST be approved by the IESG prior to registration.

3.3.3 IANA Registration

Provided that the media type meets all of the relevant requirements and has obtained whatever approval is necessary, the author may submit the registration request to the IANA. Registration requests can be sent to iana@iana.org. A web form for registration requests is also available:

<http://www.iana.org/cgi-bin/mediatypes.pl>

Sending to ietf-types@iana.org does not constitute submitting the registration to the IANA.

When the registration is either part of an RFC publication request or a registration in the standards tree submitted to the IESG, close coordination between the IANA and the IESG means IESG approval in effect submits the registration to the IANA. There is no need for an additional registration request in such cases.

3.3.4 Media Types Reviewer

Registrations submitted to the IANA will be passed on to the media types reviewer. The media types reviewer, who is appointed by the IETF Applications Area Director(s), will review the registration to make sure it meets the requirements set forth in this document. Registrations which do not meet these requirements will be returned to the submitter for revision.

Decisions made by the media types reviewer may be appealed to the IESG as specified in [[RFC2026](#)].

Once a media type registration has passed review the IANA will register the media type and make the media type registration available to the community.

3.4 Comments on Media Type Registrations

Comments on registered media types may be submitted by members of the community to the IANA. These comments will be reviewed by the media types reviewer and then passed on to the "owner" of the media type if possible. Submitters of comments may request that their comment be attached to the media type registration itself, and if the IANA approves of this the comment will be made accessible in conjunction with the type registration itself.

3.5 Location of Registered Media Type List

Media type registrations are listed by the IANA at:

<http://www.iana.org/assignments/media-types/index.html>

3.6 IANA Procedures for Registering Media Types

The IANA will only register media types in the standards tree in response to a communication from the IESG stating that a given

registration has been approved. Vendor and personal types will be registered by the IANA automatically and without any formal review as long as the following minimal conditions are met:

- o Media types MUST function as an actual media format. In particular, charsets and transfer encodings MUST NOT be registered as media types.
- o All media types MUST have properly formed type and subtype names. All type names MUST be defined by a standards-track RFC. All subtype names MUST be unique, must conform to the MIME grammar for such names, and MUST contain the proper tree prefix.
- o Types registered in the personal tree MUST either provide a format specification or a pointer to one.
- o All media types MUST have a reasonable security considerations section. (It is neither possible nor necessary for the IANA to conduct a comprehensive security review of media type registrations. Nevertheless, the IANA has the authority to identify obviously incompetent material and return it to the submitter for revision.)
- o Registrations in the standards tree MUST satisfy the additional requirement that they originate from the IETF itself or from another standards body recognized as such by the IETF.

3.7 Change Procedures

Once a media type has been published by the IANA, the owner may request a change to its definition. The descriptions of the different registration trees above designate the "owners" of each type of registration. The same procedure as would be appropriate for the original registration request is used to process a change request.

Changes should be requested only when there are serious omissions or errors in the published specification. When review is required, a change request may be denied if it renders entities that were valid under the previous definition invalid under the new definition.

The owner of a media type may pass responsibility to another person or agency by informing the IANA and the ietf-types list; this can be done without discussion or review.

The IESG may reassign responsibility for a media type. The most common case of this will be to enable changes to be made to types where the author of the registration has died, moved out of contact

or is otherwise unable to make changes that are important to the community.

Media type registrations may not be deleted; media types which are no longer believed appropriate for use can be declared OBSOLETE by a change to their "intended use" field; such media types will be clearly marked in the lists published by the IANA.

3.8 Registration Template

To: ietf-types@iana.org

Subject: Registration of MIME media type XXX/YYY

MIME media type name:

MIME subtype name:

Required parameters:

Optional parameters:

Encoding considerations:

Security considerations:

Interoperability considerations:

Published specification:

Applications which use this media type:

Additional information:

 Magic number(s):

 File extension(s):

 Macintosh File Type Code(s):

Person & email address to contact for further information:

Intended usage:

(One of COMMON, LIMITED USE or OBSOLETE)

Author/Change controller:

(Any other information that the author deems interesting may be added below this line.)

4. External Body Access Types

[RFC2046] defines the message/external-body media type, whereby a MIME entity can act as pointer to the actual body data in lieu of including the data directly in the entity body. Each message/external-body reference specifies an access type, which determines the mechanism used to retrieve the actual body data. [RFC 2046](#) defines an initial set of access types, but allows for the registration of additional access types to accommodate new retrieval mechanisms.

4.1 Registration Requirements

New access type specifications MUST conform to a number of requirements as described below.

4.1.1 Naming Requirements

Each access type MUST have a unique name. This name appears in the access-type parameter in the message/external-body content-type header field, and MUST conform to MIME content type parameter syntax.

4.1.2 Mechanism Specification Requirements

All of the protocols, transports, and procedures used by a given access type MUST be described, either in the specification of the access type itself or in some other publicly available specification, in sufficient detail for the access type to be implemented by any competent implementor. Use of secret and/or proprietary methods in access types is expressly prohibited. The restrictions imposed by [\[RFC2026\]](#) on the standardization of patented algorithms must be respected as well.

4.1.3 Publication Requirements

All access types MUST be described by an RFC. The RFC may be informational rather than standards-track, although standard-track review and approval are encouraged for all access types.

4.1.4 Security Requirements

Any known security issues that arise from the use of the access type MUST be completely and fully described. It is not required that the access type be secure or that it be free from risks, but that the known risks be identified. Publication of a new access type does not require an exhaustive security review, and the security considerations section is subject to continuing evaluation. Additional security considerations SHOULD be addressed by publishing revised versions of the access type specification.

4.2 Registration Procedure

Registration of a new access type starts with the the publication of the specification as an internet-draft.

4.2.1 Present the Access Type to the Community

Send a proposed access type specification to the "ietf-types@iana.org" mailing list for a two week review period. This mailing list has been established for the purpose of reviewing proposed access and media types. Proposed access types are not formally registered and must not be used.

The intent of the public posting is to solicit comments and feedback on the access type specification and a review of any security considerations.

4.2.2 Access Type Reviewer

When the two week period has passed, the access type reviewer, who is appointed by the IETF Applications Area Director(s), either forwards the request to iana@iana.org, or rejects it because of significant objections raised on the list.

Decisions made by the reviewer must be posted to the ietf-types mailing list within 14 days. Decisions made by the reviewer may be appealed to the IESG as specified in [[RFC2026](#)].

4.2.3 IANA Registration

Provided that the access type has either passed review or has been successfully appealed to the IESG, the IANA will register the access type and make the registration available to the community. The specification of the access type must also be published as an RFC.

4.3 Location of Registered Access Type List

Access type registrations are listed by the IANA on the web page:

<http://www.iana.org/assignments/access-types>

4.4 IANA Procedures for Registering Access Types

The identity of the access type reviewer is communicated to the IANA by the IESG. The IANA then only acts in response to access type definitions that either are approved by the access type reviewer and forwarded by the reviewer to the IANA for registration, or in

response to a communication from the IESG that an access type definition appeal has overturned the access type reviewer's ruling.

5. Transfer Encodings

Transfer encodings are transformations applied to MIME media types after conversion to the media type's canonical form. Transfer encodings are used for several purposes:

- o Many transports, especially message transports, can only handle data consisting of relatively short lines of text. There can also be severe restrictions on what characters can be used in these lines of text -- some transports are restricted to a small subset of US-ASCII and others cannot handle certain character sequences. Transfer encodings are used to transform binary data into textual form that can survive such transports. Examples of this sort of transfer encoding include the base64 and quoted-printable transfer encodings defined in [[RFC2045](#)].
- o Image, audio, video, and even application entities are sometimes quite large. Compression algorithms are often quite effective in reducing the size of large entities. Transfer encodings can be used to apply general-purpose non-lossy compression algorithms to MIME entities.
- o Transport encodings can be defined as a means of representing existing encoding formats in a MIME context.

IMPORTANT: The standardization of a large numbers of different transfer encodings is seen as a significant barrier to widespread interoperability and is expressly discouraged. Nevertheless, the following procedure has been defined to provide a means of defining additional transfer encodings, should standardization actually be justified.

5.1 Transfer Encoding Requirements

Transfer encoding specifications **MUST** conform to a number of requirements as described below.

5.1.1 Naming Requirements

Each transfer encoding **MUST** have a unique name. This name appears in the Content-Transfer-Encoding header field and **MUST** conform to the syntax of that field.

5.1.2 Algorithm Specification Requirements

All of the algorithms used in a transfer encoding (e.g., conversion to printable form, compression) **MUST** be described in their entirety in the transfer encoding specification. Use of secret and/or

proprietary algorithms in standardized transfer encodings is expressly prohibited. The restrictions imposed by [\[RFC2026\]](#) on the standardization of patented algorithms MUST be respected as well.

[5.1.3](#) Input Domain Requirements

All transfer encodings MUST be applicable to an arbitrary sequence of octets of any length. Dependence on particular input forms is not allowed.

It should be noted that the 7bit and 8bit encodings do not conform to this requirement. Aside from the undesireability of having specialized encodings, the intent here is to forbid the addition of additional encodings similar to or redundant with 7bit and 8bit.

[5.1.4](#) Output Range Requirements

There is no requirement that a particular transfer encoding produce a particular form of encoded output. However, the output format for each transfer encoding MUST be fully and completely documented. In particular, each specification MUST clearly state whether the output format always lies within the confines of 7bit data, 8bit data, or is simply pure binary data.

[5.1.5](#) Data Integrity and Generality Requirements

All transfer encodings MUST be fully invertible on any platform; it MUST be possible for anyone to recover the original data by performing the corresponding decoding operation. Note that this requirement effectively excludes all forms of lossy compression as well as all forms of encryption from use as a transfer encoding.

[5.1.6](#) New Functionality Requirements

All transfer encodings MUST provide some sort of new functionality. Some degree of functionality overlap with previously defined transfer encodings is acceptable, but any new transfer encoding MUST also offer something no other transfer encoding provides.

[5.1.7](#) Security Requirements

To the greatest extent possible transfer encodings SHOULD NOT contain known security issues. Regardless, any known security issues that arise from the use of the transfer encoding MUST be completely and fully described. If additional security issues come to light after initial publication and registration they SHOULD be addressed by publishing revised versions of the transfer encoding specification.

5.2 Transfer Encoding Definition Procedure

Definition of a new transfer encoding starts with the the publication of the specification as an internet-draft. The draft **MUST** define the transfer encoding precisely and completely, and **MUST** also provide substantial justification for defining and standardizing a new transfer encoding. This specification **MUST** then be presented to the IESG for consideration. The IESG can

- o reject the specification outright as being inappropriate for standardization,
- o assign the specification to an existing IETF working group for further work,
- o approve the formation of an IETF working group to work on the specification in accordance with IETF procedures, or,
- o accept the specification as-is for processing as an individual standards track submission.

Transfer encoding specifications on the standards track follow normal IETF rules for standards track documents. A transfer encoding is considered to be defined and available for use once it is on the standards track.

5.3 IANA Procedures for Transfer Encoding Registration

There is no need for a special procedure for registering Transfer Encodings with the IANA. All legitimate transfer encoding registrations **MUST** appear as a standards-track RFC, so it is the IESG's responsibility to notify the IANA when a new transfer encoding has been approved.

5.4 Location of Registered Transfer Encodings List

The list of transfer encoding registrations can be found at:

<http://www.iana.org/assignments/transfer-encodings>

6. Security Considerations

Security requirements for media type registrations are discussed in [Section 3.2.6](#). Security requirements for access types are discussed in [Section 4.1.4](#). Security requirements for transfer encodings are discussed in [Section 5.1.7](#)

7. IANA Considerations

The sole purpose of this document is to define IANA registries for media types, access types, and transfer encodings. The IANA procedures for these registries are specified in [Section 3.6](#), [Section 4.4](#), and [Section 5.3](#) respectively.

8. Acknowledgements

The current authors would like to acknowledge their debt to the late Dr. Jon Postel, whose general model of IANA registration procedures and specific contributions shaped the predecessors of this document. We hope that the current version is one with which he would have agreed but, since it is impossible to verify that agreement, we have regretfully removed his name as a co-author.

Normative References

- [RFC2045] Freed, N. and N. Borenstein, "Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part One: Format of Internet Message Bodies", [RFC 2045](#), November 1996.
- [RFC2046] Freed, N. and N. Borenstein, "Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part Two: Media Types", [RFC 2046](#), November 1996.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC2396] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R. and L. Masinter, "Uniform Resource Identifiers (URI): Generic Syntax", [RFC 2396](#), August 1998.
- [RFC3023] Murata, M., St. Laurent, S. and D. Kohn, "XML Media Types", [RFC 3023](#), January 2001.

Informative References

- [RFC2026] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", [BCP 9](#), [RFC 2026](#), October 1996.
- [RFC2048] Freed, N., Klensin, J. and J. Postel, "Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part Four: Registration Procedures", [BCP 13](#), [RFC 2048](#), November 1996.
- [RFC2798] Smith, M., "Definition of the inetOrgPerson LDAP Object Class", [RFC 2798](#), April 2000.

Authors' Addresses

Ned Freed
Sun Microsystems
1050 Lakes Drive
West Covina, CA 91790
USA

Phone: +1 626 850 4350
EMail: ned.freed@mrochek.com

John C Klensin
1770 Massachusetts Ave, #322
Cambridge, MA 02140

EMail: klensin@jck.com

Appendix A. Grandfathered Media Types

A number of media types, registered prior to 1996, would, if registered under the guidelines in this document, be placed into either the vendor or personal trees. Reregistration of those types to reflect the appropriate trees is encouraged, but not required. Ownership and change control principles outlined in this document apply to those types as if they had been registered in the trees described above.

Appendix B. Changes made since [RFC 2048](#)

- o Much of the document has been clarified in the light of operational experience with these procedures.
- o The unfaceted IETF tree is now called the standards tree and the registration rules for this tree have been relaxed to allow use by other standards bodies.
- o The text describing the media type registration procedure has clarified.
- o The rules and requirements for constructing security considerations sections have been extended and clarified.
- o [RFC 3023](#) is now referenced as the source of additional information concerning the registration of XML media types.
- o Several of the references in this document have been updated to refer to current versions of the relevant specifications.
- o The option of assigning the task of working on a new transfer encoding to an existing working group has been added to the list of possible actions the IESG can take.
- o A note has been added discouraging the assignment of multiple names to a single media type.
- o Security considerations and IANA considerations sections have been added.
- o Concerns regarding copyrights on media type registration templates produced by other standards bodies have been dealt with by requiring that the IANA be allowed to copy the registration template into the registry.

Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in [BCP-11](#). Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementors or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to practice this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assignees.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION

HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF
MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the
Internet Society.