

# Early action I-Ds and 8126bis

Amanda Baber

IETF 125 Shenzhen

17 March 2026

# draft-baber-early-registries

---

- For WGs that need to coordinate registrations across I-Ds or with an outside org
- Registry creation/renewal/expiration procedures borrowed from 7120bis
  - Should ADs have to approve changes to registry structure/labels? Does type of change matter?
- Two registration procedures:
  - WG Chair (or Sponsoring AD) Approval: for FCFS/Expert Review/some Spec Req
  - Early Allocation (7120 procedure): for registries that will require RFCs
    - This type not available to I-Ds outside the IETF Stream
    - If a different WG wants an early allocation, should chairs for both WGs have to approve?
- Do we need more Security Considerations text? Can IANABIS supply it?
- Given that registries can expire, what happens if the I-D for a registration is approved before the I-D for the registry?

# 7120bis: Early Allocation for SDOs

- For SDOs that need Specification Required codepoints, but can't publish without values
  - renewal process non-trivial - want to be fairly sure org will publish.
- Need to create "IESG-Recognized Standards-Related Organizations" registry
  - Repurpose media type org registry at <https://www.iana.org/assignments/iesg-recognized-organizations>  
?
  - Should IESG have the option to approve only for specific registries?
    - If there's no "applicable registries" field, reusing the registry means grandfathering all the standards-tree media type orgs
- Possible changes in next version:
  - Make these renewable?
  - Retract claim that I-D process is meant for specs at any stage of development, but SDO docs should be nearing

# 7120bis/8126bis: Permanent Allocation for WG I-Ds

- **New question:** is it OK that authors of WG I-Ds can submit requests for permanent FCFS/Expert Review/Specification Required (where applicable) registration without notifying the WG?
  - Should IANA be required to ask WG chairs to confirm that we can process the submission?
  - Non-WG I-Ds would not be affected
  - Would this text belong in 7120bis or 8126bis?

# 8126bis: Specification Required

---

## ● I-Ds:

- Decision: by default, going forward, I-Ds won't qualify for permanent registration, but the WG that creates the registry can declare that they do
  - IETF-stream I-Ds still eligible for 7120 early allocation
  - Non-IETF I-Ds become ineligible until approved for publication
  - If the WG has closed, ADs can decide (and announce to last call list)
- Questions:
  - Does WG decision require an RFC?
  - If an expert has already accepted I-Ds for permanent registration, will they need to get a WG decision before doing it again?
- Request for text:
  - Guidance for WGs/ADs making decision

## ● Purchase-Only Specs:

- OK if they provide a free copy for the expert

- Proposal: the expert can decide that a purchase-only spec isn't appropriate for that registration/registry

# 8126bis: Banning (Most) Suggested Values?

- **New topic:** we tell authors they shouldn't specify values that haven't been assigned yet, but if they must, to mark them "(suggested)" or similar. Should we instead tell them that they have to use one of these options?
  - Request early allocation
  - Add a note like "[NOTE TO IANA: please ask about suggested values]" (not encouraged in FCFS registries?)
  - Suggest a preferred range
  - Suggest values only if that registry already has its own bespoke value-suggestion convention (CORE's "TBC###" – doesn't work for other areas if two registries should have the same value)
- Note: early registry creation should help

# 8126bis: New Items in -01

---

- URN sub-namespace registry creation: points out that accompanying <https://www.iana.org/assignments/params> registration may be required for urn:ietf:foo, urn:ietf:params:foo
  - Subsection needs to be checked for accuracy/phrasing
  - Add reminder that urn:foo:bar needs URN registration?
- Reworded text concerning change control for registries (as opposed to registrations)
- Spec Req subsection: “Common Specification Issues” (I-Ds, purchase-only, pointer to 7120bis for SDOs)
- IANA will go back and add change controller field for RFC Required registries as well as FCFS, Expert Review, Spec Req
  - Should IETF be listed as the change controller for existing registrations made by IETF-stream RFCs, or should that field be left blank, just in case?

# Still Pending

---

- **From IANA:**

- 7120bis: write up SDO decisions/clarification
- 8126bis: update examples (include pointers to more recent IC sections), split more sections into subsections for navigability/readability, remove note proposing “FCFS with URL”

- **Text requests for IANABIS:**

- Early registries: sec cons
- 8126bis: reasons WGs/ADs should/shouldn't accept I-Ds for Spec Req
- 8126bis, if wanted: provisional registrations - how they differ from early allocations, when to make them available
- 8126bis: status field issues - examples of inconsistent term usage across registries