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Issues Fixed in -01

- #54: Give more details about what 'provisional' status means
- #56: References in 4395bis
- #57: Add some language similar to RFC 3864, section 4.4
Scheme Syntax Consistency for URI<->IRI Conversions

• **Issue #63**, raised by Björn Höhrmann
• Question: What if a scheme allows e.g. “ö”, but not its percent-encoded form (i.e. %c3%b6)
• Simple answer: Such schemes are not allowed (why: IRI->URI conversion won’t work)
• Question: How do we make that happen
Solution Ideas for Issue 63

(1) Define in 4395bis that the necessary percent-encoded variants are automatically included by definition for any character given in a production.

(2) Same as (1), but make this contingent on the scheme definition not doing something else to address the problem more explicitly.

(3) Require in 4395bin that any scheme definition that defines the scheme on the IRI level either include the necessary percent-encoding (explicitly or by a general provision such as in (1) above).

(4) Define in 4395bis that any potential IRI in a given scheme which would be illegal in that scheme when converted to an URI (because the necessary percent-encoded syntax isn't part of the scheme definition) is not part of the IRIs allowed by the scheme.
Naming Issues

• #60: Should we recommend using different ABNF rule names to clarify escaping?
  example in draft-duerst-eai-mailto:
  addr-spec -> addr-spec-enc

• #59: How to reduce the number of "URI/IRI" occurrences

• #62: Change the name of the registry itself
Other Non-Editorial Issues

• #49: Say that fragment identifiers are not scheme-specific
• #51: Make URI/IRI scheme registration template mandatory
• #48: Can schemes set specific length limits? Should RFC4395bis say something about this?
• #55: Decide on the status of 'afs' URI scheme
Editorial Issues

• #61: Remove most historic stuff (references to RFC 2717,...)
• #58: Use colons at end of item titles of registration template