4395bis irireg

Tony Hansen, Larry Masinter, Ted Hardie

IETF 82, Nov 16, 2011

MAJOR	
#70	RFC 2119 language in Section 3.1 of 4395bis
#79	Change controller for provisional registrations
#97	Provisional schemes de-asssignment
#98	Registry format
#99	New schemes should make sure query part uses UTF-8
#100	Reduce review period to two weeks?
#106	Restore text about reverse domain name use for private URI/IRI schemes

#70 RFC 2119 language in Section 3.1 of 4395bis

- §3.1

  "New URI/IRI schemes **SHOULD** have clear utility to the broad Internet community, beyond that"

  – Change SHOULD to MUST ?

- Proposal: no change

- Allows registration of more private schema

#79 Change controller for provisional registrations

- §6.4 Author/Change controller:

  "Person (including contact information) authorized to change this, *if a provisional registration*."

- Proposal:

  "Group, person or people (including contact information) authorized to change this.

#97 Provisional schemes de-asssignment

- Should URI/IRI schemes be allowed to be de-assigned by their registrants?
- Proposal: no change
    - Instead of de-assignment, reassign to "historic"

#98   Registry format

- in the IANA considerations section of 4395bis include the description of the registry
  - Claims that it is "required by RFC 5226"

- Proposal: no change
  1. In my reading of 5226 no such language is required
  2. It's pretty obvious that we're using name+value pairs

#99 New schemes should make sure query part uses UTF-8

- Currently, http(s): schemes handle the query part with reference to the "document charset", whereas other schemes such as mailto: handle query parts based on UTF-8. We should say that new schemes should/must choose the later. (It's very difficult to introduce exceptions for new schemes.)

- Proposal: no change
  - The query part is not part of the scheme definition

#100   Reduce review period to two weeks?

- "It works on another list with the same expert. IANA or expert can always bounce a request if they feel that it needs more tuning"

- Proposal: ????
  What is consensus?

#73　Decide on organization-specific schemes
#106　　　　Restore text about reverse domain name use for private URI/IRI schemes

- #73: remove the text on using reverse domain name registrations

- #106: restore the removed text

- Note: there is at least one such registration now, com-eventbrite-attendee

- Proposal: no change

MINOR
#60   Should we recommend using different ABNF rule names to clarify escaping?
#64   Disallow registration of URI schemes with generic names 'uri', 'url', etc.
#69   Several issues in Introduction of 4395bis
#73   Decide on organization-specific schemes
#74   Resolving ambiguous registrations
#75   Historical registrations and RFC 2119 lang
#77   Change controller in IESG-approved schemes specs
#82   Use of ":" in scheme specs
#83   Create registration revision field in the template
#84   No retroactivity

#60 Should we recommend using different ABNF rule names to clarify escaping

- "When defining an URI/IRI scheme, in many cases rule names are taken from an existing spec, and prose explains that certain characters have to be escaped. It may be helpful to recommend explicitly changing rule names so that it is clear that the escaped (in the scheme spec) and unescaped (in the preexisting protocol spec) rules are not exactly the same."

- Proposal: ????

  What is consensus?

#64 Disallow registration of URI schemes with generic names 'uri', 'url', etc.

- §3.8:
  - Avoid using names that are either very general purpose or associated in the community with some other application or protocol. Avoid scheme names that are overly general or grandiose in scope (e.g., that allude to their "universal" or "standard" nature.)
  - Clarify by saying that such URI scheme names as, for example, 'uri', 'url', 'iri', etc. SHALL NOT be registered
- Proposal: Add sentence,
  - In particular, scheme names such as uri, url and iri MUST NOT be registered.

#69 Several issues in Introduction

- §1 change this sentence:
  - *From:* [RFC3987] introduced IRIs by defining a mapping between URIs and IRIs; [RFC3987bis] updates that definition, allowing an IRI to be interpreted directly without translating into a URI.
  - *To:* [RFC3987] introduced IRIs by extending the character range allowed for URIs from ASCII to Universal Character Set (UCS); [RFC3987bis] updates that definition to suit IRIs' current usage.
  - Reason: "I actually don't see RFC 3987 requiring an IRI to be translated to URI under any circumstances. Current implementations of IRIs, under RFC 3987, work perfectly without mapping any IRI to URI."
- Proposal: ????

  What is consensus?

#69 Several issues in Introduction

- §1 change this sentence
  - *From:* reserving the term "URN" explicitly for those **URIs/IRIs** using the "urn" scheme name ([RFC2141]).
  - *To:* reserving the term "URN" explicitly for those **URIs** using the "urn" scheme name ([RFC2141]).
  - Reason: RFC 2141 doesn't allow 'urn' IRIs, not they exist at all.
- Proposal: no change
- Reason: statement is technically accurrate, even if 2141 didn't call them IRIs

#74 Resolving ambiguous registrations

- §4:
  - (In the unfortunate case that there are multiple, different uses of the same scheme name, the IESG may approve a request to modify an existing entry to note the separate use.)
  - I don't really think this may be necessary (probably for the sake of robustness, but...). Maybe I'm wrong, but I don't know whether there are some schemes which have different usage.
- Proposal: no change

#75 Historical registrations and RFC 2119 lang

- §5:
  - Any scheme that is no longer in common use MAY be designated as historical
  - "I suppose "SHOULD" is more appropriate here. But RFC 2119 might also be inappropriate to be used here as well, and "should" may be OK as well."
- Proposal: no change

#77 Change controller in IESG-approved schemes specs

- §6.3:
  - In cases where the original definition of the scheme is contained in an IESG-approved document, update of the specification also requires IESG approval.
  - "I suppose you should have clearly mentioned that the Standards Track document MUST have IESG as the change controller"
- Proposal: add parenthetical clause
  - "(IESG is the change controller)"

#82   Use of ":" in scheme specs

- §3.8 should prescribe that the ":" character should not occur in URI scheme name, as eg. in RFC 6196.

- 6196 erroneously referred to the "mailserver:" URI scheme, which is technically inaccurate.

- Proposal: Add a note along the lines of:
  - Note, per the syntax of URI scheme names, the ":" is not part of the scheme name.

#83 Create registration revision field in the template

- §6.4, registration template. Won't this be useful to add a new field "registration information" with the contents as for URN namespaces RFC3406 appendix A?
  - Registration Information: This is information to identify the particular version of registration information:
    - registration version number: starting with 1, incrementing by 1 with each new version
    - registration date: date submitted to the IANA, using the format outlined in [ISO8601]: YYYY-MM-DD

- Proposal: ????

  What is consensus?

#84   No retroactivity

- The document should be clear that its recommendations don't have retroactivity; those RI schemes which weren't suited to IRIs, as being registered before it, shouldn't be used with IRIs.

- Proposal: ????

What is consensus?

TRIVIAL – fixed		
#71	Typo in ABNF production	<absolute-URI> → <absolute-IRI>
#72	Another typo in ABNF production	<scheme-specific-part> → <hier-part>/<ihier-part>
#76	Fix reference to RFC 5378	RFC 3978 → RFC 5378