

Guidelines and Registration Procedures for New URI Schemes

draft-ietf-appsawg-uri-scheme-reg-01

Dave Thaler
dthaler@microsoft.com

Status

- Two revisions since last IETF meeting
- 8 open tickets
- 3 of them were discussed earlier but left open pending W3C feedback
 - #16: Scheme prefix registration (or not)
 - #17: Reserve “.” in future scheme names to mean it embeds a domain name
 - #19: FCFS for Provisional (still Expert Review for Permanent/Historical)
 - Draft -01 contains text for #17 and #19 with crefs
- Liaison sent to W3C to solicit feedback on draft

#28: domain schemes and ownership change

- RFC 4395 encouraged, and draft currently requires, putting domain name in private use (unregistered) scheme names to avoid collisions
- Andrew asked: What happens if the domain name changes ownership?
 - Domain names aren't "permanent", but scheme names are

A) Nothing, so collisions are possible

- but at least it's "private use", and provides an incentive to register as Provisional

B) Scheme names transition with domain name

- but there's no natural process for this

C) Don't use domain name in private use scheme names

- how do you avoid collisions? Embed UUIDs (aka GUIDs)?
- how do you identify owner in the usual case?

#25: URI scheme name conflict contradiction

RFC 4395 section 3 (Provisional Registrations):

- 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.

RFC 4395 section 5.2 (Registration Procedures):

- IANA checks the current registry for a entry with the same name; if such a registry exists, **IANA rejects the registration request.**

Q1) How fix contradiction?

Strawman: IANA should send request to IESG (but see Q4) before rejecting.

Q2) Does the 'note' approval process apply *only* to Provisional requests or Historical/Permanent too?

Strawman: Any.

Q3) It doesn't say if the "existing" entry must also be Provisional.

Strawman: Could be any, so conflicting use could have different status (e.g. Historical).

#18: Approver of conflicting scheme name use

Q4) Must the IESG do it, why not the Designated Expert?

A) IESG

B) IESG if either is Permanent, else Designated Expert

C) Designated Expert

Want to scale to potentially large number of Provisional registrations

#16: Scheme prefixes (1/2)

- Last IETF we had rough consensus in the room on:
 - Don't allow registering a scheme prefix,
 - But we need W3C feedback before closing issue
- Newer discussion points...
- Use case 1: Triggering collision process
 - Say the IETF has Permanent schemes “coap+ws”, “coap+sms”, etc., using a “coap+<foo>” convention.
 - If another org sends a Provisional request for “coap+foo”, should a conflict approval process be triggered?
 - If yes, need a way to maintain a list of such prefixes OR a convention (like “+”) to denote it.
 - Strawman: No

#16: Scheme prefixes (2/2)

- Use case 2: Avoiding collisions among large numbers of private use schemes

Type	Approx. # of schemes
Registered by first party	114
Registered by us during 3 rd party experiment	74
Private use by Xbox Live (ms-xbl-<guid>)	6873

- Private use dwarfs registered use in terms of # schemes
- Negligible incentive to register *all* such schemes
- Strawman: register at least one, and let guid handle collision avoidance?