

# IDR Code Point Management

John Scudder  
IETF-99, Prague



# Code Points

- Code points that haven't been allocated **MUST NOT** be listed in WG documents
  - They **SHOULD NOT** be in documents targeted to become WG documents
  - Need an exception? Talk to the chairs.
- Can't we stop having this discussion?
  - Believe us, we'd love to.



## But, but...

- Publishing them ad-hoc is better than squatting without publishing!
  - And a broken leg is better than bubonic plague.
- We can't wait for the slow, heavyweight process of getting a code point.
  - Even early allocation requires WG adoption. That's too late!

# Words of Wisdom from RFC 8126



While it is sometimes necessary to restrict what gets registered (e.g., for limited resources such as bits in a byte, or for items for which unsupported values can be damaging to protocol operation), in many cases having what's in use represented in the registry is more important. Overly strict review criteria and excessive cost (in time and effort) discourage people from even attempting to make a registration. If a registry fails to reflect the protocol elements actually in use, it can adversely affect deployment of protocols on the Internet, and the registry itself is devalued.

# Permissive Policies (examples)



- FCFS: web form or email with name, email, descriptive string. Get code point in  $\leq 2$  business days (usually).
- Expert Review: as FCFS, but a “designated expert” gets to sanity-check.

# Restrictive Policies (examples)



- Standards Action: you get your code point when you get your RFC number. (We use this a lot.)
- Specification Required: you get your code point when you provide a “permanent and readily available public specification”. (This often means “an RFC”.)
- Also “RFC Required” and “IETF Review”.



# Early Allocation

- See RFC 7120
- Applies to “registries for which "Specification Required", "RFC Required", "IETF Review", or "Standards Action" policies apply”.
- Major criteria:
  - The format, semantics, processing, and other rules related to handling the protocol entities defined by the code points ... must be adequately described in an Internet-Draft.



# Early Allocation [2]

- Major criteria
  - The specifications of these code points must be stable...
  - The Working Group chairs and Area Directors (ADs) judge that there is sufficient interest in the community for early (pre-RFC) implementation and deployment...

# Early Allocation [3]

- IDR process
  - WG adoption (if you can't get WG adoption, it's hard for Working Group chairs and Area Directors to “judge that there is sufficient interest”).
  - Authors request Early Allocation.
  - Chairs poll IDR list (typically 2 weeks).
  - Chairs request AD approval and then request IANA to allocate.
  - Can be as little as ~3 weeks for whole process.



# Options

- We can double down on our diligence
  - Policing squatting
  - Doing Early Allocation
- We can embrace anarchy
  - Forget policing code points
- We can reclassify some (many?) registries to be permissive
  - IANA is very good at coordinating number spaces. We are... not.
  - Process: write a draft, progress it to RFC.

# Next Steps

- Discuss now at mic
- Discuss on list

