# HTTP Header Registry

DISPATCH - IETF103 Bangkok

### Permanent Message Header Field Names

#### **Registration Procedure(s)**

Expert Review

#### Expert(s)

Graham Klyne

#### Reference

[RFC3864]

#### Note

[RFC5504] specified that no new header fields be registered that begin with "Downgraded-". That restriction is now lifted, per [RFC6857].

#### Note

See section 8.3.1 of [RFC7231] for information on registering new HTTP Header Fields.

#### **Available Formats**



**CSV** 

Header Field Name	Template 🔳	Protocol 🖫	Status 🗵	Reference 🔳
A-IM		http		[RFC4229]
Accept		http	standard	[RFC7231, Section 5.3.2]
Accept-Additions		http		[RFC4229]
Accept-Charset		http	standard	[RFC7231, Section 5.3.3]
Accept-Datetime		http	informational	[RFC7089]
Accept-Encoding		http	standard	[RFC7231, Section 5.3.4][RFC7694, Section 3]
Accept-Features		http		[RFC4229]
Accept-Language		http	standard	[RFC7231, Section 5.3.5]
Accept-Language		mail		[RFC4021]
Accept-Patch		http		[RFC5789]
Accept-Post	perm/accept-post	http	standard	[https://www.w3.org/TR/ldp/]
Accept-Ranges		http	standard	[RFC7233, Section 2.3]
Age		http	standard	[RFC7234, Section 5.1]
Allow		http	standard	[RFC7231, Section 7.4.1]
ALPN		http	standard	[RFC7639, Section 2]
Also-Control		netnews	obsoleted	[RFC1849][RFC5536]
Alt-Svc		http	standard	[RFC7838]
Alt-Used		http	standard	[RFC7838]
Alternate-Recipient		mail		[RFC4021]
Alternates		http		[RFC4229]
Apply-To-Redirect-Ref		http		[RFC4437]
Approved		netnews	standard	[RFC5536]
Archive		netnews	tandard	[RFC5536]
Archived-At		mail	standard	[RFC5064]

[Docs] [txt|pdf] [draft-klyne-msg...] [Tracker] [Diff1] [Diff2]

BEST CURRENT PRACTICE

Network Working Group

Request for Comments: 3864

BCP: 90

Category: Best Current Practice

G. Klyne
Nine by Nine
M. Nottingham
BEA
J. Mogul
HP Labs
September 2004

#### Registration Procedures for Message Header Fields

Status of this Memo

This document specifies an Internet Best Current Practices for the Internet Community, and requests discussion and suggestions for improvements. Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

#### Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004).

#### Abstract

This specification defines registration procedures for the message header fields used by Internet mail, HTTP, Netnews and other applications.

- HTTP
- netnews
- mail
- MIME
- SIP

# Header registry #42



mnot opened this issue on Nov 23, 2017 · 3 comments



exey: I would like you to take this issue to dispatch. If you are suggesting to change the registration procede dispatched.	dure it should

Network Working Group

Internet-Draft

M. Nottingham September 22, 2017

Updates: 3864, 7231 (if approved)
Intended status: Standards Track

Expires: March 26, 2018

# A Registry for HTTP Header Fields

draft-nottingham-httpbis-header-registry-00

# **Abstract**

This document defines a separate IANA registry for HTTP header fields, and establishes the procedures for its operation.

## **Note to Readers**

The issues list for this draft can be found at https://github.com/mnot/I-D/labels/httpbis-header-registry.

The most recent (often, unpublished) draft is at https://mnot.github.io/l-D/httpbis-header-registry/.

Recent changes are listed at https://github.com/mnot/l-D/commits/gh-pages/httpbis-header-registry.

[RFC3864] established common IANA registries for header fields from a variety of protocols. Experience has shown that having a combined registry has few benefits, and creates a number of issues, including:

- Difficulty in evolving the registration process (without coordination with other protocols),
- Registry user confusion, due to the large number of header fields registered,
- Using one expert to review all header field registrations is onerous to that individual,
- Lack of HTTP community involvement / oversight in reviews.

While these issues could be mitigated by a RFC3864bis, it is more straightforward to separate the HTTP registrations out into a separate registry; since there is only slight syntactic similarity between header fields between protocols (and often, the mismatches create confusion), and little semantic overlap, this seems like the best path forward.

Therefore, this document establishes a new HTTP Header Field Registry, defines its procedures, and guides the transition of existing values to it. Doing so effectively removes HTTP header fields from the scope of [RFC3864] and the registries it defines, and updates [RFC7231] Section 8.3 with a new process for managing them.