

# Guidelines and Registration Procedures for New URI Schemes

~~draft-ietf-iri-4395bis-irireg-04~~

draft-thaler-appsawg-uri-scheme-reg-00

Dave Thaler

dthaler@microsoft.com

# Problem statement presented last time (draft-thaler-uri-scheme-reg-ps-01)

- **Most URI schemes today are not registered**
- Goals of IANA registry from RFC 4395:
  - 1) Discover names and defining docs
  - 2) Discourage collisions
  - 3) Discern conventions and avoid confusion with existing schemes
  - 4) Encourage registration via low bar for Provisional
- Current goals are not being met
  - Do we change the goals or change the process or both?
- RFC 5218: success most likely if benefits aligned with costs
  - #2 (discourage collisions) is the only goal benefiting the new applicant

# Another (unstated) benefit of current process

- Improve compliance with guidelines/recommendations (and thus interop with generic URI parsers etc.)
  - But we're not getting that for unregistered schemes
  - And we're not getting it for third-party registrations

# Why don't people register schemes today?

Various reasons including...

- Unaware of reasons to do so, or even possibility
- Belief that a unique enough name is sufficient to avoid collision
- Takes too long / too late to make any changes
- No desire to make a defining doc public (or maybe even to write one to begin with)

# #19: Expert Review vs FCFS for Provisional

- Proposal: FCFS for Provisional (keep Permanent as Expert Review)
  - Rationale: Still meets all goals, addresses some reasons to not register, and scales better
- This gives up the property NOT stated as a goal in RFC 4395:
  - Improve compliance with guidelines/recommendations (and interop with generic URI parsers)
  - We're not getting that today anyway with unregistered/third-party reg
- Some have proposed Expert Review *after* registration
- Questions:
  - What would Expert Review provide that wouldn't disincent further registration?
  - How could this scale if we actually got most schemes to register?

# #23: Lowering the bar for Provisional registration

- How can we reduce effort to get a Provisional registration without conflicting with goals?
- Some possibilities:
  1. Don't require a defining document for Provisional registration
    - Rationale: disincentivizes applications, and we don't get one for 3<sup>rd</sup>-party ones anyway
  2. Move some template fields like Security Considerations into the defining document instead of the template request itself (ticket [#24](#))
    - Rationale: we don't get useful values for third-party ones today anyway
  3. Replace "RECOMMENDED that Provisional *registration* follow the same guidelines as for Permanent registration" with statement for defining document author
    - Rationale: wrong audience. E.g., third-party registrant can't do so.

# #16: Scheme prefix registration/delegation

- Use of prefix already allowed RFC 4395 section 2.8:  
“Organizations that desire a private name space for URI scheme names are encouraged to use a prefix based on their domain name, expressed in reverse order.”
- But not registered
- Some known uses of prefixes not based on domain name (“web+”, “ms-”, etc.)
- Proposal: Allow registering a prefix, with Expert Review required
- Rationale:
  - Helps meet all 4 goals, compared to unregistered use
  - Scales better if prefix is IANA registered and full schemes are not

## #17: Prefixes looking like reversed domain names

- Are strings that look like reversed FQDNs *reserved* for use as such?
- Example: "iris.beep" exists today. What if there's a gTLD applicant for ".iris"?
- Appurl.org giving guidance to use forward domain names
- Proposal: NEW schemes must not use a "." unless constructed from a reversed domain name
  - Grandfathered ones should just be kept in mind by ICANN's application evaluators (some are IETF people we know, so this should already happen)



# Goals, revisited

## 1) Discover names and defining docs

- Problem is that definers don't agree with the goal to discover defining docs
- Third-party registration already allowed and don't have doc anyway
- Proposal: change *doc* discovery goal to be specific to *standards (Permanent)*

## 2) Discourage collisions

- Problem is belief that “unique” (domain name based, or trademarked) names are good enough
- Proposal: admit that domain name based names are unique enough to meet this goal. Encourage registration for everything else.

## 3) Discern conventions and avoid confusion with existing schemes

## 4) Encourage registration via low bar for Provisional

- Problem is belief that process is still too onerous
- Proposal: require much less for Provisional.

# Next steps

- Adopt as WG document?