Registry Track

Ege Korkan
Siemens AG

WoT Charter Discussion - 18.01.2023

Goal of this Presentation

- Summarize important points about registry track from W3C Process Document
  - With some interpretation indicated separately
- Give outlook to the future of binding templates, and possibly profiles and introduction mechanisms for discovery

Definition from W3C Process Document

Working Groups can also publish registries in order to document collections of values or other data. These are typically published in a separate registry report, although they can also be directly embedded in Recommendation Track documents as a registry section. Defining a registry requires wide review and consensus, but once set up, changes to registry entries are lightweight and can even be done without a Working Group. See § 6.5 The Registry Track for details.

Meaning

- We can continue as a normal Recommendation/Note
- Include a **Registry Section** in the recommendation/note
- Switch to a **Registry Report**

Overall Structure

A **registry** documents a data set consisting of one or more associated **registry tables**, each table representing an updatable collection of logically independent, consistently-structured **registry entries**.

Analogy: Looking at the binding templates document, the core document is the registry document which has 3 registry tables: protocols, payloads and platforms. Each table has multiple entries, e.g. protocols has HTTP, CoAP etc.

Overall Structure

A registry has three associated components:

- the [registry definition](), defining how the [registry tables]() are structured and maintained
  - Analogy: How to write a protocol in the binding templates

- one or more [registry tables](), holding the data set represented by the [registry]() (the *registry data*)
  - Analogy: 3 tables with list of bindings

- one or more referencing specifications, which make use of the [registry]()
  - Analogy: The individual bindings

Example Registry Report

- **WebCodecs Codec Registry**

§ 3. Audio Codec Registry

codec string	common name	public specification
flac	Flac	FLAC codec registration [WEBCODECS-FLAC-CODEC-REGISTRATION]
mp3	MP3	MP3 WebCodecs Registration [WEBCODECS-MP3-CODEC-REGISTRATION]
mp4a.*	AAC	AAC WebCodecs Registration [WEBCODECS-AAC-CODEC-REGISTRATION]
opus	Opus	Opus WebCodecs Registration [WEBCODECS-OPUS-CODEC-REGISTRATION]
vorbis	Vorbis	Vorbis WebCodecs Registration [WEBCODECS-VORBIS-CODEC-REGISTRATION]
ulaw	u-law PCM	u-law PCM WebCodecs Registration [WEBCODECS-ULAW-CODEC-REGISTRATION]
alaw	A-law PCM	A-law PCM WebCodecs Registration [WEBCODECS-ALAW-CODEC-REGISTRATION]
pcm-*	Linear PCM	Linear PCM WebCodecs Registration [WEBCODECS-PCM-CODEC-REGISTRATION]

§ 4. Video Codec Registry

FLAC WebCodecs Registration

W3C Group Draft Note, 4 January 2023

▼ More details about this document

This version:
https://www.w3.org/TR/2023/DNOTE-webcodecs-flac-codec-registration-20230104/

Latest published version:
https://www.w3.org/TR/webcodecs-flac-codec-registration/

Editor's Draft:
https://w3c.github.io/webcodecs/flac_codec_registration.html

Previous Versions:
https://www.w3.org/TR/2022/DNOTE-webcodecs-flac-codec-registration-20221212/

History:
https://www.w3.org/standards/history/webcodecs-flac-codec-registration

Feedback:
GitHub

Editors:
Paul Adenot (Mozilla)
Bernard Aboba (Microsoft Corporation)

There is also WebCodecs Recommendation

Questions?

Patent Policies

A registry report or registry section is purely documentational, is not subject to the W3C Patent Policy, and *must not* contain any requirements on implementations. For the purposes of the Patent Policy [PATENT-POLICY], any registry section in a Recommendation track document is not a normative portion of that specification.

Interpretation for Binding Templates: If the core document is a registry report, it cannot contain normative parts other than registry definition that applies for individual bindings.

Way Forward

- Core Document: Going for a normal REC track would not allow updating the list of bindings as the time goes on. A new REC publication is necessary even if we publish (separately) just another protocol binding and want to reference it in the core document.
  - Each binding being published as a REC is not the issue, referencing them in the core document is.

Way Forward

- Registry Tables are definitely needed. There are two ways to have them:
  - Binding Templates Core Document goes for REC with 3 registry sections
  - Binding Templates Core Document goes for Registry Track with 3 registry tables

- I do not see a big difference between the two in our case. Updating purely informative text (e.g. what is a binding) needs to be clarified for the registry track.

Questions?