

RFC 275 WIP: Resolve confusion around "Sourcegraph extensions" vs "Browser extension(s)"

Editor: joel@sourcegraph.com

Status: WIP

Requested reviewers (please review by EOD YYYY-MM-DD): Alicja Suska

Approvals:

Team: Web

Background

Sourcegraph has three browser extensions: Chrome, Firefox, and Safari. We call these browser extensions because that's what Chrome and Safari call them (Firefox = add-ons).

Sourcegraph also has a [registry of extensions](#) that we call Sourcegraph extensions. We call these extensions partly because that's what [VSCode calls theirs](#), and our extensions API takes a lot of similarities from the VSCode API.

Problem

Using the word "extension" for both of these purposes is internally and externally confusing, according to near-constant (2+ times/month) feedback.

Considerations:

We also have the "migration" problem that any changes would need to propagate in both our docs and vocabularies since we've been using these terms for years.

"Extension" as a term is built into [our extensions API](#), meaning that changing the name from Sourcegraph extensions either wouldn't line up with the name of functions in the API, we'd have to rename parts of the API (involving changes across our extensions), or we'd have to support two versions of the API (to avoid the naming inconsistency but also avoid the migration code changes).

Proposal

TODO

Change "Sourcegraph Extensions" to:

- Sourcegraph Integrations

- Andy Schumeister Code host integrations would be one of many categories of integrations. We already link to some extensions from the integrations docs:
<https://docs.sourcegraph.com/integration>.

Change “Browser Extensions” to:

Plugins? (Figma) Better docs/clear use of the words “Browser Extension”?

Definition of success

How do we know if this project was successful? Are there any metrics we need to start tracking? Link to the [delivery plan](#) for customer oriented features.