

Internationalization Review Procedures

Pete Resnick &
Peter Saint-Andre, Chairs
IETF 102

Note Well

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

- By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
- If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
- As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
- Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
- As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (<https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/>) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

- BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
- BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
- BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
- BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
- BCP 78 (Copyright)
- BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)
- <https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/> (Privacy Policy)



Administrivia

- Minutes - <http://etherpad.tools.ietf.org/p/notes-ietf-102-i18nrp>
- Jabber Scribe - <xmpp:i18nrp@jabber.ietf.org?join>
- Blue Sheets
- Agenda Bashing

Agenda (for bashing)

1. Administrivia (2m)
2. Goals and non-goals for the BoF (5m)
3. Current review procedures (5m)
4. Problems with current review procedures (10m)
5. Non-mutually-exclusive (strawman) proposals
 - Internationalization directorate (20m)
 - Internationalization considerations RFC (15m)
6. Next steps and action items (5m)

Goals & Non-Goals

- Better understand the problem space of i18n reviews
- Come to high-level agreement on sustainable solutions; two proposals made on the list:
 - i18n review team
 - i18n considerations RFC
- Figure out how to handle larger i18n initiatives

Current Review Topics

- Character sets
- UTF-8 and other encodings
- Internationalized domain names (IDNs)
- Handling and comparison of non-DNS textual strings & protocol identifiers
- Security implications (e.g., authorization)
- Etc.

Documents Needing Review

- Non-i18n Internet-Drafts that touch on the aforementioned topics
- Relatively straightforward applications of existing i18n technologies (e.g., RFCs 8398/8399)
- Thornier i18n issues such as those discussed in:
 - draft-faltstrom-unicode11
 - draft-freytag-troublesome-characters
 - draft-klensin-idna-5892upd-unicode70
 - draft-klensin-idna-rfc5891bis

What Currently Triggers a Review?

- Best case: spec authors / WG chairs reach out early (example: LAMPS WG -> RFCs 8398/8399)
- Typical case: Area Directors flag issues during IESG review
- Worst case: review doesn't happen at all

Who Currently Does Reviews?

- We have 5-10 people with good competence in internationalization
- Someone reaches out to one or more of them (author, chair, AD)
- One or more of them informally provide feedback based on their understanding of the issues

Problems with Current Procedures

- We don't reliably identify documents needing review
- Often we identify issues only late in the process
- We have a small number of reviewers and they do not function as a team
- We're not training new reviewers or educating spec authors systematically
- Other?

Proposal for an i18n Directorate: Scope

- Review non-i18n I-Ds for common issues
- Provide guidance on applications of existing i18n technologies (cf. LAMPS WG)
- Help solve thornier i18n issues
 - This work might border on a design team?

Proposal for an i18n Directorate: Processes

- Don't review every I-D (à la Gen-ART)
- Triage function to identify documents needing review (criteria and tools TBD)
- Where necessary, review documents as a team to share knowledge and perspectives (à la some expert review teams)

Proposal for an i18n Directorate: Participation

- Small team to start (~5 people?)
- Team should formulate a strategy for recruiting and training new members

Proposal for an i18n RFC

- Audience: people with basic i18n knowledge
- Not an introductory tutorial
- Describe key issue and principles for reviews (document the “oral tradition”)
- Do not mandate an “Internationalization Considerations” section in all RFCs

Conclusions

- Sense of the room regarding:
 - i18n directorate
 - i18n RFC
- Next steps
- Action items