

Handling Long Lines in Inclusions in Internet-Drafts and RFCs

draft-ietf-netmod-artwork-folding

NETMOD WG
IETF 104 (Prague)

Since IETF 103

- Clarified that the algorithm (and script) is for a single instance of a `<sourcecode>` or `<artwork>` inclusion.
- Clarified that the algorithm is expected to be applied to each `<sourcecode>` and `<artwork>` inclusion in a draft.
- Added an "Applicability Statement" to say that
 - the algorithm MAY be used outside of IETF drafts
 - for IETF drafts, the algorithm is primarily for
 - `xml2rfc v3 <sourcecode>` elements
 - `xml2rfc v2 <artwork>` element
- Added YANG tree diagrams, and ASCII art in general, to the lists of unsuitable content types.
- Replaced the manual folding example (Section 8.5) with an XML document.
- Modified the script so it is itself no longer folded.
- Myriad of editorial updates.

Issues

1. Fix for the overloaded use of the word "artwork"?
2. Also have a single-backslash ('\') option?
3. Also have End markers?

1. Fix for the overloaded use of the word "artwork"?

This draft has been using the word "artwork" somewhat loosely.

From an email thread entitled "Line width in formats other than plain-text"

Kent:

That said, since we haven't officially moved to v3 yet, the reference to "artwork" in the draft title primarily reflects the v2 sense of the <artwork> element more so than the v3 sense of it.

Henrik:

Ack, but 1) it's easy to make the wrong association at the start of reading, and 2) I think fitting this idea into the toolchain will be substantively easier if we target only v3 output.

Noticing that RFC 7991 refers to "inclusion" several times, as well that the standard XML Inclusions (XInclude) refers to "inclusions" many times, *I switched "artwork" to, depending on the sentence, either "inclusion" or "text [based] content". For instance, new title:*

Handling Long Lines in Inclusions in Internet-Drafts and RFCs

Concerningly, Adrian writes: "I don't really know what an "inclusion" is, but we've been overtaken by XML2RFCv3 and your text on <sourcecode> covers it nicely."

The plan is to move forward with the current language, but are there any comments?

2. Also have a Single-backslash ('\') Option?

Discussed on list, but with no clear consensus...

The proposal is for to support both headers:

1. **NOTE: '\'** line wrapping per BCP XX (RFC XXXX)
 - whereby (i) folding only occurs on max-col and always continue on column 1
 - or, perhaps, (ii) on any column with option indented continuation
2. **NOTE: '\\'** line wrapping per BCP XX (RFC XXXX)
 - whereby folded lines continue after next '\'
 - as it is defined in the current draft

Note, while they look similar, it is sufficient to communicate to both humans and computers how to unfold.

Options:

- A) Leave draft as is (only support #2)
- B) Modify draft to support both #1 and #2
 - If “B” then (i) or (ii)?

3. Also have End Markers?

Discussed at IETF 103, but with no clear consensus...

The proposal is to add a footer:

START: '\\' line wrapping per BCP XX (RFC XXXX)

<folded text content here>

END: '\\' line wrapping per BCP XX (RFC XXXX)

The motivation for wanting to a footer is unclear (and one is not requested by RFC Editor)

1. To aid extractions

- but what about all of the unfolded inclusions?
- and, besides, folks should extract from XML only

2. To help readers

- again, what about all of the unfolded inclusions?
- and, is this even an issue?

Options:

A) Leave draft as is (only support header)

B) Modify draft to support both a header and a footer



Thanks for the input!

