IRI BOF -- Presentation

IETF 76, Hiroshima Japan 11/9/2009 Larry Masinter

History of prior IRI specifications

(10 min)

- 1993: discussions of "internationalized URLs"
- 1997-2001: draft-masinter-url-i18n-00 to -08

 This memo defines two kinds of URLs: nternationalized but hex-encoded URLs (compatible with [RFC-URL-SYNTAX], and 8-bit URLs. For traditional URLs, characters should be translated into UTF8 and then any octet not allowed in RFC-URL-SYNTAX should be hex-encoded. (with Dürst)
- 2002-2005: draft-duerst-iri-00 to -11 2005: RFC 3987
- 2007-2009: draft-duerst-iri-bis-00 to -06
- Topics: translation IRI -> URI, URI -> IRI, characters to avoid, comparison, BIDI

Review of current documents

(15 min)

- draft-duerst-iri-bis-07
 From -06: IRI always processed, not translated
- draft-duerst-mailto-bis-07
 Update in progress
- RFC 4395 ("Guidelines ... new schemes")

Major issues

- IRI as protocol element vs IRI -> URI
- Normative reference to IDNA
- Different levels of "liberal proccessing"

Other documents & committees

(15 min)

- HTML5: WhatWG and W3C HTML WG
 Depends on this work
 Affects browser and OS implementations
 Want "liberal processing rules" in IRI specs
- IETF IDNABIS WG

 Consistency with IRI on host names
- IETF EAI WG

 Consistency with mailto: scheme definition

And please try not to break:

HTTPBIS (http URI scheme), XML Core (LEIRI), ICANN (I18N TLDs), URI itself, Unicode

Charter review

(20 min

- Scope: focus on IRI, mailto:
 No other URI "fixes" or "tweaks"
 Update BCP for I18N but no other requirements
- Goals
 general principles (needed to be explicit)
- Splitting the documents (tactic for speed)
- Explicit Liaisons
 HTML5, IDNA, EAI
- Schedule
 - Aggressive timeline splitting documents helps finish IRI update before EAI
- Other documents for review
 To hum or run, that is the question...