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: internationalized 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

• 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…