

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: December 11, 2011

P. Faltstrom, Ed.  
Cisco  
P. Hoffman, Ed.  
VPN Consortium  
June 9, 2011

The Unicode code points and IDNA - Unicode 6.0  
draft-faltstrom-5892bis-05.txt

## Abstract

This memo documents IETF consensus for IDNA derived character properties related to the three code points, existing in Unicode 5.2, that changed property values when version 6.0 was released. The consensus is that no update is needed to RFC 5892 based on the changes made in Unicode 6.0.

## Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on December 11, 2011.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2011 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as

described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	3
1.1. U+0CF1 KANNADA SIGN JIHVAMULIYA . . . . .	3
1.2. U+0CF2 KANNADA SIGN UPADHMANIYA . . . . .	3
1.3. U+19DA NEW TAI LUE THAM DIGIT ONE . . . . .	3
2. IETF Consensus . . . . .	3
3. IANA Considerations . . . . .	3
4. Security Considerations . . . . .	4
5. Acknowledgements . . . . .	4
6. Normative References . . . . .	4
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	4

## 1. Introduction

RFC 5892 [RFC5892] specifies an algorithm that was defined when version 5.0 (later updated to version 5.2) [Unicode5.2] was the current version of Unicode, and it also defines a derived property value based on that algorithm. Unicode 6.0 [Unicode6] has changed GeneralCategory of three code points that were allocated in Unicode 5.2 or earlier. This implies the derived property value differs depending on whether the property definitions used are from Unicode 5.2 or 6.0. These are non-backward-compatible changes as described in section 5.1 of RFC 5892.

The three code points are:

### 1.1. U+0CF1 KANNADA SIGN JIHVAMULIYA

The GeneralCategory for this character changes from So to Lo. This implies that the derived property value changes from DISALLOWED to PVALID.

### 1.2. U+0CF2 KANNADA SIGN UPADHMANIYA

The GeneralCategory for this character changes from So to Lo. This implies that the derived property value changes from DISALLOWED to PVALID.

### 1.3. U+19DA NEW TAI LUE THAM DIGIT ONE

The GeneralCategory for this character changes from Nd to No. This implies that the derived property value changes from PVALID to DISALLOWED.

## 2. IETF Consensus

No change to RFC 5892 is needed based on the changes made in Unicode 6.0.

This consensus does not imply that no changes will be made to RFC 5892 for all future updates of The Unicode Standard.

This RFC is being produced because 6.0 is the first version of Unicode to be released since IDNA2008 was published.

## 3. IANA Considerations

IANA is to update the derived property value registry according to

RFC 5892 and property values as defined in The Unicode Standard version 6.0.

#### 4. Security Considerations

When the algorithm presented in RFC 5892 is applied using the property definitions of Unicode Standard Version 6.0, the result will be different from when it is applied using the property definitions of Unicode 5.2 for the three code points discussed in this document in addition to the changes for code points being unassigned in Unicode 5.2. The three code points are unlikely to occur in internationalized domain names, however, so the security implications of the changes are minor.

#### 5. Acknowledgements

The main contributors are (in alphabetical order) Eric Brunner-Williams, Vint Cerf, Tina Dam, Martin Duerst, John Klensin, Mark Davis, Pete Resnick, Markus Scherer, Andrew Sullivan, Kenneth Whistler and Nicholas Williams.

Not all contributors believe the solution for the issues discussed in this document is optimal.

#### 6. Normative References

[RFC5892] Faltstrom, P., "The Unicode Code Points and Internationalized Domain Names for Applications (IDNA)", RFC 5892, August 2010.

[Unicode5.2] The Unicode Consortium, "The Unicode Standard, Version 5.2.0", Unicode 5.0.0, Boston, MA, Addison-Wesley ISBN 0-321-48091-0, as amended by Unicode 5.2.0 <http://www.unicode.org/versions/Unicode5.2.0/>, 2009, <<http://www.unicode.org/versions/Unicode5.2.0/>>.

[Unicode6] The Unicode Consortium, "The Unicode Standard, Version 6.0.0", October 2010.

Authors' Addresses

Patrik Faltstrom (editor)  
Cisco

Email: [paf@cisco.com](mailto:paf@cisco.com)

Paul Hoffman (editor)  
VPN Consortium

Email: [paul.hoffman@vpnc.org](mailto:paul.hoffman@vpnc.org)

