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Topics

• Applicability
• Markup for metadata
• Example tooling
• Editing experience
• How much HTML5?
Applicability

• HTML as output from RFC Editor? Only?
• Internal format for RFC Editor? Only?
• Input format for RFC Editor? Only?
• Edit format? Only?

Put these questions aside for the moment, please
HTML Meta-Data

• Ideal: markup readable by:
  Human +
  <div>Machine</div>

• Lots of choices in this space
  microformats.org
  RDFa
  data-*
  WHATWG microdata (itemprop)

Suggest we don’t pick a “winner”, stay simple for now
CSS Queries

- **element**: Element by name
- **#id**: Only one in the document by design
- **.class**: Multiple answers
- **Internal structure**: 
  `element#id .class`
- **More generic query = liberal receive**
CSS Query Example

```html
<div id='document'>
  <div class='identifiers'>
    <div class='published'>2012-07-30</div>
  </div>
</div>
```

div#document .identifiers .published

= 2012-07-30
Tooling

- html2xml2rfc.xslt (early)
- xml2rfc2html.xslt (needed)
- idemponit (working)
- rfcq (working)

% rfcq '#authors .family-name' draft-hildebrand...
Hildebrand
Editing Experience

• Run idemponit often (-b)
• Do not inline until publish time
• Current HTML parser needs work
• JavaScript + jQuery feels natural
• Doc-specific generators are nice
Open Topic: How much HTML5?

- Do we use HTML5 or HTML4.01?
- Old browsers:
  - Elements that don’t render? (svg)
  - Elements that don’t style? (figcaption)
  - CSS? (content)
- Newer tags = better semantic match
- Older tags = more compatible
HTML vs. other formats

• HTML and XML contain enough data
• Round-trippable (with work)
• Other formats generatable from either
• Most-consumed will be HTML
• Authors likely to want less steps
• Opinion: HTML is better, but XML will work