

# HTML for RFCs

Background for  
[draft-hildebrand-html-rfc](#)

**Joe Hildebrand**  
RFCFORM, IETF 84 (Vancouver)  
2012-07-31

# 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](http://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

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

div#document .identitfiers .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