draft-ietf-iri-rfc4395bis-irireg

Tony Hansen, Ted Hardie, Larry Masinter

IETF 81
7/29/2011

11 issues on Issues Tracker

- All 11 closed in tracker
- draft-...-02 posted yesterday

Concurred

- ticket #49 say that fragment identifiers are not scheme-specific

    - added to intro:

    - "A scheme definition cannot override the orverall syntax for IRIs. For example, this means that fragment identifiers (#) cannot be re-used outside the generic syntax restrictions, and in particular scheme-specific syntax cannot override the fragment identifier syntax because it is generic."

Concurred (cont)

- ticket #58 use colons at end of item titles of registration template

  - made consistent

- ticket #51 make uri/iri scheme registration template mandatory

  - agreed: make the registration a MUST

Concurred (cont.)

- ticket #61 remove most historic stuff (references to RFC 2717,...)
  - agreed, introduction rewritten somewhat

- ticket #62 change the name of the registry itself
  - added to IANA considerations

- ticket #63 consistency of scheme syntax definitions for URI<->IRI conversion
  - updated based on consensus at ietf80

Disagreed

- ticket #59 how to reduce the number of URI/IRI occurrences

  - no change

- ticket #60 should we recommend using different ABNF rule names to clarify escaping?

  - no change

Disagreed (continued)

- ticket #64 disallow registration of URI schemes with generic names 'uri','url', etc.

  - disagree -- doesn't need to be spelled out

- ticket #65 - should we allow transition from 'historical' status to others

  - out of scope of iri wg

Disagreed (continued)

- Happiana Mailing List
  - Cross-IETF/W3C design team
    - http://www.w3.org/wiki/FriendlyRegistries
    - happiana@ietf.org
  - Working on generic issues with various IANA registries affecting W3C
    - URI/IRI registries
    - Media types
    - Link Relations
    - HTTP Headers

Issues

- ticket #48 can schemes set specific length limits?

    - If an IRI scheme has specific length limitations, they MUST be specified in terms of Unicode codepoints and not in terms of octets (in any particular encoding).

- However, how do the length restrictions interact with %-encoding?

- Recommend that any length limitations are only considered *after* translation from %-encoding back to Unicode form

finis