HTTPbis

Charter and Process

"Politics is not the art of the possible. It consists of choosing between the disastrous and the unpalatable."

- attributed to John Kenneth Galbraith

Charter

The working group will refine RFC2616 to:
- Incorporate errata and updates (e.g., references, IANA registries, ABNF)
- Fix editorial problems which have led to misunderstandings of the specification
- Clarify conformance requirements
- Remove known ambiguities where they affect interoperability
- Clarify existing methods of extensibility
- Remove or deprecate those features that are not widely implemented and also unduly affect interoperability
- Where necessary, add implementation advice
- Document the security properties of HTTP and its associated mechanisms (e.g., Basic and Digest authentication, cookies, TLS) for common applications

In doing so, it should consider:
- Implementer experience
- Demonstrated use of HTTP
- Impact on existing implementations and deployments

The Working Group must not introduce a new version of HTTP and should not add new functionality to HTTP. The WG is not tasked with producing new methods, headers, or extension mechanisms, but may introduce new protocol elements if necessary as part of revising existing functionality which has proven to be problematic.

The Working Group's specification deliverables are:

- A document that is suitable to supersede RFC 2616
- A document cataloguing the security properties of HTTP

Goals and Milestones:

Nov 2007 First HTTP Revision Internet Draft

Feb 2008 First HTTP Security Properties Internet Draft

Jun 2008 Request Last Call for HTTP Revision

Jul 2008 Request Last Call for HTTP Security Properties

Oct 2008 Submit HTTP Revision to IESG for consideration as a Draft Standard

Oct 2008 Submit HTTP Security Properties to IESG for consideration as Informational

Process

Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- the IETF plenary session,
- any IETF working group or portion thereof,
- the IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG,
- the IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB,
- any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices,
- the RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 3978 (updated by RFC 4748) and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice.

Please consult RFC 3978 (and RFC 4748) for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.

Opening HTTP Issues

- Send mail with NEW ISSUE in Subject
- Will be added to the issues list as long as
  - it's clearly in-scope, or
  - it may be in scope, and there is interest in discussing it
- Identified as either:
  - editorial
  - design

Closing HTTP Issues

- Editorial issues:
  - Editors change text, informed by WG discussion (if any)
  - WG reviews; if you don't agree, say so
- Design issues:
  - Proposal (anyone, including editors)
  - Consensus (chair)
  - Incorporation (editors)
  - Verification (WG)

Drafts as Checkpoints

- Each draft will have:
  - Summary of issues closed
  - Diff from previous draft
- This give us a paper trail

Interim Meetings

- Weekly (?), brief telephone conference

- Jabber channels

- F2F?

"A protocol spec is worth as much as what implementers get out of it [...] so I'd like to see an ongoing effort that takes the partitioned spec to have an updated compliance test suite. If [httpbis] does not help reduce compliance violation, it may not have been worth the effort.
After all, the goal is not to have a nice-looking cement bag but to ensure that the edifices built out of the cement stand up. "

- Balachander Krishnamurthy