



## The Unicode Consortium Discussion Forum

[Forum Home](#)
[Unicode Home Page](#)
[Code Charts](#)
[Technical Reports](#)
[FAQ Pages](#)
[Forum FAQ](#) - [Smartfeed](#) - [0 new messages](#) - [Search](#) - [Members](#) - [User Control Panel](#) - [Logout \[ Sarasvati \]](#)

Last visit was: Mon Oct 31, 2011 8:36 pm

It is currently Tue Nov 01, 2011 9:48 am

[View unanswered posts](#) | [View active topics](#)
[View new posts](#) | [View your posts](#)
[Board index](#) » [Public Review Discussions](#) » [PRI 185 - Extension of UBA for improved display of URL/IRIs](#)

All times are UTC - 8 hours

### Forum rules

Please click here to view the forum rules

## Summary of previous feedback

[\[ Moderator Control Panel \]](#)
**Page 1 of 1** [ 1 post ]

[Subscribe topic](#) | [Bookmark topic](#) | [Print view](#) | [E-mail friend](#) [Previous topic](#) | [First unread post](#) | [Next topic](#)

#### Author

mark

Forum Admin

**Joined:** Fri Dec 04, 2009

6:13 pm

**Posts:** 28

#### Message

**Post subject:** Summary of previous feedback

 **Posted:** Sun Oct 23, 2011 2:14 pm

The following summarizes feedback that was received before the last UTC. This is just a high-level summary; the authors are invited to go into detail in separate postings. I'll try to write up a summary of new feedback for the UTC in a couple of days, so please add any comments soon.

=====

#### Scope

=====

S1. Any extension needs to be more comprehensive, more than just IRIs.

The committee did alter the PRI text to extend it to the main other types that were felt to be most important in UIs: email addresses and filenames. Note also that the main focus for IRIs is on the schemes in very common usage: http and https.

S2. File name extensions. Extensions like .exe need to be treated as separate fields for the purpose of BIDI.

The committee didn't make any changes for this issue; more feedback is requested.

S3. Escaped characters (%3f) need to be handled.

Some text was added to the PRI for this.

S4. Recent decisions at ICANN are likely to make the list of top-level domains (TLDs) much

bigger and more dynamic than it has been, undermining the technique of recognising TLDs mentioned in the PRI.

The committee discussed this, but considered that the roll-out of significant domain names on the new TLDs was likely to be slow enough that updated versions of the UBA extension would be able to copy with them reasonably.

S5. A malicious author could construct an IRI that was not caught by the extension rules, but that when displayed in the browser's address bar, would look like a different IRI that was.

The committee didn't discuss this issue in detail. (Personal note: I think we should add a clause indicating that an IRI in the address bar containing RTL characters but that was not flagged by the extension should be called out in the UI as being suspicious.)

S6. The UBA shouldn't be changed, because any changes would increase the complexity. While it may make phishing harder in some ways, it would make it easier in others.

See <http://www.unicode.org/forum/viewtopic.php?p=534#p534> for a discussion of the committee's reasoning. Note that the PRI text also added: "The Unicode Technical Committee approaches changes to the UBA very carefully. Any changes must be carefully vetted, because the exact behavior of the UBA is crucial to the appearance of millions of already-published documents and web pages. Thus an extended period of comment and testing is required. Any specification for an extension may be initially characterized as experimental."

=====

#### Display Options

=====

D1. There need to be additional options for display, such as keying the choice of RTL or LTR being whether there was at least one RTL character in the IRI.

The committee added several different options in the PRI for consideration. That one is Option 3.

D2. The options should be judged on the basis of simplicity, and the constant LTR ordering of fields is the simplest and easiest. Basing the choice on a single RTL character would be too sensitive. ...

Basing the direction on the content would have security problems.

WWW.HACKERS.COM/com.bank.www would be displayed as

www.bank.com/MOC.SREKCAH.WWW, the same as

www.bank.com/COM.HACKERS.WWW. Even IRIs that include the schema name suffer

from this problem: <http://WWW.HACKERS.COM?path/boring/and/> ... [www//:http](http://www://http) would

be displayed as <http://www.bank.com/a/very/long/and/bor> ... [WWW//:http](http://WWW//:http), the same

as <http://www.bank.com/a/very/long/and/bor> ... [WWW//:http](http://WWW//:http).

These were taken as votes for Option 1.

D3. Basing the order on the TLD would be the most general, and allow customization for that domain.

That is now Option 4.



Top



Display posts from previous:  Sort by



Page 1 of 1 [ 1 post ]

**Board index » Public Review Discussions » PRI 185 - Extension of UBA for improved display of URL/IRIs**

All times are UTC - 8 hours

**Who is online**

Users browsing this forum: **Sarasvati** and 0 guests

Quick-mod tools:

You **can** post new topics in this forum  
You **can** reply to topics in this forum  
You **can** edit your posts in this forum  
You **can** delete your posts in this forum  
You **can** post attachments in this forum

Search for:

Jump to:

[ Administration Control Panel ]

Powered by phpBB © 2000, 2002, 2005, 2007 phpBB Group  
Template made by DEVPPPL.com