



IETF 80 - Content-Disposition

[Julian Reschke](#), greenbytes

Problem Statement

- As of recent, there was no interop for non-ASCII filenames in Content-Disposition header fields. See <http://greenbytes.de/tech/tc2231/> for the ugly details.
- There was confusion about who is defining what (RFC 2616 vs RFC 2183).
- RFC 2183 contains complicated options that do not make sense in HTTP.

Thus...

- Define in separate spec from the two above, clarifying I18N, removing options, fixing bugs.
- Approved `<blink>2011-03-28</blink>`.
- Firefox, Opera, and Konqueror did implement this for a long time.
- Chrome 9 and IE 9 followed since IETF LC.
- Only one major UA left (just saying).

Why six months between IETF LC and now?

- Some UA vendors wanted to discuss error handling.
- Turns out that in this case, error handling was inconsistent.

Next steps

- Reference from HTTPbis specs?
- Advance to Draft Standard soon?