PNG WG Meeting Minutes

Dec 13th, 2021

Attendees:

(Alphabetical order, black text means attended, red text means missed.)
Chris Blume
Chris Lilley
Chris Seeger
Leonard Rosenthol
Pierre-Anthony Lemieux

Topics & Minutes:

- Should we accept the private APNG chunks as part of the standard? Should we have public chunks but mention that private chunks are commonly used? (Would that effectively be accepting private chunks?) How does this affect the definition of the public/private chunk attribute?
    - CL: Public chunks are either part of the standard or part of the registered extensions. https://w3c.github.io/PNG-spec/extensions/Overview.html
    - CL: However, the issue as brought up is correct. APNG was proposed as private chunks because at the time that was the correct thing to do.
    - CL: We don't gain anything by creating public APNG chunks that no one has incentive to use. We should perhaps standardize the private chunk in this case.
    - CB: I agree.
    - PAL: We should update the definition to note exceptions are allowed. And should we change the definition? Perhaps private chunks can be overlapped.
    - CL: Mime types also have this public/private overlap issue.
    - PAL: The spec perhaps should say private has unclear content but should still be registered.
    - CB: The existing bit never protected against two private companies having name conflicts. That was always a hole in the standard.
    - PAL: So the registry fixes that.
    - CB: Would the registry process be too much work? Would a namespace type solution (such as seen in CSS) be better?
    - PAL: We can make the registry near-zero.
    - CB: Would a company want to hide their chunks and not register?
    - PAL: If so, the company would be on its own anyway.

- CB: So it sounds like we agree on accepting private chunks, updating the public/private attribute definition to allow exceptions (and perhaps list them), and have a registry where people should register their private chunks.
- CB: 10-years from now, if all chunks are registered, no one will care about public/private anyway, right? Should we just go ahead and remove that definition?
- PAL: I agree that it would no longer be important. Perhaps the public attribute could be reserved for use in the standard. The registry should list "You shall not use a public attribute." The paragraph should link to the registry.
- No objections.

- CB: Any other issues?
- PAL: The spec doesn't use Bikeshed or ReSpec, right?
- CL: The existing spec is old and is written in HTML.
- PAL: It might be straight-forward to move to ReSpec.
- CB: I'm happy to learn these and work on the conversion if this is the preferred method.
- PAL: If we do this, it gets us closer to passing the publication rules checker.

Action Items:

- CL to edit PNG spec to clarify on private/public.
- PAL to create an issue and work on the definition of the public/private attribute.
- CB to look into ReSpec conversion.