

INTERNET-DRAFT

Intended Status: Informational
Expires: July 20, 2014

H. Flanagan
RFC Editor
S. Ginoza
RFC Editor
January 16, 2014

RFC Style Guide
draft-flanagan-style-03

Abstract

This document is a summary of the style conventions and editorial policies that apply to the the RFC Series. It captures the RFC Editor's fundamental requirements and offers guidance regarding the style and structure of an RFC. Guidance provided by this document will not be applied until published as an RFC. Please send your comments about the contents of this document to <rfc-interest@rfc-editor.org>.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/1id-abstracts.html>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

Copyright and License Notice

Copyright (c) 2013 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents

(<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	RFC Editorial Philosophy	4
3.	RFC Style Conventions	5
3.1.	Language	5
3.2.	Punctuation	6
3.3.	Capitalization	6
3.4.	Citations	7
3.5.	Abbreviation Rules	7
4.	Structure of an RFC	7
4.1.	First-Page Header	8
4.1.1.	Author/Editor	8
4.1.2.	Organization	9
4.1.3.	"ISSN: 2070-1721"	9
4.1.4.	Updates and Obsoletes	9
4.2.	Full Title	10
4.3.	Abstract	10
4.4.	RFC Editor or Stream Manager Notes	11
4.5.	Status of This Memo	11
4.6.	Copyright, Licenses, and IPR Boilerplate	11
4.7.	Table of Contents	11
4.8.	Body of the Memo	11
4.8.1.	Introduction	11
4.8.2.	Requirement Words (RFC 2119)	12
4.8.3.	IANA Considerations Section	12
4.8.4.	Security Considerations Section	13
4.8.5.	References	13
4.8.5.1.	URLs and DNS Names in RFCs	14
4.8.5.2.	Referencing RFCs	15
4.8.5.3.	Referencing Internet-Drafts	15
4.8.5.4.	Referencing Errata	16
4.8.5.5.	Referencing Other Standards Development Organizations (SDOs)	16
4.9.	Appendices	17
4.10.	Acknowledgments Section	17
4.11.	Contributors Section	17
4.12.	"Author's Address" Section	17
5.	IANA Considerations	18
6.	Security Considerations	18

- [7.](#) References [19](#)
- [7.1.](#) Normative References [19](#)
- [7.2.](#) Informative References [19](#)
- [Appendix A.](#) Related Procedures [21](#)
- [A.1.](#) Dispute Resolution [21](#)
- [A.2.](#) Returning an I-D to the Stream Manager [21](#)
- [A.3.](#) Revising This Document and Associated Web Pages [21](#)
- Acknowledgements [21](#)
- Contributors [22](#)
- Authors' Addresses [22](#)

1. Introduction

The ultimate goal of the RFC publication process is to produce documents that are readable, clear, consistent, and reasonably uniform. The basic format conventions for RFCs were established in the 1970s by the original RFC Editor, Jon Postel. This document describes the fundamental and unique style conventions and editorial policies currently in use for the RFC Series [[RFC4844](#)]. It is intended as a stable, infrequently updated reference for authors, editors, and reviewers.

The RFC Editor also maintains a web portion of the Style Guide (see [Appendix A](#)) that describes issues as they are raised and indicates how the RFC Editor intends to address them. As new style issues arise, the RFC Editor will first address them on the web portion of the Style Guide [[StyleWeb](#)]. These may become part of the greater Style Guide when it is revised.

The world of technical publishing has generally accepted rules for grammar, punctuation, capitalization, sentence length and complexity, parallelism, etc. The RFC Editor generally follows these accepted rules as defined by the Chicago Manual of Style (CMOS) [[CMOS](#)], with a few important exceptions to avoid ambiguity in complex technical prose and to handle mixtures of text and computer languages. This document presents these exceptions where they are required.

All RFCs begin as an Internet-Draft, and a well-written and properly constructed Internet-Draft [[IDGuide](#)] provides a strong basis for a good RFC. The RFC Editor accepts Internet-Drafts from specified streams for publication [[RFC4844](#)] and applies the rules and guidelines for the RFC Series during the editorial process.

2. RFC Editorial Philosophy

Authors may find it helpful to understand the RFC Editor's goals during the publication process, namely:

- Prepare the document to RFC style and format.
- Make the document as clear, consistent, and readable as possible.
- Look for larger content/clarity issues; flag any unclear passages for author review.
- Point out inconsistencies (e.g., terms that appear in various forms, text that appears multiple times, or inconsistent capitalization).

We strive for consistency within:

- a. the document,
- b. a set of documents, and
- c. the series of RFCs on the subject matter.

The editorial process of the RFC Editor is not an additional technical review of the document. Where the RFC Editor may suggest changes in wording for clarity and readability, it is up to the author, working group, or stream manager (e.g., the ISE, IESG, IRSG, or IAB Chair) to determine if the changes have an impact on the technical meaning in the document. If the original wording is a more accurate representation of the technical content being described in the document, it takes precedence over editorial conventions.

The activity of editing often creates a tension between author and editor. The RFC Editor attempts to minimize this conflict for RFC publication, while continually striving to produce a uniformly excellent document series. The RFC Editor refers to this fundamental tension as "editorial balance", and maintaining this balance is a continuing concern for the RFC Editor. There is a prime directive that must rule over grammatical conventions: do not change the intended meaning of the text.

If a document is submitted to the RFC Editor that proves to be uneditable due to consistently unclear and poorly written text, the document may be returned to the stream for revision. See more details in [Appendix A.2](#).

3. RFC Style Conventions

All RFCs begin as an Internet-Draft, and a well-written and properly constructed Internet-Draft [[IDGuide](#)] provides a strong basis for a good RFC. The RFC Editor generally follows accepted rules as defined by the Chicago Manual of Style (CMOS) [[CMOS](#)], with a few important exceptions to avoid ambiguity in complex technical prose and to handle mixtures of text and computer languages. This document presents these exceptions where they are required.

3.1. Language

The RFC publication language is English. This may be either American or British as long as an individual document is internally consistent. Where both American and British English are used within a document or cluster of documents, the text will be modified to be consistent with American English.

3.2. Punctuation

- * No overstriking (or underlining) is allowed.
- * When a sentence ended by a period is immediately followed by another sentence, there should be two blank spaces after the period.
- * A comma is used before the last item of a series, e.g.,

"TCP service is reliable, ordered, and full-duplex"
- * When quoting literal text, punctuation is placed outside quotation marks, e.g.,

'Search for the string "Error Found"'.

When quoting general text, such as general text from another RFC, punctuation may be included within the quotation marks, e.g.,

[RFC 4844](#) indicates that "RFCs are available free of charge to anyone via the Internet."

Quotes are not necessary when block quotes are used.

- * Angle brackets are strongly recommended around URIs [[STD66](#)], e.g.,

<http://example.com/>

Note that URIs may not be the sole information provided for a reference entry.

3.3. Capitalization

- * Capitalization must be consistent within the document and should be consistent with related RFCs. Refer to the online "Table of decisions on consistent usage of terms in RFCs" [[PubProcess](#)].
- * Per CMOS guidelines, the major words in RFC titles and section titles should be capitalized (this is sometimes called "title case"). Typically, all words in a title will be capitalized, except for internal articles, prepositions, and conjunctions.
- * Section titles that are in sentence form will follow typical sentence capitalization.
- * Titles of figures may be in sentence form or use title case.

3.4. Citations

- * References and citations must match. That is, there must be a reference for each citation used, and vice versa.
- * Citations must be enclosed in square brackets, e.g., "[CITE1]".
- * A citation/reference tag must not contain spaces or hyphens.

Example: "[[RFC2119](#)]", not "[[RFC 2119](#)]".

However, the proper textual naming of an RFC contains a space.

Example: "See [RFC 2119](#) [[BCP14](#)] for more information."

- * Cross references within the body of the text and to other RFCs should use section numbers rather than page numbers, as pagination may change per format and device.

3.5. Abbreviation Rules

Abbreviations must be expanded in document titles and upon first use in the body of the document, which includes the Abstract. The full expansion of the text should be followed by the abbreviation itself in parentheses. The exception is abbreviations that are so common that the readership of RFCs can be expected to recognize them immediately; examples include (but are not limited to) TCP, IP, SNMP, and FTP. The online list of abbreviations [[ABBR](#)] provides guidance. Some cases are marginal, and the RFC Editor will make the final judgment, weighing obscurity against complexity.

Note: The online list of abbreviations is not exhaustive or definitive. It is a list of abbreviations appearing in RFCs and sometimes reflects discussions with authors, WG chairs, and/or ADs. Note that some abbreviations have multiple expansions. Additionally, this list includes some terms that look like abbreviations but are actually fixed names for things, and hence cannot and should not be expanded. These are noted as "No expansion".

4. Structure of an RFC

A published RFC will contain the elements in the following list. Some of these sections are required, as noted. Those sections marked with "*" will be supplied by the RFC Editor during the editorial process when necessary. The rules for each of these elements are described in more detail below.

First-page header	* [Required]
Title	[Required]
Abstract	[Required]
RFC Editor or Stream Manager Note	* [Upon request]
Status of this Memo	* [Required]
Copyright and License Notice	* [Required]
Table of Contents	[Required]
Body of the Memo	[Required]
1. Introduction	[Required]
2. Requirement Words (RFC 2119)	
3. ...	
MAIN BODY OF THE TEXT	
6. ...	
7. IANA Considerations	[Required in I-D]
8. Security Considerations	[Required]
9. References	
9.1. Normative References	
9.2. Informative References	
Appendix A .	
Appendix B .	
Acknowledgments	
Contributors	
Author's Address	[Required]

Within the body of the memo, the order shown above is strongly recommended. Exceptions will be questioned. Outside the body of the memo, the order above is required. The section numbers above are for illustrative purposes; they are not intended to correspond to required numbering in an RFC.

The elements preceding the body of the memo should not be numbered. Typically, the body of the memo will have numbered sections and the appendices will be labeled with letters. Any sections that appear after the appendices should not be numbered or labeled (e.g., see "Contributors" above).

[4.1.](#) First-Page Header

Headers will follow the format as described in "RFC Streams, Headers, and Boilerplates" [[RFC5741](#)] and its successors. In addition, the following conventions will apply.

[4.1.1.](#) Author/Editor

The determination of who should be listed as an author or editor on an RFC is dependent on Stream policy. The RFC Editor provides guidelines for number and format of the author-related components of an RFC.

The author's name (initials followed by family name) appears on the first line of the heading. Some variation, such as additional initials or capitalization of family name, is acceptable but the author should be consistent once they've selected a name format.

The total number of authors or editors on the first page is generally limited to five individuals and their affiliations. If there is a request for more than five authors, the stream manager needs to consider if one or two editors should have primary responsibility for this document, with the other individuals listed in the Contributors or Acknowledgements section. There must be a direct correlation of authors and editors in the header and Authors' Address section. These are the individuals that must sign off on the document during the AUTH48 process and respond to inquiries, such as errata.

4.1.2. Organization

The author's organization is indicated on the line following the author's name.

For multiple authors, each author name appears on its own line, followed by that author's organization. When more than one author is affiliated with the same organization, the organization can be "factored out", appearing only once following the corresponding Author lines. However, such factoring is inappropriate when it would force an unacceptable reordering of author names.

If an author cannot or will not provide an affiliation for any reason, "Independent", "Retired", or some other term that appropriately describes the author's affiliation may be used. Alternatively, a blank line may be included in the document header when no affiliation is provided.

4.1.3. "ISSN: 2070-1721"

The RFC Series has been assigned an International Standard Serial Number of 2070-1721 [[IS03297](#)]. It will be included by the RFC Editor.

4.1.4. Updates and Obsoletes

When an RFC obsoletes or updates a previously published RFC or RFCs, this information is in the header. For example:

"Updates: nnnn" or "Updates: nnnn, ..., nnnn"

"Obsoletes: nnnn" or "Obsoletes: nnnn, ... , nnnn"

If the document updates or obsoletes more than one document, numbers will be listed in ascending order.

4.2. Full Title

The title must be centered below the rest of the heading, preceded by two blank lines and followed by one blank line.

Choosing a good title for an RFC can be a challenge. A good title should fairly represent the scope and purpose of the document without being either too general or too specific and lengthy.

Abbreviations or acronyms in a title must generally be expanded when first encountered (see [Section 3.5](#) for additional guidance on acronyms).

It is often helpful to follow the expansion with the parenthesized abbreviation, as in the following example:

Encoding Rules for the
Common Routing Encapsulation Extension Protocol (CREEP)

An RFC that documents a particular company's private protocol should bear a title of the form "Foo's ... Protocol" (where Foo is a company name), to clearly differentiate it from a protocol of more general applicability.

4.3. Abstract

Every RFC must have an Abstract of a maximum of 20 lines.

The Abstract should provide a concise and comprehensive overview of the purpose and contents of the entire document, to give a technically knowledgeable reader a general overview of the function of the document.

Composing a useful Abstract generally requires thought and care. Usually an Abstract should begin with a phrase like "This memo ..." or "This document ...". A satisfactory Abstract can often be constructed in part from material within the Introduction section, but an effective Abstract may be shorter, less detailed, and perhaps broader in scope than the Introduction. Simply copying and pasting the first few paragraphs of the Introduction is allowed, but it may result in an Abstract that is both incomplete and redundant. Note also that an Abstract is not a substitute for an Introduction; the RFC should be self-contained as if there were no Abstract.

Similarly, the Abstract should be complete in itself. It will

appear in isolation in publication announcements and in the online index of RFCs. Therefore, the Abstract must not contain citations.

[4.4.](#) RFC Editor or Stream Manager Notes

The RFC Editor or a stream manager may request that an editorial note be added to an RFC. A note is generally added to explain anything unusual about the process that led to the document's publication or to note a correction.

Additionally, the RFC Editor may choose to include a note to highlight special circumstances surrounding an RFC.

[4.5.](#) Status of This Memo

The RFC Editor will supply an appropriate "Status of This Memo" section as defined in [RFC 5741](#) [[RFC5741](#)].

[4.6.](#) Copyright, Licenses, and IPR Boilerplate

The full copyright and license notices are available on the IETF Trust Legal Provisions Documents website [[IETFTrust](#)].

[4.7.](#) Table of Contents

A Table of Contents (TOC) is required in all RFCs. It must be positioned after the Copyright notice and before the Introduction.

[4.8.](#) Body of the Memo

Following the TOC is the body of the memo.

Each RFC must include an "Introduction" section that (among other things) explains the motivation for the RFC and (if appropriate) describes the applicability of the document, e.g., whether it specifies a protocol, provides a discussion of some problem, is simply of interest to the Internet community, or provides a status report on some activity. The body of the memo and the Abstract must be self-contained and separable. This may result in some duplication of text between the Abstract and the Introduction; this is acceptable.

[4.8.1.](#) Introduction

The Introduction section should always be the first section following the TOC (except in the case of MIB module documents). While "Introduction" is recommended, authors may choose alternate titles such as "Overview" or "Background". These alternates are acceptable.

For MIB module documents, common practice has been for "The Internet-Standard Management Framework" [[MIBboiler](#)] text to appear as [Section 1](#).

[4.8.2.](#) Requirement Words ([RFC 2119](#))

Some documents use certain capitalized words ("MUST", "SHOULD", etc.) to specify precise requirement levels for technical features. [RFC 2119](#) [[BCP14](#)] defines a default interpretation of these capitalized words in IETF documents. If this interpretation is used, [RFC 2119](#) must be cited (as specified in [RFC 2119](#)) and included as a normative reference. Otherwise, the correct interpretation must be specified in the document.

This section must appear as part of the body of the text (as defined by this document). It must appear as part of, or subsequent to, the Introduction section.

These words are considered part of the technical content of the document and are intended to provide guidance to implementers about specific technical features, generally governed by considerations of interoperability. [RFC 2119](#) says:

Imperatives of the type defined in this memo must be used with care and sparingly. In particular, they must only be used where it is actually required for interoperation or to limit behavior which has potential for causing harm (e.g., limiting retransmissions). For example, they must not be used to try to impose a particular method on implementers where the method is not required for interoperability.

To simply specify a necessary logical relationship, the normal lowercase words should be used. On the other hand, if the capitalized words are used in a document, choose and use them carefully and consistently.

To forestall confusion between uppercase conformance terms and their lowercase equivalents, authors are encouraged to use words and phrases such as "mandatory", "ought to", and "might" instead of "MUST", "SHOULD", and "MAY".

[4.8.3.](#) IANA Considerations Section

See "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs" [[BCP26](#)].

The RFC Editor will update text accordingly after the IANA assignments have been made. It is helpful for authors to clearly identify where text should be updated to reflect the newly assigned values. For example, the use of "TBD1", "TBD2", etc., is recommended in the IANA Considerations section and in the body of the document.

If the authors have provided values to be assigned by IANA, the RFC Editor will verify that the values inserted by the authors match those that have actually been registered on the IANA site. When writing a given value, consistent use of decimal or hexadecimal is recommended.

If any of the IANA-related information is not clear, the RFC Editor will work with IANA to send queries to the authors to ensure that assignments and values are properly inserted.

The RFC Editor will remove an IANA Considerations section that says there are no IANA considerations (although such a section is required in the Internet-Draft preceding the RFC).

[4.8.4. Security Considerations Section](#)

All RFCs must contain a section that discusses the security considerations relevant to the specification; see "Guidelines for Writing RFC Text on Security Considerations" [[BCP72](#)] for more information.

[4.8.5. References](#)

The reference list is solely for recording reference entries. Introductory text is not allowed.

The RFC style allows the use of any of a variety of reference styles, as long as they are used consistently within a document. However, where necessary, in specific instances, some reference styles have been described for use within the Series. See the examples in this document.

The RFC Editor ensures that references to other RFCs refer to the most current RFC available on that topic (unless provided with reason not to do so). It is acceptable for an obsoleted document to be listed as long as the most recent document is referenced also.

A reference to an RFC that has been assigned an STD [[RFC1311](#)], BCP [[RFC1818](#)], or FYI [[FYI90](#)] sub-series number must include the sub-

series number of the document. Note: the FYI series was ended by [RFC 6360](#). RFCs that were published with an FYI sub-series number and still maintain the FYI number must include the sub-series number in the reference.

Reference lists must indicate whether each reference is normative or informative, where normative references are essential to implementing or understanding the content of the RFC, and informative references provide additional information. For example, the reference section might be split into two subsections:

s. References

s.1. Normative References

xxx
xxx

s.2. Informative References

xxx
xxx

References will generally appear in alphanumeric order by citation tag.

Normative references to Internet-Drafts will cause publication of the RFC to be suspended until the referenced draft is also ready for publication; the RFC Editor will then update the entry to refer to the RFC and publish both documents simultaneously.

[4.8.5.1](#). URLs and DNS Names in RFCs

The use of URLs in references is acceptable as long as the URL is the most stable (i.e., unlikely to change and expected to be continuously available) and direct reference possible. The URL will be verified as valid during the RFC editorial process. Personal web pages and web caching services are not considered stable and will not be accepted as a normative reference. Informative references to blogs are acceptable if they are an organizational blog and not a personal space.

DNS names, whether or not in URLs, that are used as generic examples in RFCs should use the particular examples defined in "Reserved Top-Level DNS Names" [[RFC2606](#)], to avoid accidental conflicts.

If a dated URL is available for a referenced web page, its use is required.

4.8.5.2. Referencing RFCs

The following format is required for citing RFCs. Note the ordering for multiple authors: the last author listed is treated differently than the already listed authors.

For 1 Author:

[RFCXXXX] Last name, First initial., "RFC Title",
BCP/FYI/STD ## (if applicable), RFC ####,
Date of Publication.

Example:

[RFC3080] Rose, M., "The Blocks Extensible Exchange
Protocol Core", [RFC 3080](#), March 2001.

For 2 Authors:

[RFCXXXX] Last name, First initial. and First initial,
Last name, "RFC Title", BCP/FYI/STD ##
(if applicable), RFC ####, Date of Publication.

Example:

[RFC6323] Renker, G. and G. Fairhurst, "Sender RTT
Estimate Option for the Datagram Congestion
Control Protocol (DCCP)", [RFC 6323](#), July 2011.

For 3 or more Authors:

[RFCXXXX] Last name, First initial., Last name, First
initial., and First initial. Last name, "RFC
Title", BCP/FYI/STD ## (if applicable),
RFC ####, Date of Publication.

Example:

[RFC6429] Bashyam, M., Jethanandani, M., and A. Ramaiah,
"TCP Sender Clarification for Persist
Condition", [RFC 6429](#), December 2011.

4.8.5.3. Referencing Internet-Drafts

References to Internet-Drafts can only appear as Informative references. Given that several revisions of an I-D may be produced in a short time frame, references must include the publication date (month and year), the full Internet-Draft file name (including the

version number), and the use the phrase "Work in Progress". If the I-D referenced has a version published as an RFC, references must also include the RFC.

[SYMBOLIC-TAG] Last name, First initial. and First initial, Last name, "I-D Title", Work in Progress, [draft-string-NN](#), Month, Year.

Example:

[RFC-STYLE] Flanagan, H., and S. Ginoza, "RFC Style Guide", Work in Progress, [draft-flanagan-style-01](#), August 2013.

[4.8.5.4. Referencing Errata](#)

The following format is required when a reference to an errata report is necessary:

[ErrNNNN] RFC Errata, Errata ID NNNN, RFC NNNN, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org>>.

[Err1912] RFC Errata, Errata ID 1912, [RFC 2978](#), <<http://www.rfc-editor.org>>.

[4.8.5.5. Referencing Other Standards Development Organizations \(SDOs\)](#)

The following format is suggested when referencing a document or standard from another SDO in which authors are listed:

[W3C.REC-xml11]
Bray, T., Paoli, J., Sperberg-McQueen, C., Maler, E., Yergeau, F., and J. Cowan, "Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.1 (Second Edition)", W3C Recommendation REC-xml11-20060816, August 2006, <<http://www.w3.org/TR/2006/REC-xml11-20060816>>.

Note that the list of authors is ordered as on the actual document and the common, abbreviated form of the SDO is used.

Alternatively, when no list of authors is available, the following format is recommended:

[SYMBOLIC-TAG] Organization, "Document Title", Document reference number, date of publication.

Example:

[IEEE802.1Q] IEEE, "Local and Metropolitan Area Networks -- Media Access Control (MAC) Bridges and Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks", IEEE Std 802.1Q-2011, August 2011.

4.9. Appendices

The RFC Editor recommends placing references before the Appendices. Appendices should be labeled as "Appendix A. [Appendix A](#) Title", "A.1. [Appendix A.1](#) Title", "Appendix B. [Appendix B](#) Title", etc.

4.10. Acknowledgments Section

This optional section may be used instead of or in addition to a Contributors section. It is often used by authors to publicly thank those who have provided feedback regarding a document and to note any documents from which text was borrowed.

4.11. Contributors Section

This optional section acknowledges those who have made significant contributions to the document.

In a similar fashion to the Author section, the RFC Editor does not make the determination as to who should be listed as a contributor to an RFC. The determination of who should be listed as a contributor on an RFC is determined by stream policy.

The Contributors section may include brief statements about the nature of particular contributions ("Sam contributed [Section 3](#)"), and it may also include affiliations of listed contributors. At the discretion of the author(s), contact addresses may also be included in the Contributors section, for those contributors whose knowledge makes them useful future contacts for information about the RFC. Any contact information should be formatted similar to how the information is formatted in the Author's Address section.

4.12. "Author's Address" Section

This required section gives contact information for the author(s) listed in the first-page header.

Contact information must include a long-lived email address and optionally may include a postal address and/or telephone number. If the postal address is included, it should include the country name using the English short name listed by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency [[IS03166](#)]. The purpose of this section is to (1) unambiguously define author identity (e.g., the John Smith who works

for FooBar Systems) and to (2) provide contact information for future readers who have questions or comments.

The practice of munged addresses (i.e., altering an email address to make it less readable to bots and web crawlers to avoid spam) is not appropriate in an archival document series. Author contact information is provided so that readers can easily contact the author with questions and/or comments. Address munging is not allowed in RFCs.

5. IANA Considerations

No IANA actions required.

6. Security Considerations

No security considerations.

7. References

7.1. Normative References

[StyleWeb] RFC Editor, "Web Portion of the Style Guide",
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc-style-guide/part2.html>>.

7.2. Informative References

- [ABBR] RFC Editor Abbreviations List,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc-style-guide/abbrev.expansion.txt>>.
- [BCP14] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/bcp14>>.
- [BCP26] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 5226](#), May 2008, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/bcp26>>.
- [BCP72] Rescorla, E. and B. Korver, "Guidelines for Writing RFC Text on Security Considerations", [BCP 72](#), [RFC 3552](#), July 2003, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/bcp72>>.
- [CMOS] Chicago Manual of Style, 16th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- [FYI90] Malkin, G. and J. Reynolds, "FYI on FYI: Introduction to the FYI Notes", FYI Notes, [RFC 1150](#), March 1990.
- Housley, R., "Conclusion of FYI RFC Sub-Series", [RFC 6360](#), August 2011.
- <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/fyi90>>
- [IDGuide] IETF, "Guidelines to Authors of Internet Drafts",
<<http://www.ietf.org>>.
- [IETFTrust] IETF Trust, "Trust Legal Provisions (TLP) Documents",
<<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info/>>.
- [ISO3166] ISO, "Country Codes - ISO 3166", <http://www.iso.org/iso/country_names_and_code_elements_txt>.
- [ISO3297] Technical Committee ISO/TC 46, Information and

documentation, Subcommittee SC 9, Identification and description, "Information and documentation - International standard serial number (ISSN)", 09 2007.

[MIBboiler]

IETF OPS Area, "Boilerplate for IETF MIB Documents",
<<http://www.ops.ietf.org/mib-boilerplate.html>>.

[PubProcess]

RFC Editor, "Publication Process",
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/pubprocess.html>>.

[RFC1818] Postel, J., Li, T., and Y. Rekhter, "Best Current Practices", [RFC 1818](#), August 1995,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1818>>.

[RFC2223] Postel, J. and J. Reynolds, "Instructions to RFC Authors",
[RFC 2223](#), October 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2223>>.

[RFC2606] Eastlake 3rd, D. and A. Panitz, "Reserved Top Level DNS Names", [BCP 32](#), [RFC 2606](#), June 1999,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2606>>.

[RFC4844] Daigle, L., Ed., and Internet Architecture Board, "The RFC Series and RFC Editor", [RFC 4844](#), July 2007,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4844>>.

[RFC5741] Daigle, L., Ed., and Kolkman, O., Ed., and IAB, "RFC Streams, Headers, and Boilerplates", [RFC 5741](#), December 2009, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4844>>.

[RFC6635] Kolkman, O., Ed., Halpern, J., Ed., and IAB, "RFC Editor Model (Version 2)", [RFC 6635](#), June 2012,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6635>>.

[STD66] Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and L. Masinter, "Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax", STD 66, [RFC 3986](#), January 2005,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3986>>.

[WEBSTERS] Merriam-Webster Online, <<http://www.m-w.com/>>.

[Appendix A](#). Related Procedures

The following procedures are related to the application and updating of the RFC Style Guide.

[A.1](#). Dispute Resolution

There are competing rationales for some of the rules described in this Guide, and the RFC Editor has selected the ones that work best for the Series. However, at times, an author may have a disagreement with the RFC Production Center (RPC) over the application of style guide conventions. In such cases, the authors should discuss their concerns with the RPC. If no agreement can be reached between the RPC and the authors, the RFC Series Editor will, with input from the appropriate stream manager, make a final determination. If further resolution is required, the dispute resolution process as described in the RFC Editor Model [[RFC6635](#)] will be followed.

[A.2](#). Returning an I-D to the Stream Manager

For a given document, if the RFC Editor determines that it cannot be edited without serious risk of altering the meaning of the technical content or if the RFC Editor does not have the resources to provide the level of editing it needs, it may be sent back to the stream manager with a request to improve the clarity, consistency, and/or readability of the document. This is not to be considered a dispute with the author.

[A.3](#). Revising This Document and Associated Web Pages

The RFC Series is continually evolving as a document series. This document focuses on the fundamental and stable requirements that must be met by an RFC. From time to time, the RFC Editor may offer less formal recommendations that authors may apply at their discretion; these recommendations may be found on the RFC Editor website "Guidelines for RFC Style" [[StyleWeb](#)].

When a new recommendation is made regarding the overall structure and formatting of the RFCs, it will be published on that page and accepted for a period of time before the RFC Editor determines whether it should become part of the fundamental requirements in the RFC Style Guide or remain as a less formal recommendation. That period of time will vary in part depending on the frequency with which authors encounter and apply the guidance.

Acknowledgements

This document refers heavily to [RFC 2223](#) [[RFC2223](#)] and [draft-rfc-editor-rfc2223bis-08](#); as such, we are grateful to the authors of those documents for their time and effort in to the RFC Series.

Robert T. Braden
USC Information Sciences Institute

Joyce Reynolds

Jon Postel

Contributors

Alice Russo
RFC Production Center

Authors' Addresses

Heather Flanagan
RFC Series Editor

EMail: rse@rfc-editor.org

Sandy Ginoza
RFC Production Center

EMail: rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org

