

Workgroup: Network Working Group
Internet-Draft:
draft-iab-rfcedfp-rfced-model-02
Obsoletes: [RFC8728](#) (if approved)
Updates: [RFC8729](#) (if approved)
Published: 14 September 2021
Intended Status: Informational
Expires: 18 March 2022
Authors: P. Saint-Andre, Ed.
Mozilla

RFC Series Policy Definition and Implementation

Abstract

This document describes updated processes for defining and implementing policies regarding the RFC Series. As specified here, the model divides the responsibilities for the RFC Series into two high-level functions: policy definition governing the RFC Series as a whole, and policy implementation for publication of documents in the RFC Series. The policy definition function is the responsibility of the RFC Series Working Group (RSWG), which produces policy proposals that are subject to approval by the RFC Series Approval Board (RSAB). The policy implementation function is primarily the responsibility of the RFC Production Center (RPC), under the ultimate authority of the IETF Administration Limited Liability Company (IETF LLC).

This document reflects experience gained with version 1 of the RFC Editor Model as specified in RFC 5620 and with version 2 as specified in RFC 6635 and RFC 8728.

This document obsoletes RFC 8728.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

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."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 18 March 2022.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 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 (<https://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](#)
- [2. Overview of the Model](#)
- [3. Policy Definition Function](#)
 - [3.1. Structure and Roles](#)
 - [3.1.1. RFC Series Working Group \(RSWG\)](#)
 - [3.1.2. RFC Series Approval Board \(RSAB\)](#)
 - [3.2. Process](#)
 - [3.2.1. Intent](#)
 - [3.2.2. Specifics](#)
 - [3.2.3. Community Calls for Comment](#)
 - [3.2.4. Appeals](#)
 - [3.2.5. Anti-Harassment Policy](#)
- [4. RFC Series Editor/Advisor \(RSEA\)](#)
 - [4.1. RSEA Selection](#)
 - [4.2. RSEA Performance Evaluation](#)
- [5. Policy Implementation Function](#)
 - [5.1. Roles and Processes](#)
 - [5.2. Editorial and Publication Policies](#)
 - [5.3. Resolution of Disagreements between Authors and the RPC](#)
 - [5.4. Administrative Implementation](#)
 - [5.4.1. Vendor Selection for the RFC Production Center](#)
 - [5.4.2. Budget](#)
- [6. Streams](#)
- [7. IANA Considerations](#)
- [8. Security Considerations](#)
- [9. Changes from RFC 8728](#)
 - [9.1. RFC Series Editor](#)
 - [9.2. RFC Series Oversight Committee \(RSOC\)](#)
- [10. Updates to RFC 8729](#)
- [11. IANA Considerations](#)
- [12. Informative References](#)
- [Acknowledgments](#)

1. Introduction

As described in RFCs have been published continually since 1969 [[RFC8729](#)], the Request for Comments (RFC) Series is the archival series dedicated to documenting Internet technical specifications, including general contributions from the Internet research and engineering community as well as standards documents. [[RFC8700](#)].

The processes and organizational models for publication of RFCs have changed significantly over the years. Most recently, in 2009 [[RFC5620](#)] defined the RFC Editor Model (Version 1) and in 2012 [[RFC6635](#)] defined the RFC Editor Model (Version 2), since modified slightly in 2020 by [[RFC8728](#)]. Following historical precedent, these documents used the term "RFC Editor function" or "RFC Editor" to identify the collective set of responsibilities for publishing documents in the RFC series.

In order to provide a sustainable basis for ongoing publication of the RFC series, this document divides the responsibilities for the RFC Series into two high-level functions: policy definition governing the Series as a whole, and policy implementation through publication of documents in the Series. The policy definition function is the responsibility of the RFC Series Working Group (RSWG), which produces policy proposals that are subject to approval by the RFC Series Approval Board (RSAB). The policy implementation function is primarily the responsibility of the RFC Production Center (RPC), under the ultimate authority of the IETF Administration Limited Liability Company (LLC) [[RFC8711](#)]. Therefore this document introduces new functions and in some cases makes significant changes to the responsibilities of existing bodies and functions (see Section 7 of this document for a summary of the changes).

This document obsoletes RFC 8728.

2. Overview of the Model

Version 2 of the RFC Editor Model [[RFC8728](#)] specified a structure consisting of the RFC Series Editor, the RFC Production Center, and the RFC Publisher, with oversight provided by the RFC Series Oversight Committee (RSOC) on behalf of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB).

Discussion within the RFCED-Future Program has led in the direction of a more consensus-oriented structure (similar in some respects to the structure of technical work within the IETF or IRTF) that retains roles for specialized expertise in document editing and publication.

The policy definition function is performed by the RFC Series Working Group (RSWG), which produces policy proposals that are subject to approval by the RFC Series Approval Board (RSAB), after which such policies are formally established through publication in the Editorial Stream within the RFC Series. The RSWG is an open working group (as described below) that seeks input and participation from a wide range of persons who have an interest in the RFC Series. The RSAB consists of appointed members who represent the various RFC streams [[RFC8728](#)] as well as an expert in technical publishing, the RFC Series Editor/Advisor (RSEA).

The policy implementation function is performed by the RFC Production Center (RPC), under the ultimate authority of the IETF Administration Limited Liability Company (IETF LLC).

In short:

- *The RSWG proposes policies that govern the RFC Series as a whole, with input from the community, the RSAB, and the RSEA.
- *The RSAB considers those proposals and approves them, returns them to the RSWG for further consideration, or declines to publish them, as appropriate.
- *If approved, such proposals are published as RFCs in the Editorial Stream and thus define the policies to be followed by the RSWG, RSAB, RSEA, and RPC.
- *The RSEA provides expert advice to the RPC and RSAB on how to implement established policies on an ongoing and operational basis, which can include raising issues or initiating proposed policy changes within the RSWG.
- *The RPC implements the policies defined by the Editorial Stream in its day-to-day editing and publication of RFCs from other streams.
- *If issues arise with the implementation of particular policies, the RPC brings those issues to the RSAB, which interprets the policies and provides interim guidance to the RPC, informing the RSWG of those interpretations.

The remainder of this document describes the model in greater detail.

3. Policy Definition Function

Policies governing the RFC series as a whole are defined in the open through proposals that are generated by and discussed within the RFC

Series Working Group (RSWG) and then approved by the RFC Series Approval Board (RSAB).

Policies under the purview of the RSWG and RSAB might include but are not necessarily limited to document formats, processes for publication and dissemination of RFCs, and overall management of the RFC series.

3.1. Structure and Roles

3.1.1. RFC Series Working Group (RSWG)

NOTE: There is discussion within the RFCED-Future Program regarding the appropriate name for this entity; provisionally "RFC Series Working Group" (RSWG) is used here, but the name might change in future versions of this document.

The RFC Series Working Group (RSWG) shall formulate proposals regarding policies that govern the RFC series. The intent is that the RSWG operate in a way similar to working groups in the IETF and research groups in the IRTF. Therefore, all RSWG meetings shall be open to any participant, and all RSWG contributions shall be subject to intellectual property policies, which must be consistent with those of the IETF as specified in BCP 78 [[RFC5378](#)] and BCP 79 [[RFC8179](#)].

The RSWG shall operate by rough consensus, a mode of operation informally described in [[RFC7282](#)].

When the RSWG is formed, all discussions shall take place on an open email discussion list. Subsequently, the RSWG may decide by rough consensus to also use additional tooling (e.g., GitHub as specified in [[RFC8874](#)]), forms of communication (e.g., in-person or online meetings), and working methods (e.g., design teams) as long as they are consistent with [[RFC2418](#)].

All interested persons are welcome to participate in the RSWG (subject to anti-harassment policies as described below). This includes participants in the IETF and IRTF, IAB and IESG members, individuals who use RFCs in procurement decisions, authors of RFCs and Internet-Drafts, developers of tools used to authors RFCs, and the like. The IETF LLC Board members, staff, and the IETF Executive Director are invited to participate as community members in the RSWG to the extent permitted by any relevant IETF LLC policies. Members of the RSAB are also expected to participate actively.

The RSWG shall have two chairs, one appointed by the IESG and the other appointed by the IAB. When the RSWG is formed, the chair appointed by the IESG shall serve for a term of one (1) year and the chair appointed by the IAB shall serve for a term of two (2) years;

thereafter, chairs shall serve for a term of two (2) years, with no term limits on renewal. The appointing bodies shall determine their own processes for making these appointments, such as provision for an open nominations period. Community members who have concerns about the performance of an RSWG chair should direct their feedback to the relevant appointing body. Each appointing body shall have the power to replace its appointed chair at its discretion at any time, with the replacement serving the remainder of the original chair's term.

It is the responsibility of the chairs to encourage rough consensus within the RSWG and to follow that consensus in their decision making, for instance regarding acceptance of new proposals and advancement of proposals to the RSAB.

Absent specific guidance in this document regarding the roles and responsibilities of the chairs, the general guidance provided in Section 6.1 of [[RFC2418](#)] should be considered appropriate.

NOTE: This section is intended to address [ISSUE #9](#), [ISSUE #14](#), [ISSUE #16](#), [ISSUE #28](#), [ISSUE #29](#), [ISSUE #41](#), [ISSUE #44](#), [ISSUE #68](#), and [ISSUE #72](#).

3.1.2. RFC Series Approval Board (RSAB)

The RFC Series Approval Board (RSAB) shall act as the approving body for proposals generated within the RSWG. The sole function of the RSAB is to review policy proposals generated by the RSWG; it shall have no independent authority to formulate policy on its own. It is expected that the RSAB will respect the rough consensus of the RSWG wherever possible, without ceding its review function.

The voting members of the RSAB shall be as follows:

- *One delegate representing the IETF stream, appointed by the IESG
- *One delegate representing the IAB stream, appointed by the IAB
- *One delegate representing the IRTF stream, appointed by the IRTF Chair
- *The Independent Submissions Editor [[RFC8730](#)]
- *The RFC Series Editor/Advisor

The appointing bodies shall determine their own processes for appointing delegates, such as provision for an open nominations period. If it becomes necessary to replace such a delegate for any reason, then for the sake of continuity the appointing body should name a new delegate to complete the former delegate's term.

To ensure the smooth functioning of the RFC Series, the RSAB shall include the IETF Executive Director as a non-voting member since the IETF LLC is ultimately responsible for the operation of the policy implementation function. The RSAB may at its discretion include additional non-voting members, for instance a liaison from the RPC.

Whenever a new stream is created, the document that creates the stream shall specify if a voting member representing that stream shall also be added to the RSAB, along with any rules and processes related to that representative (e.g., whether the representative is a member of the body responsible for the stream or an appointed delegate thereof). In effect, the RSEA is the voting member representing the Editorial Stream.

The RSAB shall annually choose a chair from among its members using a method to be determined by the RSAB. If the chair position is vacated during the chair's term, the RSAB should choose a new chair from among its members.

The RSAB is expected to operate via email, in-person meetings, teleconferencing systems, and any additional tooling it deems necessary.

The RSAB shall keep a public record of its proceedings, including minutes of all meetings and a record of all decisions.

The RSAB shall announce plans and agendas for their meetings on the RFC Editor website and by email to the RSWG at least a week before such meetings. The meetings shall be open for public attendance and the RSAB may consider allowing open participation. If the RSAB needs to discuss a confidential matter in executive session, that part of the meeting shall be private to the RSAB, but must be noted on the agenda, and must be documented in the minutes with as much detail as confidentiality requirements permit.

NOTE: This section is intended to address [ISSUE #9](#), [ISSUE #38](#), [ISSUE #50](#), [ISSUE #53](#), and [ISSUE #71](#).

3.2. Process

3.2.1. Intent

The intent is to provide an open forum by which policies related to the RFC series are defined and evolved. The general expectation is that all interested parties will participate in the RSWG, and that only under extreme circumstances should RSAB members need to hold "CONCERN" positions as described below.

Because policy issues can be difficult and contentious, RSWG participants and RSAB members are strongly encouraged to work

together in a spirit of good faith and mutual understanding to achieve rough consensus (see [[RFC7282](#)]). In particular, RSWG members are encouraged to take RSAB concerns seriously, and RSAB members are encouraged to clearly express their concerns early in the process and to be responsive to the community. All parties are encouraged to respect the value of each stream and the long-term health and viability of the RFC series.

This process is intended to be one of continuous consultation. RSAB members should consult with their constituent stakeholders (e.g., authors, editors, tool developers, and consumers of RFCs) on an ongoing basis, so that when the time comes to consider a proposal, there should be no surprises. Appointing bodies are expected to establish whatever processes they deem appropriate to facilitate this goal.

3.2.2. Specifics

The following process shall be used to formulate or modify processes related to the RFC series:

1. An individual participant in the RSWG generates a proposal in the form of an Internet-Draft, which is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 [[RFC5378](#)] and BCP 79 [[RFC8179](#)].
2. If (following procedures for rough consensus) the chairs determine that there is sufficient interest in the proposal, the RSWG may adopt the proposal as a draft proposal of the RSWG, in much the same way a working group of the IETF or research group of the IRTF would (see [[RFC2418](#)]).
3. The RSWG shall then further develop the proposal. Members of the RSAB are expected to participate in discussion relating to such proposals so that they are fully aware of proposals early in the policy definition process and so that any issues or concerns that they have will be raised during the development of the proposal (not be left until the RSAB review period). The RSWG chairs are also expected to participate as individuals.
4. At some point, if the RSWG chairs believe there may be rough consensus for the proposal to advance, they will issue a last call for comment within the working group.
5. After a comment period of suitable length, the RSWG chairs will determine whether rough consensus for the proposal exists (taking their own feedback as individuals into account along with feedback from other participants). If comments have been received and substantial changes have been made, additional last calls may be necessary.

6. Once consensus is established in the RSWG, the RSAB shall issue a community call for comments as further described below. If substantial comments have been received, the RSWG will again consider those comments and make revisions as they see fit. At this same time, the RSAB will also consider the proposal.
7. If substantial changes have been made, additional community calls for comment should be issued by the RSAB, and again comments considered by the RSWG.
8. Once all comments have been addressed, the RSWG chairs will submit the proposal to the RSAB for its consideration.
9. Within a reasonable period of time, the RSAB will then poll among its members regarding the proposal. Positions may be as follows:

*"YES": the proposal should be approved

*"CONCERN": the proposal raises substantial concerns that must be addressed

*"RECUSE": the person holding the position has a conflict of interest

Any RSAB member holding a "CONCERN" position must explain their concern to the community in detail. The explanation might or might not be actionable.

A CONCERN may be made for two reasons:

*The proposal represents a serious problem for the stream or group that a particular member represents.

*The RSAB member believes that the proposal would cause serious harm to the overall series, including harm to the long term health and viability of the series.

Because RSAB members should have been participating in discussions within the RSWG, no position of CONCERN should ever come as a surprise to the RSWG.

1. If a CONCERN exists, discussion will take place within the RSWG. Again, all RSAB members are expected to participate.
2. A proposal without any CONCERN positions is approved. If substantial changes have been made in order to address CONCERN positions, an additional call for community input might be needed.

3. If, after a suitable period of time, any CONCERN positions remain, a formal vote of the RSAB is taken. If a majority of RSAB members vote to approve, the proposal is approved. Otherwise, it is returned to the RSWG. In the case of a tie, the proposal is approved.
4. When a proposal is approved, a notification is sent to the community, and the document enters the queue for publication as an RFC within the Editorial Stream.

NOTE: This section is intended to address [ISSUE #45](#) and [ISSUE #69](#).

3.2.3. Community Calls for Comment

When a community call for comment is made, the RSAB sends a notice containing:

- *A subject line beginning with 'Call for Comment:'
- *A clear, concise summary of the proposal
- *A URL for the proposal document
- *Any commentary or questions for the community that the RSAB deems necessary (using their usual decision-making procedures)
- *Clear instructions on how to provide public comments
- *A deadline for comments

Notices will always be sent to the rfc-interest mailing list. The RSAB and RSWG should also send notices to other communities that may be interested in or impacted by a proposal as they see fit, following policies for those communities as appropriate. Notices are also to be made available and archived on the rfc-editor.org web site. In addition, other communication channels can be established for notices (e.g., using an RSS feed or social media).

A comment period will not last less than two weeks. Comments will be publicly archived on the rfc-editor.org web site.

NOTE: This section is intended to address [ISSUE #67](#).

3.2.4. Appeals

Appeals of RSWG decisions shall be made to the RSAB. Decisions of the RSWG can be appealed only on grounds of failure to follow the correct process. Appeals should be made within 30 days of any action, or in the case of failure to act, of notice having been given to the RSWG. The RSAB will then decide if the process was

followed and will direct the RSWG chairs as to what procedural actions are required.

Appeals of RSAB decisions shall be made to the IAB and should be made within thirty (30) days of public notice of the relevant RSAB decision (typically, when minutes are posted). The IAB shall decide whether a process failure occurred and what if any corrective action should take place.

NOTE: This section is intended to address [ISSUE #16](#) and [ISSUE #36](#).

3.2.5. Anti-Harassment Policy

The [IETF anti-harassment policy](#) also applies to the RSWG and RSAB, which strive to create and maintain an environment in which people of many different backgrounds are treated with dignity, decency, and respect. Participants are expected to behave according to professional standards and to demonstrate appropriate workplace behavior. See also [[RFC7154](#)], [[RFC7776](#)], and [[RFC8716](#)].

4. RFC Series Editor/Advisor (RSEA)

NOTE: Discussion continues within the RFCED-Future Program regarding the appropriate title for an expert in technical publication processes. To retain flexibility, this document temporarily refers to the individual as the "RFC Series Editor/Advisor" ("RSEA").

The RFC Series Editor/Advisor (RSEA) is a senior technical publishing professional who will apply their deep knowledge of technical publishing processes to the RFC series.

The primary responsibilities of the RSEA are as follows:

- *Serve as a voting member on the RSAB
- *Identify problems with the RFC publication process and opportunities for improvement
- *Provide expert advice regarding policy proposals within the RSWG
- *If requested, provide expert advice to the RPC and IETF LLC

Matters on which the RSEA might be consulted could include proposed changes to the RFC style guide [[RFC7322](#)], RFC formatting in general, web presence for the RFC Series, copyright matters, archiving policy, and dissemination and cataloguing of RFCs.

The IETF LLC is responsible for the method of and management of the engagement of the RSEA. Therefore, whether the RSEA role is

structured as a contractual or employee relationship is a matter for the IETF LLC and the IETF Executive Director to determine.

NOTE: This section is intended to address [ISSUE #12](#) and [ISSUE #24](#).

4.1. RSEA Selection

The IETF LLC will form a selection committee, including members from the community, that will be responsible for making a recommendation to the IETF LLC for the RSEA role. The selection committee will take into account the [role definition](#) as well as any other information that the committee deems necessary or helpful in making its decision. The IETF LLC is responsible for contracting or employment of the RSEA.

4.2. RSEA Performance Evaluation

Periodically, the IETF LLC will evaluate the performance of the RSEA, including a call for confidential input from the community. The IETF LLC will produce a draft performance evaluation for the RSAB (not including the RSEA), which will provide feedback to the IETF LLC.

5. Policy Implementation Function

5.1. Roles and Processes

Publication of RFCs shall be handled by the RFC Production Center (RPC).

In general, the RPC is instructed by RFCs published in the Editorial Stream (i.e., not directly by the RSWG, RSAB, or RSEA), is advised by the RSAB and has a duty to ask for that advice under specific circumstances, and is contractually overseen by the IETF LLC to ensure that it performs in accordance with contracts in place.

Within these parameters, at a high level the RPC is tasked with the following activities:

- *Editing documents from the streams and publishing them as RFCs.
- *Participating in the creation of new Editorial Stream RFCs that impact the RPC, at least in an advisory capacity.
- *Providing reports to the community on its performance and plans.
- *Consulting with the community on its plans.
- *Negotiating its resources with the IETF LLC.

All matters of budget, timetable and impact on its performance targets, are between the RPC and IETF LLC.

The RPC shall report regularly to the IETF LLC, RSAB, RSWG, and broader community regarding its activities and any key risks or issues affecting it.

In the event that the RPC is required to make a decision without consultation that would normally deserve consultation, or makes a decision against the advice of the RSAB, the RPC must notify the RSAB.

This document does not specify the exact relationship between the IETF LLC and the RPC; for example, the work of the RPC could be performed by a separate corporate entity under contract to the IETF LLC, it could be performed by employees of the IETF LLC, or the IETF LLC could engage with independent contractors for some or all aspects of such work. The exact relationship is a matter for the IETF LLC and the IETF Executive Director to determine.

The IETF LLC is responsible for the method of and management of the engagement of the RPC. Therefore, the IETF LLC has authority over negotiating performance targets for the RPC and also has responsibility for ensuring that those targets are adhered to. The IETF LLC is empowered to appoint a manager or to convene a committee to complete these activities.

If individuals or groups within the community have concerns about the performance of the RPC, they can request that the IETF LLC look into the matter. Even if the IETF LLC opts to delegate this activity, concerns should be raised with the IETF LLC. The IETF LLC is ultimately responsible to the community via the mechanisms outlined in its charter.

5.2. Editorial and Publication Policies

Under and consistent with the high-level policies defined for the RFC Series in general or particular streams, the RPC shall define more particular policies regarding matters related to the editorial preparation and final publication and dissemination of RFCs. Examples include:

- *Maintenance of a style guide that defines editorial standards to which RFCs must adhere (see [[RFC7322](#)] and the [style guide web page](#)).
- *Policies regarding the file formats that are accepted as input to the editing and publication process.

*Policies regarding the final structure and layout of published documents. In the context of the XML vocabulary ([\[RFC7991\]](#)), such policies could include matters such as the exact XML elements and attributes used to capture the semantic content of RFCs. More generally, such policies could address the readability and presentation of information in RFCs.

5.3. Resolution of Disagreements between Authors and the RPC

During the process of editorial preparation and publication, disagreements can arise between the authors of an RFC-to-be and the RPC. Where an existing policy clearly applies, typically such disagreements are handled in a straightforward manner through direct consultation between the authors and the RPC, sometimes in collaboration with other individuals such as a document shepherd, IETF working group chair, IRSG research group chair, or IETF Area Director.

However, if it is unclear whether an existing policy applies, or if the interpretation of an existing policy is unclear, the parties may need to consult with additional individuals or bodies (e.g., RSAB, IESG, IRSG, or stream manager) to help achieve a resolution. The following points are intended to provide more particular guidance.

*If there is a conflict with a policy for a particular stream, the RPC should consult with the relevant stream manager to help achieve a resolution, if needed also conferring with a per-stream body such as the IESG or IRSG.

*If there is a conflict with a cross-stream policy, the RPC should consult with the RSAB to achieve a resolution.

*If the disagreement raises a new issue that is not covered by an existing policy or that cannot be resolved through consultation between the RPC and other relevant individuals and bodies (as described above), the issue should be brought to the RSWG in order to formulate a new policy. However, in the interest of time the disagreement may be resolved as the parties best see fit while the RSWG formulates a more general policy.

NOTE: This section is intended to address [ISSUE #6](#) and [ISSUE #59](#).

5.4. Administrative Implementation

The exact implementation of the administrative and contractual activities described here are a responsibility of the IETF LLC. This section provides general guidance regarding several aspects of such activities.

NOTE: This section is intended to address [ISSUE #25](#), [ISSUE #57](#), [ISSUE #61](#), [ISSUE #62](#), and [ISSUE #63](#),

5.4.1. Vendor Selection for the RFC Production Center

Vendor selection is done in cooperation with the streams and under the final authority of the IETF LLC.

The IETF LLC develops the work definition (the Statement of Work) for the RPC and manages the vendor selection process. The work definition is created within the IETF LLC budget and takes into account the needs of stream managers as well as community input.

The process to select and contract for an RFC Production Center and other RFC-related services is as follows:

- *The IETF LLC establishes the contract process, including the steps necessary to issue an RFP when necessary, the timing, and the contracting procedures.
- *The IETF LLC establishes a selection committee, which will consist of the IETF Executive Director and other members selected by the IETF LLC in consultation with the stream managers. The committee shall select a chair from among its members.
- *The selection committee selects the vendor, subject to the successful negotiation of a contract approved by the IETF LLC. In the event that a contract cannot be reached, the matter shall be referred to the selection committee for further action.

5.4.2. Budget

The expenses discussed in this document are not new expenses. They have been and remain part of the IETF LLC budget.

The RFC Series portion of the IETF LLC budget shall include funding to support the RSEA, the RFC Production Center, and the Independent Stream.

The IETF LLC has the responsibility to approve the total RFC Editor budget (and the authority to deny it). All relevant parties must work within the IETF LLC budgetary process.

6. Streams

This document creates the Editorial Stream. Any and all future documents produced by the RSWG and approved by the RSAB shall be published in the Editorial Stream. Documents published in the Editorial Stream shall have a status of Informational. The Editorial Stream is not authorized to publish RFCs that are Standards Track or

Best Current Practice, since such RFCs are reserved to the IETF Stream [[RFC8729](#)].

The Editorial Stream will be used only to specify and update the strategy, policy, and procedures of the RFC Series itself; no other use of the Editorial Stream is authorized by this memo and no other streams are so authorized. This policy may be changed only by agreement of the IAB, IESG, and IETF LLC.

The requirements and process for creating any additional RFC streams are outside the scope of this document.

NOTE: This section is intended to address [ISSUE #22](#), [ISSUE #35](#), [ISSUE #63](#), and [ISSUE #73](#).

7. IANA Considerations

This document defines several functions related to the RFC Series and places the responsibility for coordination of registry value assignments with the RPC. The IETF LLC facilitates management of the relationship between the RPC and IANA.

This document does not create a new registry nor does it register any values in existing registries, and no IANA action is required.

8. Security Considerations

The same security considerations as those in [[RFC8729](#)] apply. The processes for the publication of documents must prevent the introduction of unapproved changes. Since the RFC Editor maintains the index of publications, sufficient security must be in place to prevent these published documents from being changed by external parties. The archive of RFC documents, any source documents needed to recreate the RFC documents, and any associated original documents (such as lists of errata, tools, and, for some early items, originals that are not machine-readable) need to be secured against any kind of data storage failure.

The IETF LLC should take these security considerations into account during the implementation and enforcement of any relevant contracts.

9. Changes from RFC 8728

9.1. RFC Series Editor

The RSWG and RSAB together provide a public process by which policies for the RFC Series can be defined. It is expected that these bodies will therefore cover some of the responsibilities of the RFC Series Editor function as defined by RFC 8728.

9.2. RFC Series Oversight Committee (RSOC)

In practice, the relationships and lines of authority and responsibility between the IAB, RSOC, and RSE have proved unwieldy and somewhat opaque. To overcome some of these issues, this document dispenses with the RSOC.

10. Updates to RFC 8729

This document incorporates some text directly from [RFC8729] and also makes the following updates:

*This document creates the Editorial Stream.

*Future changes to policies governing the RFC Series as a whole now occur through documents defined by the RSWG and approved by the RSAB.

*As described above, several responsibilities previously assigned to the "RFC Editor function" are now performed by the RSWG, RSAB, RPC, and IETF LLC (alone or in combination). These include aspects of operational oversight (Section 3.3 of [RFC8729]), policy oversight (Section 3.4 of [RFC8729]), the editing, processing, and publication of documents (Section 4.2 of [RFC8729]), and series-wide guidelines and rules (Section 4.4 of [RFC8729]).

In addition, some details regarding these responsibilities have been modified to accord with the new framework defined in this document.

11. IANA Considerations

This document has no actions for IANA.

12. Informative References

[RFC2418] Bradner, S., "IETF Working Group Guidelines and Procedures", BCP 25, RFC 2418, DOI 10.17487/RFC2418, September 1998, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2418>>.

[RFC3777] Galvin, J., Ed., "IAB and IESG Selection, Confirmation, and Recall Process: Operation of the Nominating and Recall Committees", RFC 3777, DOI 10.17487/RFC3777, June 2004, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3777>>.

[RFC5378] Bradner, S., Ed. and J. Contreras, Ed., "Rights Contributors Provide to the IETF Trust", BCP 78, RFC

5378, DOI 10.17487/RFC5378, November 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5378>>.

[RFC5620] Kolkman, O., Ed. and IAB, "RFC Editor Model (Version 1)", RFC 5620, DOI 10.17487/RFC5620, August 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5620>>.

[RFC6635] Kolkman, O., Ed., Halpern, J., Ed., and IAB, "RFC Editor Model (Version 2)", RFC 6635, DOI 10.17487/RFC6635, June 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6635>>.

[RFC7154] Moonesamy, S., Ed., "IETF Guidelines for Conduct", BCP 54, RFC 7154, DOI 10.17487/RFC7154, March 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7154>>.

[RFC7282] Resnick, P., "On Consensus and Humming in the IETF", RFC 7282, DOI 10.17487/RFC7282, June 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7282>>.

[RFC7322] Flanagan, H. and S. Ginoza, "RFC Style Guide", RFC 7322, DOI 10.17487/RFC7322, September 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7322>>.

[RFC7776] Resnick, P. and A. Farrel, "IETF Anti-Harassment Procedures", BCP 25, RFC 7776, DOI 10.17487/RFC7776, March 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7776>>.

[RFC7991] Hoffman, P., "The "xml2rfc" Version 3 Vocabulary", RFC 7991, DOI 10.17487/RFC7991, December 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7991>>.

[RFC8179] Bradner, S. and J. Contreras, "Intellectual Property Rights in IETF Technology", BCP 79, RFC 8179, DOI 10.17487/RFC8179, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8179>>.

[RFC8700] Flanagan, H., Ed., "Fifty Years of RFCs", RFC 8700, DOI 10.17487/RFC8700, December 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8700>>.

[RFC8711] Haberman, B., Hall, J., and J. Livingood, "Structure of the IETF Administrative Support Activity, Version 2.0", BCP 101, RFC 8711, DOI 10.17487/RFC8711, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8711>>.

[RFC8716] Resnick, P. and A. Farrel, "Update to the IETF Anti-Harassment Procedures for the Replacement of the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC) with the IETF Administration LLC", BCP 25, RFC 8716, DOI 10.17487/

RFC8716, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8716>>.

[RFC8728] Kolkman, O., Ed., Halpern, J., Ed., and R. Hinden, Ed., "RFC Editor Model (Version 2)", RFC 8728, DOI 10.17487/RFC8728, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8728>>.

[RFC8729] Housley, R., Ed. and L. Daigle, Ed., "The RFC Series and RFC Editor", RFC 8729, DOI 10.17487/RFC8729, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8729>>.

[RFC8730] Brownlee, N., Ed. and B. Hinden, Ed., "Independent Submission Editor Model", RFC 8730, DOI 10.17487/RFC8730, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8730>>.

[RFC8874] Thomson, M. and B. Stark, "Working Group GitHub Usage Guidance", RFC 8874, DOI 10.17487/RFC8874, August 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8874>>.

Acknowledgments

Portions of this document were borrowed from [RFC5620], [RFC6635], [RFC8728], [RFC8729], and earlier proposals submitted within the RFCED-Future Program by Martin Thomson, Brian Carpenter, and Michael StJohns. Thanks to the chairs of the Program, Eliot Lear and Brian Rosen, for their leadership and assistance. Thanks also for feedback and proposed text to Jari Arkko, Sarah Banks, Scott Bradner, Carsten Bormann, Nevil Brownlee, Ben Campbell, Jay Daley, Martin Duerst, Lars Eggert, Adrian Farrel, Stephen Farrell, Sandy Ginoza, Bron Gondwana, Joel Halpern, Wes Hardaker, Bob Hinden, Russ Housley, Christian Huitema, Ole Jacobsen, John Klensin, Mirja Kuehlewind, Ted Lemon, John Levine, Lucy Lynch, Andrew Malis, Larry Masinter, S. Moonesamy, Mark Nottingham, Tommy Pauly, Colin Perkins, Julian Reschke, Eric Rescorla, Adam Roach, Alice Russo, Doug Royer, Rich Salz, Tim Wicinski, and Nico Williams.

Author's Address

Peter Saint-Andre (editor)
Mozilla

Email: stpeter@stpeter.im