

Workgroup: Network Working Group
Internet-Draft:
draft-iab-rfcedfp-rfced-model-04
Obsoletes: [RFC8728](#) (if approved)
Updates: [RFC7841](#), [RFC8729](#), [RFC8730](#)
(if approved)
Published: 11 October 2021
Intended Status: Informational
Expires: 14 April 2022
Authors: P. Saint-Andre, Ed.
Mozilla

RFC Editor Model (Version 3)

Abstract

This document describes updated processes for defining and implementing policies regarding the RFC Series as a whole and thus specifies version 3 of RFC Editor Model. The model defines two high-level tasks related to the RFC Series. Policy definition 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). Policy implementation 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 obsoletes RFC 8728. This document updates RFC 7841, RFC 8729, and RFC 8730.

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 14 April 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
 - 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. Workflow
 - 3.2.3. Community Calls for Comment
 - 3.2.4. Appeals
 - 3.2.5. Anti-Harassment Policy
 - 3.2.6. RFC Boilerplates
4. Policy Implementation
 - 4.1. Roles and Processes
 - 4.2. Implementation-Specific Policies
 - 4.3. RPC Responsibilities
 - 4.4. Resolution of Disagreements between Authors and the RPC
 - 4.5. External Representation
 - 4.6. Administrative Implementation
 - 4.6.1. Vendor Selection for the RFC Production Center
 - 4.6.2. Budget
5. RFC Series Consulting Editor (RSCE)
 - 5.1. RSCE Selection
 - 5.2. RSCE Performance Evaluation
 - 5.3. Conflict of Interest
6. Editorial Stream
 - 6.1. Editorial Stream Boilerplate
7. Security Considerations
8. IANA Considerations
9. Informative References

Appendix A. Changes from Version 2 of the RFC Editor Model

- A.1. RFC Editor Function
- A.2. RFC Series Editor
- A.3. RFC Publisher
- A.4. IAB
- A.5. RFC Series Oversight Committee (RSOC)
- A.6. RFC Series Advisory Group (RSAG)
- A.7. Editorial Stream

Acknowledgments

Author's Address

1. Introduction

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. As described in [RFC8700], RFCs have been published continually since 1969. The overall framework for the RFC Series and the RFC Editor function are described in [RFC8729] and updated here.

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].

This document reflects experience gained with version 1 and version 2 of the Model, and therefore describes version 3 of the Model while remaining consistent with [RFC8729].

In 2020, following up on meetings led by the RFC Series Editor in 2019, the IAB formed an open program to conduct a community discussion and consensus process for the further evolution of the RFC Editor model. Under the auspices of this program, the community considered changes that would increase transparency and community input regarding the definition of policies for the RFC Series as a whole, while at the same time ensuring the continuity of the RFC Series, maintaining RFC quality, maintaining timely processing, ensuring document accessibility, and clarifying lines of authority and responsibility.

More specifically, in order to ensure sustainable maintenance and support of the RFC Series based on the principles of expert implementation, clear management and direction, and appropriate

community input [RFC8729], this document divides the responsibilities for the RFC Series into two high-level tasks:

1. Policy definition governing the Series as a whole. This 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).
2. Policy implementation through publication of documents in the Series. This is primarily the responsibility of the RFC Production Center (RPC), under the ultimate authority of the IETF Administration Limited Liability Company (LLC) [RFC8711].

In this model, documents are produced and approved through multiple document streams. The stream manager for each stream is responsible for the content of that stream. The RFC Editor function is responsible for the packaging and distribution of the documents. As such, documents from these streams are edited and published by the Production Center.

The four streams that now exist are described in [RFC8729]. This document adds a fifth stream, the Editorial Stream.

This document obsoletes [RFC8728]. This document updates [RFC7841], [RFC8729], and [RFC8730].

2. Overview of the Model

Version 2 of the RFC Editor Model [RFC8728] defined 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).

By contrast, version 3 of the RFC Editor Model, specified here, provides a more consensus-oriented framework (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.

Policy definition happens within 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 through a public process 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 Consulting Editor (RSCE).

Policy implementation 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 RSCE.

- *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, RSCE, and RPC.

- *The RSCE 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.

This model is designed to ensure public processes and definition documents, clear responsibilities and mechanisms for updates and changes to policies governing the RFC Series as a whole, and operational implementation of the RFC Series, thus meeting the requirements specified in Section 4 of [\[RFC8729\]](#).

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

3. Policy Definition

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: This section is intended to address ISSUE #9, ISSUE #14, ISSUE #16, ISSUE #28, ISSUE #29, ISSUE #41, ISSUE #44, ISSUE #55, ISSUE #68, ISSUE #72, and ISSUE #80.

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.

3.1.2. RFC Series Approval Board (RSAB)

OPEN ISSUES: Discussion continues regarding (1) operation of the RSAB in the case of vacancies (ISSUE 82) and (2) quorum requirements for voting by the RSAB (ISSUE 84). The text regarding these issues is provisional and is subject to change.

NOTE: This section is intended to address [ISSUE #9](#), [ISSUE #38](#), [ISSUE #50](#), [ISSUE #53](#), [ISSUE #71](#), [ISSUE #82](#), and [ISSUE #84](#).

The RFC Series Approval Board (RSAB) shall act as the approving body for proposals generated within the RSWG. The only policy-making role 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 responsibility to provide appropriate review of RSWG proposals.

The voting members of the RSAB are as follows:

- *The IETF chair or their delegate appointed by the IESG
- *The IAB chair or their delegate appointed by the IAB
- *The IRTF chair or their delegate appointed by the IRTF Chair
- *The Independent Submissions Editor (ISE) [[RFC8730](#)] or their delegate appointed by the ISE
- *The RFC Series Consulting Editor

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. Appointing bodies should ensure that voting members are seated at

all times and should fill any vacancies with all due speed, if necessary on a temporary basis. In the case that the IRTF chair or ISE is incapacitated or otherwise unable to appoint a delegate, this responsibility shall fall to the IAB as the appointing body for the IRTF chair and ISE respectively.

To ensure the smooth operation 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 implementation of policies governing the RFC Series. 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 RSAB is the voting member representing the Editorial Stream.

The RSAB shall annually choose a chair from among its members using a method of its choosing. 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.

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. Workflow

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

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 position of CONCERN may be filed 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 vote of the RSAB is taken. If a majority of RSAB members vote YES, the proposal is approved. Otherwise, it is returned to the RSWG.
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.

3.2.3. Community Calls for Comment

NOTE: This section is intended to address ISSUE #67.

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 to the Internet-Draft that defines the proposal
- *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.

3.2.4. Appeals

NOTE: This section is intended to address ISSUE #16 and ISSUE #36.

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.

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. For further information about these policies, see [[RFC7154](#)], [[RFC7776](#)], and [[RFC8716](#)].

3.2.6. RFC Boilerplates

As part of the RFC Style Guide (see [[RFC7322](#)] and [style guide web page](#)), new or modified RFC boilerplates (see [[RFC7841](#)]) considered under version 3 of the RFC Editor Model must be approved by the following parties, each of which has a separate area of responsibility with respect to boilerplates:

- *Each stream to which the boilerplate applies, which approves that the boilerplate meets its needs
- *The RSAB, which approves that the boilerplate is not in conflict with the boilerplate used in the other streams
- *The RPC, which approves that the language of the boilerplate conforms to the RFC Style Guide
- *The IETF Trust, which approves that the boilerplate correctly states the Trust's position regarding rights and ownership

4. Policy Implementation

4.1. Roles and Processes

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

A few general considerations apply:

*The general roles and responsibilities of the RPC are defined by RFCs published in the Editorial Stream (i.e., not directly by the RSWG, RSAB, or RSCE).

*The RPC is advised by the RSCE and RSAB, and has a duty to consult with them under specific circumstances, such as those relating to disagreements between authors and the RPC.

*The RPC is contractually overseen by the IETF LLC to ensure that it performs in accordance with contracts in place.

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 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.

4.2. Implementation-Specific 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.

4.3. RPC Responsibilities

The core responsibility of the RPC is continuous improvement regarding the implementation of RFC policies (including the dimensions of document quality, timeliness of production, and accessibility of results), while taking into account issues raised by the community through the RSWG and by the stream managers. More specifically, the RPC's responsibilities include the following:

1. Editing inputs from all RFC streams to comply with the RFC Style Guide.
2. Creating and preserving records of edits performed on documents.
3. Identifying where editorial changes might have technical impact and seeking necessary clarification.
4. Engaging in dialogue with authors, document shepherds, IANA, or stream-specific contacts (e.g., working group chairs and stream managers) when clarification is needed.
5. Creating and preserving records of dialogue with document authors.
6. Requesting advice from the RSAB and RSCE as needed.
7. Providing suggestions to the RSAB and RSCE as needed.

8. Participating in the creation of new Editorial Stream RFCs that impact the RPC, at least in an advisory capacity.
9. Providing reports to the community on its performance and plans.
10. Consulting with the community on its plans.
11. Negotiating its specific plans and resources with the IETF LLC.
12. Providing sufficient resources to support reviews of RPC performance by the IETF LLC.
13. Coordinating with IANA to ensure correct documentation of IANA-performed protocol registry actions.
14. Assigning RFC numbers.
15. Establishing publication readiness of each document through communication with the authors, document shepherds, IANA, or stream-specific contacts, and, if needed, with the RSAB and RSCE.
16. Liaising with stream managers and other representatives of the streams as needed.
17. Announcing and providing on-line access to RFCs.
18. Providing an on-line system to submit RFC Errata.
19. Providing on-line access to approved RFC Errata.
20. Providing backups.
21. Providing storage and preservation of records.
22. Authenticating RFCs for legal proceedings.

4.4. Resolution of Disagreements between Authors and the RPC

NOTE: This section is intended to address ISSUE #6 and ISSUE #59.

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.

4.5. External Representation

NOTE: This section is intended to address ISSUE #83.

From time to time, individuals or organizations external to the IETF and the broader RFC Series community may have questions about the RFC Series. Such inquiries should be directed to the `rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org` email alias and then handled by the appropriate bodies (e.g., RSAB, RPC) or individuals (e.g., RSWG chairs, RSCE).

4.6. Administrative Implementation

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

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.

4.6.1. 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.

4.6.2. 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 RSCE, 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.

5. RFC Series Consulting Editor (RSCE)

NOTE: This section is intended to address ISSUE #12, ISSUE #24, and ISSUE #55.

The RFC Series Consulting Editor (RSCE) 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 RSCE 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 RSCE might be consulted could include the following (see also Section 4 of [[RFC8729](#)]):

- *Editing, processing, and publication of RFCs
- *Publication formats for the RFC Series
- *Changes to the RFC style guide
- *Series-wide guidelines regarding document content and quality
- *Web presence for the RFC Series
- *Copyright matters related to the RFC Series
- *Archiving, indexing, and accessibility of RFCs

The IETF LLC is responsible for the method of and management of the engagement of the RSCE, including selection, evaluation, and the timely filling of any vacancy. Therefore, whether the RSCE role is structured as a contractual or employee relationship is a matter for the IETF LLC to determine.

5.1. RSCE 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 RSCE 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 RSCE.

5.2. RSCE Performance Evaluation

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

5.3. Conflict of Interest

The RSCE is expected to avoid even the appearance of conflict of interest or judgment in performing these roles. To ensure this, the RSCE will be subject to a conflict of interest policy established by the IETF LLC.

6. Editorial Stream

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

This document creates the Editorial Stream as separate space for publication of policies, procedures, guidelines, rules, and related information regarding the RFC Series as a whole.

All documents produced by the RSWG and approved by the RSAB shall be published as RFCs in the Editorial Stream with a status of Informational. (Note that 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 policies, procedures, guidelines, rules, and related information regarding the RFC Series as a whole; 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.

6.1. Editorial Stream Boilerplate

This document specifies the following text for the "Status of This Memo" section of RFCs published in the Editorial Stream. Any changes to this boilerplate must be made through the RFC Series Policy Definition process specified in this document.

Because all Editorial Stream RFCs have a status of Informational, the first paragraph of the "Status of This Memo" section shall be as specified in Appendix A.2.1 of [RFC7841].

The second paragraph of the "Status of This Memo" section shall be as follows:

"This document is a product of the RFC Series Policy Definition process. It represents the consensus of the RFC Series Working Group approved by the RFC Series Approval Board. Such documents are not candidates for any level of Internet Standard; see Section 2 of RFC 7841."

The third paragraph of the "Status of This Memo" section shall be as specified in Section 3.5 of RFC 7841.

7. 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.

8. IANA Considerations

This document places 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.

9. 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>>.
- [RFC2850] Internet Architecture Board and B. Carpenter, Ed., "Charter of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB)", BCP 39, RFC 2850, DOI 10.17487/RFC2850, May 2000, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2850>>.
- [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>>.
- [RFC7841] Halpern, J., Ed., Daigle, L., Ed., and O. Kolkman, Ed., "RFC Streams, Headers, and Boilerplates", RFC 7841, DOI 10.17487/RFC7841, May 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7841>>.
- [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>>.

Appendix A. Changes from Version 2 of the RFC Editor Model

A.1. RFC Editor Function

Several responsibilities previously assigned to the "RFC Editor" or, more precisely, the "RFC Editor function" are now performed by the RSWG, RSAB, RPC, and IETF LLC (alone or in combination). These include various aspects of strategic leadership (Section 2.1.1 of [RFC8728]), representation of the RFC Series (Section 2.1.2 of [RFC8728]), development of RFC production and publication (Section 2.1.3 of [RFC8728]), development of the RFC Series (Section 2.1.4 of [RFC8728]), 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 development and maintenance of Series-wide guidelines and rules (Section 4.4 of [RFC8729]). In addition, various details regarding these responsibilities have been modified to accord with the new framework defined in this document.

A.2. RFC Series Editor

Implied by the changes outlined in the previous section, the responsibilities of the RFC Series Editor (RSE) as a person or role (contrasted with the overall "RFC Editor function") are now split or shared amongst the RSWG, RSAB, RPC, and IETF LLC (alone or in combination). More specifically, the responsibilities of the RFC Series Consulting Editor (RSCE) under version 3 of the RFC Editor Model differ in many ways from the responsibilities of the RFC Series Editor under version 2 of the Model. In general, references in existing documents to the RSE can be taken as referring to the "RFC Editor function" as described herein, but should not be taken as referring to the RSCE.

A.3. RFC Publisher

In practice the RFC Production Center (RPC) and RFC Publisher roles have been performed by the same entity and this practice is expected to continue; therefore this document dispenses with the distinction and refers only to the RPC.

A.4. IAB

Under earlier versions of the RFC Editor Model, the IAB was responsible for oversight of the RFC Series and acted as a body for final conflict resolution regarding the Series. The IAB's authority in these matters is described in the IAB's charter [[RFC2850](#)]. Under version 2 of the Model, the IAB delegated some of its authority to the RFC Series Oversight Committee (see below). Under version 3 of the Model, authority for policy definition resides with the RSWG as an independent venue for work by members of the community (with approval of policy proposals as the responsibility of the RSAB, representing the streams and the RSCE), whereas authority for policy implementation ultimately resides with the IETF LLC.

A.5. 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. References to the RSOC in documents such as [[RFC8730](#)] are obsolete because this document does away with the RSOC.

A.6. RFC Series Advisory Group (RSAG)

NOTE: This section is intended to address [ISSUE #85](#).

Version 1 of the RFC Editor Model [[RFC5620](#)] specified the existence of the RFC Series Advisory Group (RSAG), which was no longer specified in version 2 of the Model. For the avoidance of doubt, this document affirms that the RSAG is obsolete and its charter is no longer in force.

A.7. Editorial Stream

This document creates the Editorial Stream in addition to the streams already described in [[RFC8729](#)].

Acknowledgments

Portions of this document were borrowed from [[RFC5620](#)], [[RFC6635](#)], [[RFC8728](#)], [[RFC8729](#)], and earlier proposals submitted within the IAB's RFC Editor Future Development 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