Network Working Group
Request for Comments: 4845
Category: Informational

L. Daigle, Ed.
Internet Architecture Board
(IAB)

July 2007

# Process for Publication of IAB RFCs

## Status of This Memo

This memo provides information for the Internet community. It does not specify an Internet standard of any kind. Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

## Abstract

From time to time, the Internet Architecture Board (IAB) publishes documents as Requests for Comments (RFCs). This document defines the process by which those documents are produced, reviewed, and published in the RFC Series.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . . 2
2. Review and Approval . . . . . 2
3. IAB RFC Publication Process . . . . . 3
4. Security Considerations . . . . . 3
5. IAB Members at the Time of Approval . . . . . 4
6. References . . . . . 4

## 1. Introduction

From time to time, the IAB has cause to publish documents as Requests for Comments (RFCs). These occasions include the following:

- documents that arise from consideration of an issue by the IAB and are authored by the IAB through a nominated editor.

- documents that report on IAB activities, such as workshop reports, and are authored by a nominated editor, generally from among the activity participants.

- documents that are not the outcome of an Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) Working Group effort but that the IAB has determined would be of benefit to the IETF community to publish. Such documents need not necessarily be authored or revised by the IAB.

The majority of documents published by the IAB will be classified as Informational RFCs (see [RFC2026]). Generally speaking, the IAB does not publish Standards-Track or Experimental RFCs. If the IAB has cause to publish a document as a Best Current Practice (BCP), it would fall under the approval process of the IETF standards stream of RFCs (see [RFC4844]).

## 2. Review and Approval

In many cases, the IAB publishes documents to provide a permanent record of an IAB statement or position. In such cases, the IAB uses its internal discussion processes to refine the expression and technical content of the document, and the document is approved for publication if, and only if, the IAB is in agreement on its substantive content.

For certain documents, it may not be appropriate for the IAB to take responsibility for technical correctness. For example, where the IAB has sponsored a workshop in which not all the participants were members of the IAB and/or not all the members of the IAB were present, approval by the IAB of a report of the workshop is used only to assert that the report is a faithful report of the proceedings of the workshop and that the matter is of interest to the community.

Documents for which the IAB takes responsibility for technical correctness (the most usual case) will be indicated by noting the IAB as an author of the document, with individuals noted as editors or text authors. Other documents, such as workshop reports, will not specify the IAB as an author (although this does not preclude individual IAB members from being authors or editors).

In general, the document (introductory) text should make plain the role of the IAB in publishing and supporting the text. Should the IAB have significant issues with any individual item in the document, a note may be included in the document explaining the issue.

## 3. IAB RFC Publication Process

The following is a description of the process used by the IAB to publish IAB documents as RFCs.

1. The document is determined to be an IAB document by the IAB, as described in Section 1.

2. The IAB publishes an IAB draft (draft-iab-*). Comments on the draft are reviewed and may be integrated into successive iterations of the draft. In addition to considering comments received on the draft, the IAB may elect to refer the document to individuals or groups and explicitly solicit comments as appropriate.

3. For documents intended to be published as BCPs, the document is passed to the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) with a sponsoring Area Director (AD), and follows the process outlined in [SPONSOR].

4. For documents intended to be Informational RFCs, the remainder of this process is followed.

5. The chair of the IAB issues an IETF-wide Call for Comment on the IETF Announce mailing list. The comment period is normally no shorter than four weeks.

6. Comments received are considered for integration into the document. The IAB shall determine whether the document is ready for publication based on the comments received, or whether another round of document editing and, optionally, a further call for input is required.

7. The document is passed to the RFC Editor for publication as an IAB document Informational RFC.

## 4. Security Considerations

This document does not discuss matters with any particular security implications.

## 5. IAB Members at the Time of Approval

Bernard Aboba
Loa Andersson
Brian Carpenter
Leslie Daigle
Elwyn Davies
Kevin Fall
Olaf Kolkman
Kurtis Lindqvist
David Meyer
David Oran
Eric Rescorla
Dave Thaler
Lixia Zhang

## 6. References

[RFC2026] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", RFC 2026, BCP 9, October 1996.

[RFC4844] Daigle, L., Ed., "The RFC Series and RFC Editor", RFC 4844, July 2007.

[SPONSOR] Arkko, J., Ed., "Guidance on Area Director Sponsoring of Documents", ION, May 2007.

## Authors' Addresses

Leslie L. Daigle (editor)

EMail: ledaigle@cisco.com, leslie@thinkingcat.com

(IAB)

EMail: iab@iab.org
URI: http://www.iab.org/

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in BCP 78, and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY, THE IETF TRUST AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

## Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at http://www.ietf.org/ipr.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at ietf-ipr@ietf.org.

## Acknowledgement

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.