

The "xml2rfc" version 3.1
Vocabulary
(or something like that...)

Paul Hoffman
IETF 115, London
November 2022

Big picture

- After draft-irise-draft-irise-xml2rfcv3-implemented is completed, there is still work to do
- Some things in the as-implemented draft are possibly bad ideas (even though they are implemented)
- Some things removed from RFC 7991 might be put back in
- There are ramifications to making a 3.1

Removing the bad ideas

- Some were introduced in RFC 7991 itself
 - The community thought they were good ideas and they weren't
- Some were introduced during the implementation of RFC 7991
 - They were added without community review or consensus

Adding back the ones we still want

- Some parts of the grammar were removed during the implementation of RFC 7991
 - We might want to add them back because they were in fact reasonable ideas

Ramifications of a 3.1

- Need changes to the tooling, but that is relatively easy
- Need to decide how to say in an XML document which grammar was used
 - ...but this is probably needed for the current XML files as well

Archival

- When we create a 3.1, we also need to decide what to do about the currently-published XML
- This is little consensus so far on what “archival” means for the XML
- The basic question is whether it is OK to replace the current XML with new XML that generates the same (or exceptionally similar) output that every human reader would consider to be equivalent

Proposed way forward

- Wait for the as-implemented document to complete IETF Last Call
- Start from a list of differences between RFC 7991 and the final as-implemented draft
- Categorize every difference
- Find rough consensus on every difference
- Only then think about the “archival” issue