



RFC Artifacts

...or regenerating TXT, HTML, PDF

RFC 7990

“The canonical format for RFCs is XML”

... however...

RFC 7990 is not very clear about publication formats

There are three concepts here

Canonical: Of or appearing in the biblical canon

Authoritative: Having or arising from authority; official

Archival: Of, relating to, kept in, or suitable for archives

Let's start with XML



(If we decide that XML can change,
changing publication formats seems unavoidable*)

Syntax and Semantics

Key property to retain is **authority**

Authority is carried in the expression of **semantics**

We use XML because better captures semantics

In contrast **syntax** changes might

- ...ensure consistency across the series

- ... retain agreed semantics (and maintain authority)

- ...or even better express semantics

Preserving semantics

Not always clear

Address changes arguably remove some semantics

But this should not affect what was agreed

Proposal:

offer only loose guidance to future RSWG

rely on future RSWG exercising good judgment

XML change options

1. No changes
2. Syntax changes only
3. Semantic changes (! seems unwise)



Archival

Proposal:

- require archival of XML at each change

- say nothing about archival of publication formats

Note that we might expect that, in practice:

- publication formats will be archived as well

- ...but maybe not always

Publication formats

As a consequence:

Publication formats can be regenerated at will

UNDER HEAVY CONSTRUCTION

Problems

xml2rfc has been highly inconsistent over time

this makes uniform styling unreasonably difficult

examples: table of contents, figures, tables

also:

```
Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)
Request for Comments: 8996
BCP: 195
Obsoletes: 5469, 7507
Updates: 3261, 3329, 3436, 3470, 3501, 3568, 3656, 3749, 3767, 3856, 3884, 3903, 3943, 3983, 4097, 4162, 4168, 4217, 4235, 4261, 4497, 4513, 4531, 4540, 4582, 4642, 4680, 4681, 4712, 4732, 4751
```

href="https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/
rfc%E2%80%8B%204162"