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What is the Independent Series?

- Informational discussions of technologies, options, or experience with protocols
- Discussion of Internet-related technologies that are not part of the IETF agenda
- Documents considered by IETF Working Groups but not standardized
- Introduction of important new ideas as a bridge publication venue between academia and IETF engineering
- Meeting notes and reports
- Critiques and discussions of alternatives to IETF Standards-Track protocols and processes
- April 1st RFCs and other humor
- Informational publication of vendor-specific protocols
- Eulogies

Source: RFC 4846
Why Independent Submissions?

A check on the IETF process

But not an “end run”
(No standards or BCPs may be published)

A means to publish RFCs when standards, BCPs, and IETF consensus are not necessary or appropriate.

A means to raise important issues for the community's consideration
## What documents govern the Independent Series?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFC 4846</td>
<td>defines the series and the general publishing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC 5744</td>
<td>specifies the IPR policies for the series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC 8730</td>
<td>specifies the role of the independent series editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC 8726</td>
<td>specifies policies around IANA considerations for independent submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(RFC 5742 governs the IESG in how it conducts conflict reviews)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Independent Submissions Editor

Appointed by and responsible to the IAB for repeatable two-year terms

Comments about ISE may be sent to the IAB (iab@iab.org)

Before 2007: Combined "RFC Editor" role
(Before the IETF came to be, Jon Postel made all publication decisions)
History

- Joyce Reynolds
- Adrian Farrel (2018 – 2022) (ISE)
- Eliot Lear (2022 – present) (ISE)
The Independent Submissions Editorial Board

Serves at the pleasure of the ISE

Provides document reviews

Is informed of decisions by the ISE

Receives reviews by the ISE for comment

By practice, assists the ISE when there is a potential for conflict of interest
What’s the process?

The ISE reserves the right to decline publication at any stage.
Reviews

All documents must receive reviews from both the ISE and external reviewers

Reviews are made available to authors by default, and authors are expected to interact with reviewers

The ISE generally acts on the preponderance of opinions of reviewers (but this is expected to be an iterative process)

The ISE may request area/directorate reviews

The ISE must seek conflict reviews from the IESG, but still makes an independent decision.
The IESG’s Formal Role:
RFC 5742
Reviews:
Advise the ISE

Common choices:

- No conflict between this document and IETF work; or
- Work is related to IETF work done in WG <X>, but this relationship does not prevent publishing; or
- Publication could potentially disrupt the IETF work done in WG <X> and recommends not publishing the document at this time; or
- Document violates IETF procedures for <Y> and should therefore not be published without IETF review and IESG approval; or
- Document extends an IETF protocol in a way that requires IETF review and should therefore not be published without IETF review and IESG approval.
### How the ISE processes results of a RFC 5742 review

- Consider advice and publish
- Consider advice and ask authors to make some changes
- Negotiate an IESG note
- Delay publication for a time
- Consider advice and decide not to publish
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A word about volume
My priorities

Interoperability

Levity

Continuous Improvement
Some recent examples of Independent Stream RFCs

RFC 9558: Use of GOST 2012 Signature Algorithms in DNSKEY and RRSIG Resource Records for DNSSEC

RFC 9518: Centralization, Decentralization, and Internet Standards

RFC 9517: A URN Namespace for the Data Documentation Initiative (DDI)

RFC 9498: The GNU Name System

RFC 9446: Reflections on Ten Years Past the Snowden Revelations
### Common reasons for rejections

- IETF conflict or likely IETF conflict
- Poorly written
- Inappropriate technical approach
- IANA considerations
- Not applicable to the community
- Inappropriate IPR
“Somewhere else” might be CACM, TPRC, NDSS, I2, RIRs, GÉANT, IEEE Computing Society, WEIS, IACR, SIGCOMM, another SDO, or elsewhere else.

Criteria: what will serve the community best?
What about Encryption?

Cannot / won’t publish crypto algorithms, themselves (lack of expert reviewers)

Sometimes RFCs are **required** by IANA considerations (cf DNSSEC)

Applications of cryptography in in protocol suite are permitted

Not a priority, but not a non-priority

Reviewed just the same as per RFC 4846
(Always reviewed by Crypto Panel)

Current number of crypto-related-documents in queue: 1
Some documents under consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>draft-nichols-iotops-defined-trust-transport</td>
<td>Defined-Trust Transport (DeftT) Protocol for Limited Domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft-tschofenig-rats-psa-token</td>
<td>Arm's Platform Security Architecture (PSA) Attestation Token</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft-dekater-scion-{dataplane,controlplane,pki}</td>
<td>SCION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft-menon-svr</td>
<td>Juniper’s Secure Vector Routing (SVR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft-spinosa-urn-lex</td>
<td>A Uniform Resource Name (URN) Namespace for Sources of Law (LEX)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some additional thoughts

No stream is an island

- We all serve to better the Internet

RFCs serve many purposes

- Standardization is a big one (not the only one)