

Anachronisms in IETF Process Documents

draft-carpen-ter-gendispatch-anachronisms

Brian Carpenter

IETF 125
March 2026

Problem statement

- PROCON WG is chartered to revise RFC 2026 and RFC 2418 by incorporating approved updates and errata.
- (Plus some specific changes described in the WG charter.)
- That will leave numerous anachronisms in the many IETF process documents untouched.

Some examples (1)

- Internet-Drafts do not actually expire after 6 months; they are simply archived.
- The “rule” about citing I-Ds as Work in Progress is illogical as written.
- Today, the process for elevating a document to Internet Standard is so similar to the process for approving a Proposed Standard that there is almost no practical difference.

Some examples (2)

- Current practice about the number of BOFs on the same topic is inconsistent with the rules.
- Current practice about AD sponsoring of non-WG drafts is not properly described in the rules.
- “What is the IETF?” is answered differently in two different BCPs.

No doubt more such issues are waiting to be discovered.

The Dispatch questions

- Do we care?
- Is there energy to work on this?
- Should the PROCON charter be extended accordingly?

