2026bis update IETF 126

Rich Salz, Scott Bradner

Draft 6, 7, 8 (March, April, May 2026)

- Draft 6: Typo fixes, editorial fixes for BCP/STD numbering and contents; link for BCP/STD. Shuffle text about IESG evaluation and IETF LC.

- Draft 7: Follow-on changes from -06. Add reference to BCP97. Change RFC editor link for subseries info.

- Draft 8: Add "standards action requires IESG approval" paragraph.

Draft 9 (June 18)

- Remove text that clarified things, but weren't part of the updating documents.
  - Identified by Dan Bernstein
  - Confirmed by Roman

Draft 10 (June 23); address WGLC issues #1

- Thanks to Jari for reviewing and summarizing the WGLC items
- Editorial changes:
  - Use Unicode instead of ASCII as external standard
  - Add references to RFC 8712 and RFC 9920;
  - Mention other online fora per RFC 9945
  - Move "IETF stream needs rough consensus" to the RFC section (4.1)
  - Remove mention of other streams from Experimental
  - All inf/exp drafts get IETSG review (implied by 2026 and 8789).
  - Remove "directly" from inf/exp publication as its a holdover from when the RFC Editor (sic) could publish them w/o IESG
  - Edit section headings and move text to avoid re-using the draft title as a section header
  - Add WG folks to acknowledgements

Draft 11 (July); WGLC #3

- There was no ~~Rule 6~~ WGLC #2
- Revise wording to say non-standard-track maturity levels also follow the process defined in Sec 8 (editorial)
  - Follow-on that all standards designations follow the IESG / IETF-LC process; that's why this is editorial
- A TS can use elect to use the word *optional* or, optionally, use *elective*
- "We also thank Dan Bernstein for his feedback."

Draft 12 (forthcoming); last WGLC feedback

- Tweak wording about IETF LC to "Except as described below"
- Draft 10 missed one instance about non-public discussions

Open issues deferred (from Jari's summary)

- Who determines IETF consensus?
  - Implied but not stated that the IESG does
  - Captured as issue 77
- Use "inactive not expired"
  - Massive tooling change
  - IETF has discussed this before with no change
  - Captured as issue 82
- Incorporate RFC 1311
  - Not as simple as it looked, captured as issue 83

Open issue needing WG input

- Referencing RFC Editor URL's
  - For example, https://www.rfc-editor.org and https://www.rfc-editor.org/authors/rfc-style-guide/ and not only RFC 9920 and RFC 7322.
  - Do this or not?
  - Links to subseries (top page or sub-pages?)
  - Ask RSWG what they want?

- Related: Remove reference to RFC 7322?

Sequencing with 2418bis?

- Look to the Chairs to lead this

Next steps

- Confirm consensus on the list
- Publish a new draft
- Do another WGLC
- AD Review
- See previous slide