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Why a (separate) stream?

- Offer RGs an alternative to the existing independent submission stream for RFCs
  - Potentially a faster publication track
  - Quality is improved by IRSG review
  - Independent submissions are still an option

- An avenue for groups to publish findings with an IRTF label
  - Informational or Experimental RFCs
The Process in a Nutshell

(Draft)

1. Thorough review by the Research Group
   • Technical review
   • Editorial review
   • RG reaches agreement on publication
2. IRSG Review and Approval
3. IESG Review
4. Submitted to RFC Editor for publication
Document Shepherds

• Purpose is to track the review process, to ensure timely response to issues raised
  – Find IRSG reviewers, summarize comments
  – Facilitate resolution of issues
  – Keep tracker* up-to-date
    * Today, a separate IRTF tracker; eventually, IETF tracker

• Normally, RG chair is shepherd
  – If RG chair is author, IRTF chair must approve
  – RG chair may delegate to an RG member
RG Preparation

- Abstract should identify as product of RG
- Paragraph describing level of RG support
- Also note breadth of I-D review within RG
- Make it clear: not IETF doc, not a standard
- Include appropriate caveats for protocols
- If previously considered in IETF, so note
- Cite the relevant literature appropriately
IRSG Review

• Initial Steps (performed by shepherd)
  – Request review, enter into tracker, find reviewers, open a poll

• Reviews
  – Looking for clear, cogent, consistent writing
  – Accessible to non-experts; proper citations to literature

• IRSG Poll: at least two other members must vote
  – ‘Ready to publish’, ‘Not ready to publish’, ‘No objection’, ‘Request more time’

• Follow-up
  – Shepherd documents everything in the tracker
IESG Review

• Scope is "[t]o ensure that the non-standards track Experimental and Informational designations are not misused to circumvent the Internet Standards Process."

• IESG response is due within 4 weeks, typically

• If IESG recommends Do-Not-Publish, RG may revise document per feedback, or appeal to IAB
RFC Editor Handling

• IRTF Chair forwards document to Editor

• Document enters the publication queue
  – Same priority as IETF/IAB non-standards documents
  – Shepherd ensures authors are responsive as the document moves through editing process
I-D History and Current Status

• draft-irtf-rfcs
  – 00 draft released 26 February 2006
  – 01 draft released 08 June 2007
  – An update is currently in progress, awaiting input from IAB/IESG

• For the latest draft text, see http://www3.tools.ietf.org/group/irtf/trac/wiki/IRTF-RFCs