

An RFC Stream for the IRTF

Wednesday, 12 March 2008

Scalable Adaptive Multicast RG

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>