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It’s a short draft

• ...and this is a short presentation
• Expectation: for each RFC, the RFC Editor will publish one format that is canonical, and many other formats that are not
• The canonical RFC never changes, but the other representations can
• People want the information in the format that is best for them, and that’s different between different readers
Canonical format

- XML (or maybe HTML; more later)
- Supported with good tooling
- This doesn’t have to be the format you turn in your Internet-Drafts, but it might be
- XML/HTML can hold all of the metadata we want; we really want the metadata in the canonical format
- Start with xml2rfc, but make a bunch of improvements
Other formats that will be published

- One or more robust HTMLs (both 4 and 5?)
- More than one plain text format (one like today’s, plus some that are better for some readers)
- PDF
- Stuff in the future that we don’t know about
Making it better for RFC readers

- RFCs will be found at predictable URLs so that people can find the format they like best
- For XML and HTML, the art will be in the document
- Metadata is important both to the publishing process and to later searching, so it’s all in the canonical document (and hopefully in some of the derived ones as well)
Input to the RFC series

• XML, using the same tools that the RFC Editor uses
• Other formats should be allowed so that people can create Internet-Drafts in a way that works for them
XML vs. HTML, my view

• Using XML to produce multiple profiles of HTML is more intuitive than having just one profile of HTML (which version?) or using one HTML profile to produce another
• They both accept the same semantics, and cross-creation is easy with simple tools
• By 2015, we will want more than one HTML format
• So, XML is better, but HTML is acceptable