Individual Draft Submission Process

Stewart Bryant

stbryant@cisco.com

The Statistics

June 2003 to Feb 2006

- 896 RFC published
- 79 Individual drafts submitted for publication (~9%)
- Of these:
  - 60 are RFC, or in RFCedQ (~6.5% of RFC)
  - 3 Technical broken drop
  - 5 WG conflict delay or WG incorp or WG conflict drop
  - 4 Authors gave up
  - 2 waiting for review
  - 5 unknown
- Of the 60, the overwhelming majority benefited (minor to major) from the technical review by the IESG

Commercialism

- Small number of IS describe proprietary protocols.

- Identified by company name in title.

- In all but one case the timbre was a "dry" description similar to a WG product.

- One – which was technically sound - contained significant marketing material, and was rejected.

IS Current Process

- Historically IS have suffered significant delay due to lower priority that WG output and conflict with technical opinion of the Ads

- Since Oct 2004 process set by RFC3932

- IESG only checks for conflict with other IETF work, or with IETF process

- First stage review by the IESG is not a scalable, which is one reason for the process change.

- Technical review is at the discretion of individual ADs.

Five Responses

1. Publish – no conflict
2. Related to WG, but OK to publish
3. Harmful to IETF work, do not publish
4. Violates procedure, do not publish without IETF review & IESG approval
5. Extends IETF protocol, do not publish without IETF review & IESG approval

Note that although technical review is encouraged there is no technical review "go-round", nor is there a commercial "go-round"

Proposed New IS Process

Pre-condition:

1. Draft MUST NOT be standards track or BCP.

2. Draft must be published first as I-Ds.

Process:

1. Author requests Publication

2. Draft is reviewed by an independent review board (IRB) and the review is published.

3. If the IRB recommends publishing, draft submitted to the IESG, for RFC 3932 (non conflict with IETF work) review.

4. If the IESG recommends against publication and the IRB decides to publish, any note written by the IESG MUST be included.

5. The draft then goes to the technical publisher as per current process.

Proposed Process Change

Two key changes from current process:

1. Add peer review step (IRB). Note the term "peer", this is review by a group accountable to the community. Review by a group accountable to the editor takes place later.

2. Gives IESG the additional right to add an IESG note section to the draft for publication.

Peer Review Process

- Similar to technical journal peer review, report must be public.
- Author can at any time submit a corrected draft
- Peer review report forwarded with draft to IESG.

- Need to consider whether the author should be given the right to exit the review process without reaching agreement with the IRB. In that event, the IRB report would state that agreement was not reached and elaborate the IRB concerns.

IESG Note

- Normally based on the peer-review report.
- Provides for the IESG to comment on the content of the draft, but not to alter the content itself.
- Author can revise draft, or continue with publication (which would include the IESG Note)
- Who gets the final say on the contents of this note – the IESG or the RFC Editor?

Extended Process

- Balances freedom of expression with the increased quality that always results from peer review.

- May allow the author to expedite to next stage on their request to prevent stonewalling.

- Allows the IESG to add a section providing guidance to the reader as to the technical quality/merits of the final RFC.