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Abstract

This document describes a roadmap for various IETF process documents, intended both to assist IETF participants and to support discussions about process reform.
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1. Introduction

BCP 9 [RFC2026] has been the basis for the IETF standards process for many years. However, many other process documents exist, some of which are partial updates to BCP 9. This situation is confusing and would ideally be resolved by a clear set of interlocking documents. The present document suggests a structured way of looking at the existing documents, and mentions some (but not all) drafts covering possible changes and updates.

It is difficult to linearise a complicated and interlocked process. This document presents the roadmap in one particular order, but that is not intended to imply priority or importance, and it cannot capture all interactions between components.

2. Outline of roadmap

For readability of what follows, this section simply lists the process document structure. The following section repeats this structure with explanatory text.

Modifying the process
General description of workflow in the IETF
Definition of standards track and related document types
  Specifications
  Information
  Descriptors
Intellectual Property
  Rights in Contributions
  Rights in Technology
  Trademarks
Review and approval process
  Criteria for review
  Criteria for approval
  Appeal process
Bodies involved in the process
  WG procedures
  IESG
  Review panel TBD
  IAB
    Liaison management
  Nomcom
Conduct of participants
Publication process
Requirements
3. Details of roadmap

Note 1: RFC numbers have been used rather than BCP numbers, for convenient lookup. Most of the cited RFCs are BCPs. Of course, many of them may need updating.

Note 2: Where drafts are cited, it is not implied that they have reached consensus. Drafts are cited by filename only; the curious may consult http://tools.ietf.org/id/.

- Modifying the process
  A general description of how the IETF modifies its own processes does not exist, but probably should. An experimental procedure is described in [RFC3933]. Some recent discussion is captured in draft-davies-pesci-initial-considerations.

- General description of workflow in the IETF
  This document does not exist, although the Tao ([RFC3160], draft-hoffman-taobis) offers contains most of it informally. How ideas for new work enter the IETF, reach a BOF (draft-narten-successful-bof), enter IAB or IRTF discussion, and possibly become material for a new or existing WG. How WGs are chartered – the Area Director’s role. How specific proposals become drafts and flow through the development, review and approval process.

- Definition of standards track and related document types.
  This material is currently embedded in [RFC2026]. Additional requirements for routing protocols are defined in [RFC1264], being updated by draft-fenner-zinin-rtg-standard-reqts. The newtrk WG is chartered to revise the standards track – multiple proposals have been floated, most recently draft-carpenter-newtrk-twostep and draft-loughney-newtrk-one-size-fits-all.

  * Specifications
    This material is currently embedded in [RFC2026], covering standards track, BCP and experimental documents. The STD (standard) designation is documented in [RFC1311]. A variance procedure for down-level normative references is in [RFC3967].
A specific process for advancing MIB documents is in [RFC2438].

* Information
  This material is currently embedded in [RFC2026], covering informational and historic documents. A distinction between obsolete and deprecated documents is not currently made.

* Descriptors
  See draft-ietf-newtrk-repurposing-isd and draft-otis-newtrk-rfc-set.

o Intellectual Property
  * Rights in Contributions
    [RFC3978], draft-ietf-ipr-rules-update
  * Rights in Technology [RFC3979] (Guidelines, [RFC3669])
  * Trademarks
    draft-ietf-ipr-trademarks
  * IETF Trust [RFC4371]

o Review and approval process
  This material is currently embedded in [RFC2026].
  * Criteria for review
    Some material was in draft-carpenter-solution-sirs and a version can be found at http://www.alvestrand.no/ietf/gen/art/review-guidelines.html
  * Criteria for approval
    Material on current IESG practice can be found in draft-iesg-discuss-criteria
    + Appeal process
      This material is currently embedded in [RFC2026].

o Bodies involved in the process
  Bodies involved [RFC2028]; Defining the IETF [RFC3233]; Mission Statement [RFC3935].
  * WG procedures [RFC2418]
  * IESG [RFC3710]
  * Proposed review panel
draft-klensin-stds-review-panel
  * IAB [RFC2850]
    + Liaison management
      [RFC4052], [RFC4053], draft-iab-liaison-guidelines
  * Nomcom [RFC3777], draft-klensin-nomcom-term
  * Relationship to ISOC
    [RFC2031], [RFC3677]

o Conduct of participants
  [RFC3005], [RFC3184], [RFC3683], [RFC3934], and also discussed in [RFC2418] and in the Tao ([RFC3160], draft-hoffman-taoabis).
Publication process
* Requirements
  This is the subject of the techspec BOFs at IETF 64 and 65. See draft-mankin-pub-req.
* Format and mechanics for drafts
  http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-guidelines.html
* Format and mechanics for archival publications
  See draft-hoffman-rfc-author-guide for a minimalist version, or
draft-rfc-editor-rfc2223bis for a version including other topics. [RFC2223] is the published version today. Those
writing standards will find the following especially useful: [RFC2360], [RFC2434], [RFC3552].
* Direct submissions to RFC Editor [RFC3932]

Registration process
* Requirements [RFC2860]
* Guidelines for authors
  [RFC2434], draft-narten-iana-considerations-rfc2434bis
* Assignment criteria
  draft-klensin-iana-reg-policy
* Format and mechanics
  Case by case at IANA web site.

Administration
  [RFC4071], [RFC4371], [RFC4333], draft-alvestrand-subpoena

4. Security Considerations

This document has no security implications for the Internet.

5. IANA Considerations

This document requires no action by the IANA. However, it does
mention how IANA’s registration functions are documented.
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