

Internet Architecture Board (IAB)  
Request for Comments: 8729  
Obsoletes: 4844  
Category: Informational  
ISSN: 2070-1721

R. Housley, Ed.

L. Daigle, Ed.  
February 2020

## The RFC Series and RFC Editor

### Abstract

This document describes the framework for an RFC Series and an RFC Editor function that incorporate the principles of organized community involvement and accountability that has become necessary as the Internet technical community has grown, thereby enabling the RFC Series to continue to fulfill its mandate. This document obsoletes RFC 4844.

### Status of This Memo

This document is not an Internet Standards Track specification; it is published for informational purposes.

This document is a product of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB) and represents information that the IAB has deemed valuable to provide for permanent record. It represents the consensus of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB). Documents approved for publication by the IAB are not candidates for any level of Internet Standard; see Section 2 of RFC 7841.

Information about the current status of this document, any errata, and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8729>.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document.

### Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. RFC Series Mission
3. Roles and Responsibilities
  - 3.1. RFC Editor
  - 3.2. IAB
  - 3.3. Operational Oversight
  - 3.4. Policy Oversight
4. Framework
  - 4.1. Document Approval
    - 4.1.1. Definition
    - 4.1.2. Operational Implementation
    - 4.1.3. Process Change
    - 4.1.4. Existing Approval Process Documents
  - 4.2. Editing, Processing, and Publication of Documents

- 4.2.1. Definition
- 4.2.2. Operational Implementation
- 4.2.3. Process Change
- 4.2.4. Existing Process Documents
- 4.3. Archiving, Indexing, and Accessibility
  - 4.3.1. Definition
  - 4.3.2. Operational Implementation
  - 4.3.3. Process Change
  - 4.3.4. Existing Process Documents
- 4.4. Series-Wide Guidelines and Rules
  - 4.4.1. Definition
  - 4.4.2. Operational Implementation
  - 4.4.3. Process Change
  - 4.4.4. Existing Process Documents
- 5. RFC Streams
  - 5.1. RFC Approval Processes
    - 5.1.1. IETF Document Stream
    - 5.1.2. IAB Document Stream
    - 5.1.3. IRTF Document Stream
    - 5.1.4. Independent Submission Stream
  - 5.2. RFC Technical Publication Requirements
    - 5.2.1. IETF Documents
    - 5.2.2. IAB Documents
    - 5.2.3. IRTF Documents
    - 5.2.4. Independent Submissions
- 6. Security Considerations
- 7. Changes Since RFC 4844
- 8. Informative References
- Appendix A. A Retrospective of IAB Charters and RFC Editor
  - A.1. 1992
  - A.2. 1994
  - A.3. 2000
- IAB Members at the Time of Approval
- Authors' Addresses

## 1. Introduction

The first Request for Comments (RFC) document was published in April of 1969 as part of the effort to design and build what we now know of as the Internet. Since then, the RFC Series has been the archival series dedicated to documenting Internet technical specifications, including both general contributions from the Internet research and engineering community as well as standards documents.

As described in the history of the first 30 years of RFCs ([RFC2555]), the RFC Series was created for the purpose of capturing the research and engineering thought that underlie the design of (what we now know of as) the Internet. As the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) was formalized to carry out the discussion and documentation of Internet standards, IETF documents have become a large part (but not the entirety) of the RFC Series.

As the IETF has grown up and celebrated its own 30 years of history, its requirements for archival publication of its output have changed and become more rigorous. Perhaps most significantly, the IETF must be able to define (based on its own open consensus discussion processes and leadership directions) and implement adjustments to its publication processes.

At the same time, the Internet engineering and research community as a whole has grown and come to require more openness and accountability in all organizations supporting it. More than ever, this community needs an RFC Series that is supported (operationally and in terms of its principles) such that there is a balance of:

- \* expert implementation;

- \* clear management and direction -- for operations and evolution across the whole RFC Series (whether originating in the IETF or not); and
- \* appropriate community input into and review of activities.

In the past, there has been confusion and therefore sometimes tension over where and how to address RFC issues that are particular to contributing groups (e.g., the IETF, the Internet Architecture Board (IAB), or independent individuals). It was not always clear where there should be community involvement versus RFC Editor control; depending on the issue, there might be more or less involvement from the IAB, the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG), or the community at large. There are similar issues with handling RFC Series-wide issues -- where to discuss and resolve them in a way that is balanced across the whole series.

For example, there have been discussions about Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) for IETF-generated documents, but it's not clear when or how to abstract the portions of those discussions that are relevant to the rest of the RFC Series. Discussions of labeling (of RFCs in general, IETF documents in particular, or some combination thereof) generally must be applied to the whole RFC Series or not at all. Without an agreed-on framework for managing the RFC Series, it is difficult to have those discussions in a non-polarized fashion -- either the IETF dictating the reality of the rest of the RFC Series, or the RFC Series imposing undue restrictions on documents from the IETF.

As part of its charter (see Appendix A), the IAB has a responsibility for the RFC Editor. Acknowledging the IETF's needs and the general Internet engineering and research community's evolving needs, the IAB supports a future for the RFC Series that continues to meet its original mandate of providing the archival series for the technical research and engineering documentation that describes the Internet.

With this document, the IAB provides the framework for the RFC Series and an RFC Editor function with the specific purpose of ensuring that the RFC Series is maintained and supported in ways that are consistent with the stated purpose of the RFC Series and the realities of today's Internet research and engineering community. The framework describes the existing "streams" of RFCs, draws a roadmap of existing process documents already defining the implementation, and provides clear direction of how to evolve this framework and its supporting pieces through discussion and future document revision.

Specifically, this document provides a brief charter for the RFC Series, describes the role of the RFC Editor, the IAB, and the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA) in a framework for managing the RFC Series, and discusses the streams of input to the RFC Series from the various constituencies it serves.

## 2. RFC Series Mission

The RFC Series is the archival series dedicated to documenting Internet technical specifications, including general contributions from the Internet research and engineering community as well as standards documents.

RFCs are available free of charge to anyone via the Internet.

## 3. Roles and Responsibilities

As this document sets out the framework for supporting the RFC Series

mission, this section reviews the updated roles and responsibilities of the entities that have had, and will have, involvement in continued support of the mission.

### 3.1. RFC Editor

Originally, there was a single person acting as editor of the RFC Series (the RFC Editor). The task has grown, and the work now requires the organized activity of several experts, so there are RFC Editors, or an RFC Editor organization. In time, there may be multiple organizations working together to undertake the work required by the RFC Series. For simplicity's sake, and without attempting to predict how the role might be subdivided among them, this document refers to this collection of experts and organizations as the "RFC Editor".

The RFC Editor is an expert technical editor and series editor, acting to support the mission of the RFC Series. As such, the RFC Editor is the implementer handling the editorial management of the RFC Series, in accordance with the defined processes. In addition, the RFC Editor is expected to be the expert and prime mover in discussions about policies for editing, publishing, and archiving RFCs.

### 3.2. IAB

In this model, the role of the IAB is to ensure that the RFC Series mission is being appropriately fulfilled for the whole community for which it was created. The IAB does not, organizationally, have comprehensive publishing or editorial expertise. Therefore, the role of the IAB is focused on ensuring that principles are met, the appropriate bodies and communities are duly informed and consulted, and the RFC Editor has what it needs in order to execute on the material that is in their mandate.

It is the responsibility of the IAB to approve the appointment of the RFC Editor and to approve the general policy followed by the RFC Editor.

### 3.3. Operational Oversight

The IETF Administration Limited Liability Company (IETF LLC), as part of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA), is responsible for administrative and financial matters for the IETF, the IAB, and the Internet Research Task Force (IRTF) [RFC8711]. The IASA is tasked with providing the funding for the RFC Editor. The IASA, through the IETF Executive Director, provides contractual and financial oversight of the RFC Editor. Additionally, as described in Section 3.1 of [RFC8728], the RFC Series Oversight Committee (RSOC), acting with authority delegated from the IAB, is responsible for ensuring that the RFC Series is run in a transparent and accountable manner, including design and execution of the RFC Series Editor selection process.

The IETF Executive Director works with the IAB to identify suitable persons or entities to fulfill the mandate of the RFC Production Center and the RFC Publisher roles as defined in [RFC8728].

The IETF Executive Director establishes appropriate contractual agreements with the selected persons or entities to carry out the work that will satisfy the technical publication requirements defined for the various RFC input streams (see Section 5.2). The IETF Executive Director may define additional operational requirements and policies for management purposes to meet the requirements defined by the various communities.

The IETF Administration LLC Board approves a budget for operation of the RFC Editor activity, and the IETF Executive Director establishes and manages the necessary operational agreements for the RFC Editor activity.

### 3.4. Policy Oversight

The IAB monitors the effectiveness of the policies in force and their implementation to ensure that the RFC Editor activity meets the editorial management and document publication needs as referenced in this document. In the event of serious non-conformance, the IAB, either on its own initiative or at the request of the IETF Administration LLC Board, may require the IETF Executive Director to vary or terminate and renegotiate the arrangements for the RFC Editor activity.

## 4. Framework

With the RFC Series mission outlined above, this document describes a framework for supporting

- \* the operational implementation of the RFC Series,

based on

- \* public process and definition documents,

for which there are

- \* clear responsibilities and mechanisms for update and change.

Generally speaking, the RFC Editor is responsible for the operational implementation of the RFC Series. As outlined in Section 3.3, the IETF Executive Director provides the oversight of this operational role.

The process and definition documents are detailed below, including responsibility for the individual process documents (maintenance and update). The RFC Editor works with the appropriate community to ensure that the process documents reflect current requirements. The IAB is charged with the role of verifying that appropriate community input has been sought and that any changes appropriately account for community requirements.

There are three categories of activity, and a fourth category of series-wide rules and guidelines, described for implementing the RFC Series to support its mission:

- \* Approval of documents.
- \* Editing, processing, and publication of documents.
- \* Archiving and indexing the documents and making them accessible.
- \* Series rules and guidelines.

### 4.1. Document Approval

The RFC Series mission implicitly requires that documents be reviewed and approved for acceptance into the series.

#### 4.1.1. Definition

Section 5.1 describes the different streams of documents that are put to the RFC Editor for publication as RFCs today. While there may be general policies for approval of documents as RFCs (to ensure the

coherence of the RFC Series), there are also policies defined for the approval of documents in each stream. Generally speaking, there is a different approving body for each stream. The current definitions are catalogued in Section 5.1.

#### 4.1.2. Operational Implementation

Each stream has its own documented approval process. The RFC Editor is responsible for the approval of documents in one of the streams (Independent Submission stream, see Section 5.1.4) and works with the other approving bodies to ensure smooth passage of approved documents into the next phases, ultimately to publication and archiving as an RFC.

#### 4.1.3. Process Change

From time to time, it may be necessary to change the approval processes for any given stream, or even add or remove streams. This may occur when the RFC Editor, the IAB, the body responsible for a given stream of documents, or the community determines that there are issues to be resolved in general for RFC approval or for per-stream approval processes.

In this framework, the general approach is that the IAB will work with the RFC Editor and other parties to get community input, and it will verify that any changes appropriately account for community requirements.

#### 4.1.4. Existing Approval Process Documents

The existing documents describing the approval processes for each stream are detailed in Section 5.1.

### 4.2. Editing, Processing, and Publication of Documents

Producing and maintaining a coherent, well-edited document series requires specialized skills and subject matter expertise. This is the domain of the RFC Editor. Nevertheless, the community served by the RFC Series and the communities served by the individual streams of RFCs have requirements that help define the nature of the series.

#### 4.2.1. Definition

General and stream-specific requirements for the RFC Series are documented in community-approved documents (catalogued in Section 5.2 below).

Any specific interfaces, numbers, or concrete values required to make the requirements operational are the subject of agreements between the IASA and the RFC Editor (e.g., contracts, statements of work, service level agreements, etc).

#### 4.2.2. Operational Implementation

The RFC Editor is responsible for ensuring that editing, processing, and publication of RFCs are carried out in a way that is consistent with the requirements laid out in the appropriate documents. The RFC Editor works with the IASA to provide regular reporting and feedback on these operations.

#### 4.2.3. Process Change

From time to time, it may be necessary to change the requirements for any given stream, or the RFC Series in general. This may occur when the RFC Editor, the IAB, the approval body for a given stream of documents, or the community determines that there are issues to be

resolved in general for RFCs or for per-stream requirements.

In this model, the general approach is that the IAB will work with the RFC Editor to get community input, and it will approve changes by validating appropriate consideration of community requirements.

#### 4.2.4. Existing Process Documents

Documents describing existing requirements for the streams are detailed in Section 5.2.

### 4.3. Archiving, Indexing, and Accessibility

The activities of archiving, indexing, and making accessible the RFC Series can be informed by specific subject matter expertise in general document series editing. It is also important that they are informed by requirements from the whole community. As long as the RFC Series is to remain coherent, there should be uniform archiving and indexing of RFCs across all streams and a common method of accessing the resulting documents.

#### 4.3.1. Definition

In principle, there should be a community consensus document describing the archiving, indexing, and accessibility requirements for the RFC Series. In practice, we continue with the archive as built by the capable RFC Editors since the series' inception.

Any specific concrete requirements for the archive, index, and accessibility operations are the subject of agreements between the IASA and the RFC Editor (e.g., contracts, statements of work, service level agreements, etc).

#### 4.3.2. Operational Implementation

The RFC Editor is responsible for ensuring that the RFC archive and index are maintained appropriately and that the resulting documents are made available to anybody wishing to access them via the Internet. The RFC Editor works with the IASA for regular reporting and feedback.

#### 4.3.3. Process Change

Should there be a community move to propose changes to the requirements for the RFC archive and index or accessibility, the IAB will work with the RFC Editor to get community input, and it will approve changes by validating appropriate consideration of community requirements.

#### 4.3.4. Existing Process Documents

There are no applicable process documents.

### 4.4. Series-Wide Guidelines and Rules

The RFC Series style and content can be shaped by subject matter expertise in document series editing. They are also informed by requirements by the using community. As long as the RFC Series is to remain coherent, there should be uniform style and content for RFCs across all streams. This includes, but is not limited to, acceptable language, use of references, and copyright rules.

#### 4.4.1. Definition

In principle, there should be a community consensus document (or set of documents) describing the content requirements for the RFC Series.

In practice, some do exist, though some need reviewing and more may be needed over time.

#### 4.4.2. Operational Implementation

The RFC Editor is responsible for ensuring that the RFC Series guidelines are upheld within the RFC Series.

#### 4.4.3. Process Change

When additions or changes are needed to series-wide definitions, the IAB will work with the RFC Editor and stream stakeholders to get community input and review. The IAB will approve changes by validating appropriate consideration of community requirements.

#### 4.4.4. Existing Process Documents

Existing series-wide rules and guidelines documents include:

- \* RFC Style Guide [RFC7322],
- \* The Use of Non-ASCII Characters in RFCs [RFC7997],
- \* Copyright and intellectual property rules [RFC5378],
- \* Normative references [RFC3967] [RFC4897], [RFC8067].

### 5. RFC Streams

Various contributors provide input to the RFC Series. These contributors come from several different communities, each with its own defined process for approving documents that will be published by the RFC Editor. This is nothing new; however, over time the various communities and document requirements have grown and separated. In order to promote harmony in discussing the collective set of requirements, it is useful to recognize each in their own space -- and they are referred to here as "streams".

Note that by identifying separate streams, there is no intention of dividing them or undermining their management as one series. Rather, the opposite is true -- by clarifying the constituent parts, it is easier to make them work together without the friction that sometimes arises when discussing various requirements.

The subsections below identify the streams that exist today. There is no immediate expectation of new streams being created, and it is preferable that new streams NOT be created. Creation of streams and all policies surrounding general changes to the RFC Series are discussed above in Section 4.

#### 5.1. RFC Approval Processes

Processes for approval of documents (or requirements) for each stream are defined by the community that defines the stream. The IAB is charged with the role of verifying that appropriate community input has been sought and that the changes are consistent with the RFC Series mission and this overall framework.

The RFC Editor is expected to publish all documents passed to it after appropriate review and approval in one of the identified streams.

##### 5.1.1. IETF Document Stream

The IETF document stream includes IETF WG documents as well as "individual submissions" sponsored by an IESG area director. Any



document being published as part of the IETF standards process must follow this stream -- no other stream can approve Standards-Track RFCs or Best Current Practice (BCP) RFCs.

Approval of documents in the IETF stream is defined by

- \* the IETF standards process [RFC2026] (and its successors).
- \* the IESG process for sponsoring individual submissions [SPONSOR].

Changes to the approval process for this stream are made by updating the IETF standards process documents.

#### 5.1.2. IAB Document Stream

The IAB defines the processes by which it approves documents in its stream. Consistent with the above, any documents that the IAB wishes to publish as part of the IETF Standards Track (Standards or BCPs) are subject to the approval processes referred to in Section 5.1.1.

The review and approval process for documents in the IAB stream is described in

- \* the IAB process for review and approval of its documents [RFC4845].

#### 5.1.3. IRTF Document Stream

The IRTF is chartered as an activity of the IAB. With the approval of the IAB, the IRTF may publish and update a process for publication of its own, non-IETF Standards-Track, documents.

The review and approval process for documents in the IRTF stream is described in

- \* IRTF Research Group RFCs [RFC5743].

#### 5.1.4. Independent Submission Stream

The RFC Series has always served a broader Internet technical community than the IETF. The "Independent Submission" stream is defined to provide review and (possible) approval of documents that are outside the scope of the streams identified above.

Generally speaking, approval of documents in this stream falls under the purview of the RFC Editor, and the RFC Editor seeks input to its review from the IESG.

The process for reviewing and approving documents in the Independent Submission stream is defined by

- \* Procedures for Rights Handling in the RFC Independent Submission Stream [RFC5744],
- \* Independent Submission Editor Model [RFC8730],
- \* Independent Submissions to the RFC Editor [RFC4846],
- \* The IESG and RFC Editor Documents: Procedures [RFC5742].

#### 5.2. RFC Technical Publication Requirements

The Internet engineering and research community has not only grown, it has become more diverse, and sometimes more demanding. The IETF, as a standards-developing organization, has publication requirements that extend beyond those of an academic journal. The IAB does not

have the same interdependence with IANA assignments as the IETF stream does. Therefore, there is the need to both codify the publishing requirements of each stream, and endeavor to harmonize them to the extent that is reasonable.

Therefore, it is expected that the community of effort behind each document stream will outline their technical publication requirements.

As part of the RFC Editor oversight, the IAB must agree that the requirements are consistent with and implementable as part of the RFC Editor activity.

#### 5.2.1. IETF Documents

The requirements for this stream are defined in [RFC4714].

#### 5.2.2. IAB Documents

Although they were developed for the IETF standards process, the IAB has identified applicable requirements in [RFC4714] for its stream. In addition, procedures related to IPR for the IAB stream are captured in [RFC5745].

If the IAB elects to define other requirements, they should deviate minimally from those (in an effort to keep the collective technical publication requirements reasonably managed by one technical publisher).

#### 5.2.3. IRTF Documents

The IRTF has identified applicable requirements in [RFC5743] for its stream.

If the IRTF elects to define other requirements, they should deviate minimally from those (in an effort to keep the collective technical publication requirements reasonably managed by one technical publisher).

#### 5.2.4. Independent Submissions

Procedures and processes for the Independent Stream are described in [RFC4846] and [RFC8730].

Although they were developed for the IETF standards process, the RFC Editor has identified applicable requirements in [RFC4714] for the Independent Submissions stream. In addition, procedures related to IPR for the independent submissions stream are captured in [RFC5744].

If the RFC Editor elects to define other requirements, they should deviate minimally from those (in an effort to keep the collective technical publication requirements reasonably managed by one technical publisher).

### 6. Security Considerations

The processes for the publication of documents must prevent the introduction of unapproved changes. Since the RFC Editor maintains the index of publications, sufficient security must be in place to prevent these published documents from being changed by external parties. The archive of RFC documents, any source documents needed to recreate the RFC documents, and any associated original documents (such as lists of errata, tools, and, for some early items, non-machine readable originals) need to be secured against failure of the storage medium and other similar disasters.

## 7. Changes Since RFC 4844

Sections 3.3, 3.4, and 4 have been updated to align with the restructuring of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA). Under the new structure, the IETF LLC performs the tasks related to IASA that were previously assigned to the IETF Administrative Director and to the Internet Society.

Many references were updated to point to the most recent documents.

Minor editorial changes were made to reflect 10 years of using the framework provided in RFC 4844. For example, RFC 4844 said, "... this document sets out a revised framework ...", and it is now more appropriate to say, "... this document sets out the framework ...".

## 8. Informative References

- [RFC1358] Chapin, L., "Charter of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB)", RFC 1358, DOI 10.17487/RFC1358, August 1992, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1358>>.
- [RFC1601] Huitema, C., "Charter of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB)", RFC 1601, DOI 10.17487/RFC1601, March 1994, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1601>>.
- [RFC2026] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", BCP 9, RFC 2026, DOI 10.17487/RFC2026, October 1996, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2026>>.
- [RFC2555] Editor, RFC. and et. al., "30 Years of RFCs", RFC 2555, DOI 10.17487/RFC2555, April 1999, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2555>>.
- [RFC2850] Internet Architecture Board and B. Carpenter, Ed., "Charter of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB)", BCP 39, RFC 2850, DOI 10.17487/RFC2850, May 2000, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2850>>.
- [RFC3967] Bush, R. and T. Narten, "Clarifying when Standards Track Documents may Refer Normatively to Documents at a Lower Level", BCP 97, RFC 3967, DOI 10.17487/RFC3967, December 2004, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3967>>.
- [RFC4714] Mankin, A. and S. Hayes, "Requirements for IETF Technical Publication Service", RFC 4714, DOI 10.17487/RFC4714, October 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4714>>.
- [RFC4845] Daigle, L., Ed. and Internet Architecture Board, "Process for Publication of IAB RFCs", RFC 4845, DOI 10.17487/RFC4845, July 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4845>>.
- [RFC4846] Klensin, J., Ed. and D. Thaler, Ed., "Independent Submissions to the RFC Editor", RFC 4846, DOI 10.17487/RFC4846, July 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4846>>.
- [RFC4897] Klensin, J. and S. Hartman, "Handling Normative References to Standards-Track Documents", BCP 97, RFC 4897, DOI 10.17487/RFC4897, June 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4897>>.
- [RFC5378] Bradner, S., Ed. and J. Contreras, Ed., "Rights Contributors Provide to the IETF Trust", BCP 78, RFC 5378, DOI 10.17487/RFC5378, November 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5378>>.

- [RFC5742] Alvestrand, H. and R. Housley, "IESG Procedures for Handling of Independent and IRTF Stream Submissions", BCP 92, RFC 5742, DOI 10.17487/RFC5742, December 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5742>>.
- [RFC5743] Falk, A., "Definition of an Internet Research Task Force (IRTF) Document Stream", RFC 5743, DOI 10.17487/RFC5743, December 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5743>>.
- [RFC5744] Braden, R. and J. Halpern, "Procedures for Rights Handling in the RFC Independent Submission Stream", RFC 5744, DOI 10.17487/RFC5744, December 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5744>>.
- [RFC5745] Malis, A., Ed. and IAB, "Procedures for Rights Handling in the RFC IAB Stream", RFC 5745, DOI 10.17487/RFC5745, December 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5745>>.
- [RFC7322] Flanagan, H. and S. Ginoza, "RFC Style Guide", RFC 7322, DOI 10.17487/RFC7322, September 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7322>>.
- [RFC7997] Flanagan, H., Ed., "The Use of Non-ASCII Characters in RFCs", RFC 7997, DOI 10.17487/RFC7997, December 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7997>>.
- [RFC8067] Leiba, B., "Updating When Standards Track Documents May Refer Normatively to Documents at a Lower Level", BCP 97, RFC 8067, DOI 10.17487/RFC8067, January 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8067>>.
- [RFC8711] Haberman, B., Hall, J., and J. Livingood, "Structure of the IETF Administrative Support Activity, Version 2.0", BCP 101, RFC 8711, DOI 10.17487/RFC8711, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8711>>.
- [RFC8728] Kolkman, O., Ed., Halpern, J., Ed., and R. Hinden, Ed., "RFC Editor Model (Version 2)", RFC 8728, DOI 10.17487/RFC8728, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8728>>.
- [RFC8730] Brownlee, N., Ed. and R. Hinden, Ed., "Independent Submission Editor Model", RFC 8730, DOI 10.17487/RFC8730, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8730>>.
- [SPONSOR] IESG, "Guidance on Area Director Sponsoring of Documents", IESG Statement, March 2007, <<http://www.ietf.org/iesg/statement/ad-sponsoring-docs.html>>.

## Appendix A. A Retrospective of IAB Charters and RFC Editor

With this document, the IAB's role with respect to the RFC Series and the RFC Editor is being adjusted to work more directly with the RFC Editor and provide oversight to ensure the RFC Series mission principles and communities' input are addressed appropriately.

This section provides an overview of the role of the IAB with respect to the RFC Editor as it has been presented in IAB Charter RFCs dating back to 1992. The point of this section is that the IAB's role has historically been substantive -- whether it is supposed to be directly responsible for the RFC Series' editorial management (circa 1992, Appendix A.1), or appointment of the RFC Editor organization and approval of general policy (circa 2000, Appendix A.3).

A.1. 1992

[RFC1358] says:

```
| [The IAB's] responsibilities shall include:  
| [...]  
| (2) The editorial management and publication of the Request  
|     for Comments (RFC) document series, which constitutes the  
|     archival publication series for Internet Standards and  
|     related contributions by the Internet research and  
|     engineering community.
```

A.2. 1994

[RFC1601] says:

```
| [The IAB's] responsibilities under this charter include:  
|  
| (d) RFC Series and IANA  
|  
|     The IAB is responsible for editorial management and publication  
|     of the Request for Comments (RFC) document series, and for  
|     administration of the various Internet assigned numbers.
```

Which it elaborates as:

```
| 2.4 RFC Series and Assigned Numbers
```

```
|     The RFC Series constitutes the archival publication channel  
|     for Internet Standards and for other contributions by the  
|     Internet research and engineering community. The IAB  
|     shall select an RFC Editor, who shall be responsible for  
|     the editorial management and publication of the RFC Series.
```

A.3. 2000

The most recent IAB Charter [RFC2850] says:

```
| (d) RFC Series and IANA  
|  
| The RFC Editor executes editorial management and publication of  
| the IETF "Request for Comment" (RFC) document series, which is  
| the permanent document repository of the IETF. The RFC Series  
| constitutes the archival publication channel for Internet  
| Standards and for other contributions by the Internet research  
| and engineering community. RFCs are available free of charge to  
| anyone via the Internet. The IAB must approve the appointment  
| of an organization to act as RFC Editor and the general policy  
| followed by the RFC Editor.
```

IAB Members at the Time of Approval

The IAB members at the time of approval of RFC 4844 were:

Bernard Aboba  
Loa Andersson  
Brian Carpenter  
Leslie Daigle  
Elwyn Davies  
Kevin Fall  
Olaf Kolkman  
Kurtis Lindqvist  
David Meyer  
David Oran  
Eric Rescorla  
Dave Thaler

Lixia Zhang

The IAB members at the time of approval of this document were:

Jari Arkko  
Alissa Cooper  
Stephen Farrell  
Wes Hardaker  
Ted Hardie  
Christian Huitema  
Zhenbin Li  
Erik Nordmark  
Mark Nottingham  
Melinda Shore  
Jeff Tantsura  
Martin Thomson  
Brian Trammell

#### Authors' Addresses

Russ Housley (editor)

Email: [housley@vigilsec.com](mailto:housley@vigilsec.com)

Leslie L. Daigle (editor)

Email: [ldaigle@thinkingcat.com](mailto:ldaigle@thinkingcat.com)