RFC Editor Tutorial

IETF 68

Prague, Czech Republic

18 March 2007

Overview of this Tutorial

1. Background: The RFC Series and the RFC Editor

2. The Publication Process

3. Contents of an RFC

4. How to Write an RFC

5. Conclusion

1. The RFC Series

- Earliest document series to be published online.
    - 1969 – today: 38 years old.
    - 4500+ documents.
- *An ARCHIVAL* series: RFCs are *forever*!
- A comprehensive record of Internet technical history

RFCs

- ## RFC document series

  - Begun by Steve Crocker (RFC 3) and Jon Postel in 196'

  - Informal memos, technical specs, and much more.

- ## Jon Postel quickly became *the* RFC Editor.

  - 28 years: 1970 until his death in 1998.

  - He established and maintained the consistent style anc editorial quality of the RFC series.

  - Jon was a 2-finger typist.

Jon Postel

Postel had an enormous influence on the developing ARPAnet & Internet protocols – the "Protocol Czar" and the "Deputy Internet Architect" as well as the IANA and RFC Editor.


Photo by Peter Lothberg – IETF34 Aug 1995

Newsweek Aug 8, 1994

Historical Context of RFC Series

- **1969: Building ARPAnet**   RFC 1
- **1975: TCP/IP research begun**   ~RFC 700
  - Recorded in separate IEN series
- **1983: Internet born 1 Jan**   ~RFC 830
- **1985: IETF created**   ~RFC 950
- **1993: Modern IESG/IAB org**   ~RFC 1400
- **1998: Postel passed away**   ~RFC 2430
- **Today**   ~RFC 4800

RFC Publication Rate

Number of RFC documents Published per Year

Jon Postel's Playful Side

- April 1st RFCs
  - A little humorous self-parody is a good thing…
  - Most, but not all, April 1st RFCs are satirical documents.
  - We expect you can tell the difference   ;-)

- April 1st submissions are reviewed for cleverness, humor, and topical relation to IETF themes.
  - Avian Carriers is famous (RFC 1149)
  - Evil Bit is a favorite (RFC 3514)

- April 1st submissions are the only RFCs-to-be that do not need to be published as Internet-Drafts. Please send directly to rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org.

The RFC Editor today

- A small group at Jon's long-term home,
  - the Information Sciences Institute (ISI) of USC.
  - ~6 FTEs
- Under contract with ISOC/IASA
- Current leadership:
  - Bob Braden, colleague of Postel 1970-1998.
  - Sandy Ginoza, editor of RFCs for 7 years.
- RFC Editorial Board
  - Provides advice and counsel to the RFC Editor, particularly about independent submissions.

The RFC Editor Web Site

http://www.rfc-editor.org

- Official repository and master index of RFCs
  - ftp://ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfc-index.txt, .xml
- Search engines for RFCs, Internet Drafts
- "Official Internet Protocols Standards" list
- RFC publication queue
- Policy changes, news, FAQ, and more
- Errata (see next slide)

Errata Page

- **www.rfc-editor.org/errata.html**
  - A list of technical and editorial errors that have been reported to the RFC Editor.
  - Verified by the authors and/or the IESG, unless marked "UNVERIFIED".
  - The RFC Editor search engine results contain hyperlinks to errata, when present.
- Pending errata - a file of emails
  ftp://ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/pending-errata/pending-errata.msgs
  - Claimed errata that have been reported to the RFC Editor, but not yet verified or posted to errata.html.

RFCs and the IETF

- It was natural to adapt the existing RFC series to publication of Internet standards specifications.

  - Informally: mid 1980s

  - Formally: RFC 1602 (1994), RFC 2026 (1996)

RFC Categories

- RFC 2026 defines specification maturity levels:
  - Standards track: Proposed, Draft, Standard.
  - Non-standards track: Experimental, Informational, Historic.
  - "Almost standard": Best Current Practice.
- Shown on RFC header as "Category:"
  - Except, one category "Standards Track" for PS, DS, S.
  - Often called "status".
- A published RFC can NEVER change, but its *category* can change (see rfc-index.txt).

Sources for RFCs

- IETF submissions
  - Mostly products of Working Groups
  - Rest are *individual* submissions via the IESG.
  - Submitted to the RFC Editor by the IESG after approval process [RFC2026].

- Independent submissions
  - Submitted directly to the RFC Editor
  - See http://www.rfc-editor.org/indsubs.html

- IAB submissions
  - Submitted directly by IAB Chair

- IRTF submissions
  - Submitted directly by IRTF Chair

Review of Independent Submissions

- Only Experimental or Informational category.
- RFC Editor finds competent reviewer(s), with advice and aid from the Editorial Board.
- Possible conclusions:
  - Out of scope for RFC series.
  - Incompetent or redundant, not worth publication.
  - Important, but should go through IETF process first ("Throw it over t wall to the IESG!")
  - Serious flaws – report to author, reject for now.
  - Suggest changes to author, then OK to publish.
  - Great! Publish it.
- IESG reviews for conflict with any WG, makes publish/do-not publish recommendation.
- RFC Editor has final decision, with advice from Editorial Boar

RFC Sub-Series

- All RFCs are numbered sequentially.

- There was a desire to identify significant subsets of RFCs, so Postel invented "sub-series". An RFC may have a sub-series designator.
    - e.g., "RFC 2026, BCP 9"

- Sub-series designations:
    - BCP   Best Current Practice category
    - STD   Standard category
    - FYI   Informational category: user documentation

STD Sub-Series

- Originally: all protocol specs were expected to quickly reach (full) Standard category.
  - Then the STD sub-series would include all significant standards documents.
  - Of course, it did not work out that way; most standards-track documents do not get beyond Propose Standard.
  - See "Official Internet Protocol Standards"
    - See: www.rfc-editor.org/rfcxx00.html (occasionally published STD 1) for the REAL list of current relevant standards-track docs.

STD Sub-Series

- STDs were overloaded to represent "complete standards"; one STD # can contain multiple RFCs.

- Examples:

  - STD 5 = "IP", includes RFCs 791, 792, 919, 922, 950, 111

    NB: When multiple RFCs make up a sub-series doc (for example, ftp://ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/std/std5.txt) the file starts with

    `[Note that this file is a concatenation of more than one RFC.]`

  - STD 13 = "DNS", includes RFCs 1034, 1035
  - STD 12 = "Network Time Protocol", currently no RFCs.

STDs as Protocol Names

- Really, "RFCxxxx" is only a *document name.*
  - But, people often talk about "RFC 821" or "821" when they mean "SMTP".
- As protocols evolve, RFC numbers make confusing names for protocols. Postel hoped that STD numbers would function as protocol names.
  - But reality is too complicated for this to work well.
  - It HAS been working for BCPs.
- We need a better way to name protocols.
  - ISD (Internet Standards Document) proposal ??

2. RFC Publication Process

- Overview from the Authors' Perspective
- More Details on Queue States

Overview from the Authors' Perspective

- Step 0: Write an Internet-Draft

  - ➤ *IESG approval -> your document is added to the queue*
- Step 1: Send your source file (if you have one).
  - ➤ *questions from the RFC Editor*
- Step 2: Answer questions.
- Step 3: See your document progress.
  - ➤ *AUTH48 notification with a pointer to the edited version*
- Step 4: Review your document carefully and
             send changes / approvals for publication.
- Step 5: Publication!

Step 0: Write an Internet-Draft

- A well-formed RFC starts with a well-formed I-D.

  - http://www.ietf.org/ID-Checklist.html

  - http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-guidelines.txt

- Authoring tools

  - http://www.rfc-editor.org/formatting.html

  - http://tools.ietf.org//inventory/author-tools

  - More on this later.

A Generic Case: draft-ietf-wg-topic-05

Let's say your document has been approved by the IESG...

IETF Submission

Working group doc, or individual standards track doc

Submit

Concerns

IESG

RFC Editor

"Last Call"

Comments, suggestions

Published RFC

IETF Community Review

I E T F

figure from Scott Bradner's Newcomer's Presentation

Step 1: Send your source file.

> From: rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org
>
> Subject: [RFC State] <draft-ietf-wg-topic-05> has been added to RFC Editor database.

- Your document has been added to the queue (www.rfc-editor.org/queue.html).

- Please send us your nroff or xml source file.
  - Let us know if there are any changes between the version you send and the IESG-approved version.

- If you don't have one, don't worry, we will use the Internet-Draft text to create an nroff file.

Step 2: Answer questions.

From: rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org

Subject: draft-ietf-wg-topic-05

- Please reply to questions about your draft. Typically, these questions are about
  - missing citations
    - Ex: [RFC4301] appears as a normative reference, where would you like to cite it in the text?
  - inconsistent terminology
    - Ex: Which form of the term should be used throughout?
      RESTART Flag / Re-Start flag / Restart Flag
  - unclear sentences

Step 3: See your document progress.

From: rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org

Subject: [RFC State] <draft-ietf-wg-topic-05> has changed state

Basic Process

Submission → EDIT → RFC-EDITOR → AUTH48 → Publication → Archive

IANA and/or REF holds

Also, you can check http://www.rfc-editor.org/queue.html

Step 4: Review your document carefully

From: rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org

Subject: AUTH48 [SG]: RFC 4999 <draft-ietf-wg-topic-05>

- This is your chance to review the edited version.
- We send pointers to the txt and diff files
  - and the XML file (when AUTH48 in XML)
- Submit changes by sending OLD/NEW text or indicating global changes.
  - Insert directly into the XML file (when AUTH48 in XML)
- Each author listed on the first page must send their approval before the document is published.

Step 5: Publication!

- Announcement sent to lists:

  ietf-announce@ietf.org and rfc-dist@rfc-editor.org

- Canonicial URI:

  http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfcXXXX.txt

- Also available here:

  ftp://ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfcXXXX.txt

- Mirrored at IETF site and other sites.

- txt, nroff, and XML files archived.

More details on queue states

- **Normative References**
  - Set of RFCs linked by normative refs must be published simultaneously.
  - Two hold points:
    - MISSREF state: a doc with norm. ref to a doc not yet received by RFC Editor.
    - REF state: a doc that is edited but waiting for dependent docs to be edited.

- **IANA**
  - Acts on IANA Considerations section (more on this later).
  - Creates new registries and assigns numbers.

Publication Process

START: IETF submission → IESG: protocol / document action

START: IAB submission → request arrives w/ ID

MISSREF: wait to receive normative references

IANA: registry creation

EDIT: nroff, grammar, spelling

AUTH: fix

REF: waiting for normative references

RFC EDITOR: final review

STOP: withdrawn

assign RFC #

AUTH 48: authors review ("48 hours") — long delay → AUTH: fix

PUBLISH

STATES:
AUTH = holding for author action
AUTH48 = "authors 48 hours" final review
EDIT = approved by IESG, awaiting processing
IANA = RFC-Editor/IANA registration coordination
IESG = holding for IESG action
ISR = Independent Submission Review
ISR-AUTH = revisions based on ISR feedback
REF = holding for normative reference
RFC-EDITOR = pending RFC Editor review

Aaron Falk November 1, 2005, v.15

More about AUTH48: Final Author Review

- Last-minute editorial changes allowed – But should not be substantive or too extensive.

  - Else, must get OK from AD, WG chair.

- This process can involve a fair amount of work & time

  - AT LEAST 48 hours!

  - All listed authors must sign off on final document

  - Authors should take it seriously - review the entire document, not just the diffs.

  - Your last chance to avoid enrollment in the *Errata Hall of Infamy*!

3. Contents of an RFC

- Header
- Title
- Header boilerplate (Short copyright, Status of Memo)
- IESG Note (when requested by IESG)
- Abstract
- Table of Contents (not required for short docs)
- Body
- References
- Authors' Addresses
- IPR boilerplate

RFC Header

```
Network Working Group                          T. Berners-Le
Request for Comments: 3986                           W3C/MIT
STD: 66                                          R. Fielding
Updates: 1738                                   Day Software
Obsoletes: 2732, 2396, 1808                     L. Masinter
Category: Standards Track                        Adobe System
                                                  January 200
```

- ## STD sub-series number 66

- ## Updates, Obsoletes: relation to earlier RFCs.
  - Please note this information in a prominent place in your Internet-Draft; preferably the header.

RFC Header: Another Example

```
Network Working Group                      T. Berners-Lee
Request for Comments: 2396                        MIT/LCS
Updates: 1808, 1738                           R. Fielding
Category: Standards Track                     U. C. Irvine
                                              L. Masinter
                                        Xerox Corporation
                                              August 1998
```

Corresponding RFC Index entry (search on "2396")

| RFC2396 | T. Berners-Lee, R. Fielding, L. Masinter | August 1998 | ASCII | Obsoleted by RFC3986, Updates RFC1808, RFC1738, Updated by RFC2732 Errata | DRAFT STANDARD |

Red fields were not known when RFC was published

Authors in Header

- Limited to lead authors, document editors.

- There must be very good reason to list more than 5.

- Each author in the header must give approval during AUTH48 review.

- Each author in the header should provide unambiguous contact information in the Authors' Addresses section.

- Other names can be included in Contributors and/or Acknowledgments sections.

Titles

- Should be thoughtfully chosen

- No un-expanded abbreviations - except for very well-known ones (e.g., IP, TCP, HTTP, MIME, MPLS)

- We like short, snappy titles, but sometimes we get titles like:

  - *"An alternative to XML Configuration Access Protocol (XCAP) for manipulating resource lists and authorization lists, Using HTTP extensions for Distributed Authoring and Versioning (DAV)"*

Abstracts

- Carefully written for clarity (*HARD* to write!)

- No un-expanded abbreviations (again, except well-known)

- No citations
    - Use "RFC xxxx", not "[RFCxxxx]" or "[5]"

- Less than 20 lines! Shorter is good.

- Not a substitute for the Introduction; redundancy is OK.

- We recommend starting with "This document..."

Body of RFC

- First section should generally be "1. Introduction".
- Special sections that may appear:
  - Contributors, Acknowledgments
  - Internationalization Considerations
    - When needed -- see Section 6, RFC 2277/BCP 18.
- Sections that MUST appear:
  - Security Considerations
  - IANA Considerations

Security Considerations Section

- Security Considerations section required in every RFC.

- See RFC 3552: "Guidelines for Writing RFC Text on Security Considerations"

- Important!

IANA Considerations Section

- ## What is an IANA Considerations section?
  - A guide to IANA on what actions will need to be performed
  - A confirmation if there are NO IANA actions

- ## Section is required in draft
  - But "No IANA Considerations" section will be removed by RFC Editor.

Why is this section important?

- Forces the authors to 'think' if anything should be requested from IANA

- A clear IANA Considerations section will allow the IANA to process the IANA Actions more quickly

- Establishes documented procedures

What should be included in the IANA Considerations section?

- What actions is the document requesting of IANA
- Individual number or name registrations
- New registries (number or name spaces)
- Registration procedures for new registries
- Reference changes to existing registrations

BE CLEAR AND DESCRIPTIVE IN YOUR INSTRUCTIONS
(IANA is not the expert for your name or number space)

Review of IANA Considerations

- IANA Consideration sections are reviewed before the document is published as an RFC
  - During IESG Last Call
  - During IESG Evaluation
  - IANA will also review your section at any time by request
- If you do not have an IC section or if your IC section is not complete, your document will not move forward

Where to get help on writing this section

- See RFC 2434, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs"
  - Soon to be replaced by RFC2434bis
- Look at existing registries for examples
- Ask IANA
  - Available at the IANA booth at IETF meetings
  - Send an e-mail [iana@iana.org] or [michelle.cotton@icann.org]

References

- Normative vs. Informative
  - Normative refs can hold up publication.
- Please do not use numeric citations (e.g., "[37]") unless you submit an XML source file.
- Citations and references must match.
- Handy file of RFC reference text:
  - ftp://ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfc-ref.txt
- Include draft strings of any I-Ds.

Copyrights and Patents

- Copyright Issues
  - Specified in RFC 3977/BCP 77 "IETF Rights in Contributions"
  - Independent submissions: generally follow IETF rules

- Patent ("IPR") issues
  - RFC boilerplate specified in RFC 3978/BCP 78 "Intellectual Property Rights in IETF Technology"
  - Recently updated by RFC 4748/BCP 78.

- Generally, you supply the correct boilerplate in the Internet Draft, and the RFC Editor will supply the correct boilerplate in the RFC.

4. How to Write an RFC

- Some editorial guidelines
- Improving your writing
- Preparation tools
- MIBs and formal languages

"Instructions to Request for Comments (RFC) Authors". draft-rfc-editor-rfc2223bis-08.txt aka

ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfceditor/instructions2authors.txt

General Editorial Guidelines

- Immutability – once published, never change
- All RFCs in English
  - RFC 2026 allows translations
  - British English is allowed in principle, but there is some preference for American English.
- Consistent Publication Format
  - ASCII (also .txt.pdf for Windows victims)
  - Also .ps or .pdf (special process for handling)

RFC Formatting Rules

- ASCII, 72 char/line.

- 58 lines per page, followed by FF (^L).

- No overstriking or underlining.

- No "filling" or (added) hyphenation across a line.

- <.><sp><sp> between sentences.

- No footnotes.

RFC Editing

- For correct syntax, spelling, punctuation.
    - We use these sources:
        - The Elements of Style, Strunk & White (4th Ed., 2000)
        - A Pocket Style Manual, Diana Hacker (4th Ed., 2004)
        - Merriam-Webster (http://www.merriam-webster.com)

- To improve clarity and consistency.

- To improve quality of the technical prose.

- By general publication standards, we edit lightly.

    - Balance: author preferences against consistency and accepted standards of technical English.

Writing RFCs

- Simple fact: writing clear, unambiguous technical prose is very *HARD* !!

- Goal: Easy to read, hard to misunderstand.
  - Avoid ambiguity.
  - Use consistent terminology and notation.
    - If you choose "4-bit", then use it throughout (not "four-bit").
  - Define each term at first use.
  - Expand each abbreviation at first use.

Preserving the Meaning

- A comment that concerns us very much:
  "You have changed the meaning of what I wrote".
  - Because we misunderstood what you meant.
  - That implies that your prose is ambiguous.
  - You should recast the sentence/paragraph to make it clear and unambiguous, so even the RFC Editor cannot mistake the meaning. ;-)

The RFC Editor checks many things

- Header format and content
- Title format
- Abstract length and format
- Table of Contents
- Presence of required sections
- No uncaught IANA actions
- Spelling checked
- ABNF/MIB/XML OK, using algorithmic checker
- Citations match references
- Most recent RFC/I-D cited
- Pure ASCII, max 72 char lines, hyphens, etc.
- Header and footer formats
- Page breaks do not create "orphans"
- References split into Normative, Informative
- Boilerplate OK

Grammar Tips

- Avoid passive voice.

- "which" (non-restrictive) vs. "that" (restrictive)
  - "which" is used parenthetically and follows a comma.
    - The Foo Protocol, which is less robust, may be more vulnerabl to session hijacking.
  - "that" introduces information essential to the meaning.
    - A protocol that is less robust may be more vulnerable to session hijacking.

- Some Protocol Engineers over-capitalize Nouns.

Punctuation Conventions

- A comma before the last item of a series:
    - "TCP service is reliable, ordered, and full-duplex"
    - Avoids ambiguities, clearly shows parallelism.

- Punctuation outside quote marks:
  "This is a sentence"{.|?|!}

    - To avoid computer language ambiguities.

- "i.e.," and "e.g.," are followed by commas.

Lean and Mean

- You often improve your writing by simply crossing out extraneous ~~extra~~ words.

  - Look at each sentence and ask yourself,
    "Do I need every word to make my meaning clear and unambiguous?"

  - English professors call it the "Lard Factor" (LF) [Lanham79]

  - *"If you've not paid attention to your own writing before, think of a LF of ⅓ to ½ as normal and don't stop revising until you've removed it."* [Lanham79]

[Lanham79] Richard Lanham, "Revising Prose", Scribner's, New York, 1979.

A Real Example

"When the nature of a name is decided one must decide whether the name should be of fixed length or whether it is variable length." (25 words

A. "One must decide whether the length of a name should be fixed or variable." (14 words, LF = .44)

B. "We may choose fixed or variable length for a particular class of name." (13 words)

C. "A name may have fixed or variable length."
   (7 words, LF = .72)

Another (reality-based) Example

"This is the kind of situation in which the receiver is the acknowledger and the sender gets the acknowledgments." (19 words)

A. "An acknowledgment action is taking place from the receiver and the sender." (11, LF=.42)

B. "The receiver returns acknowledgments to the sender." (7, LF=.63)

Another Real Example

"Also outside the scope are all aspects of network security which are independent of whether a network is a PPVPN network or a private network (for example, attacks from the Internet to a web-server inside a given PPVPN will not be considered here, unless the way the PPVPN network is provisioned could make a difference to the security of this server)."

- Two sentences!!
- "make a difference to" -> "affect"

iceberg

RFC Editor

Format for Readability

- Careful use of indentation and line spacing can greatly improve readability.
  - Goes a long way to compensate for single font.
  - Bullets often help.
    - xml2rfc tip: You can set the list element's style attribute to symbols, letters, numbers, and more
  - High density on a page may be the enemy of clarity and readability.
- The RFC Editor will format your document according to these guidelines, but it is helpful if you can do it in the I-D.

Hard to read

3.1 RSVP Message Formats

3.1.1 Common Header

The fields in the common header are as follows:

Flags: 4 bits

   0x01-0x08: Reserved

   No flag bits are defined yet.

  Send_TTL: 8 bits

   The IP TTL value with which the message is sent. See Section 3.8.

Formatted for Easier Reading

```
3.1.   Message Formats

3.1.1.   Common Header

   The fields in the common header are as
   follows:

      Flags: 4 bits

         0x01-0x08: Reserved

         No flag bits are defined yet.

      Send_TTL: 8 bits

         The IP TTL value with which the message is
         sent. See Section 3.8.
```

Text Formatting Tools

- Author tools: www.rfc-editor.org/formatting.html
  - xml2rfc
  - nroff
  - Microsoft word template
  - LaTeX

- RFC Editor does final RFC formatting using venerable Unix tool nroff –ms.

xml2rfc (http://xml.resource.org)

- The xml2rfc tool converts an XML source file to text, HTML, or nroff. RFC 2629 and its unofficial successor define the format.

- Templates available from www.rfc-editor.org/formatting.html.
  - template-bare.xml (by Elwyn Davies) that goes with his xml2rfc tutorial.
  - draft-harrington-text-mib-doc-template.xml (by David Harrington) for documents containing MIBs.

nroff, groff

- Handy templates for authors using nroff:
  - ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfc-editor/2-nroff.template
    - Published in 1991 by J. Postel. Updated October 2006.
    - Gives instructions on using macros for creating RFCs.
  - www.1-4-5.net/~dmm/generic_draft.tar.gz
    - Updated nroff template maintained by David Meyer.

- If you use nroff –ms (without a private `make` file), give the nroff source to the RFC Editor.

MIBs: A Special Case

- MIB references
  - O&M Web Site at www.ops.ietf.org/
  - MIB doctors at www.ops.ietf.org/mib-doctors.html
  - MIB Review: See RFC 4181, BCP 111: "Guidelines for Authors and Reviewers of MIB Documents"
- Tools
  - http://www.ops.ietf.org/mib-review-tools.html
  - smilint at www.ibr.cs.tu-bs.de/projects/libsmi/
  - SMICng at www.snmpinfo.com/
- MIB boilerplate
  - The Internet-Standard Management Framework:
    www.ops.ietf.org/mib-boilerplate.html
  - Security Considerations: www.ops.ietf.org/mib-security.html

Use of Formal Languages

- Formal languages and pseudo-code can be useful as an aid in explanations, although English remains the primary method of describing protocols.

- Pseudo-code judged on the basis of clarity.
  - http://www.ietf.org/IESG/STATEMENTS/pseudo-code-in-specs.txt

- Formal Languages (e.g., ABNF, XML, ASN.1 (MIBs))
  - Requires a normative reference to language specification
  - RFC Editor will run verifier program.
  - ABNF parser: http://rtg.ietf.org/~fenner/abnf.cgi

5. Conclusion: Hints to Authors

- Read your I-D carefully before submission, as you would read the final document in AUTH48!

- Respond promptly to all messages from the RFC Editor.

- If your I-D is in the queue, and you see typos or have a new email address, send us an email.

- Don't use numeric citations (unless you submit an XML file)

- Avoid gratuitous use of requirement words (MUST, etc.)

- Craft title and abstract carefully.

- Remember that your document should be understandable by people who are not deep experts in the subject matter.

Ongoing Issues

- Normative references
  - Practical effect: can hold up publication
- MUST/MAY/SHOULD/... requirement words
  - Do they belong in Informative documents at all?
  - Tend to be overused or used inconsistently.
- URLs in RFCs
  - Some are more stable than others...
- *Updates* and *Obsoletes* relationships
  - Some disagreement on what they mean
  - At best, only high-order bit of complex relationship
  - RFC Editor hopes ISD (Internet Standard Document) [Newtrk] will be more systematic and complete.

Authoritative References

- Overview of RFC publication:

  www.rfc-editor.org/howtopub.html

- "Instructions to Request for Comments (RFC) Authors" draft-rfc-editor-rfc2223bis-08.txt aka

  ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfc-editor/instructions2authors.txt

Thank you.

- Questions? Comments?

- RFC Editor Desk at IETF 68
  - Mon. - Wed., 9:30 am - 4:00 pm

- Web site: http://www.rfc-editor.org

- Contact Us: rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org

- Interest List: rfc-interest@rfc-editor.org