**March 2008** 



## RFC Editor Report 71st IETF Meeting Philadelphia, Pennsylvania





## RFC Editor Office Hours at IETF 70 Monday - Wednesday 9:30 - 4:00

## RFC Editor Tutorial Sunday @ 3:00 pm Slides available at:

ftp://ftp.rfc-editor.org/in-notes/rfc-editor/tutorial.latest.pdf



Errata portal

 Receiving feedback and making relevant changes to the automated messages that notify when new errata have been reported

 Participating in discussion as the IESG determines their process for handling errata and the requirements for a tool that enables that process

Submit errata at: <u>http://www.rfc-editor.org/errata.php</u>

Errata Process Proposal - send comments to rfc-interest@rfc-editor.org



- Continued use of xml2rfc
  - xml2rfc team updated RFC copyright to match current boilerplate.
- XML submission
  - Upon adding documents to the queue, the RFC Editor retrieves the XML source file (if available) that the authors submitted using the I-D submission tool.



Helpful Hints to Authors

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

- RFC Style Guide
  - Includes relevant portions of rfc2223bis
  - Many details resulting from discussions with authors and ADs
- Abbreviations list
- Terms list



## November 1 – February 29, 2008

<u>Processed</u> DNPs/Withdrawals:	0	<u>Pages</u>
Total Published:	102	~2773
<u>Submissions</u>	<b>Docs</b>	
IETF Submissions:	52	
IAB Submissions:	0	
IRTF Submission	1	
Individual Submissions:	24	
Independent Submissions:	3	
<b>Total Submissions:</b>	80	



~4-Month Sub Period	omitted/ Month	Published/ Month	Reported @
Nov05 - Feb06	32.5	45.8	IETF 65
Mar – Jun06	31.25	39.5	IETF 66
July – Sep06	23.67	33.33	IETF 67
Oct06 - Feb07	27.2	27.2	IETF 68
Mar - Jun07	40.5	26.25	IETF 69
Jul - Oct07	21.25	35.25	IETF 70
Nov07 - Feb08	20	25.5	IETF 71



#### **Current Queue Breakdown**

as of February 29, 2008

	Count in State	Median Wks in State	Max Wks		
Editable:	9	0.4 #	*		
Await final RFC review:	12	1.3	2.6		
Await Norm. Ref(s):	32	*	*		
Await author (AUTH48):	15	1.0	7.2		
#: Was 1.1 weeks at IETF 67					
Was 3.0 weeks at IETF 68					
Was 3.8 weeks at IETF 69					
Was 2.4 weeks at IETF 70 *: Not meaningful because of Norm Ref holds					



#### **Annual Publication Rate**

Number of RFC documents Published per Year 2003: 235 2004: 281 2005: 327 2006: 459 2007: 382 

**RFC Editor** 





## Monthly RFC Editor Statistics

2008 - 2007	Feb	Jan	Dec	Nov	Oct	Sep
[New Arrivals: Standards Track]						
Working Group	7	6	5	11	21	10
Non-Working Group	3	1	0	5	1	4
[New Arrivals: Info & Expr]						
Working Group	0	7	6	10	2	4
Non-Working Group	3	7	2	7	4	2
*Total Submitted	13	21	13	33	28	20
[Published: Standards Track]						
Working Group	14	18	16	6	16	20
Working Group DNPs/Withdrawals	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Working Group	1	5	2	1	1	4
Non-Working Group DNPs/Withdrawals	0	0	0	0	0	0
[Published: Info & Expr]						
Working Group	6	7	3	4	8	4
Working Group DNPs/Withdrawals	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Working Group	9	13	2	5	1	8
Non-Working Group DNPs/Withdrawals	0	0	0	0	1	0
*Total Published	30	33	23	16	27	35
*Remaining at the End of this Month	87	104	116	126	109	108

# RFC Editor

#### **Document Processing**





Aaron Falk November 1, 2005, v.15



## Thank you.

#### Web site: <u>http://www.rfc-editor.org/</u>

#### Interest list: <u>rfc-interest@rfc-editor.org</u>

This list was created to facilitate community discussion on the RFC series and to make suggestions about RFC Editor functions. The RFC Editor hopes that this mailing list will provide a focal point for input, information, and discussion about the details of the RFC process, as well as an archive to avoid the continual re-hashing of some issues. Topics appropriate to this list may include formatting, tools, style, content, and indexing aspects of the RFC series. It will not be used for discussion of the IETF standards process, general IETF organizational issues, or issues for which the NOTE WELL admonition is needed for IPR reasons. The posting policy is subscriber-only to reduce spam. It will initially be unmoderated, but the RFC Editor will cut off any discussions that are inappropriate according to the guidelines above.