Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)
Request for Comments: 6322
Category: Informational
ISSN: 2070-1721

P. Hoffman
VPN Consortium

July 2011

Datatracker States and Annotations for the IAB, IRTF, and Independent Submission Streams

Abstract

This document describes extending the IETF Datatracker to capture and display the progression of Internet-Drafts that are intended to be published as RFCs by the IAB, IRTF, or Independent Submissions Editor. The states and annotations that are to be added to the Datatracker will be applied to Internet-Drafts as soon as any of these streams identify the Internet-Draft as a potential eventual RFC, and will continue through the lifetime of the Internet-Draft. The goal of adding this information to the Datatracker is to give the whole Internet community more information about the status of these Internet-Drafts and the streams from which they originate.

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 Engineering Task Force (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has received public review and has been approved for publication by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Not all documents approved by the IESG are a candidate for any level of Internet Standard; see Section 2 of RFC 5741.

Information about the current status of this document, any errata, and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6322.

1. Introduction

As described in Section 5 of [RFC4844], there are currently four streams that feed into the RFC publication process: the IETF document stream, the Internet Architecture Board (IAB) document stream, the Internet Research Task Force (IRTF) document stream, and the Independent Submissions stream that is administered by the Independent Submissions Editor (ISE). Each of these streams consist of Internet-Drafts (often abbreviated "I-Ds") that have been identified by an organization or role as being part of their stream. Each stream maintainer progresses documents towards RFC publication in its own fashion. A document can only be in one stream at a time.

In recent years, there has been a desire by IETF participants and others to see more of the process used by each stream. For example, some people want to know how close the IAB is to finishing a particular document; IETF participants might want to know the progress of IRTF research documents that are in areas related to their engineering work; people who have asked for the ISE to publish

their document want to track its progress. If the IETF Datatracker ("tracker") has more information about each stream's states, this information is much more easily accessible.

In this document, the term "IETF Datatracker" is used as a generic name for the existing tool used to track state changes as Internet-Drafts are processed. The word "IETF" in the name "IETF Datatracker" is not meant to limit use of the tool to the IETF document stream; this document expands use of the tool to the other streams described in RFC 4844.

This document describes the additional tracker states that are specific to each of the IAB, the IRTF, and the ISE document flows. A document might also have one or more annotations assigned as well. Because each stream is controlled by a different organization, this document separates out the proposed states and annotations for each stream, and associates specific semantics stream-by-stream.

Annotations may be applied at any time to a document that is intended for the particular stream. A document may have more than one annotation applied to it. It is likely that the comments for these annotations will supply valuable information about the annotation. Each stream owner needs to have write access to the states and annotations for all the documents in their stream. They should also be able to assign others to have the same write privileges.

This document does not describe which person in each stream might be able to edit these states and annotations; it is assumed that this is a simple enough task that it can be negotiated between each stream administrator and the tracker administrator. Also, this document assumes that whoever is making the edits to the state and annotations can enter comments that will be publicly visible.

Some streams have comments that are very long, such as document reviews and document poll results. The tracker needs to be able to store long annotation comments.

Note that this document does not discuss documents in the IETF stream. The states and permissions for IETF stream documents that have been requested for publication are already implemented in the tracker. A separate set of documents, [RFC6174] and [RFC6175], describe the tracker states and associated permissions proposed for documents in the IETF stream that have been adopted, or are being considered for adoption, by IETF Working Groups.

The intent of this document is to inform an initial development effort for the tool described here. It is not intended to stand as the requirements against the tool once it is deployed. That is,

there is no current intention to update this document frequently as the tool evolves and small features are added and changed.

This document defines three state machines that fit into the IETF Datatracker. The Datatracker will have multiple state machines. This document was prepared in coordination with the IAB, IRTF, and ISE, at the request of the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC).

2. IAB Stream

This section describes the desired states and annotations for the IAB stream.

2.1. States for the IAB Stream

- Candidate IAB Document -- A document being considered for the IAB stream.
- Active IAB Document -- This document has been adopted by the IAB and is being actively developed.
- Parked IAB Document -- This document has lost its author or editor, is waiting for another document to be written, or cannot currently be worked on by the IAB for some other reason. Annotations probably explain why this document is parked.
- IAB Review -- This document is awaiting the IAB itself to come to internal consensus.
- Community Review -- This document has completed internal consensus within the IAB and is now under community review. (The IAB normally allows community input during earlier stages of the process as well.)
- Approved by IAB, To Be Sent to RFC Editor -- The consideration of this document is complete, but it has not yet been sent to the RFC Editor for publication (although that is going to happen soon).
- Sent to a Different Organization for Publication -- The IAB does not expect to publish the document itself, but has passed it on to a different organization that might continue work on the document. The expectation is that the other organization will eventually publish the document.

- Sent to the RFC Editor -- The IAB processing of this document is complete and it has been sent to the RFC Editor for publication. The document may be in the RFC Editor's queue, or it may have been published as an RFC; this state doesn't distinguish between different states occurring after the document has left the IAB.

- Dead IAB Document -- This document was an active IAB document, but for some reason it is no longer being pursued for the IAB stream. It is possible that the document might be revived later, possibly in another stream.

2.2. Annotations for the IAB Stream

- Editor Needed -- The document has lost its editor but it is still intended to be part of the IAB stream.

- Waiting for Dependency on Other Document -- Activity on this document is expected to be low or non-existent while waiting for another document (probably listed in the comments) to progress.

- Waiting for Partner Feedback -- The IAB often produces documents that need to be socialized with outside organizations (such as the IEEE) or other internal organizations (such as the IESG or the IAOC). This document has been sent out for feedback from one of these partner groups.

- Awaiting Reviews -- Activity on this document is expected to be low or non-existent while waiting for reviews that were solicited by the IAB.

- Revised I-D Needed -- Comments that will cause changes have been submitted, and no processing is expected until a new draft is issued.

- Document Shepherd Followup -- The document's shepherd is expected to take some action before the document can proceed.

2.3. Access Control for IAB States and Annotations

Some IAB members, and members of the IAB Executive Directorate, need to be able to set the states and annotations for IAB documents during their life cycle. The IAB Chair needs to be able to grant access to individuals to modify the state and annotations; such access applies to all IAB Stream documents.

3. IRTF Stream

This section describes the desired states and annotations for the IRTF stream. Some of the steps take place in IRTF Research Groups (RGs), while others take place in the Internet Research Steering Group (IRSG).

3.1. States for the IRTF Stream

- Candidate RG Document -- This document is under consideration in an RG for becoming an IRTF document. A document in this state does not imply any RG consensus and does not imply any precedence or selection. It's simply a way to indicate that somebody has asked for a document to be considered for adoption by an RG.

- Active RG Document -- This document has been adopted by an RG and is being actively developed.

- Parked RG Document -- This document has lost its author or editor, is waiting for another document to be written, or cannot currently be worked on by the RG that adopted it for some other reason.

- In RG Last Call -- The document is in its final review in the RG.

- Waiting for Document Shepherd -- IRTF documents have document shepherds who help RG documents through the process after the RG has finished with the document.

- Waiting for IRTF Chair -- The IRTF Chair is meant to be performing some task such as sending a request for IESG Review.

- Awaiting IRSG Reviews -- The document shepherd has taken the document to the IRSG and solicited reviews from one or more IRSG members.

- In IRSG Poll -- The IRSG is taking a poll on whether or not the document is ready to be published.

- In IESG Review -- The IRSG has asked the IESG to do a review of the document, as described in [RFC5742].

- Sent to the RFC Editor -- The document has been submitted for publication (and not returned to the IRTF for further action). The document may be in the RFC Editor's queue, or it may have been published as an RFC; this state doesn't distinguish between different states occurring after the document has left the IRTF.

- Document on Hold Based on IESG Request -- The IESG has requested that the document be held pending further review, as specified in RFC 5742, and the IRTF has agreed to such a hold.

- Dead IRTF Document -- This document was an active IRTF document, but for some reason it is no longer being pursued for the IRTF stream. It is possible that the document might be revived later, possibly in another stream.

3.2. Annotations for the IRTF Stream

- Editor Needed -- The document has lost its editor but it still intended to be the output of an RG.

- Shepherd Needed -- The document needs a shepherd assigned to it.

- Waiting for Dependency on Other Document -- Activity on this document is expected to be low or non-existent while waiting for another document (probably listed in the comments) to progress.

- Revised I-D Needed -- Discussion has ensued that is expected to cause changes, and no progress is expected until a new draft is issued.

- IESG Review Completed -- The IESG has completed its review on the document, as described in [RFC5742].

3.3. Access Control for IRTF States and Annotations

An RG Chair needs to be able to set the states and annotations for an IRTF document before the RG has sent the document to the IRSG for review. The RG Chair also needs to be able to give the same ability to a shepherd that is assigned by the RG chair. This access control is similar to the access control that is specified in [RFC6175] for IETF WG chairs and their document shepherds.

The RG chairs should be able to modify the state and annotations for any of that RG's documents at any time. The IRTF Chair should be able to modify the state and annotations for any IRTF Stream document at any time.

RG chairs and document shepherds may change at any point in a document's life cycle. The Datatracker must allow for and log these changes.

4. Independent Submission Stream

This section describes the desired states and annotations for the Independent Submission stream. The ISE will do his or her own record-keeping for data not related to states and annotations.

Many documents in the Independent Submission stream come from the other three streams. Because of this, the tracker needs to preserve previous states and annotations on drafts that come to the Independent Submission stream.

4.1. States for the Independent Submission Stream

- Submission Received -- The draft has been sent to the ISE with a request for publication.
- Finding Reviewers -- The ISE is finding initial reviewers for the document.
- In ISE Review -- The ISE is actively working on the document.
- Response to Review Needed -- One or more reviews have been sent to the author(s), and the ISE is awaiting response.
- In IESG Review -- The ISE has asked the IESG to do a review on the document, as described in [RFC5742].
- Sent to the RFC Editor -- The ISE processing of this document is complete and it has been sent to the RFC Editor for publication. The document may be in the RFC Editor's queue, or it may have been published as an RFC; this state doesn't distinguish between different states occurring after the document has left the ISE.
- No Longer In Independent Submission Stream -- This document was actively considered in the Independent Submission stream, but the ISE chose not to publish it. It is possible that the document might be revived later. A document in this state may have a comment explaining the reasoning of the ISE (such as if the document was going to move to a different stream).
- Document on Hold Based on IESG Request -- The IESG has requested that the document be held pending further review, as specified in RFC 5742, and the ISE has agreed to such a hold.

4.2. Annotations for the Independent Submission Stream

- Waiting for Dependency on Other Document -- Activity on this document is expected to be low or non-existent while waiting for another document (probably listed in the comments) to progress. The other documents may or may not be in the Independent Submission stream.

- Awaiting Reviews -- Activity on this document is expected to be low or non-existent while waiting for reviews that were solicited by the ISE.

- Revised I-D Needed -- Requests for revisions have been sent to the author(s), and no further ISE processing is expected until a new draft is issued.

- IESG Review Completed -- The IESG has completed its review on the document, as described in [RFC5742].

5. Display in the Datatracker

When the Datatracker displays the metadata for an individual draft in the IAB stream, IRTF stream, or ISE stream, it should show at least the following information:

Document stream:	IAB / IRTF / Independent Submission
I-D availability status:	Active / Expired / Withdrawn / RFC Replaces / Replaced I-D or RFC (if applicable)
Last updated:	year-mm-dd (e.g. 2010-07-25)
IRTF RG status: *	Applicable RG state *and* name of RG (or RGs)
Intended RFC status:	Informational / Experimental / etc.
Document shepherd: **	Name of Document Shepherd (if assigned)
Approval status:	Name of applicable state from the IAB / IRTF / Independent Submission stream

* The "IRTF RG status" is only shown for the IRTF stream; it is to be completely removed for the IAB and Independent Stream

** This field displays the name and email of the person assigned as the shepherd for the I-D; the line is omitted if the shepherd has not yet been assigned

6. Movement between Streams

Internet-Drafts sometimes move between streams. For example, a draft might start out in the IETF stream but then move to the Independent Submission stream, or a draft might move from an IRTF RG to the IETF stream. Thus, the IETF Datatracker needs to be able to change the designated stream of a draft. It is expected that this will be done by the stream managers. In addition, the IETF Datatracker should preserve all data from the earlier stream(s) when a document moves between streams.

Internet-Drafts sometimes move out of a stream into a non-stream state. For example, a draft that is in the "Candidate IAB Document", "Candidate RG Document", or "Submission Received" state might not be adopted by the stream and revert back to having no stream-specific state. The IETF Datatracker needs to be able to handle the transition from having a stream-related state to a null state.

New streams may be added in the future, and the tool needs to be able to handle additional streams.

7. IESG Mail Sent for the IRTF and Independent Stream

After the IESG performs a review of potential RFCs from the IRTF and Independent streams, as described in RFC 5742, the IETF Datatracker sends out email to the IANA, the IESG, ietf-announce@ietf.org, and the stream manager with the results of the IESG's review. In the past, the subject line and body of that message has been misleading about the scope and purpose of the message. There is now a requirement that the message clearly state that the message is about the IETF-conflict review of a particular Internet-Draft.

Note that these letters have effects on the state machine for the IESG, although those effects are not covered in this document.

8. Security Considerations

Changing the states in the Datatracker does not affect the security of the Internet in any significant fashion.

9. Review of These Requirements

The IAB has reviewed this document and agrees that this document meets the IAB's consent requirements.

The IRTF Chair has reviewed this document and agrees that this document meets the requirements for the IRTF stream.

The ISE has reviewed this document and agrees that this document meets the requirements of the technical community, as represented by the Independent Submission stream.

10. Acknowledgements

This document draws heavily on, including wholesale copying from, earlier work done by Henrik Levkowetz, Phil Roberts, and Aaron Falk. Additional significant input has been received from Aaron Falk, Nevil Brownlee, Olaf Kolkman, Ross Callon, Ed Juskevicius, Subramanian SM Moonesamy, and Alfred Hoenes.

11. References

11.1. Normative References

[RFC4844] Daigle, L., Ed., and Internet Architecture Board, "The RFC Series and RFC Editor", RFC 4844, July 2007.

11.2. Informative References

[RFC5742] Alvestrand, H. and R. Housley, "IESG Procedures for Handling of Independent and IRTF Stream Submissions", BCP 92, RFC 5742, December 2009.

[RFC6174] Juskevicius, E., "Definition of IETF Working Group Document States", RFC 6174, March 2011.

[RFC6175] Juskevicius, E., "Requirements to Extend the Datatracker for IETF Working Group Chairs and Authors", RFC 6175, March 2011.

Author’s Address

Paul Hoffman
VPN Consortium

EMail: paul.hoffman@vpnc.org