

RFC PRODUCTION CENTER (RPC) STATEMENT OF WORK

This Statement of Work describes tasks to be performed by the RFC Production Center (RPC).

The RPC is one of the distinct components of the RFC Editor. The primary responsibility for the RPC is to edit the text [and review the final XML markup](#) of approved Internet Drafts to a consistently high level of quality as described by the RFC Style [Guide and appropriate formatting guides for the approved publication formats](#). The RFC Series Editor (RSE) [provides technical guidance to the RPC](#). Further detail on RPC responsibilities may be found in RFC 6635.

As described in RFC 4844, RFCs are documents generated by one of the four streams:

- (i) The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF),
- (ii) The Internet Research Task Force (IRTF),
- (iii) The Internet Architecture Board (IAB), and
- (iv) Independent Submissions.

The IETF, IRTF and IAB streams are managed by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG), the Internet Research Steering Group (IRSG), and the IAB respectively. The Independent Submissions stream is managed by the Independent Submissions Editor (ISE).

Where reference is made to individuals or roles that may authorize certain actions, these individuals or roles will be identified from time to time by the IAB, IESG, IRSG, and ISE for their respective streams.

1. Edit Internet Drafts

The following tasks apply to all documents from any of the streams.

1.1. Editing

1.1.1. [The RPC shall edit in accordance with the versions of RFC Style Guide and various publication format guides current at the time of editing. This includes the review](#) and edit the document for formal grammar, spelling, formatting, alignment with boilerplate, document structure, readability, etc. The review should strive to maintain [both consistency of style with previously published documents and a high level of quality according to current editorial standards](#).

1.1.2. Maintain a tracking system for edits, and ensure that changes are signed off by all authors except when the need for sign-off is waived by an authorized representative of the relevant stream and approved by the RSE. Also ensure that that any technical changes are approved by an authorized representative of the relevant stream.

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: Manual.

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: RPC takes direction from the

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted:).

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: Review

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: and appearance

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: ,

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: , and clarity. The RSE maintains the 'RFC Style Manual'. The RPC shall edit in accordance with the version of the RFC Style Manual current at the time of editing. The Style Manual specification now in use will be used by the RPC until replaced.

1.1.3. In rare cases and at the request of the stream manager, the RSE may direct the RPC to process all or parts of the document without any change to its editorial style or substantive content.

1.2. Editing markup

1.2.1. For documents submitted in a format as described by <draft-flanagan-rfc-framework> or its successors, run submitted XML files through the validators and converters supplied by the IETF Tools Team to validate the XML and produce the final XML document. If a document does not pass validation checks, it must move to a non-RFC Editor controlled state (see A.2.1.3.). Files submitted as plain text will be converted to XML for ease of editing, but that XML should not be published.

1.2.2. XML which is valid but which does not match best practice as indicated by <draft-hoffman-xml2rfc> or its successors will be updated by the RPC.

1.2.3. Review the visual output of the publication formatting tool for obvious errors. If errors are found, move the document to a non-RFC Editor controlled state and submit a bug report. The RPC will work with the authors, any support vendors, and the Tools team to determine appropriate next steps. The RPC should not manually edit the outputs of the formatting tool.

1.3. Validation of references

Ensure that references within specifications are available and that referenced documents are described and cited as per the RFC Style Guide. For standards track documents in the IETF stream, specific rules on the suitability and availability of references apply, as documented in RFC 2026 and successors, as interpreted by the IESG. Editing of documents may be delayed waiting for normative references to become available.

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: (RFCs and Internet Drafts) are latest versions available. Also, match citations and references for consistency.

1.4. Validation of formal languages

The RPC should validate the syntax of sections of documents containing formal languages. In particular MIB modules, YANG, ABNF, and XML code components should be verified using one or more tools as approved by the RSE. The RSE will consult with the IAD and tools developers in the Internet community in a reasonable effort to ensure that such tools are obtained, tested, adapted, extended, and maintained to meet the needs of the RPC.

1.5. Insertion of Parameter Values

Review documents for actions required by organizations maintaining registries of protocol parameters (such as the IANA), work with these organizations to populate protocol parameters into documents, and update appropriate related text when required prior to publication.

1.6. Pre-Publication Corrections

Incorporate changes upon request of the relevant individuals ([e.g., authors, Area Directors, stream managers](#)). [Any](#) changes that are beyond editorial will be sent to the stream manager for approval.

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: any

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted:).

1.7. Document Format Conversions

1.7.1. Follow the guidance provided in the RFC Series Format Requirements and Future Development document (RFC 6949) and subsequent communications from the RSE regarding what document formats may be accepted and published.

1.7.2. Accept files that may contain information such as: code, formal descriptions (XML, ABNF, etc.), graphics, data files, etc. as specified by the RSE.

1.8. Language Translation

Documents are published only in English.

1.9. Exception Handling

Permit documents being processed for publication to be withdrawn or put on hold where the stream-dependent process permits.

1.10. Expedited Handling

On instructions from, and with priorities set by, the RSE, expedite the processing of specific documents within a given document stream at the request of the appropriate stream manager.

1.11. Process and Document Evolution

At the direction of the RSE:

1.11.1. Participate in the discussions of author guidelines and publication process changes.

1.11.2. Participate in and support process experiments and prototyping efforts proposed by the community involving the technical publication process that may improve the processes associated with the RFC Series. [Depending on the size of the project, additional resources may be required.](#)

2. Documents forwarded to RFC Publisher

2.1. The RPC will edit the documents from all streams consistent with the RFC Style [Guide](#), the RFC Series, and the intent of the Authors. Upon completion, the RPC will [assign appropriate metadata](#), [cryptographically](#) sign the documents, send a notice to the community, and then deposit the final documents with the [RFC Publisher](#) for archiving and public access [as described in <draft-iab-rfc-preservation> or its successors.](#)

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: Manual

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: RPC publisher

- 2.2. Additionally, the RPC will forward records of all interaction and edits relative to the document, including dialogue with the document authors and stream representatives, to the RFC Publisher for archiving.
3. Accountability
The RPC is responsible to the RSE as regards to RFC Series consistency, conformance with the Statement of Work and the Style Guide.
4. Pre-Approval Editorial Review (Optional)
The RPC should be capable of performing an editorial review of stable Internet-Drafts upon request by a stream representative. Such review should take place early enough to allow any proposed changes to be reviewed within the technical review process. This is an optional service that may or may not be requested. If it is requested, it will be separately priced. For the IETF standards process stream this review is expected to be performed before WG Last Call to provide feedback to the authors to improve quality of the documents.
5. Communication of relevant RPC processing information online
The RPC shall keep the information on the RFC Editor website current and provide the following information:
 - 5.1. Processing status of all submitted documents
 - 5.2. Editing Statistics and Status Reports
 - 5.2.1. Provide monthly reports reflecting service level compliance data for RPC-controlled states. See Work Standards.
 - 5.2.2. Provide monthly statistics on median queue times, counts and pages of documents published, editing processing time, and RPC total processing time (defined in Work Standards), in the aggregate and also sorted by document stream. The presentation should provide a historical context to identify trends.
 - 5.2.3. The RPC will, upon request, provide status reports to IETF meetings to apprise the community of its work and the performance of the RPC.
6. Community liaison and training
 - 6.1. Tutorial and Help Services
 - 6.1.1. Provide and maintain documentation giving guidance to authors on the layout, structure, and style required to develop documents suitable for publication.
 - 6.1.2. Provide tutorials to prospective RFC authors to educate authors on the processes and expectations of the RPC.

6.1.3. Provide a contact e-mail address and correspond as required to progress the publication work, and address queries from the Internet community.

6.1.4. Provide a help desk at IETF meetings.

6.2. Response to general questions directed to rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org, coordinating as necessary with the RFC Publisher and RSE.

7. Coordination Responsibility

The RPC will interact with the RSE, IANA, authors, and representatives of the different streams, and others in the proper performance of its responsibilities. It will be responsible for managing those relationships, including the establishment of due dates, follow-up notices, and escalation to maintain the publication process in a timely fashion.

8. Collaboration

The RPC shall work with the appropriate parties to [make sure](#) its document tracking system [remains properly integrated through all enhancements](#) with the RFC Publisher, the IETF Secretariat, and the IANA tracking systems and others as directed by the RSE.

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM
Deleted: integrate

9. Liaison and Communication Support

9.1. The RPC will, when requested, participate in coordination telechats, and face-to-face meetings, with other RFC stream representatives, the RFC Publisher, the IAD, and others as appropriate.

9.2. The RPC will, when requested, make regular reports at IETF meetings, online, in writing, in person, or [some combination thereof](#).

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM
Deleted: all three

9.3. The RFC Style [Guide](#)

9.3.1. The RPC shall assist the RSE in the preparation and ongoing upkeep of an RFC Style [Guide](#), which shall describe with clarity the grammar, style, usage, typography, punctuation, and spelling to hone clear, concise technical prose, and so on, for the drafting and editing of RFCs. It will be published on the RFC Publisher web site. [v](#)

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM
Deleted: Manual

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM
Deleted: Manual

9.3.2. The RPC shall advise the RSE of any concerns or issues that may arise in the application of the Style [Guide](#).

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM
Deleted: The Style Manual shall replace RFC 2223 "Instructions to RFC Authors".

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM
Deleted: Manual

10. Specific Deliverables

In addition to the foregoing functions and tasks there are specific deliverables:

10.1. The RPC Procedures Manual: The RPC shall prepare and maintain a Procedures Manual describing with clear detail each task performed in the provision of RPC services.

- 10.2. System Documentation: The RPC will document the systems supporting the RFC editing process.
- 10.3. RFC Editor website: The RPC will maintain the content of the RFC Editor website.
- 10.4. Information Systems and Tools Development
 - 10.4.1. Tools development includes systems development in direct support of the RPC, enhancements and applications providing for 3rd party interaction and shall be undertaken with goals of:
 - 10.4.1.1. Improving performance of staff,
 - 10.4.1.2. Enhancing participation of necessary third parties, e.g., authors,
 - 10.4.1.3. Enhancing interaction with the streams, RSE, RFC Publisher, authors, and IANA,
 - 10.4.1.4. Enhancing portability during a future transition, if any, and
 - 10.4.1.5. Adding services required by this SOW.
 - 10.4.2. All non-proprietary tools shall be licensed in accordance with current IETF Trust policy.
 - 10.4.3. Proprietary tools shall not be used without the written authorization of the IAD obtained at the request of the RSE.
- 10.5. Innovations
 - 10.5.1. The RPC, under the guidance of the RSE, will continually examine its system administration for possible improvements, experiment with feasible and useful ones, and adopt those that succeed. The RPC should consider innovations to improve efficiency, improve coordination and transparency, and improve quality. The RPC will review all proposed changes with the RSE for approval and report out to the streams on the implementation and result of those changes.
 - 10.5.2. The RPC will attempt steady progress on their proposed innovations and shall report progress thereon three times a year, before each IETF meeting, and provide such additional reports and reviews as directed by the RSE.
- 10.6. Legal verification
 - The RPC will respond, with direction from the IAOC or its designee, to subpoena requests verifying the publication process and specific document status.

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: 3rd

APPENDIX 1

WORK STANDARDS

A.1. INTRODUCTION

A.1.1. Vendor will provide the services set forth in the SOW in accordance with the service levels set forth herein (“Service Levels”). In the event that vendor does not meet the defined Service Levels, the Internet Society shall be entitled to exercise the provisions of the Master Agreement.

A.1.2. The applicable Service Levels are set forth below

A.2. Document Processing Service Levels

A.2.1. Edit Processing

A.2.1.1. A document is “received” by the RPC on the date of the receipt of a request to publish by each of the respective streams (Receipt Date).

A.2.1.2. A document is "published" on the date the RFC is made available on the RFC Editor website and the RFC announcement is sent (Publication Date).

A.2.1.3. A document is in an “RPC-controlled state” when the work of the RPC is not being delayed by the actions of a third party. RPC operations that are blocked by a [third party](#) are outside an RPC-controlled state.

A.2.2. Processing Times

A.2.2.1. Processing times per document are from Receipt Date to Publication Date in total business days.

A.2.2.2. While the overall goal for document publication is 30 business days (6 weeks) from Receipt Date to Publication Date, the times measured in the defined Service Levels are times in RPC-controlled state. [The SLA shall be reported on a quarterly basis and shall be averaged for the final report of the year.](#)

A.2.2.3. [The ready-to-publish documents shall have a RPC processing time \(RPC-controlled states only\) guided by the rate and quantity of documents and pages submitted.](#)

[\(i\) When there is a normal amount of input, the SLA is 67% of documents published within the period have an RFC Editor controlled time that adds up to six weeks or fewer. \(Where 'normal' is defined as less than 1950 Pages gone to EDIT \(PGTE\).\)](#)

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: 3rd

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: 67% of the

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM

Deleted: 30 business days

(ii) When there is a moderate burst in the amount of input, then the SLA shifts to 50% of documents published within the period have an RFC Editor controlled time that adds up to 12 weeks or fewer within the given quarter or the subsequent quarter. (Where a 'moderate' burst is defined as 1950 - 3072 (inclusive) Pages gone to EDIT (PGTE).)

(iii) When there is a large burst in the amount of input, then the SLA must be discussed and re-evaluated. Where 'large' burst is defined as greater than 3072 Pages gone to EDIT (PGTE).

A.2.2.4. The RPC shall interact with third parties to promote an efficient and timely publication process, using escalation methods when appropriate.

A.2.2.5. The RPC shall commit to continuous process improvement leading to the reduction of outliers in RPC and publication processing times.

A.2.2.6. There shall be no long-term growth trend in the length of the publication queue. The RSE, IAD, and the RPC shall review growth trends in the queue to determine causality and whether, among other things, adjustments in expectations and/or resources may be required.

A2.3. Document Style and Quality

A.2.3.1. Document style shall be in accordance with the RFC Style [Guide and appropriate format documentation \(see draft-flanagan-rfc-framework or its successors\)](#). Questions concerning style shall be directed to the RSE. The RSE may review and comment on documents at the same time that authors review the ready-to-publish result of RPC processing.

A.2.3.2. The RPC may raise concerns about document quality from a stream with the stream manager and the RSE.

A.2.3.3. The RPC may discuss the level of effort necessary to process a stream's output with the stream's manager, the RSE and the IAOC.

Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM
Deleted: consistent with the RFC Series historically and
Ray Pelletier 3/31/2015 3:00 PM
Deleted: Manual.