

Request for Proposal
RFC Production Center

The Internet Society

On behalf of

The IETF Administrative Oversight Committee

Date of Issuance: June 15, 2015
Proposal Submission Deadline: August 3, 2015 5:00 P.M. EDT

Table of Contents

Request for Proposal	1
RFC Production Center	1
Section I: General Procedural Information.....	3
Section II: Specifications	6
Section III: Proposal Format	9
Section IV: Selection.....	10
Section V: Other Terms and Conditions	11
Section VI: References.....	12
Section VII: Signature Page.....	13
Appendix 1: RFC Production Center Statement of Work.....	14
Appendix 2: Work Standards.....	20
Appendix 3: Offeror's Affidavit	22

SECTION I: GENERAL PROCEDURAL INFORMATION

- A. Summary
- B. Questions/Inquiries
- C. Bidders Conference
- D. Addenda to RFP and Errata
- E. Presentations and Tests
- F. Proposal Evaluation Board
- G. Process Modification
- H. Projected Schedule of Events

A. Summary

The IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC), on behalf of the RFC Series Editor (RSE) and the Internet Architecture Board (IAB), announces this Request for Proposal for the RFC Production Center (RPC or Production Center). The Internet Society (ISOC) will be executing the contract on behalf of the IAOC.

The IAOC desires a long-term relationship of up to six (6) years with a successful contractor commencing on January 1, 2016. The contract will be for two-years plus the opportunity for two, two-year contract extensions upon successful performance. The contract will be for a fixed price, except for certain services as noted herein.

The closing date for submission of proposals is Monday, August 3, 2015 not later than 5:00 P.M. EDT.

B. Questions/Inquiries

1. The sole point of contact regarding this Request for Proposal (RFP) is the IETF Administrative Director (IAD).
2. All questions/inquiries must be submitted in writing and must be received no later than July 3, 2015.
3. Questions/inquiries will be accepted by email at rpc-select@ietf-bids.org.
4. All questions and answers shall be posted without identification of the question originator at <https://iaoc.ietf.org/rfps.html> no later than July 17, 2015.

C. Bidders Conference

1. A Bidders Conference will be held on July 10th from 10:00 AM to 1:00 PM PT at the World Trade Center, Seattle, WA, Suite 200, 2211 Elliott Avenue, Seattle, WA 98121-1692 The conference will provide an opportunity for potential bidders to ask questions of the current RFC Series Editor concerning the RFC Production Center and the RFC Editor organization. Reservations are required by July 8th, 5:00 PM PT and must be addressed to rpc-select@ietf-bids.org. The conference will be cancelled if there are no reservations made by the July 8th deadline.

D. Addenda to RFP and Errata

1. If the IAOC finds it necessary to revise any part of this RFP or correct any errors, an addendum will be provided in the same manner as the original RFP.

2. Any addenda and errata will be posted at <https://iaoc.ietf.org/rfps.html>.
3. Addenda and errata to the RFP will not be issued after July 27, 2015.
4. The Statement of Work is subject to modification as a result of changes to the RFC 6635.
5. Proposals submitted in response to this RFP shall reflect an acknowledgement of changes to the RFC 6635 model up to the date of the proposal, and an acknowledgement of any amendments, addenda, and errata, if issued, to the RFP with the following statement:

"We hereby acknowledge that our proposal in response to the RFP reflects changes made prior to the date of submission to the RFC Editor Services model, RFC 6635 and, if issued, any amendments, addenda, and errata, to the RFP itself."

E. Presentations and Tests

1. Oral presentations and/or teleconferences may be required. If requested, said presentations may be conducted at a time and place to be determined. Offerors will be responsible for their own expenses associated with such presentations.
2. Tests may be required to demonstrate the necessary skills. Tests may include, for example, copy editing for editing, formatting, and compliance with the RFC Style Guide, RFC 7322. Offerors will be responsible for their own expenses associated with such tests.
3. Final candidates will be measured against their qualifications and experience in performing the work as described in this RFP.

F. Assistance

1. The IAOC may seek the assistance of others in the fulfillment of its responsibilities in regards to evaluating responses to this RFP.

G. Process Modification

1. In the case where responses to this RFP fail to meet the basic requirements defined by the IAOC, the IAOC reserves the right to modify this RFP process.
2. The IAOC may choose to re-open the RFP or to enter into further negotiations with one or more of the Offerors if the situation warrants.

H Projected Schedule of Events

The IAOC intends to process this RFP in accordance with the following schedule:

RFC Production Center RFP Projected Schedule of Events	
Date	Action
15 June 2015	RFP Issued
3 July	Questions Due
10 July	Bidders Conference, if not cancelled
17 July	Answers to questions posted online
27 July	Addenda & Errata deadline
3 August	Proposals due
4 Aug – 4 Sept	Initial Proposal Evaluation Period
10 September	Negotiations
21 September	MoU, if necessary
22 October	Contract Award
November – December	Vendor transition
1 January 2016	Contract commences

SECTION II: SPECIFICATIONS

This section provides details about the proposal submission, contract terms and contractor requirements.

- A. Term of Contract
- B. Closing Date & Submittal Requirements
- C. Duration of Proposal Offer
- D. IAOC Discretion; Cancellation, Negotiation, Contracting, Rejection, Clarification
- E. Public Information
- F. Subcontractors
- G. Incurred Expenses
- H. Type of Contract
- I. General Contractual Conditions
- J. Offeror Affidavit
- K. Experience
- L. Key Personnel
- M. Contractor Obligations

A. Term of Contract

1. The IAOC desires a long-term relationship of up to six (6) years with a successful contractor commencing on January 1, 2016. The contract will be for two-years plus the opportunity for two, two-year contract extensions upon successful performance. The contract will be for a fixed price, except for certain services as noted herein.

2. Extensions should not be presumed, as it will be based on each party's sole discretion, the needs of the IETF Community and performance under the contract.

B. Closing Date & Submittal Requirements

1. The proposal shall arrive not later than 5:00 P.M. EDT Monday, 3 August 2015, in order to be considered.

2. Proposals or unsolicited amendments to proposals arriving after the closing time and date will not be considered.

3. A PDF version of the proposal must be submitted by email to rpc-select@ietf-bids.org by the closing date and time.

C. Duration of Proposal Offer

1. Proposals shall be valid and irrevocable for at least 180 days following the submission date for this RFP.

2. This period may be extended by written agreement between an Offeror and the IAD.

D. IAOC Discretion; Cancellation, Negotiation, Contracting, Rejection, Clarification

1. The IAOC may cancel this RFP, in whole or in part, at any time.

2. The IAOC may obtain the assistance of others in fulfillment of its responsibilities in regards to the evaluation of responses to this RFP.

3. The IAOC may disqualify proposals that it deems to be non-responsive.
4. The IAOC may reject an Offeror's proposal if the Offeror:
 - a. Fails to submit by the deadline
 - b. Fails to submit the information required
 - c. Fails to submit a proposal in accordance with the required format
 - d. Fails to submit a costs quotation response
 - e. Fails to respond to requests for clarification, make an oral presentation, or perform tests if requested
 - f. Fails to complete the Offeror Affidavit
 - g. For any other reason that the IAOC deems to be reasonable
5. The IAOC may seek clarification of any element of an Offeror's proposal.
6. The IAOC may require Offerors to make oral presentations in person and/or participate in teleconferences at a time and place to be determined by the parties. Each Offeror will be responsible for its own expenses associated with such presentations.
7. The IAOC may select one or more Offerors for contract negotiations on the basis of the strength, viability and financial terms of their proposals and presentations, their known track records for similar functions, and the credentials and experience presented in their proposals. The IAOC does not make any commitment regarding the outcome of these negotiations.
8. The IAOC will seek to enter into contract with an Offeror or Offerors that IAOC deems, in its sole discretion, to represent the best value combination of performance and cost, not necessarily the low bidder.
9. Following the successful negotiation of the principal financial and performance terms with an Offeror, ISOC may enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with such Offeror prior to negotiating and executing a definitive service agreement. A contract shall not be deemed to be awarded hereunder unless and until the execution of a definitive agreement with the Offeror.
10. All proposals shall become the property of the IAOC.

E. Public Information

The IETF is a community committed to transparency in the manner in which it conducts its operations. Accordingly, the following will apply to the contract, proposal, and negotiations:

1. The contract will be made public except for mutually agreed upon business confidential material and costs.
2. The Offerors' names will be announced on or after 3 August.
3. The Offeror's proposal will NOT be released.
4. Negotiations are private among the Offeror, and the IAD, the RPC Selection Committee, the IAB, the IAOC, and ISOC leadership.
5. All proposals submitted by an Offeror shall become the property of the IAOC.

F. Subcontractors

1. The Internet Society will enter into agreements with selected Offeror only, not the Offeror's subcontractors.
2. The selected Offeror shall be responsible for all products and services as required by this RFP.
3. Subcontractors, if any, shall be identified with a complete description of qualifications and roles relative to this proposal, and shall be included at the time of proposal submission.
4. Subcontractors may not be placed under contract in any way without the written approval of the IAD.

G. Incurred Expenses

1. The Offeror shall be responsible for any cost incurred in the preparation and submission of a proposal, oral presentations in support of such proposal, performance of any tests, and negotiation of a Memorandum of Understanding, if any, and a definitive services agreement.

H. Type of Contract

1. The contract will be a fixed-price contract, except as noted under 'Pre-Approval Editorial Review' in the statement of work.

I. General Contractual Conditions

1. Any contract will contain the general provisions included in this RFP.
2. This RFP, including the Statement of Work, and the successful Offeror's proposal will be incorporated by reference and made a part of the contract. Certain IETF process documents (Best Current Practices) define rules that affect the performance of the work and shall also be incorporated by reference.

J. Offeror Affidavit

1. Each proposal shall include a completed Offeror Affidavit, a copy of which is included in the Appendix.

K. Experience

1. Offeror must have experience in editing technical standards, technical writing and/or on-line publishing, technical materials, and such technical expertise as appropriate to the proposal.

L. Key Personnel

1. Offeror shall identify and provide the resumes of Key Personnel.
2. The contract may be adjusted or terminated if Key Personnel are identified but cannot be supplied by Offeror at contract execution or within ninety days thereafter, at the discretion of IAOC.

M. Contractor Obligations

1. Offeror shall provide for and pay the compensation of its personnel, including Subcontractors, and shall pay all taxes, contributions and benefits (such as, but not limited to, workers' compensation benefits) which an employer is required to pay relating to the employment of employees.
2. The ISOC and IAOC will not be responsible for providing any compensation, insurance, medical, disability or other benefits to Offeror's personnel or subcontractors.

SECTION III: PROPOSAL FORMAT

- A. Proposals
- B. Preparation
- C. Costs
- D. Proposal Format

A. Proposals

1. Proposals shall be submitted in the proposal format to facilitate proposal review.
2. Failure to submit the proposal in the format may be grounds for proposal rejection.
3. The successful Offeror will define their proposed methodology and why the approach is the preferred approach.

B. Preparation

1. Proposals should be prepared simply and economically, in a concise and straightforward manner, while providing a complete and detailed description of the Offeror's abilities and methodologies to meet the requirements set forth in the RFP.

C. Costs

1. Offeror shall identify all project-related costs included directly in a proposed budget.
2. In cases where institutional overhead is commonly represented as an indirect rate or shared F&A, the Offeror will provide explicit back-up documentation for both the rate and items and services covered.
3. Offerors shall include a quote for Pre-Approval Editorial Review. (See [Appendix 1: RFC Production Center Statement of Work](#))

D. Proposal Format

The proposal shall follow the following format:

1. Transmittal letter with signature of authorized representative
2. Executive Summary
3. Table of Contents
4. Experience, Qualifications and Accomplishments in this area
5. Key Personnel
6. Commitment to meet functional requirement and service levels
7. Methodologies for meeting functional requirements, including with RFC Series Editor and the RFC Publisher, and service levels
8. References (Three references attesting to performance in similar publishing function)
9. Cost Quotation including quotation for pre-approval editing.
10. Resumes of Key Personnel
11. Subcontractor Information, if any proposed
12. Assumptions
13. Exceptions to any specifications, terms, conditions, service levels
14. Offeror Affidavit
15. Annual Reports of Business
16. Miscellaneous Information
17. Signature Page

SECTION IV: SELECTION

- A. Selection Procedure
- B. Selection Criteria
- C. Negotiation Stage
- D. Award

A. Selection Procedure

1. The RPC Selection Committee (RSC) will or will cause the review and evaluation of all proposals to determine if they are qualified.
2. Oral presentations and/or teleconferences may be requested by the RSE, or designees.
3. Tests may be required to demonstrate the necessary skills. Tests may include, for example, copy editing for editing, formatting, and compliance with the RFC Style Guide, RFC 7322. Offerors will be responsible for their own expenses associated with such tests.
4. Requests for clarity may be made of the Offeror.
5. Qualified Offerors will be notified of their selection for advancement to the negotiation phase on 10 September.

B. Selection Criteria

1. Vendor qualifications and experience performing similar services
2. Key Personnel
3. Vendor ability to meet requirements, including results of tests, if requested
4. Proposal as a reflection of Offeror's understanding of scope of work and methodologies
5. Oral presentation and/or teleconferences, if conducted
6. Cost to furnish the services (Note: The lowest cost offer will not necessarily be awarded a contract.)
7. References

C. Negotiation Phase

1. ISOC may enter into a contract with an Offeror that represents the best value combination of performance and cost, not necessarily the low bidder.
2. The RSC will submit questions to each Offeror seeking clarification of any element of their proposal, if needed.
3. Negotiations will be undertaken in accordance with the timetable in Section I.
4. Negotiations may include face-to-face sessions. Offerors are responsible for their own expenses associated therewith.
5. The IAOC reserves the right to solicit a best and final offer from each remaining Offeror.

D. Award

1. The Contract is/are expected to be concluded by September 24, 2015, however, if it appears that date will not be met, the essential terms of an agreement may be concluded in an MoU by September 17th.
2. The Contract will not be awarded until a definitive contract is executed by the parties.
3. The Contract term begins January 1, 2016

SECTION V: OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

A. Intellectual Property Rights

1. All work performed by the RFC Production Center shall be “work for hire” and the RFC Production Center shall obtain no rights therefrom. All rights belong to the IETF Trust.

SECTION VI: REFERENCES

References

- [1] Kolkman, O., "RFC Editor Model (Version 2)", RFC 6635, June 2012.
- [2] Mankin, A. and Hayes, S., "Requirements for IETF Technical Publication Service", RFC 4714, October 2006.
- [3] Daigle, L. and Internet Architecture Board (IAB), "The RFC Series and RFC Editor", RFC 4844, July 2007.
- [4] Flanagan, H. and Ginoza, S., "RFC Style Guide", RFC 7322, September 2014.
- [5] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", BCP 9, RFC 2026, October 1996.
- [6] Postel, J., and Reynolds, J., "Instructions to RFC Authors", RFC 2223, October 1997.
- [7] RFC Editor website, www.rfc-editor.org.

SECTION VII: SIGNATURE PAGE

Date Proposal Submitted: _____

Offeror: _____

Name/Title of Offeror Representative:

Address of Offeror:

Telephone: _____

Offeror Representative Email Address:

Signature of Offeror Representative:

Date: _____

APPENDIX 1: RFC PRODUCTION CENTER 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 both strategic and operational 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 editing process should strive to maintain both consistency of style with previously published RFCs 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.
- 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 published XML document. If a document does not pass validation checks, it must move to a non-RPC controlled state (see A.2.1.3.). Files submitted as plain text will be converted to XML by the RPC for ease of editing.
- 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-RPC 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.
- 1.2.4. For documents submitted as .nroff or an earlier xml format than is described in <draft-hoffman-xml2rfc>, edit the content and markup as needed to produce an RFC that matches existing output. Note that .nroff will be deprecated when the format changes described by <draft-flanagan-rfc-framework> or its successors are fully implemented.

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.

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.

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.

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. This option should be priced separately. 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.

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.

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.

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

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.

APPENDIX 2: 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 in a non-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. Performance against the defined Service Levels 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). The EDIT state is defined in RFC6359 and <http://www.rfc-editor.org/pubprocess.html>.)

(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.

APPENDIX 3: OFFEROR'S AFFIDAVIT

I HEREBY DECLARE AND AFFIRM that I am the (Title) _____,
and the duly authorized representative of (Offeror) _____,
and that I possess the legal authority to make this Affidavit on behalf of myself and the Offeror for
which I am acting.

I FURTHER AFFIRM THAT:

1. The Offeror named above is a {Insert type of entity} _____ in the
country and state of _____ and that it is in good standing and that has
filed all required statutory reports and, except as validly contested, has paid or arranged for the
payment of all taxes in the applicable jurisdictions.
2. The Offeror has been in business for _____ years and _____ months.
3. The Offeror's company registration number or U.S. Employer ID Number is: _____.

**I do solemnly declare and affirm under the penalties of perjury that the contents of this
affidavit are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.**

(Date)

By: _____
(Affiant)