

**RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

**RFC EDITOR SERVICES  
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. RFC Series Editor Statement of Work</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3. Independent Submissions Editor Statement of Work</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4. RFC Production Center Statement of Work</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5. RFC Publisher Statement of Work</b>	<b>25</b>

**RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

**RFC EDITOR SERVICES  
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

General information:

Sources Sought Notice

Posted: 23 January 2009

Response Date: 6 March 2009

Deadline for Questions: 6 February 2009

Answers to Questions Posted: 13 February 2009

Contracting Office:

Internet Society, on behalf of the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee

Address:

Internet Society

RFC Editor RFI

Attention: IAD

1775 Wiehle Ave.

Suite 201

Reston, VA 20190-5108

Description:

This is a Request for Information (RFI) only. Solicitations are not available at this time. One or more RFPs is anticipated in April 2009 for contract(s) to commence 1 January 2010. The incumbent has advised that they do not intend to respond to the RFP. This notice does not constitute a commitment by the Internet Society (ISOC) or the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF).

The RFC Editor provides editing, publishing and archiving services for the RFC series on behalf of the Internet Engineering Task Force and the broader Internet community.

The Internet Architecture Board (IAB) has described the RFC Editor services to include four functions. Following this structure could result in four vendors providing services that are currently provided by one vendor, or fewer than four vendors depending on input received from this RFI as to how the functions might be combined for the efficient delivery of professional, quality services. The overall RFC Editor function is described in RFC 4844 and the model for the RFC Editor structure is described in < <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-iab-rfc-editor-04>>.

The IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA), on behalf of the IETF and the IAB, is exploring options for contractor performance of the RFC Editor function and to that end seeks:

- (1) Comments and suggestions on the RFC Editor functions, practices and structure from any party (see Appendix A), and
- (2) Expressions of interest in the RFC Editor functions for contract award from qualified vendors. (See Appendix B)

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

### Background:

The RFC Editor performs a number of functions that may be carried out by various persons or entities. The RFC Editor model presented in <<http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-rfc-editor-04>> divides the responsibilities for the RFC Series into four functions: The RFC Series Editor, the Independent Submission Editor, the RFC Production Center, and the RFC Publisher. The model is intended to increase flexibility and operational support options, provide for the orderly succession of the RFC Editor, and ensure the continuity of the RFC series, while maintaining RFC quality, maintaining timely processing, ensuring document accessibility, reducing costs, and increasing cost transparency.

The four RFC Editor functions in brief:

1. The RFC Series Editor (RSE) is responsible for overseeing the consistency and quality of the RFC Series;
2. The Independent Submissions Editor (ISE) is responsible for managing the independent stream to the RFC series;
3. The RFC Production Center is responsible for the editing of documents consistent with the RFC Style Manual; and
4. The RFC Publisher is responsible for publishing and maintaining an archive of the RFC Series and its associated Errata.

Statements of Work for each of the functions are attached.

Additional information about the historical role and performance of the RFC Editor can be found at [www.rfc-editor.org](http://www.rfc-editor.org).

The RFC Style Manual in a draft state can be found at: [www.rfc-editor.org/styleguide.html](http://www.rfc-editor.org/styleguide.html)

The RFC Editor Procedures Manual can be found here: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/IAD-reports/proc-manual-05.pdf>

### Information Sought:

This Request for Information (RFI) has two target audiences: the Internet community and potential bidders on RFC Editor contracts. The IAOC wants to (i) gather information about implementation of the RFC Editor structure in ways that will meet the needs of the entire community and (ii) gather comments from potential bidders. The Internet community should use the format in Appendix A in their response; while potential bidders should use the format in Appendix B in their response.

The IASA is seeking the following information:

(1) Potential Bidders shall describe how they would propose to successfully organize, offer and perform the services necessary to carry out the functions as reflected in the model and the statements of work.

(2) Potential Bidders shall describe how it would integrate its implementation with the IETF and vendors performing other functions. In particular, the IAOC is interested in

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

how Potential Bidders might integrate the RFC Series Editor Function with the RFC Production Center; and how a function for which the Respondent is bidding might be integrated with the other functions.

(3) Potential Bidders shall describe any existing relationships with the Internet engineering community or Internet standards development organizations and the extent to which such relationships would enable Respondents to successfully perform each of the three services.

(4) Potential Bidders shall describe their costing model, including, if appropriate, the manner in which charges levied for any of the function(s) rendered would be derived. The eventual contractor(s) will be expected to furnish the necessary personnel, material, equipment, services, and facilities to perform the function(s) of the RFC Editor.

(5) Potential Bidders shall provide evidence of their background, experience and capability to perform the proposed function(s).

(6) Potential Bidders, if they plan to propose a person for the RFC Series Editor, shall provide the resume of a likely candidate. This role, if filled as part of a contract, requires a key personnel clause.

### Administrative Matters:

(1) Bidders shall not be obligated to provide the services described herein and it is understood by the IAOC and Internet Society that the cost estimates provided, if any, as a result of this request, are “best” estimates only.

(2) All information submitted in response to this announcement must be in English, is voluntary and may be used in the development of one or more RFP(s).

(3) Information received will be made public in accordance with the following guidelines:

a. Comments and suggestions on the RFC Editor functions, practices and structure received from any party. This input following the format at Appendix A will be used to formulate and refine one or more RFP(s). All material provided in this section will be made public without attribution. Vendors are encouraged to submit comments and suggestions.

b. Expressions of interest in the RFC Editor contract award should be submitted following the format at Appendix B. Unless otherwise indicated on the form, or by the vendor, all material in this section will be kept confidential within the ISOC, IAOC, the RFC Editor Selection Oversight Subcommittee, the IETF leadership, and the IAB. Vendors expressing interest will not be identified publicly, nor will any cost estimates received from such vendors.

c. The RFP process will be a public process and the names of vendors submitting proposals will be released.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

(4) The failure to respond to this RFI will not bar an organization from responding to an RFP. The Internet Society and the IAOC will not pay for information requested, nor will they compensate any respondent for any cost incurred in developing information provided to them.

(5) Questions should be directed to [rfc-editor-rfi2009@isoc.org](mailto:rfc-editor-rfi2009@isoc.org) no later than 6 February 2009. Responses shall be posted by 13 February 2009.

(6) It is intended the contract award will be for an initial term of 2 years, plus up to two, two-year extensions at the option of the IAOC.

(7) Respondents desiring notice of the RFP announcement should request notification on the appropriate submission form.

(8) The response date is 6 March 2009. Responses to this RFI should be completed using the appropriate format at Appendix A and B. The community should submit Appendix A to [rfced-rfi-a@isoc.org](mailto:rfced-rfi-a@isoc.org); vendors should submit Appendix B to [rfced-rfi-b@isoc.org](mailto:rfced-rfi-b@isoc.org).

(9) Point of Contact

Ray Pelletier, IETF Administrative Director  
Phone 703.652.9534, Fax 703.779.7463  
Email [rpelletier@isoc.org](mailto:rpelletier@isoc.org)

**RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

**APPENDIX A**

**COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS  
ON THE  
RFC EDITOR FUNCTIONS, PRACTICES AND STRUCTURE**

**Note: This data is to be sent to [rfced-rfi-a@isoc.org](mailto:rfced-rfi-a@isoc.org)**

**A. Identification:**

Organization:

Address:

City:

State:

Zip:

Point of Contact:

Title:

Email:

Phone:

Fax:

**B. Information sought:**

Notice:

Comments and Suggestions on the RFC Editor function, practices and structure will be used to formulate and refine one or more RFP(s). ALL MATERIAL PROVIDED IN THIS SECTION B WILL BE MADE PUBLIC WITHOUT ATTRIBUTION.

- (1) Would the Internet community be better served by a single person filling both the RFC Series Editor and Independent Submissions Editor roles? Why or why not?
- (2) Would the Internet community be better served by awarding a contract that combined the RFC Production Center and the RFC Series Editor? Why or why not?
- (3) Describe what changes in functions or the combination of functions would improve the delivery of services by the RFC Editor to the IETF and the Internet community at large.
- (4) Describe what changes in practices would improve the delivery of services by the RFC Editor to the IETF.
- (5) Describe any other combination of functions which might be more (or less) successful and describe the benefits and challenges you see for the community from those combinations.

**(6) Other Comments:**

**C. Identify the email address to which notice of the RFC Editor RFP should be sent.**

**RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

**APPENDIX B**

**EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST  
FROM VENDORS**

**Note: This data is to be sent to [rfced-rfi-b@isoc.org](mailto:rfced-rfi-b@isoc.org)**

**A. Identification:**

Organization:

Address:

City:

State:

Zip:

Point of Contact:

Title:

Email:

Phone:

Fax:

**B. Information sought:**

(1) Describe how you would propose to successfully organize, offer and perform the services necessary to carry out the RFC Editor functions, individually or in combination.

(2) If offering to perform one of the RFC Editor functions, describe how you would integrate its implementation with the IETF and vendors performing other functions.

(3) Describe any existing relationships with the Internet engineering community or Internet standards development organizations and the extent to which such relationships would enable you to successfully perform each of the services.

(4) Describe the costing model, including, if appropriate, the manner in which charges levied for any of the services rendered would be derived.

(5) Provide evidence of background, experience and capability to perform the proposed services.

(6) If you plan to propose a combination of the RFC Production Center function and RFC Series Editor, propose a person for the RFC Series Editor and provide the resume of a likely candidate. This role, if filled as part of a contract, requires a Key Personnel clause.

(7) Other Comments:

**C. Vendors are invited to submit Additional Comments and Suggestions on the RFC Editor Functions, Practices and Structure. This input will be used to formulate and refine the RFP. ALL MATERIAL PROVIDED IN THIS SECTION C WILL BE MADE PUBLIC WITHOUT ATTRIBUTION.**

**D. Identify the email address to which notice of the RFC Editor RFP should be sent.**

**RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

**STATEMENTS OF WORK**

**RFC SERIES EDITOR**

**INDEPENDENT SUBMISSIONS EDITOR**

**RFC PRODUCTION CENTER**

**RFC PUBLISHER**



## **RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

### **RFC SERIES EDITOR**

#### **STATEMENT OF WORK**

This Statement of Work describes tasks to be performed by the RFC Series Editor (RSE).

Reference: This Statement of Work was prepared based on RFC 4714, "Requirements for IETF Technical Publication Service", and the framework for the RFC Editor function expressed in RFC 4844. Additionally, various IETF process documents and operational procedures affect the work of the RFC Editor.

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 Internet Architecture Board (IAB) respectively. The independent submissions stream is managed by the Independent Submissions Editor.

It is ultimately the job of the IAB to determine that the proposed policies for the RFC Series are in line with the expectations of the Internet community. The RFC Series Editor will identify those issues within the RFC processes for which general policies need to be developed and make the IAB aware of those issues. The RFC Series Editor will act as a point of contact for the IAB for queries about the RFC Series continuity and the effectiveness of policies.

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, and IRSG, for their respective streams.

The independent submission stream of documents encompasses documents that may be submitted directly to the Independent Submissions Editor per the community defined review and approval process documented in RFC 4846. Approved Independent Submissions will then undergo the editing and publishing tasks similar to the other three streams.

The RFC Series Editor will exercise executive-level management over many of the activities of the RFC Publisher and the RFC Production Center (which can be seen as back office functions) and will be the entity that faces the community, and works with the IAB and IAOC for procedural and contractual responsibilities respectively while those entities maintain their chartered responsibility.

If during the execution of their activities, a dispute arises over a (policy) decision made by one of the four entities in the model, then the party having the conflict should first request a reconsideration of the decision. If that reconsideration is not satisfactory to the party, then the matter can be brought to the RFC Series Editor for a decision. If the RFC

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Series Editor decision is not satisfactory, the matter can be brought to the IAB, whose decision will be binding. If the dispute is with the RFC Series Editor then there are only two stages: reconsideration and the IAB consideration.

The Vendor may propose an RFC Series Editor as key personnel as part of its bid for the RFC Production Center service, which, if successful, would lead to a contract with the Internet Society on behalf of the IETF. As key personnel, replacement of an RFC Series Editor would be subject to IAD approval. The Vendor and RFC Series Editor reports to the IAOC for the performance of its services.

The IAOC may recommend that the RFC Series Editor be appointed by the IAB following a community process of its choosing. An individual so selected, or hired, shall be under contract with the Internet Society. The IAB appoints and chooses whether to release or reappoint an individual selected as the RFC Series Editor. The IAOC as part of the community process shall provide input to the IAB based upon the contractual performance, if any, of an individual under consideration.

### A. RFC Series Continuity

1. The RSE is responsible for identifying appropriate steps to assure RFC Series continuity. Aspects for which continuity needs to be achieved include policies for look and feel of the series, policies for accessibility of the material, archiving and publication policies, copyright and licensing (implementation) policies, errata policies and procedures, publication format policies, policies for extending or enhancing the indexing of the RFC Series and the like.

2. The RSE will coordinate with the stream managers, and the IAB in the identification of the appropriate steps, and through them, the implementation of those steps to attain continuity.

3. The RSE will exercise executive-level management over the implementation of policies, processes and procedures established to ensure the quality and consistency of the RFC Series. The RFC Series Editor will work with the IAB and IAOC to develop new policy and see that contractual agreements are met.

4. The RSE will take proposed changes to the community, and work with the IAB so that the IAB can ensure that there is sufficient community review before the policy is adopted.

### B. Functional Reviews

The Series Editor shall conduct a periodic review of the RFC Production Center and RFC Publisher to ensure the consistency of the RFC Series. Said review shall be forwarded to the IAB and IAOC.

### C. RFC Style and Procedures Manuals

1. To assure the consistency of the RFC series, the RFC Series Editor shall prepare and maintain an RFC Style Manual for authors and editors, the stream managers, the RFC

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Production Center, and the RFC Publisher, describing with clarity the grammar, style, usage, typography, punctuation, and spelling to hone clear, concise technical prose, etc., for the drafting and editing of RFCs. The Manual will be posted on the RFC Publisher's website. A draft of the RFC Style Manual is located at <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc-style-guide/rfc-style-manual-08.txt>. This draft will be used until replaced by the RFC Series Editor.

2. The RFC Style Manual shall be developed and maintained with community input, cooperatively with the IAB in the manner outlined in RFC 4844.

3. The RSE shall prepare and maintain a Procedures Manual describing with clear detail tasks performed by the RFC Series Editor.

### D. RFC Errata Process

The RSE shall work with the stream managers in the development of policies for an errata process for RFCs.

### E. Relationship to the IAB

The IAB is responsible for ensuring the RFC Series Editor function is carried out in accordance with the community-accepted model. From time to time, the IAB will review and revise instructions for the RFC Series Editor in accordance with that model.

### F. RFC Series Oversight

The RSE is responsible for the continuity and consistency of the RFC Series. To achieve these goals the RSE may employ or develop the following documents and processes:

1. Develop and maintain the RFC Style Manual
2. Develop and maintain FAQs for RFC publication
3. Conduct annual assessments of the RFC process
4. Participate in author document reviews
5. Administer and participate in the rfc-interest mailing list. The RSE is responsible for the list but can delegate as desired.
6. Review the performance of the ISE, the RFC Production Center, and RFC Publisher, and provide a report to the IAOC and IAB on a frequency determined by them.
7. Develop policies for the types of indexes that the RFC series will support by default and the metadata that may be required to support those indexes
8. Approve tools for the validation of syntax of documents containing formal languages.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

### G. Editorial Board

In accordance with RFC 4846 the RSE may create an Editorial Board and appoint members to it to assist the RSE in carrying out its responsibilities. The members serve at the pleasure of the RSE and are subject to replacement by the RSE at the desire of the RSE.

### H Liaison, Coordination, and Collaboration

1. Provide a contact email address for policy questions and policy inputs.
2. Through liaison participants, the RSE may take part in IESG and IAB formal meetings, usually telechats, and may participate in IESG and IAB face-to-face activities at IETF meetings, and other activities such as retreats when requested.
3. The RSE shall conduct coordination telechats with stream managers, the RFC Production Center, the RFC Publisher, the IAB Chair, the IETF Chair, the IAD, and others as the RSE considers appropriate.
4. The RSE may be requested to make regular reports at IETF meetings, online, in writing, in person, or all three.

### I. Process and Document Evolution

The RSE shall, as appropriate, participate in and support process experiments proposed by the Internet community involving the technical publication process that may improve the RFC series process.

### J. Innovations

The RSE will continuously examine the RFC production process for possible improvements, propose experiments with feasible and useful ones, and recommend those that succeed. The RSE should consider innovations to improve efficiency, improve coordination and transparency, and improve quality within the boundaries laid out in <RFC Model document> and RFC 4844.

### K. Specific Deliverables

The RFC Series Editor's deliverables are the outputs of the activities discussed above plus a quarterly report to the IAOC and IAB.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

### INDEPENDENT SUBMISSIONS EDITOR

#### STATEMENT OF WORK

This Statement of Work describes tasks to be performed by the Independent Submissions Editor (ISE).

Reference: This Statement of Work was prepared based on the framework for the RFC Editor function expressed in RFC 4844. Additionally, various IETF process documents and operational procedures affect the work of the Independent Submissions Editor.

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 Internet Architecture Board respectively. The independent submissions stream is managed by the Independent Submissions Editor.

The independent submission stream of documents encompasses documents that may be submitted directly to the Independent Submissions Editor per using the community defined review and approval process documented in RFC 4846. Approved Independent Submissions undergo the editing and publishing tasks similar to the other three streams.

It is ultimately the job of the IAB to determine that the proposed policies for the RFC Series are in line with the expectations of the Internet community. The RFC Series Editor will act as a point of contact for the IAB for queries about the RFC Series continuity and the effectiveness of policies.

The IAB shall select an Independent Submissions Editor following a community process of its choosing. The IAB appoints, and chooses whether to release early or reappoint an individual selected as the Independent Submissions Editor.

#### A. Independent Submissions approval and processing

1. Perform Initial Review. Review the submitted document to determine whether there is high likelihood of conflicts or other interactions with IETF efforts (including whether the document is one that the IESG should probably process), and, if so, forward the document to the IESG, or relevant ADs, for preliminary evaluation and comment. See 5 below.

2. Document Rejection. Reject a submitted document at any point in the process if it does not appear publishable, i.e., the submission does not meet the technical or editorial standards of the RFC Series or is not relevant to the areas that the series covers, per RFC 4846.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

3. Document Iteration. Interact with the author on the document to improve its suitability for publication in the RFC Series and quality.

4. Review and Evaluation. ISE ensures the timely completion of these steps:

(i) Arranging for one or more reviews of the document, using methodologies of their choosing.

b) Ensuring the author receives reviews that may be received from parties independent of the author.

c) Supporting the author by soliciting additional reviews, if requested.

d) In exceptional cases the author may request, in accordance with RFC 4846, that the IAB review the document(s); the ISE will support this activity.

5. IETF Interaction. ISE coordinates with the IESG and acts in accordance with RFC 4846 by:

a) Submitting documents that the ISE believes are ready and proper for publication to IESG for its review

b) Considering IESG consensus requests for delaying publication of a document for a period up to 18 months.

c) Considering IESG consensus requests to not publish a document as part of the RFC series.

Additionally, the ISE will:

d) Review and address, as appropriate, comments provided by the IESG members in the ID tracker.

6. Decision. Make the final decision whether the document is acceptable and relevant to the areas the series covers, per RFC4846, and deciding to publish the document.

7. Establish policies and procedures related to the April Fools' RFCs.

B. Forwarding Independent Submissions which the ISE has decided to publish to the RFC Production Center

1. Final Editing and Publication.

a) Forward the documents that the ISE has decided to publish to the RFC Production Center for final editing

b) The RFC Production Center will then forward the documents to the RFC Publisher for publishing in a fashion similar to other RFCs.

2. Coordination with Other Document Streams. The ISE will work with the RFC Series Editor and, if need be the IAB, regarding the coordination and prioritization of ISE documents relative to other document streams in the RFC production Center.

3. The Independent Submissions Editor may be directed by the IAB to assign additional permanent identifiers associated with Independent Submission subseries within the Independent Submission Stream documents.

4. By exception, Independent Stream documents may be withdrawn from or put on hold prior to publication by the ISE.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

### C. Independent Submissions RFC errata review and approval

1. Using tools provided by the RFC Publisher, the ISE shall review or coordinate the review of all errata submitted against RFCs in the Independent Submission Stream. As a result of the review, the errata will be placed in one of the following categories:

- (i) approve,
- (ii) reject, or
- (iii) hold for document revision.

2. This result will be published using the errata process and tools established for all RFCs by the RFC Publisher.

### D. Appoint and manage an Editorial Board (Optional)

In accordance with RFC 4846 the ISE may create an Editorial Board and appoint members to it to assist the ISE in carrying out its responsibilities. The members serve at the pleasure of the ISE and are subject to replacement by the ISE at the desire of the ISE.

### E. Communication of relevant RFC processing information online

1. The ISE shall provide the following information for the RFC Publisher's website:
  - a) Status of the review and publication of submissions in the Independent Stream
  - b) Publication Statistics and Status Reports
    - 1) Provide monthly reports reflecting level of service
    - 2) Provide monthly statistics on Independent Submissions processing, review and publishing time, including historical context to identify trends
    - 3) Provide periodic status reports to apprise the community of the ISE's work and performance

### F. Process and Document Evolution

The ISE shall, as appropriate, initiate or participate in the discussions of changes to author guidelines and publication process changes. Likewise, the ISE shall, as appropriate, participate in and support process experiments proposed by the Internet community that may improve RFC series processes.

### G. Liaison, Coordination, and Collaboration

1. Provide a contact email address and correspond as required to progress the publication work, and address queries from both inside and outside of the IETF community.

2. The ISE will interact with IANA, authors, reviewers, the IESG, the IAB and others in the proper performance of its responsibilities. The ISE is 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.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

3. The ISE shall work with the appropriate parties to integrate its document tracking system with the automated tools employed by the RFC Production, the RFC Publisher, the IESG, and the IANA.

4. The ISE may be requested to take part in IESG and IAB formal meetings, usually telechats, or participate in IESG and IAB face-to-face activities at IETF meetings, and other activities such as retreats.

5. The ISE may be requested to participate in coordination telechats with other RFC stream representatives, the RFC Series Editor, the RFC Production Center, the RFC Publisher, the IAB representative, the IETF representative, the IAD, and others as appropriate.

6. The IAB, RFC Series Editor and IAOC shall review the performance of the ISE.

### H. Specific Deliverables

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

1. The Independent Submissions Editor Procedures Manual. While maintaining alignment with RFC 4846, the ISE shall prepare a Procedures Manual describing with clear detail each task performed in the provision of Independent Submissions Editor services.

2. System Documentation. The ISE will document any systems used to support the Independent Submissions Editor process.

3. Information Systems and Tools Development. Tools development shall be open source, unless approved by the IAD. Tools development includes systems development in direct support of the Independent Submissions stream, enhancements and applications providing for third party interaction and shall be undertaken with goals of:

- a) Enhancing participation of necessary third parties, e.g., authors,
- b) Enhancing interaction with the community, IETF, RFC Production, and RFC Publisher,
- c) Enhancing portability during a future transition, if any, and
- d) Adding services required by this SOW.

### 4. Innovations

The ISE will continuously examine its process for possible improvements, experiment with feasible and useful ones, and adopt those that succeed. The ISE should consider innovations to improve efficiency, improve coordination and transparency, and improve quality within the boundaries laid out in < draft-iab-rfc-editor-model >



RFC PRODUCTION CENTER

STATEMENT OF WORK

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

Reference: This Statement of Work was prepared based on RFC 4714, "Requirements for IETF Technical Publication Service", the framework for the RFC Editor function expressed in RFC 4844, and <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-iab-rfc-editor-04>. Additionally, various IETF process documents and operational procedures affect the work of the Production Center.

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.

A. Edit Internet Drafts

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

1. Editing

a) Review and edit the document for grammar, spelling, formatting, alignment with boilerplate, document structure, etc. The review should strive to maintain consistency of style and appearance with previously published documents, editorial standards, and clarity. Editing shall be accomplished in accordance with the 'RFC Style Manual' maintained by the RFC Series Editor. A draft of the RFC Style Manual is located at <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc-style-guide/rfc-style-manual-08.txt>. This draft will be used by the Production Center until replaced.

b) Maintain a tracking system for edits, and ensure that the changes are signed off by all authors, and that any technical changes are approved by an authorized stream representative.

c) In rare cases and under the directions of the stream manager the Production Center may be instructed to process a document or parts thereof without any changes.

2. Validation of references

Ensure that references within specifications are available and that referenced IETF documents (RFCs and Internet Drafts) are latest versions available. Also, match citations

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

and references for consistency. In the IETF standards 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.

### 3. Validation of formal languages

The Production Center should validate the syntax of sections of documents containing formal languages. In particular ASN.1, ABNF, and XML should be verified using one or more tools as approved by the RFC Series Editor. The IAD will coordinate with Internet community tools developers in a reasonable effort to ensure that such tools are obtained, tested, adapted, extended, and maintained to meet the RFC Production Center needs.

### 4. 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

### 5. Pre-Publication Corrections

a) Incorporate changes for an IETF community document upon request of authorized individuals.

b) Ensure that XML and nroff source files, and others that are feasible, that are associated with a published RFC are also updated to correspond to that published document.

### 6. Document Format Conversions

1) Accept ASCII text files as input and publish documents in the required formats.

2) When mutually convenient, accept document source files, such as XML and nroff, that are valuable in the publishing process.

3) Accept supplemental files that may contain information such as: code, formal descriptions (XML, ASN.1, etc.), graphics, data files, etc.

4) Supplemental files may also include enhanced versions of the document containing graphics or sections not presentable in text format. Some supplemental files may not be editable by the RFC Production Center.

### 7. Language Translation

Documents are published only in English.

### 8. Exception Handling

Permit documents to be withdrawn from or put on hold prior to publication where stream dependent process permits.

### 9. Expedited Handling

Expedite the processing of specific documents within a given document stream at the request of the appropriate party, i.e., IESG, IRSG, ISE, or IAB. Priorities for ordering among streams will be established by the IAB.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

### 10. Process and Document Evolution

a) Participate in the discussions of changes to author guidelines and publication process changes.

b) Participate in and support process experiments proposed by the community involving the technical publication process that may improve the RFC series processes.

### B. Historical Workload

1) Statistics reflecting the workload of the RFC Editor can be found at the RFC Editor and the IAOC websites; <http://www.rfc-editor.org/RFCeditor.html> and [http://iaoc.ietf.org/rfc\\_editor\\_performance.html](http://iaoc.ietf.org/rfc_editor_performance.html)

2) The RFC Editor Services RFP in 2006 also contains data that a vendor may want to consider. The 2006 RFP can be found at: <http://iaoc.ietf.org/rfprsrfis.html> in the RFP Archive.

3) The average number of pages per document submitted to the RFC Editor in 2008 was 33.

4) Copy editors were employed by the Internet Society during a period from 2006 - 2009 to support the efforts of the incumbent RFC Editor. 2008 utilization was equivalent to a ¼ time copy editor. The Internet Society will not retain copy editors for that purpose beginning in 2010.

### C. Documents forwarded to RFC Publisher

1) The Production Center will edit the documents from all streams consistent with the RFC Style Manual, the RFC series, and the intent of the Authors. Documents so edited will be placed in the ready-to-publish state and forwarded to the RFC Publisher.

2) Additionally, the Production Center will forward records of all interaction and edits relative to the document dialogue, including dialogue with the document authors, IAB, IESG, IRSG (or members thereof), and ISE for their respective streams, to the RFC Publisher for archiving.

### D. Accountability

1. The RPC is responsible for compliance with policies, processes and procedures as they relate to the consistency of the RFC series.

2. The RPC is primarily responsible to the RFC Series Editor as regards to RFC series consistency.

3. The RFC Series Editor may refer matters involving RPC compliance to the policies, processes and procedures to the IAOC.

### E. Pre-Approval Editorial Review (Optional)

The Production Center 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 changes to be reviewed within the technical review process. This is an optional service that may or may not be required. If it is required, it will be

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

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.

### F. Communication of relevant Production Center processing information online

The Production Center shall provide the following information for publication on the RFC Publisher's website:

a. Processing status of all submitted documents

b. Editing Statistics and Status Reports

1) Provide monthly reports reflecting service level compliance data for RFC Production Center states. See Work Standards.

2) Provide monthly statistics on median queue times, counts and pages of documents published, editing processing time, and RFC Production Center 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.

3) The Production Center may be requested to provide periodic status reports to IETF meetings to apprise the community of its work and the RFC Production Center performance.

### G. IETF community liaison and training

1. Tutorial and Help Services

a) Provide and maintain documentation giving guidance to authors on the layout, structure, expectations, and so on required to develop documents suitable for publication.

b) Provide tutorials to prospective RFC authors to educate authors on the processes and expectations of the Production Center.

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

d) Provide a help desk at IETF meetings.

### H. Coordination Responsibility

The Production Center will interact with the RSE, IANA, authors, the 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.

### I. Collaboration

The RFC Production Center shall work with the appropriate parties to integrate its document tracking system with the RFC Series Editor, the RFC Publisher, the IETF Secretariat, and the IANA tracking systems.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

### J. Liaison and Communication Support

1. The Production Center may be requested to participate in coordination telechats, and face to face meetings when requested, with other RFC stream representatives, the RFC Publisher, the IAD, and others as appropriate.

2. The Production Center may be requested to make regular reports at IETF meetings, online, in writing, in person, or all three.

### K. Specific Deliverables

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

#### 1. The Production Center Procedures Manual

a) The Production Center shall prepare and maintain a Procedures Manual describing with clear detail each task performed in the provision of Production Center services.

#### 2. The RFC Style Manual

a) The Production Center shall assist the RFC Series Editor in the preparation and ongoing upkeep of an RFC Style Manual, 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. The Style Manual shall replace parts of RFC 2223 "Instructions to RFC Authors".

b) The Production Center shall advise the RFC Series Editor of any concerns or issues that may arise in the application of the Style Manual.

#### 3. System Documentation

a) The Production Center will document the systems supporting the RFC editing process.

#### 4. Information Systems and Tools Development

a) Tools development includes systems development in direct support of the Production Center, enhancements and applications providing for 3<sup>rd</sup> party interaction and shall be undertaken with goals of:

- 1) Improving performance of staff,
- 2) Enhancing participation of necessary 3<sup>rd</sup> parties, e.g., authors,
- 3) Enhancing interaction with the IETF, RFC Series Editor, RFC Publisher, authors, and IANA,
- 4) Enhancing portability during a future transition, if any, and
- 5) Adding services required by this SOW.

## **RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

b. All tools development shall be open source, unless waived in writing by the IAD.

### **5. Innovations**

The Production Center will continuously examine its process for possible improvements, experiment with feasible and useful ones, and adopt those that succeed. The Production Center should consider innovations to improve efficiency, improve coordination and transparency, and improve quality within the boundaries laid out in <RFC Model document>.

ATTACHMENT 1

WORK STANDARDS

A. INTRODUCTION

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.

2. The applicable Service Levels are set forth below

B. Document Processing Service Levels

1. Edit Processing

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

b. A document is “ready-to-publish” on the date it is forwarded to the RFC Publisher by the Production Center (Forwarded Date).

c. A document is in a Production Center state when the work of the Production Center is not being delayed by the actions of a third party. Production Center operations that are blocked by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party is outside a Production Center state.

2. Processing Times

a. Processing times per document are from Receipt Date to Forwarded Date in total business days.

b. The total processing time goal for each document from Receipt Date to Forwarded Date, including all third party activity, is 30 business days (6 weeks).

c. By July 1, 2010, 33% of the ready-to-publish documents shall have an Production Center processing time of 30 business days or fewer.

d. By January 1, 2011, 50% of the ready-to-publish documents shall have an Production Center processing time of 30 business days or fewer.

e. By July 1, 2011, 67% of the ready-to-publish documents shall have an Production Center processing time of 30 business days or fewer.

f. Publication processing time goals include Production Center states and third party states. The Production Center shall interact with third parties to promote an efficient and timely publication process, using escalation methods when appropriate.

g. The Production Center shall commit to continuous process improvement leading to the reduction of outliers in Production Center and publication processing times.

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

3. Document Style and Quality

a. Document style shall be consistent with the RFC series historically and in accordance with the RFC Style Manual. Questions concerning style shall be directed to the RFC Series Editor. The RFC Series Editor may review documents at the same time that authors review the ready-to-publish result of Production Center processing.

**RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

b. The Production Center may raise concerns about document quality from a stream with the stream manager and the RFC Series Editor.

c. The Production Center may discuss the level of effort necessary to process a streams' output with the stream's manager, the RFC Series Editor and the IAOC.



## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

### RFC PUBLISHER

#### STATEMENT OF WORK

This Statement of Work describes tasks to be performed by the RFC Publisher.

Reference: This Statement of Work was prepared based on RFC 4714, "Requirements for IETF Technical Publication Service", and the framework for the RFC Editor function expressed in RFC 4844 and draft-iab-rfc-editor-model-00. Additionally, various IETF process documents and operational procedures affect the work of the RFC Editor.

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.

#### A. RFC Publication and Access

1. The RFC is published when a 'ready-to-publish' document has arrived from the RFC Production Center. This action includes putting the publication-format document(s) online, publishing index files, and archiving a record of the interactions concerning these documents, as provided by the stream, and all final source and text files. At this time, the document is announced to the community. The date of announcement is defined as the date of publication. The archives are, by default, not public.

2. RFCs are published on the Publisher's website. This site includes one or more indexes with hyperlinked access to published documents as well as a convenient search engine. The search engine will return a catalog ("index") entry for one or more RFCs, matching on title, keywords, author, or number. The Publisher also provides access to individual RFCs and to collections of RFCs using SMTP, FTP, and RSync and other technologies as directed by the IAD. Keywords are determined by (i) author submission, (ii) RFC Production Center determination, and (iii) previous use for a document being obsoleted.

3. Websites Support. The Vendor shall provide a distributed Web service for rfc-editor.org. This includes:

- (i) providing at least two (2) independent, geographically separate sites, each capable of serving 2+ Mb/sec of data over Web and FTP.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

- (ii) allowing for updates of appropriate material by stream managers or their representatives and the Production Center,
- (iii) storage area adequate for all published RFCs as well as the archives,
- (iv) the provision of monthly reports of website performance, including whether improvements were made to increase the capacity above the 2+ Mb/sec of data over Web and FTP,
- (v) develop content as directed by IAD,
- (vi) provide and maintain site-map style indexing (in addition to the search function),
- (vii) apply common look-and-feel for all pages (apart from user-supplied content), including providing templates and style sheets for stream managers, Production Center and the RFC Series Editor,(viii) update web pages on request and within time limits specified by the contract,
- (ix) provide public feeds (ATOMPUB, RSS, etc.) as appropriate, and
- (x) provide continual incremental improvements, including regularly redesigning web page trees to respond to common usage patterns. However, stable identifiers must be maintained for the RFCs, archives, Errata, indices and other items.

4. Mailing Lists Services. With respect to all authorized RFC Editor services mailing lists the Vendor shall provide the following services:

- (i) capacity of 50,000 messages/hour (recipient side),
- (ii) the ability to host 12 or more mailing lists,
- (iii) Web-based mailing list maintenance tools.
- (iv) commercially reasonable spam filtering measures, including, at a minimum, those spam filtering measures the Vendor takes to protect its own internal and external mailing lists,
- (v) dual redundant systems except during scheduled maintenance, during which time at least one system should be available.
- (vi) collection and storage of plain text and HTML-ized archives for all RFC Editor services lists, including RFC Services mailing lists, if any, not hosted by the Publisher where Vendor has been provided access authority or that are provided to Vendor in a format for which Vendor is able to archive in accordance with Section 2(e) above, and
- (vii) spam moderation of the RFC Editor lists.

5. Customer Support Services. Vendor shall provide a trouble ticketing service that provides a ticket queue system with customizable queues. Messages sent to certain conventional addresses, such as [help@rfc-editor.org](mailto:help@rfc-editor.org) and others, shall automatically enter the ticket system.

6. IP Support. Vendor shall provide world-class IP support, IPv4 and IPv6. All services should be accessible from IPv4 and IPv6, with no difference in performance, quality, delay, and support.

7. Subdomain Support. Vendor shall provide DNS delegation and DNS support for any RFC-Editor subdomains approved by the IAD.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

8. Services Security. Services are to be protected by best commercial practice industry standard security mechanisms, such as DNSSEC.

### 9. Backups

Backups shall follow best commercial practices to provide a robust backup capability.

### 10. Distributed Information

- (i) Official Archives, and
- (ii) RSS and ATOM feeds

### 11. Tools.

(i) Vendor shall maintain, correct and update the current suite of “tools” utilized in connection with the RFC Editor services functions, a list of which is [Note: to be appended]. Vendor’s obligation to so update such tools shall be limited to any correction of any bugs or performance issues that arise during the term of the Agreement, as well as minor extensions and enhancements requested by the IAD. Such maintenance, corrections and updates shall be at no additional charge, until such work exceeds 10% of the total workload on a per month basis.

(ii) All non-proprietary tools shall be open sourced and with a license as directed by IAD. The use of tools that are not open source must be approved in advance by the IAD.

(iii) Vendor shall provide and maintain an online Tools Development and Proposal Management Report.

(iv) Future tools may be separately contracted and may be put out for separate bid.

## B. Maintenance of archives, indices, errata and lists associated with RFCs

The Publisher is the custodian of records on behalf of the IETF Trust.

### 1. Indexing: Publishing of the Catalog

- (i) Publish the index of all published documents
- (ii) Provide the permanent archive for published documents

(iii) Store and update meta information associated with a published document as its status changes

(iv) Secure the archive to prevent the modification of published documents by external parties

(v) Provide the permanent archive of any source documents associated with a published document

(vi) Archive records associated with the editing and publication of each document. Current archives consist of fewer than fifteen, four drawer filing cabinets.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

(vii) Surrender materials on termination of contract to the IETF Trust.

### 2. Post Publication Corrections

(i) Maintain a tool for accepting errata for published documents and interacting with the streams for errata evaluation and approval. The specific process to be agreed between the IAB, the stream managers, and the RFC Series Editor.

(ii) Provide access to the relevant errata and associated information (such as approval and classification) as part of the information associated with an RFC

### 3. Access to Published Documents

(i) Provide search tools for finding published documents and relevant meta information associated with a published document, and display meta information for example: category of document, maturity level (if standards track), obsoleted by or updated by information (as provided by the streams), and associated errata

(ii) Integrate Publisher search tools with the IETF search tools as appropriate

(iii) Provide direct access to published RFCs, by generally used methods such as, ftp, http and rsync.

### C. Communication of relevant RFC processing information online

The Publisher shall maintain a website on which will be the following information:

#### 1. Publication Status Tracking

(i) Provide state information for each document in the publication process

(ii) Integrate Production Center state information with the IETF tools to provide end-to-end status tracking of documents

(iii) Provide external visibility of not only the fact that a document is in an extended waiting period, but also the token-holder and circumstances of the wait

#### 2. Publishing Publication Statistics and Status Reports

(i) Publish reports provided by the Production Center, stream managers and RFC Series Editor

### D. Liaison, Coordination, and Collaboration

1. Provide a contact email address and correspond as required to progress the publication work, and address queries from both inside and outside of the community.

2. The Publisher may interact with stream managers, authors, reviewers, the RFC Productions Center, the RSE, the IAB, the IAOC, the IAD, and others in the proper performance of its responsibilities.

3. The Publisher may integrate its document tracking system with the automated tools employed by the RFC Production Center and the IETF.

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

4. Through liaison participants, the Publisher may take part in IESG and IAB formal meetings, usually telechats, and may participate in IESG and IAB face-to-face activities at IETF meetings, and other activities such as retreats when requested.

5. The Publisher may be requested to participate in coordination conferences with stream managers, the RFC Series Editor, the RFC Production Center, the IAB representative, the IETF representative, the IAD, and others.

6. The Publisher may be requested to make regular reports at IETF meetings, online, in writing, and/or in person.

### E. Specific Deliverables

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

#### 1. The Publisher's Procedures Manual

(i) The Publisher shall prepare a Procedures Manual describing with clear detail each task performed in the provision of publication services.

#### 2. System Documentation

(i) The Publisher will document the systems supporting the publication process.

#### 3. Information Systems and Tools Development

(i) Tools development includes systems development in direct support of the Publisher, enhancements and applications providing for 3<sup>rd</sup> party interaction and shall be undertaken with goals of:

a) Improving performance of staff,

b) Participation of necessary 3<sup>rd</sup> parties,

c) Interaction with the RFC Series Editor, RFC Production Center, and the Internet-Draft Tracker,

d) Portability during a future transition, if any, and

(ii) All tools development shall be open source, unless approved by the IAD.

#### 4. Innovations

(i) The Publisher will continuously examine its process for possible improvements, experiment with feasible and useful ones, and adopt those that succeed.

a) Innovations to Improve Efficiency

b) Innovations to Improve Coordination and Transparency

c) Innovations to Improve Quality

## RFC EDITOR SERVICES REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

(ii) The Publisher will attempt steady progress on their proposed innovations and shall report progress thereon quarterly.

(iii) Note that some of the innovations will require community input before work can begin.

### 5. Enhancements

(i) The Publisher will provide enhancements upon the approval of the IAD. Such enhancements may include:

- a) Support for RSS feeds
- b) String searches within an RFC

### F. Process and Document Evolution

1. Participate in the discussions of changes to author guidelines, the technical publication process, and with the RSE and the IAB, as needed, for policy changes.

2. Participate in and support process experiments proposed by the community involving the technical publication process that may improve the RFC series process.

### G. Legal Proceedings

The Publisher may be called upon to provide and authenticate documents, including RFCs and other material in its archives in legal proceedings. Frequently this is accomplished through an affidavit, occasionally through an appearance in court.

### H. Accountability

1. The Publisher is responsible for compliance with policies, processes and procedures as they relate to the consistency of the RFC series.

2. The Publisher must respond to the RFC Series Editor for matters concerning to RFC series consistency.

3. The RFC Series Editor may refer contractual matters involving Publisher compliance to the policies, processes and procedures to the IAOC.