







RFC Editor Report

IETF 96
Berlin, Germany

Since IETF 95 (Apr – Jun)

- Publications: 89 RFCs (1941 pages)
- Website: made improvements based on community feedback
- Stats project: testing completed; made preparations for install
- Errata: updated search by ART area to include RAI & APP areas
- Internal: made a number of small updates to make RPC data more accurate and efficient

SLA – RFC Editor Time (RET)

| | 2015 | | | | 2016 | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1 | Q2 |
| Submissions | | | | | | |
| Pages | 2765 | 1938 | 2033 | 1888 | 1644 | 1937 |
| Docs | 111 | 74 | 79 | 88 | 66 | 76 |
| PGTE | 3253 | 2112 | 2658 | 2227 | 1808 | 2208 |
| Publications | | | | | | |
| Pages | 2268 | 2217 | 1886 | 1613 | 1937 | 1941 |
| Docs | 71 | 86 | 74 | 69 | 91 | 89 |
| Docs meeting SLA | 71 | 82 | 72 | 66 | 72 | 61 |
| SLA Tier | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2* | 2 |
| SLA |  100% |  95% |  97% |  96% |  79% |  98% |

Tier 1

PGTE < 1950

67% RFCs pub <= 6 wks RET

Tier 2

1950 < PGTE < 3072

50% RFCs pub <= 12 wks RET

Tier 3


3072 < PGTE

possibly renegotiate expected
RET


* **Note:** If the new SLA were applied to 2015, then the Tier 2 criteria would be used for Q1 2016. Tier 2 criteria is used here.

Disclaimer: As we move to new SLA, we are in the process of making the PGTE calculation as accurate as possible. The currently posted numbers are subject to revision.

Primary Processing States




Annual Subs & Pubs




Reported Technical Errata by Source of RFC

IETF 95



as of 2016-03-31

IETF 96



as of 2016-07-14

What's Next for the RPC

- Keep documents moving
- Continue to follow format developments and be ready to test tools and draft test procedures
- Deploy new stats code on the RPC side
- Work with Robert Sparks to define requirements for infrastructure project

Updates & Obsoletes

- Previously defined in RFC 2223 and draft-rfc-editor-rfc2223bis-08. Definitions not in RFC 7322.
- RFC Editor does not determine how the RFCs are related
- Who and where should these terms be defined?

Updates & Obsoletes

From draft-rfc-editor-rfc2223bis-08

Updates: Specifies an earlier document whose contents are modified or augmented by the new document. The new document cannot be used alone, it can only be used in conjunction with the earlier document.

Obsoletes: Specifies an earlier document that is replaced by the new document. The new document can be used alone as a replacement for the obsoleted document. The new document may contain revised information or all of the same information plus some new information, however extensive or brief that new information may be.

Content Review

Sometimes docs require a significant number of editorial updates (syntax and grammar issues). To ensure intended meaning has not been altered, do you have suggestions on the following:

- Who is the right person to perform this review? Doc shepherd?
- How can we respectfully flag the doc as needing a more in-depth review during AUTH48?