The Internet Society

on behalf of

The IETF Administrative Oversight Committee

Request for Proposal

Development of
IETF Review Tracker Tool

Date of Issuance: December 28, 2015
Proposal Submission Deadline: January 18, 2016 no later than 5:00 P.M. ET

IETF Request for Proposals

Development of
IETF Review Tracker Tool

The Internet Society ("ISOC") on behalf of the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC) is soliciting this Request for Proposals ("RFP") to develop IETF Review Tracker Tools. Those submitting a Proposal ("Vendor") shall do so in accordance with this RFP.

I. Introduction

The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) desires development of an IETF Review Tracker Tool.

Several review teams ensure specific types of review are performed on Internet-Drafts as they progress towards becoming RFCs. The tools used by these teams to assign and track reviews would benefit from tighter integration to the Datatracker.

The secretaries and reviewers from several teams are using a tool of which much of its design predates the modern Datatracker.

Tighter integration with the Datatracker would simplify the logic used to identify documents ready for review, make it simpler for the Datatracker to associate reviews with documents, and allow users to reuse their Datatracker credentials. It would also make it easier to detect other potential review-triggering events, such as a document entering working group last call, or when a RFC's standard level is being changed without revising the RFC.

It is believed that this integration is best achieved by a new implementation of the tool.

The Statement of Work in Section V discusses requirements for improving those tools with new features without disrupting current work flows.

II. Instructions and Procedures

A. Submissions

Proposals must be received via email at iaoc-tmc@ietf-bids.org no later than January 18, 2016 at 5:00 P.M. ET.

Vendor assumes all risk and responsibility for submission of its Proposal by the above deadline. ISOC shall have no responsibility for non-receipt of Proposals due to network or system failures, outages, delays or other events beyond its reasonable control.

All Proposals shall become the property of the Internet Society.

B. Questions and Inquiries

Any inquiries regarding this RFP must be submitted in writing to iaoc-tmc@ietf-bids.org. Other than such inquiries, Vendors are prohibited from contacting any person or institution involved in the selection process concerning this RFP.

Questions may be submitted at any time; however, all questions/inquiries must be submitted in writing and must be received no later than 11:59 PM ET on January6, 2016.

Responses to questions and inquiries shall be posted on the IAOC website, https://iaoc.ietf.org/rfps.html, no later than 11:59 PM EDT on January 11, 2016.

C. Addenda and Updates

Any addenda and updates to this RFP shall be posted on the IAOC website, https://iaoc.ietf.org/rfps.html. Any RFP addenda and updates will be posted by 11:59PM ET on January 11, 2016. Each Vendor is responsible for checking the IAOC website prior to submission of any Proposal to ensure that it has complied with all addenda and updates to this RFP.

D. Selection Criteria

Each Proposal must specifically address each of the selection criteria listed in Section III.B, and each proposal must use the format provided in Section IV.A. Each Proposal may be accompanied by any technical or product literature that the Vendor wishes the IAOC and the Internet Society to consider.

The IAOC will seek to enter into a contract with a Vendor that the IAOC deems, in its sole discretion, to represent the best value combination of performance and cost, not necessarily the low bidder.

E. Cancellation; Rejection

The Internet Society reserves the right to cancel this RFP, in whole or in part, at any time. The IAOC may reject any or all Proposals received in response to this RFP in its sole discretion. The Internet Society makes no guarantee or commitment to purchase, license or procure any goods or services resulting from this RFP.

F. Costs and Expenses

Each Vendor is responsible for its own costs and expenses involved in preparing and submitting its Proposal and any supplemental information requested by the IAOC. The Internet Society shall not reimburse any such costs or expenses.

G. Public Information

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

The names of all Vendors submitting Proposals may be announced publicly, but the Proposals and individual negotiations with Vendors will not be publicly announced or published.

Any Agreement negotiated with a Vendor, excluding cost, and agreed Business Confidential material, will be made public after execution.

H. Intellectual Property Rights

All work performed, all software and other materials developed by the Vendor under the Agreement, shall be "works for hire" and shall be owned exclusively by the IETF Trust, and the Vendor shall not obtain or retain any rights or licenses from any work. Open source software is exempt from this requirement. Solutions based on existing vendor software are also exempt from this requirement as long as the IETF Trust is granted a non-revocable perpetual license to use the software.

I. Relationships

Describe any relationship between your company, or any parent, subsidiary or related company, or any director or officer of any of them, with the Internet Society, IAOC, IETF, IETF Trust, or any employee, director, officer or consultant of any of them.

J. Process Modification

In the case where responses to this RFP fail to meet the basic requirements defined herein, the IAOC reserves the right to modify this RFP process.

The IAOC may choose to re-open the RFP or to enter into further negotiations with one or more of the Vendors if the situation warrants at the discretion of the IAOC.

III. Selection

A. Selection Procedure

1. The IAOC will or will cause the review and evaluation of each proposal to determine if the Vendor is qualified.
2. The IAOC will contact references.
3. The IAOC may conduct interviews and may require oral presentations.
4. Requests for clarity may be made of the Vendor.
5. Qualified Vendor, if any, will be notified of their selection for advancement to the negotiation phase by January 28, 2016.

B. Selection Criteria as Judged by the IAOC

The IAOC must have confidence in the Vendor - its qualifications, experience, capabilities, personnel, timely performance, and professionalism. To that end the IAOC will evaluate the following to inform its decision:

1. Vendor qualifications and experience performing similar services
2. Key personnel qualifications, if any
3. Vendor ability to meet requirements
4. Proposal as a reflection of the Vendor's understanding of the IETF, their processes, culture, and the scope of work and methodologies
5. Responses to questions and oral presentation, if conducted
6. Cost to furnish the services in USD; note that the lowest cost offer will not necessarily be awarded a contract

C. Schedule

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

Projected Schedule of Events	
Date	**Action**
28 December 2015	RFP Issued
January 6, 2016	Questions and Inquiries deadline
January 11	Answers to questions posted online
January 11	RFP Addenda & Update issued
January 18	Proposals due
January 28	Negotiations Begin
February 8	Contract Executed
February 15	Work Begins

If an oral presentation is requested, a teleconference will be requested between January 18th and January 25th.

IV. Proposal Format

A. Proposal Submissions

Proposals shall be submitted using the following format:

1. Executive Summary
2. Project Approach & Plan
3. Schedule
4. Test Plan
5. Cost & Payment Schedule
6. Warranty & Late Delivery Consequence
7. Technical Support & Maintenance
8. Documentation
9. Experience, Qualifications and Accomplishments

10. Key Personnel Resumes, if any
11. References (Two references attesting to performance)
12. Subcontractor Information (if any)
13. Assumptions
14. Intellectual Property
15. Miscellaneous

V. Statement of Work

Statement of Work

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: February 8, 2016

R. Sparks
Oracle
T. Kivinen
INSIDE Secure

August 7, 2015

Tracking Reviews of Documents
draft-sparks-genarea-review-tracker-03

Abstract

Several review teams ensure specific types of review are performed on Internet-Drafts as they progress towards becoming RFCs. The tools used by these teams to assign and track reviews would benefit from tighter integration to the Datatracker. This document discusses requirements for improving those tools without disrupting current work flows.

Status of This Memo

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

As Internet-Drafts are processed, reviews are requested from several review teams. For example, the General Area Review Team (Gen-ART) and the Security Directorate (Secdir) perform reviews of documents that are in IETF Last Call. Gen-ART always performs a follow-up review when the document is scheduled for an IESG telechat. Secdir usually performs a follow-up review, but the Secdir secretary may choose not to request that follow-up if any issues identified at Last Call are addressed and there are otherwise no major changes to the document. These teams also perform earlier reviews of documents on demand. There are several other teams that perform similar services, often focusing on specific areas of expertise.

The secretaries of these teams manage a pool of volunteer reviewers. Documents are assigned to reviewers, taking various factors into account. For instance, a reviewer will not be assigned a document for which he is an author or shepherd. Reviewers are given a deadline, usually driven by the end of last call or a IESG telechat date. The reviewer sends each completed review to the team's mailing list, and any other lists that are relevant for document being reviewed. Often, a thread ensues on one or more of those lists to resolve any issues found in the review.

The secretaries and reviewers from several teams are using a tool developed and maintained by Tero Kivinen. Much of its design predates the modern Datatracker. The application currently keeps its own data store, and learns about documents needing review by inspecting Datatracker and tools.ietf.org pages. Most of those pages are easy to parse, but the last-call pages, in particular, require some effort. Tighter integration with the Datatracker would simplify the logic used to identify documents ready for review, make it simpler for the Datatracker to associate reviews with documents, and allow users to reuse their Datatracker credentials. It would also make it easier to detect other potential review-triggering events, such as a document entering working group last call, or when a RFC's standard level is being changed without revising the RFC. Tero currently believes this integration is best achieved by a new implementation of the tool. This document captures requirements for that reimplementation, with a focus on the workflows that the new implementation must take care not to disrupt. It also discusses new features, including changes suggested for the existing tool at its issue tracker [art-trac].

For more information about the various review teams, see the following references

Gen-ART	[Gen-ART] [RFC6385]
Secdir	[Secdir]
AppsDir	[AppsDir]
OPS-dir	[OPS-dir]
RTG-dir	[RTG-dir]
MIB Doctors	[MIBdoctors]
YANG Doctors	[YANGdoctors]

2. Overview of current workflows

This section gives a high-level overview of how the review team secretaries and reviewers use the existing tool. It is not intended to be comprehensive documentation of how review teams operate. Please see the references for those details.

For many teams, the team's secretary periodically (typically once a week) checks the tool for documents it has identified as ready for review. The tool has compiled this list from Last Call announcements and IESG telechat agendas. The secretary creates a set of assignments from this list into the reviewer pool, choosing the reviewers in roughly a round-robin order. That order can be perturbed by several factors. Reviewers have different levels of availability. Some are willing to review multiple documents a month. Others may only be willing to review a document every other month. The assignment process takes exceptional conditions such as reviewer vacations into account. Furthermore, secretaries are careful not to assign a document to a reviewer that is an author, shepherd, responsible WG chair, or has some other already existing association with the document. The preference is to get a reviewer with a fresh perspective. The secretary may discover reasons to change assignments while going through the list of documents. In order to not cause a reviewer to make a false start on a review, the secretaries complete the full list of assignments before sending notifications to anyone. This assignment process can take several minutes, and it is possible for new last calls to be issued while the secretary is making assignments. The secretary typically checks to see if new documents are ready for review just before issuing the assignments, and updates the assignments if necessary.

Some teams operate in more of a review-on-demand model. RTG-dir, for example, primarily initiates reviews at the request of a Routing AD. They may also start an early review at the request of a working group chair. In either case, the reviewers are chosen manually from the pool of available reviewers driven by context rather than using a round-robin ordering.

The issued assignments are either sent to the review team's email list or are emailed directly to the assigned reviewer. The assignments are reflected in the tool. For those teams handling different types of reviews (Last Call vs Telechat for example), the secretary typically processes the documents for each type of review separately, and potentially with different assignment criteria. In Gen-ART, for example, the Last Call reviewer for a document will almost always get the follow-up Telechat review assignment. Similarly, Secdir assigns any re-reviews of a document to the same reviewer. Other teams may choose to assign a different reviewer.

Reviewers discover their assignments through email or by looking at their queue in the tool. The secretaries for some teams (such as OPS-dir and RTG-dir) insulate their team members from using the tool directly. These reviewers only work through the review team's email list or through direct email. On teams that have the reviewers use the tool directly, most reviewers only check the tool when they see they have an assignment via the team's email list. A reviewer has the opportunity to reject the assignment for any reason. While the tool provides a way to reject assignments, reviewers typically use email to coordinate rejections with the team secretary. The secretary will find another volunteer for any rejected assignments.

The reviewer can indicate that the assignment is accepted in the tool before starting the review, but this feature is rarely used.

The reviewer sends a completed review to the team's email list or secretary, any other lists relevant to the review, and usually the draft's primary email alias. For instance, many last call reviews are also sent to the IETF general list. The teams typically have a template format for the review. Those templates usually start with a summary, describing the conclusion of the review. Typical summaries are "Ready for publication" or "On the right track, but has open issues". The reviewer (or in the case of teams that insulate their reviewers, the secretary) uses the tool to indicate that the review is complete, provides the summary, and has an opportunity to provide a link to the review in the archives. Note, however, that having to wait for the document to appear in the archive to know the link to paste into the tool is a significant enough impedance that this link is often not provided by the reviewer. The Secdir secretary manually collects these links from the team's email list and adds them to the tool.

Occasionally, a document is revised between when a review assignment is made and when the reviewer starts the review. Different teams can have different policies about whether the reviewer should review the assigned version or the current version.

3. Requirements

3.1. Secretariat focused

- The Secretariat must be able to configure secretaries and reviewers for review teams (by managing Role records).

- The Secretariat must be able to perform any secretary action on behalf of a review team secretary (and thus, must be able to perform any reviewer action on behalf of the reviewer).

3.2. Review-team Secretary focused

- A secretary must be able to see what documents are ready for review of a given type (such as a Last Call review)

- A secretary must be able to assign reviews for documents that may not have been automatically identified as ready for a review of a given type. (In addition to being the primary assignment method for teams that only initiate reviews on demand, this allows the secretary to work around errors and handle special cases, including early review requests.)

- o A secretary must be able to work on and issue a set of assignments as an atomic unit. No assignment should be issued until the secretariat declares the set of assignments complete.

- o The tool must support teams that have multiple secretaries. The tool should warn secretaries that are simultaneously working on assignments, and protect against conflcting assignments being made.

- o It must be easy for the secretary to discover that more documents have become ready for review while working on an assignment set.

- o The tool should make preparing the assignment email to the team's email list easy. For instance, the tool could prepare the message, give the secretary an opportunity to edit it, and handle sending it to the team's email list.

- o It must be possible for a secretary to indicate that the review team will not provide a review for a document (or a given version of a document). This indication should be taken into account when presenting the documents that are ready for review of a given type. This will also make it possible to show on a document's page that no review is expected from this team.

- o A secretary must be able to easily see who the next available reviewers are, in order.

- o A secretary must be able to edit a Reviewer's availability, both in terms of frequency, not-available-until-date, and skip-next-n-assignments. (See the description of these settings in the Reviewer focused section.)

- o The tool should make it easy for the secretary to see any team members that have requested to review a given document when it becomes available for review.

- o The tool should make it easy for the secretary to identify that a reviewer is already involved with a document. The current tool allows the secretary to provide a regular expression to match against the document name. If the expression matches, the document is not available for assignment to this reviewer. For example, Tero will not be assigned documents matching '^draft-(kivinen|ietf-tcpinc)-.*$'. The tool should also take any roles, such as document shepherd, that the Datatracker knows about into consideration.

- o The tool should make it easy for the secretary to see key features of a document ready for assignment, such as its length, its authors, the group and area it is associated with, its title and abstract, its states (such as IESG or WG states) and any other personnel (such as the shepherd and reviewers already assigned from other teams) involved in the draft.

- The tool must make it easy for the secretary to detect and process re-review requests on the same version of a document (such as when a document has an additional last call only to deal with new IPR information).

- Common operations to groups of documents should be easy for the secretary to process as a group with a minimum amount of interaction with the tool. For instance, it should be possible to process all the of documents described by the immediately preceding bullet with one action. Similarly, for teams that assign re-reviews to the same reviewer, issuing all re-review requests should be a simple action.

- A secretary must be able to see which reviewers have outstanding assignments.

- The tool must make it easy for the secretary to see the result of previous reviews from this team for a given document. In Secdir, for example, if the request is for a revision that has only minor differences, and the previous review result was "Ready", a new assignment will not be made. If the given document replaces one or more other prior documents, the tool must make it easy for the secretary to see the results of previous reviews of the replaced documents.

- The tool must make it easy for the secretary to see the result of previous reviews from this team for all documents across configurable recent periods of time (such as the last 12 months). A RTG-dir secretary, for example, would use this result to aid in the manual selection of the next reviewer.

- The tools must make it easy for the secretary to see the recent performance of a reviewer while making an assignment (see Section 3.5). This allows the secretary to detect overburdened or unresponsive volunteers earlier in the process.

- A secretary must be able to configure the tool to remind them to followup when actions are due. (For instance, a secretary could receive email when a review is about to become overdue).

- A secretary must be able to assign multiple reviewers to a given draft at any time. In particular, a secretary must be able to assign an additional reviewer when an original reviewer indicates their review is likely to be only partially complete.

- A secretary must be able to withdraw a review assignment.

- A secretary must be able to perform any reviewer action on behalf of the reviewer.

- A secretary must be able to configure the review-team's set of reviewers (by managing Role records for the team).

- Information about a reviewer must not be lost when a reviewer is removed from a team. (Frequently, reviewers come back to teams later.)

- A secretary must be able to delegate secretary capabilities in the tool (similar to how a working group chair can assign a Delegate). This allows review teams to self-manage secretary vacations.

3.3. Reviewer focused

- A reviewer must be able to indicate availability, both in frequency of reviews, and as "not available until this date." The current tool speaks of frequency in these terms:

  - Assign at maximum one new review per week

  - Assign at maximum one new review per fortnight

  - Assign at maximum one new review per month

  - Assign at maximum one new review per two months

    Assign at maximum one new review per quarter

- Reviewers must be able to indicate hiatus periods. Each period may be either "soft" or "hard".

  - A hiatus must have a start date. It may have an end date, or may be indefinite.

  - During a hiatus, the reviewer will not be included in the normal review rotation. When a provided end date is reached, the reviewer will automatically be included in the rotation in their usual order.

- During a "soft" hiatus, the reviewer must not be assigned new reviews, but is expected to complete existing assignments and do followup reviews.

- During a "hard" hiatus, the reviewer must not be assigned any new reviews, and the secretary must be prompted to reassign any outstanding or followup reviews.

o Reviewers must be able to indicate that they should be skipped the next n times they would normally have received an assignment.

o Reviewers must be able to indicate that they are transitioning to inactive, providing a date for the end of the transition period. During this transition time, the reviewer must not be assigned new reviews, but is expected to complete outstanding assignments and followup reviews. At the end of the transition period, the secretary must be prompted to reassign any outstanding or followup reviews. (This allows review-team members that are taking on, say, AD responsibility to transition gracefully to an inactive state for the team).

o Both the reviewer and the secretary will be notified by email of any modifications to a reviewer's availability.

o A reviewer must be able to easily discover new review assignments. (The tool might send email directly to an assigned reviewer in addition to sending the set of assignments to the team's email list. The tool might also use the Django Message framework to let a reviewer that's logged into the Datatracker know a new review assignment has been made.)

o Reviewers must be able to see their current set of outstanding assignments, completed assignments, rejected assignments. The presentation of those sets should either be separate, or, if combined, the sets should be visually distinct.

o A reviewer should be able to request to review a particular document. The draft may be in any state - available and unassigned; already assigned to another reviewer; or not yet available.

o A reviewer must be able to reject a review assignment, optionally providing the secretary with an explanation for the rejection. The tool will notify the secretary of the rejection by email.

o A reviewer must be able to indicate that they have accepted and are working on an assignment

- A reviewer must be able to indicate that a review is only partially completed, asking the secretary to assign an additional reviewer. The tool will notify the secretary of this condition by email.

- It should be possible for a reviewer to reject or accept a review either by using the tool's web interface, or by replying to the review assignment email.

- It must easy for a reviewer to see when each assigned review is due.

- A reviewer must be able to configure the tool to remind them when actions are due. (For instance, a reviewer could receive email when a review is about to become overdue).

- A reviewer must be able to indicate that a review is complete, capturing where the review is in the archives, and the high-level review-result summary

- It must be possible for a reviewer to clearly indicate which version of a document was reviewed. Documents are sometimes revised between when a review was assigned and when it is due. The tool should note the current version of the document, and highlight when the review is not for the current version.

- It must be easy for a reviewer to submit a completed review.

  - The current workflow, where the reviewer sends email to the team's email list (possibly copying other lists) and then indicates where to find that review must continue to be supported. The tool should make it easier to capture the link to review in the team's email list archives (perhaps by suggesting links based on a search into the archives).

  - The tool should allow the reviewer to enter the review into the tool via a web form (either as directly-provided text, or through a file-upload mechanism). The tool will ensure the review is posted to the appropriate lists, and will construct the links to those posts in the archives.

  - The tool could also allow the reviewer to submit the review to the tool by email (perhaps by replying to the assignment). The tool would then ensure the review is posted to the appropriate lists.

3.4. Review Requester and Consumer focused

- It should be easy for an AD or group chair to request any type of review, but particularly an early review, from a review team.

- It should be possible for that person to withdraw a review request.

- It must be easy to find all reviews of a document when looking at the document's main page in the Datatracker. The reference to the review must make it easy to see any responses to the review on the email lists it was sent to. If a document "replaces" one or more other documents, reviews of the replaced documents should be included in the results.

- It must be easy to find all reviews of a document when looking at search result pages, and other lists of documents such as the documents on a IESG telechat agenda.

3.5. Statistics focused

- It must be easy to see the following, across all teams, a given team, or a given reviewer, and independently across all time, or across configurable recent periods of time:

  - How many reviews have been completed

  - How many reviews are in progress

  - How many in progress reviews are late

  - How many completed reviews were late

  - How many reviews were not completed at all

  - Average time to complete reviews (from assignment to completion)

- It must be easy to see, for all teams, for a given team, or for a given reviewer, across all time, or across configurable recent periods:

  - Total counts of reviews in each review state (done, rejected, etc.)

  - Total counts of completed reviews by result (ready, ready with nits, etc.)

- The above statistics should also be calculated reflecting the size of the documents being reviewed (such as using the number of pages or words in the documents).

- Where applicable, statistics should take reviewer hiatus periods into account.

- Access to the above statistics must be easy to configure. Access will be initially limited as follows

  - The secretariat and ADs can see any statistic.

  - A team secretary can see any statistics for that team.

  - A reviewer can see any team aggregate statistics, or their own reviewer-specific statistics.

- Where possible, the above statistics should be visible as a time-series graph.

- The implementation should anticipate future enhancements that would allow ADs to indicate their position was informed by a given review. Such enhancements would allow reporting correlations between reviews and documents that receive one or more discusses. However, implementing these enhancements is not part of the current project.

4. Security Considerations

This document discusses requirements for tools that assist review teams. These requirements do not affect the security of the Internet in any significant fashion. The tools themselves have authentication and authorization considerations (team secretaries will be able to do different things than reviewers).

5. IANA Considerations

This document has no actions for IANA.

6. Acknowledgments

Tero Kivinen and Henrik Levkowetz were instrumental in forming this set of requirements and in developing the initial Django models in the appendix.

The following people provided reviews of this draft: David Black, Deborah Brungard, Brian Carpenter, Elwyn Davies, Stephen Farrell,

Joel Halpern, Jonathan Hardwick, Russ Housley, Barry Leiba, Jean Mahoney, Randy Presuhn, Gunter Van De Velde, and Martin Vigoureux.

(If we have missed a reviewer here, or failed to capture or respond to a review comment, please retransmit and accept our apologies.)

7. Changelog

7.1. 03

- Fixed frequent typo haitus -> hiatus

7.2. 02

- Clarified typical telechat review workflow for secdir in the introduction.
- Added MIB and Yang doctor teams.
- Captured requirement to be able to request a review assignement for a given document.
- Capture a requirement to gracefully handle teams that have multiple secretaries.
- Captured that statistics should reflect document size in addition to document count.
- Noted that assignement rejection is currently coordinated by email.
- Noted that teams often copy the draft's primary email alias on reviews.
- Noted that haitus periods should be carefully considered when building statistics.
- Highlighted a couple of scenarios where the tools needs to send email to the secretary.

7.3. 01

- Captured that OPS-dir reviewers do not use the tool directly - only the secretaries do.
- Secretaries must be able to see who has outstanding reviews.
- Reviewers must be able to see when assignments are due.

- Captured that RTG-dir reviews documents primarily only at the specific request of Routing ADs.

- Captured that RTG-dir QA-reviews can be requested by chairs.

- Captured that RTG-dir assignments are made by unicast, rather than through a directorate list.

- Added a requirement to be able to say "this team isn't going to review this (version of this) document"

- Captured that the secretariat should be able to act on behalf of secretaries

- Noted that reviewer information must not be lost as reviewers leave teams

- Captured the notion of a hiatus

- Captured the notion of transition to inactive

- Secretaries that want reminders should be able to configure the tool to prompt them as due dates arrive

- Reviewers that want reminders should be able to configure the tool to prompt them as due dates arrive

- Access to statistics for individuals should initially be limited until we have some experience with them.

- Clarified the scope of trying to correlate reviews to discusses, recognizing this is mostly future work.

- Captured that secretaries and reviewers need to be able to handle the edge cases when a review needs to be reassigned or an additional reviewer needs to be assigned after the initial assignee has started.

7.4. 00

- Initial Version

8. Informative References

[AppsDir] "Applications Directorate", Work in Progress , April 2015, <http://trac.tools.ietf.org/area/app/trac/wiki/AppsDirReview>.

[art-trac]
"Area Review Team Tool - Active Tickets", Work in Progress , April 2015, <https://wiki.tools.ietf.org/tools/art/trac/report/1>.

[Gen-ART] "General Area Review Team Guidelines", Work in Progress , April 2015, <http://trac.tools.ietf.org/area/gen/trac/wiki>.

[MIBdoctors]
"MIB Doctors", Work in Progress , April 2015, <http://www.ietf.org/iesg/directorate/mib-doctors.html>.

[OPS-dir] "OPS Directorate", Work in Progress , April 2015, <https://svn.tools.ietf.org/area/ops/trac/wiki/Directorates>.

[RFC6385] Barnes, M., Doria, A., Alvestrand, H., and B. Carpenter, "General Area Review Team (Gen-ART) Experiences", RFC 6385, DOI 10.17487/RFC6385, October 2011, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6385>.

[RTG-dir] "Routing Directorate", Work in Progress , April 2015, <http://trac.tools.ietf.org/area/rtg/trac/wiki/RtgDir>.

[Secdir] "Security Directorate", Work in Progress , April 2015, <http://trac.tools.ietf.org/area/sec/trac/wiki/SecurityDirectorate>.

[YANGdoctors]
"YANG Doctors", Work in Progress , April 2015, <http://www.ietf.org/iesg/directorate/yang-doctors.html>.

Appendix A. A starting point for Django models supporting the review tool

```
from django.db import models
from ietf.doc.models import Document
from ietf.person.models import Email
from ietf.group.models import Group, Role

from ietf.name.models import NameModel

class ReviewRequestStateName(NameModel):
    """ Requested, Accepted, Rejected, Withdrawn, Overtaken By Events,
        No Response , Completed  """

class ReviewTypeName(NameModel):
```

```
    """ Early Review, Last Call, Telechat """

class ReviewResultName(NameModel):
    """Almost ready, Has issues, Has nits, Not Ready,
       On the right track, Ready, Ready with issues,
       Ready with nits, Serious Issues"""

class Reviewer(models.Model):
    """
    These records associate reviewers with review team, and keeps track
    of admin data associated with the reviewer in the particular team.
    There will be one record for each combination of reviewer and team.
    """
    role        = models.ForeignKey(Role)
    frequency   = models.IntegerField(help_text=
                              "Can review every N days")
    available   = models.DateTimeField(blank=True,null=True, help_text=
                          "When will this reviewer be available again")
    filter_re   = models.CharField(blank=True)
    skip_next   = models.IntegerField(help_text=
                           "Skip the next N review assignments")

class ReviewResultSet(models.Model):
    """
    This table provides a way to point out a set of ReviewResultName
    entries which are valid for a given team, in order to be able to
    limit the result choices that can be set for a given review, as a
    function of which team it is related to.
    """
    team        = models.ForeignKey(Group)
    valid       = models.ManyToManyField(ReviewResultName)

class ReviewRequest(models.Model):
    """
    There should be one ReviewRequest entered for each combination of
    document, rev, and reviewer.
    """
    # Fields filled in on the initial record creation:
    time          = models.DateTimeField(auto_now_add=True)
    type          = models.ReviewTypeName()
    doc           = models.ForeignKey(Document,
                           related_name='review_request_set')
    team          = models.ForeignKey(Group)
    deadline      = models.DateTimeField()
    requested_rev = models.CharField(verbose_name="requested_revision",
                            max_length=16, blank=True)
    state         = models.ForeignKey(ReviewRequestStateName)
    # Fields filled in as reviewer is assigned, and as the review
```

```
    # is uploaded
    reviewer      = models.ForeignKey(Reviewer, null=True, blank=True)
    review        = models.OneToOneField(Document, null=True,
                                                blank=True)
    reviewed_rev  = models.CharField(verbose_name="reviewed_revision",
                                  max_length=16, blank=True)
    result        = models.ForeignKey(ReviewResultName)
```

Appendix B. Suggested features deferred for future work

Brian Carpenter suggested a set of author/editor-focused requirements that were deferred for another iteration of improvement. These include providing a way for the editors to acknowledge receipt of the review, potentially tracking the email conversation between the reviewer and document editor, and indicating which review topics the editor believes a new revision addresses.

Authors' Addresses

Robert Sparks
Oracle
7460 Warren Parkway
Suite 300
Frisco, Texas 75034
USA

Email: rjsparks@nostrum.com

Tero Kivinen
INSIDE Secure
Eerikinkatu 28
HELSINKI FI-00180
FI

Email: kivinen@iki.fi