

New Standards Track? New Document reference Theory?

- Draft-hardie-category-descriptions-00.txt
- Draft-iesg-hardie-outline-01.txt
- Feedback to hardie@qualcomm.com, or the usual suspect mailing lists.

An informal look at where we are now...

‣ Ingredients

- Components offered for the work; not all used
- Working groups may take on for use
- Commonly marked as draft-name-

‣ Baking

- Currently under active development
- Commonly marked as draft-ietf-wg
- May be marked draft-iab, draft-iesg, etc.

Where we are (cntd.)

- Baked
 - Work that is considered complete enough to use
 - Currently RFC number + Proposed Standard status
- Eaten
 - Work that has been used to develop implementations
 - Currently RFC number + Draft Standard status
- Boiled
 - Independent work that the community can use
 - Assessment by RFC Editor and those considering use
 - Currently RFC number + Information or Experimental status

Where might we go?

- “Eaten” has a counterpart, “widely enjoyed”, (Standard) which doesn't get used much and we could drop.
- We could make the “Baking” category archival, so that we could retain information from attempts that don't succeed (dead working groups) and that follow hard to reconstruct paths (sometimes an audit trail is a beautiful thing)
- We could loosen the lockstep reference requirements so that “Eaten” documents could refer to “Baked” documents, “Baked” to an archival “Baking” series, and so on. This might help promotion speed and success rate.

What are the steps to get there?

- Create a new archival series, “Candidate Specification”, for chartered documents of IETF working groups.
- Create a new designation, “Initial Standard”, for documents moving from Candidate Specification to standard status.
 - Allow these documents to refer to any archival document
- Create a new designation, “Full Standard” for documents which have proven interoperability of two implementations.
 - Allow these documents to refer to stable documents

Are the names important?

- Specific name choices are not, but changing them may be
 - Changing the rules which apply to “Proposed Standard” might cause confusion
- It may also be time to consider how IETF docs and non-IETF docs share the RFC series
 - Current review mechanism is slow and heavyweight
 - Aimed at preventing confusion between IETF and non-IETF docs
 - Shifting to different names might eliminate that step
 - It would increase the flexibility for RFC editor
 - It would still remain a user choice to implement “Informational” and “Experimental” documents.