

# A proposal for RFC formats and process

draft-hoffman-rfcformat-canon-others-03

---

Paul Hoffman  
IETF 84, Vancouver

# It's a short draft

---

- ...and this is a short presentation
- Expectation: for each RFC, the RFC Editor will publish one format that is canonical, and many other formats that are not
- The canonical RFC never changes, but the other representations can
- People want the information in the format that is best for them, and that's different between different readers

# Canonical format

---

- XML (or maybe HTML; more later)
- Supported with good tooling
- This doesn't have to be the format you turn in your Internet-Drafts, but it might be
- XML/HTML can hold all of the metadata we want; we really want the metadata in the canonical format
- Start with `xml2rfc`, but make a bunch of improvements

# Other formats that will be published

---

- One or more robust HTMLs (both 4 and 5?)
- More than one plain text format (one like today's, plus some that are better for some readers)
- PDF
- Stuff in the future that we don't know about

# Making it better for RFC readers

---

- RFCs will be found at predictable URLs so that people can find the format they like best
- For XML and HTML, the art will be in the document
- Metadata is important both to the publishing process and to later searching, so it's all in the canonical document (and hopefully in some of the derived ones as well)

# Input to the RFC series

---

- XML, using the same tools that the RFC Editor uses
- Other formats should be allowed so that people can create Internet-Drafts in a way that works for them

# XML vs. HTML, my view

---

- Using XML to produce multiple profiles of HTML is more intuitive than having just one profile of HTML (which version?) or using one HTML profile to produce another
- They both accept the same semantics, and cross-creation is easy with simple tools
- By 2015, we *will* want more than one HTML format
- So, XML is better, but HTML is acceptable