RFC Editor Reporting
October 2011

1. Monthly Summary

The following numbers represent the September 2011 statistics for documents moving through the RFC Editor queue.

Submitted	23
Published	23
Withdrawn	1

Number of Documents in Queue per State at EOM

EDIT	47
RFC-EDITOR	12
AUTH48	31
IANA	3
AUTH	1
TO	4
IESG	2
MISSREF	23

2. Submission and Publication Rates

While there were 23 Internet-Drafts approved for publication in October, there were an additional 25 released from MISSREF. This means that a total of 48 documents entered the EDIT queue in October. Unfortunately, due to a the original design of our queue reporting, once the large group of MISSREF documents were released into EDIT, the time-in-state for the EDIT state became skewed, as the 2nd, 3rd, etc. generation MISSREFs were not originally counted as being in MISSREF (they were mistakenly perceived as being in EDIT). This was cleaned up a bit later.

There were a significant number of documents submitted in January and March 2011. We believe this coincides with the March turnover in the IESG (3), as the area directors (ADs) cleared their queue before handing their duties off to the incoming ADs.

The following table shows the average submissions and publications per month on an annual basis:

| Year	Submissions	Publications
2008	27	26
2009	27	24
2010	29	30

The graphs below show that RFC publication is typically lower during the months of November-January, which we attribute to the holidays and vacation season. There are a number of factors that affected the processing times since 2009; a few of significant importance are noted here:

a. November 2008 — RFC 5378 was published, defining a new copyright notice for RFCs.
   • This created the "pre-5378 problem."
   • It also caused non-IETF stream documents to be put on hold, as it did not account for the Independent Submission and IRTF streams.
b. February 2009 — An RFC 5378-fix was approved and announced, introducing new text to serve as a work-around for people experiencing the "pre-5378 problem."
c. September 2009 — An updated TLP was announced to resolve issues surrounding the inclusion of the BSD license in RFCs.

d. December 2009 — TLP 4.0 was announced, freeing the non-IETF stream documents for publication.
e. December 2009 — RFC 5741 was published, defining new header and boilerplate material for all streams.
f. November 2009-January 2010 — RFC Editor focused on transition from USC/ISI to AMS.
g. January 2010 — RFC Editor model implemented as defined in RFC 5620.
h. March 2010 — Incumbent RSE (Bob Braden) passed baton to Transitional RSE (Glenn Kowack).
i. March 2011 — Transitional RSE passed baton to Acting RSE (Olaf Kolkman).

The following graphs show the annual submission and publication rates for RFCs over the past 3 years. The effects of the above can be viewed in publication rates in the 2009 graph.

Annual Submission and Publication Rates

3. Queue Processing Times

The subsequent figures show the processing times of documents as they move through the RFC Editor queue. The diagrams show document counts, page counts, and average times in queue per state (EDIT, RFC-EDITOR, and AUTH48).

There was an increase in the size of the EDIT queue over the last quarter of 2010, as members of the RFC Production staff invested time on other developments and because of the usual slow period at the end of the year (see Section 2). An additional part-time editor was brought on to help with the slowly building queue and in anticipation of the expected burst before AD turnover.

Note that there is a ripple effect, as spikes in document and page counts may be due to clusters of documents moving through the queue together. A cluster does not move to the next state until the entire set is ready to be moved. You will often see bursts in EDIT, then RFC-EDITOR, and finally PUB, as the set of documents move through the states together to publication.

Generally speaking, the more documents there are in the queue, the longer it takes for documents to move through the queue.

Note: the huge spike around week 42 is because of the skewed data mentioned in Section 2.

EDIT State 2011

EDIT State - Document Count

EDIT State - Page Count

Time in EDIT State, Mean & Median

5

RFC-EDITOR State 2011

RFC-EDITOR State - Document Count

Docs vs 2011 Week (weeks 1–52), y-axis 0 to 40.

RFC-EDITOR State - Page Count

Pages vs 2011 Week (weeks 1–52), y-axis 0 to 1400.

Time in RFC-EDITOR State, Mean & Median

Weeks vs 2011 Week (weeks 1–52), y-axis 0 to 5.

Legend: Median, Mean

AUTH48 State 2011

4. SLA Compliance Levels

The charts below show our compliance with the performance goals set in our SLA. Note that compliance as defined in our SLA requires that 90% of the documents published have an RFC Editor time (EDIT and RFC-EDITOR states) of less than 6 weeks.

This graph shows the total number of documents published per month, highlighting those that were published with an RFC Editor time of fewer than 6 weeks.

The following graph shows our percent compliance with the SLA (i.e., 90% of published RFCs will have an RFC Editor time of less than 6 weeks).