

## Report on RFC Errata 10 March 2010

This report describes RFC errata as available from <http://www.rfc-editor.org/errata.php>. This reports contains:

1. Overview of RFC Errata Collection
2. Use of the New System
3. Errata in the Context of the RFC Series
4. Reported Errata by Source of RFC
5. Data Quality


See [http://www.rfc-editor.org/status\\_type\\_desc.html](http://www.rfc-editor.org/status_type_desc.html) for Type and Status descriptions, and draft-rfc-editor-errata-process regarding the process.

### 1. Overview of RFC Errata Collection

The RFC Editor has been collecting errata since 2000, with a large influx from 2006 onwards. Over time, the approximate 50/50 ratio of Technical/Editorial errata has stayed intact, and the amount of Reported (unverified) errata has increased significantly. This is partly due to our underestimation of the number of errata that would be submitted, the difficulty in contacting RFC authors years after publication, our delay in processing errata, and the IESG's determining its errata process during 2008. There are currently **2017** errata reports.


More than half of the errata reports are marked Technical, and almost of half of errata are Reported.

**Errata by Type**





Total: 2017 errata  
from 892 distinct RFCs

**Errata by Status**





Total: 2017 errata  
from 892 distinct RFCs

The following graphs show the number of errata reports submitted per year since we started collecting errata in 2000. Most errata submitted before 2005 have been Verified.



The following graphs show that Held for Document Update has been used more for Editorial errata than Technical errata, which seems appropriate.





## 2. Use of the New System

In November 2007, the RFC Editor released a web portal to ease errata processing, allowing users to submit errata via a web form, and allowing the appropriate representative stream bodies to review and verify the reports.


Over 2 years later, the submission system has been used by **225** distinct users. When the IESG statement regarding errata processing for the IETF stream was completed 30 July 2008, a new status called "Hold for Document Update" was added. With this status and improved search functionality available, the verification system is starting to be used more. **19** distinct verifiers have used the new system.

The following graphs show the number of errata submitted since the new system was introduced. On average, **34** errata were submitted per month. The majority of recently submitted errata are Reported.






Recently, the verifiers have started marking errata as Verified, Rejected, and Held.




### 3. Errata in the Context of the RFC Series


The graph below shows the total number RFCs published in a given year, and of those, the number of distinct RFCs for which **any** errata have been submitted.



The graph below shows the number of RFCs in a given category, and of those, the number of distinct RFCs for which Technical errata have been submitted. Overall, 10% of RFCs have Technical errata.




The graph below shows the RFCs published over the past 10 years that have **Technical** errata that have not been Rejected. As noted earlier, Technical errata make up about half of the total errata.



#### 4. Reported Errata by Source of the RFC

The following graph shows the number of errata reports per document source. The majority of errata awaiting review are from Internet Area and IETF non-WG (AD-sponsored documents). The number of Legacy RFCs with errata has decreased because source information was updated for over 1200 RFCs in September 2009.

Reported Errata by Source of the RFC



## 5. Data Quality

Approximately 100 errata reports contain multiple errata in their notes fields, so in fact, the actual number of individual reports is larger than **2017**.

The Type labels (Technical/Editorial) should be taken with a grain of salt, as many reports (especially the older ones) may be mislabeled.

As verifiers make determinations regarding the status of errata, it is expected that the contents of some errata will be corrected – in the cases mentioned above, the reports could be atomized (or at least split by Status), and Type labels could be corrected.

As mentioned above, the source information for over 1200 RFCs that were originally marked Legacy has been updated to reflect the appropriate WG from which they originated.