

On January 31, 2019, the IAB received an appeal from Shyam Bandyopadhyay, with the title "[Procedures related to Independent Submission Stream need to be more transparent](#)". The appeal text contains the author's view of a set of interactions among the Independent Series Editor, the IESG, certain individuals, and the author. This background material requests no specific action by the IAB, and, since there is no redress requested, the IAB makes no comments on these sections. We focus instead on what we believe are the three requests to the IAB within the document:

- 1) A request for increased transparency in procedures related to the Independent Submission stream (as evidenced in the title).
- 2) A request that the author's specific documents be considered without creating conflict with other documents, e.g. RFC 8028. ("So, I would request IETF to come up with an approach such that my documents can be published without any conflict").
- 3) A request for a general update of the ISE's procedures so that priority of publication can be recognized for documents intended for publication in that stream. ("I feel that RFC 4846 needs to be updated such that work from the authors who will submit their drafts under the section of Independent Submission Stream can be protected").

On point 1, the IAB believes that - while the IETF can always improve its transparency - the process of submitting and internet-drafts and tracking their state is generally available. The submission states, including those to the ISE, are found in the IETF datatracker. While interpreting these does require some familiarity with the process, there are a number of resources available to explain the states, including requests for clarification to the ISE. For instance, the general status of drafts is available at <https://datatracker.ietf.org>, e.g., for the draft in question at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shyam-real-ip-framework/> and <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-shyam-real-ip-framework/history/>. And the ISE can be reached at rfc-ise@rfc-editor.org by email.

When drafts cover matters like IPv6 for which there is an active working group, authors always have the option to submit the draft for consideration to that working group instead of direct submission to the ISE. Submission to a working group will provide much better visibility than a submission to the ISE.

On point 2, the IAB understands from a review of the datatracker that the documents are still under review for publication by the ISE. The IAB does not direct the ISE to publish specific documents; the stream's editorial independence is its key feature. If the ISE does publish the documents, the IAB believes it will join a longer conversation on the topic of source address based routing, and that this would not normally imply any change of status of RFC 8028 or other documents that form part of that conversation. Other relevant work includes RFC 1970, RFC 2461, RFC 4861, RFC 5533, RFC 7048, and any number of related working group discussions.

On point 3, the general goal of the RFC series and other IETF documents is providing working documents for discussion by the Internet technical community, not establishing priorities among

multiple documents discussing the same topic or preventing the discussion of a topic in other than a first document. There can be implications of publications for priority in patent examinations, but those are incidental side-effects. For instance, internet-draft publications may be referenced by those seeking to examine patent applications or other IPR for prior art; the IETF maintains an archive of internet-drafts in part to ensure that the record is complete for this purpose. The publication date of the final RFC is, by necessity, later than the internet-drafts which preceded it, so it is rarely used in this context. Since the Independent Stream [requires publication as an internet-draft for all documents not intended as April 1st RFCs](#), the IAB believes that the priority between its documents and those published in other streams is relatively easily determined, since internet-drafts are used by the other streams as well.

With reference to the three points above, the IAB will informally discuss improving accessibility of the datatracker-based information with the ISE and the relevant technical team. No other actions are intended as resolutions to this appeal.