

**RFC Editor Reporting**  
**May 2009**

**1. Monthly Summary**

The following numbers represent the May 2009 statistics for documents moving through the RFC Editor queue.

Submitted	24
Published	19
Withdrawn/DNP	0




Number of Documents in Queue per State at EOM

EDIT	6
RFC-EDITOR	14
AUTH48	33
REF	12
IANA	1
AUTH	1
TO	2
MISSREF	42

Publication numbers for November 2008 through January 2009 were down, largely because of the problem in transitioning to the RFC 5378 copyright notice. RFC publication was suspended for the IETF, IAB, and IRTF streams, without each author providing explicit acknowledgement that they were aware of and approved of the copyright notice and legends as it is defined in RFC 5378 and at <http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>. With the RFC-5378-fix announced 12 February 2009, more documents were released for publication.

**2. Annual Submission and Publication Rates**

The following graphs show the submission and publication rates for RFCs. The first three show the submission and publication rates over the last 3 years. During this time, the RFC Editor has worked down the size of the queue, and the total amount of time a document spends in the queue. In 2007, there was a large (50+) submission burst in March, in which it took the RFC Editor 3-4 months to recover and return to equilibrium. In 2008, we did not experience a burst in March, which explains the steady decrease in time that an Internet-Draft spends in the publication queue. However, the submission rate increased in May - July.



### 3. Queue Processing Times

As described in Section 1, processing times were impacted for November 2008 through January 2009 because of the issues regarding the transition to the RFC 5378 copyright notice and legends. In addition, queue times were affected because of the holiday season. The queue was affected in the following ways:

- The AUTH48 queue grew, and AUTH48 times increased. As we continued to process documents and prepare them for publication, the RFCs-to-be remained in the AUTH48 state until the RFC 5378 copyright notice and legends issue was resolved.
- The total number of documents in the queue continued to increase as documents continued to be approved for publication, but could not move beyond the AUTH48 state.
- The EDIT and RFC-EDITOR times increased in the latter portion of the year because the IESG approved I-Ds at an increased rate and because the RFC Editor was closed during the holidays.

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).




Note that there is a ripple effect, as spikes in document and page counts may be due to sets of documents moving through the queue together. The set does not move to the next state until the entire set is ready to be moved. For example, in September/October 2008, there were 2 large sets of documents released for publication (ISIS – 9 docs, SIP/SIPPING – 11 docs), which shows up as a spike in the EDIT state around week 33–37. There is then a subsequent spike in the RFC-EDITOR state around week 40, which results in a spike in the AUTH48 state around week 40. These sets were published in October, creating a burst of October publications.

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




Note 1: The data for the page counts used to create the graphs on the following pages was recalculated, as the automated reports sent to the IESG/IAB and as shown at <http://www.rfc-editor.org/CurrQstats.txt> were incorrect for January and February of 2008.

Note 2: In January 2008, the queue stats were adjusted to remove 2nd and 3rd generation MISSREFS (i.e., documents that reference other documents that are in MISSREF) from being included in RFC Editor time. There were some anomalies that needed to be worked out. Data post-Feb 2008 is more accurate.




## EDIT State 2009



## RFC-EDITOR State 2009




## AUTH48 State 2009




#### 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 20 days.

This graph shows the total number of documents published per month, highlighting those that were published with an RFC Editor time of fewer than 20 days.



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 20 days).



(Note: There was an error in the above graph for March in the March report. In March, we met the SLA compliance levels at 100%.)