

Instructions to RFC Authors

Status of this RFC

This RFC provides information to the NASA Earth Science community. This RFC does not specify an Earth Science Data Systems (ESDS) standard. Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

Change Explanation

Changes since Version 1

Incorporated Errata from Version 1 (sections 6.1 and 6.4).

Minor revisions throughout to reflect evolution in standards process as discussed at the Earth Science Data Systems Working Groups meeting November 2006.

Updates to section 7.5 (Copyright notice) to reflect clarifications discussed via email March 2004.

Other minor editorial corrections throughout.

Changes since Version 0.07

Revised material explaining errata and versioning. This required modifying sections 6.1, 7, 7.1 and 7.4 and removing section 8.

Copyright Notice

Copyright © 2004,2007 United States Government as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

This document provides information about the preparation of Requests for Comment (RFCs), documents submitted to the NASA Standards Process Group describing proposed standards or other technical notes. These instructions detail certain policies pertaining to the publication of RFCs, acceptable document style, required and optional content, and the packaging and file format requirements for all ESDS RFC submissions, from their initial submission until their final release as either an ESDS standard or a technical note.

RFCs may cover a broad range of topics related to Earth Science Data Systems standards and practices. RFCs may be submitted by anyone. All RFCs are available online and publicly accessible by the public.

Table of Contents

Status of this RFC	1
Change Explanation	1
Copyright Notice	1
Abstract	1
Table of Contents	2
1 Introduction	4
1.1 Version Management	4
1.2 Not all RFCs are standards	5
1.3 Publication Language	5
1.4 Normative References	5
1.5 URLs in RFCs	6
1.6 Relation to other RFCs	6
1.6.1 Updates	6
1.6.2 Obsoletes	6
1.6.3 Cross referencing	6
1.7 Authors Listed on RFC	7
1.8 RFC Content, Style, and Submission Format	7
2 RFC Required and Optional Sections	7
2.1 Running Page Headers	8
2.2 Title	8
2.3 Status of this Memo	8
2.4 Change Explanation	8
2.5 Copyright Notice	9
2.6 Abstract	9
2.7 Table of Contents	9
2.8 Body of Memo	9
2.8.1 Introduction	9
2.9 References Section	10
2.10 Authors Section	10

2.11	Appendix	11
3	Submission and Packaging Instructions.....	11
3.1	Submission Formats.....	11
3.2	Single vs. Multiple Files.....	11
3.3	File and/or Directory Naming.....	11
3.4	Supporting Materials.....	12
3.4.1	Evidence of Implementation and Operational Readiness.....	12
3.4.2	Other Supporting Materials	13
3.4.3	Note On Supporting Materials.....	13
3.5	Submission Mechanism.....	13
3.6	ESDS Process Materials.....	13
4	References	13
5	Authors	14
6	Appendix A - Glossary.....	14

1 Introduction

The role of the ESDS Standards Process Group (SPG), described in ESDS-RFC-001 “Charter RFC” [1], is to manage the NASA Earth Science Data Systems Working Group's standards process. This includes maintaining an archive of all materials associated with ESDS standards and ESDS technical notes. The guidelines in this document were developed in order to make this task as simple as possible for both the submitters and the SPG. This document has been adapted from the IETF “Instructions to the RFC Authors” document [2].

ESDS RFC submissions shall be submitted to the SPG as described in ESDS-RFC-002 “Standards Process” [3]. RFC authors and the SPG (via the office of the RFC Editor) will work together to collect all the materials needed to submit an RFC, to track its progress through the ESDS standards process, and to maintain the eventual ESDS standard or technical note that results when a submission successfully negotiates the process.

This document provides information about the preparation of the RFC: acceptable document style, the required and optional content of the RFC, the acceptable packaging and document formats, and the policies for the publication of the RFCs. RFCs may cover a broad range of topics related to Earth Science data systems standards and practices. RFCs will be publicly accessible online.

Information about the ESDS Standards, and the ESDS Standards Process itself, including this document, can be found at the SPG website: <http://spg.gsfc.nasa.gov/> in the Directory on the center of the home page. “Earth Science Data Systems Standards Process”, “ESDS Approved Standards”, and “How to Submit an RFC” are of particular interest to prospective RFC authors. It is recommended that you familiarize yourself with the contents of the ESDS Standards Process, ESDS-RFC-002 before reading this document. When you are ready to write an RFC, “How to Submit and RFC” provides a step-by-step guide with links to these instructions, document templates, and points of contact.

1.1 Version Management

An RFC cannot be substantially altered once it enters the ESDS Standards Process. To accommodate the need for minor editorial changes, corrections or clarifications over the lifetime of an RFC, the SPG has adopted the use of an errata document and a version management system.

Each time the RFC document is modified in a minor (i.e. editorial) way, it is released with a new version number. Alternatively the RFC Editor may choose to list the changes in an Errata file rather than release new versions of the document. The latter approach may be employed as a guard against releasing several new versions in quick succession.

Changes from the previous version must be noted in the Section labeled "Change Explanation" of the RFC.

If more substantive technical changes are required, a new RFC must be written that obsoletes the previous one. For this reason, the authors should thoroughly review the final draft of the document before final submission.

The version number for an RFC is encapsulated in up to three digits following the letter “v” appended to the document number, with major and minor version numbers separated by a single period (“.”). All major releases starting with the digit “0” shall be deemed to represent the “editorial” phase or development phase of the document. This phase shall have a mandatory two-digit minor version number that shall be updated at the discretion of the RFC Editor. All other non-zero major releases shall be deemed to represent the “published” phase or stable phase. The major release number shall be updated in the event of editorial changes to an already published document. This phase shall not contain minor version numbers. Further explanation of the RFC versioning scheme and some examples are provided on the SPG website at <http://spg.gsfc.nasa.gov/About/version-number-scheme/>.”

The Document Index on the SPG website will indicate whether there is an errata file for an RFC and if so, will provide a link to that file.

If you find what you believe to be an error in an RFC, consult the errata page, if there is one. If the bug is not listed, please send e-mail to the authors of the document, and copy the RFC Editor.

1.2 Not all RFCs are standards

RFCs fall into two broad categories; standards track documents and technical notes. Technical notes, such as this document, do not represent a standard of any kind. Even those documents on the standards track are not recommended earth science data systems standards until approved by NASA Headquarters.

1.3 Publication Language

Because the Earth Science Data Systems Working Groups are a NASA activity, sponsored by the U.S. government, English is the official publication language for ESDS RFCs. RFCs submitted for publication are required to meet a reasonable standard for clear and correct English.

1.4 Normative References

Within an RFC, references to other documents fall into two general categories: "normative" and "informative". Normative references specify documents that must be read to understand or implement the technology in the new RFC, and whose requirements must be complied with for the technology in the new RFC to work. For example, if an ESDS proposed standard is a profile or extension of an existing standard (or if the proposal is to adopt an existing standard unchanged for ESDS purposes), then it needs to include a normative reference to the existing standard document, in whatever form it exists. If possible, the SPG will keep a copy of the referenced base standard on the SPG web site, in addition to the profile/extension RFC. The SPG will also provide a link to the current authoritative version of the base standard.

An informative reference is not normative; rather, it only provides additional information. For example, an informative reference might provide background or historical information. Material in an informative reference is not required to implement the technology in the RFC.

The distinction between normative and informative references is often important. The ESDS standards process and the SPG RFC publication process must indicate whether a reference to a work in progress is normative because standards-track RFCs cannot be published for review until all of the documents that it lists as normative references have been published. In practice, this may result in the simultaneous publication of a group of inter-related RFCs.

An RFC must include separate lists of normative and informative references (see Section 2.9 below.)

1.5 URLs in RFCs

The use of URLs in RFCs is discouraged, because many URLs are not stable references. Exceptions may be made for normative references in those cases where the URL is demonstrably the most stable reference available.

1.6 Relation to other RFCs

Sometimes an RFC adds information on a topic discussed in a previous RFC or completely replaces an earlier RFC. Two terms are used for these cases: Updates and Obsoletes, respectively.

1.6.1 Updates

Specifies an earlier document whose contents are modified or updated by the new document. The new document cannot be used alone; it can only be used in conjunction with the earlier document.

1.6.2 Obsoletes

Specifies an earlier document that the new document replaces. The new document can be used alone as a replacement for the obsolete document. The new document may contain revised information or all of the same information plus some new information, however extensive or brief that new information may be.

1.6.3 Cross referencing

In lists of RFCs and in the Document Index on the SPG web site (but not on the RFCs themselves), the following are used for older documents that were referred to by Obsoletes or Updates relations in newer documents:

“Obsoleted-by” is used to specify newer document(s) that replace the older document.

“Updated-by” is used to specify newer document(s) that modify the older document.

Updated versions of a particular RFC, as indicated in the ESDS-RFC number, are assumed to obsolete any previous version. Therefore, only the latest version of an RFC will appear in the Document Index. Previous versions can be found in the appropriate RFC folder on the SPG web site.

The Document Index is available at: <http://spg.gsfc.nasa.gov/docindexfolder/>

1.7 Authors Listed on RFC

The primary author(s) of an RFC work closely with the RFC Editor to ready the document for publication. While others may contribute to drafting and editing the RFC, the primary author(s) are equally responsible for the final form and content of the published RFC and must approve the final document. When there are many contributors, the best choice will be to list the person or (few) persons who acted as document editor(s) (e.g., "Tom Smith, Editor"). Contact information for the lead author(s) is provided in the Authors section.

1.8 RFC Content, Style, and Submission Format

There is a distinction between the content of an RFC, the style (i.e. visual appearance), and file format (i.e. what software applications are required/able to edit the document) in which that content is presented. Section 2 presents the content requirements. Section 3 presents the style and format instructions.

All abbreviations that are used in the body must be expanded the first time they occur. A few exceptions will be made for abbreviations that are so well known that expansion is unnecessary, e.g., TCP, FTP, NASA, etc.

2 RFC Required and Optional Sections

An RFC may contain the following sections. Some of these are optional, as noted. When they are present, the generally recommended order is shown in the following list.

1. Running Page Headers
2. Title
3. Status of this Memo
4. Change Explanation
5. Copyright Notice
6. Abstract
7. Table of Contents [optional for documents less than five pages]
8. Body of Memo [the first section of the body is the first numbered section]
8. References [optional]
9. Authors
10. Appendix [optional]
 - A. Glossary of acronyms
 - B. Other information

The rules for each of these sections are described below in corresponding subsections.

2.1 Running Page Headers

The running header on all pages must minimally include: RFC number, Author, Category, Title, Updates/Obsoletes, and Date of the current version. Note that some source document formats such as HTML are not page oriented. In that case, the page header information shall appear once at the top of the document and where possible the Title and Date shall appear in the page title.

Please see any page of this memo for an example of a running page heading.

The RFC number must reflect the current version as described in section 1.1.

"ESDS-RFC-NNNvX[.YY]"

"Updates/Obsoletes: ESDS-RFC-NNN" or "None" (Note that this shall not be used to indicate a new version of an existing RFC, it is meant to provide information about other RFCs whose use may be affected by this RFC.)

"Category: xxxxxxxxx" (required – may be either standards track or technical note. The "standards track" category indicates that the status is either a proposed or endorsed standard or standard.)

The author's name is also listed in the header on each page of the RFC. If there are two authors, the form "name & name" may be used; for more than two authors, use the form "name, et al."

2.2 Title

Choosing a good title for an RFC can be a challenge. A good title should fairly represent the scope and purpose of the document without being either too general or too specific.

RFCs that document a particular company's private protocol must bear a title of the form "XXX's ... Protocol" (where XXX is a company name), to clearly differentiate it from an ESE product.

Similarly, RFCs that are profiles or extensions of existing standards should include in the title the name of the standards body that manages the existing standard on which the proposed ESDS standard is based. That is, if an ESDS RFC defines a profile of an Open GIS (OGC) standard, "OGC" should be included in the title.

2.3 Status of this Memo

Each RFC must include on its first page the "Status of this Memo" section that contains a paragraph describing the type of the RFC and its status.

2.4 Change Explanation

This section provides a description of the update or change when the RFC updates or obsoletes any previously existing RFC. If the RFC does not update or change any others, the content shall be "This RFC does not update or change a previous RFC." If the RFC is a new version, the changes from the previous version shall be described. All previous change information shall be preserved and the most recent information shall be kept at the beginning of the section.

2.5 Copyright Notice

NASA requires the applicable Copyright Notice in each RFC. This copyright applies to the RFC document itself, and allows NASA to freely distribute the document. NASA copyright does not apply to documents referenced in the RFC or included in it that came with intellectual property rights restrictions from their creators. However, note that the Office of Management and Budget in OMB A-119 states that a voluntary consensus standard "includes provisions requiring that owners of relevant intellectual property have agreed to make that intellectual property available on a non-discriminatory, royalty-free or reasonable royalty basis to all interested parties."

Copyright statement should be one of the following:

1. If created by a contractor pursuant to NASA contract and rights obtained from creator by assignment:

Copyright © {YEAR} United States Government as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. All Rights Reserved.

2. If created by civil servants only:

Copyright © {YEAR} United States Government as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. No copyright is claimed in the United States under Title 17, U.S.Code. All Other Rights Reserved.

2.6 Abstract

Every RFC must have an Abstract section following the Copyright notice. An Abstract will typically be 5-10 lines, but an Abstract of more than 20 lines is generally not acceptable. The Abstract section should provide a concise and comprehensive overview of the purpose and contents of the entire document, to give a technically knowledgeable reader a general overview of the function of the document. In addition to its function in the RFC itself, the Abstract section text will appear in publication announcements and in the online index of RFCs.

2.7 Table of Contents

A Table of Contents section is required in RFCs five pages and longer. A Table of Contents section must be positioned after the Abstract and before the body of the memo.

2.8 Body of Memo

Following the Table of Contents, if any, comes the body of the memo.

2.8.1 Introduction

Each RFC should have an Introduction section that (among other things)

- explains the motivation for the RFC;

- describes the applicability of the document, e.g., whether it specifies a protocol, provides a discussion of some problem, is simply of interest to the NASA Earth Science community, or provides a status report on some activity;
- and in the case of a proposed standard
 - describes why the specification is needed;
 - explains what purpose will be served by making it an ESDS standard.
 - describes the usability of the proposed standard, including the current and potential future user community
 - describes any limitations of the proposed standard, if any

2.9 References Section

Nearly all RFCs contain citations to other documents, listed near the end of the RFC. There are many styles for references, and the RFCs have one of their own. Please follow the reference style used in recent RFCs; in particular, see the Reference section of this RFC for an example.

Reference lists must indicate whether each reference is normative or informative. For example, if both normative and informative references are included, then the reference section should be split into two sections, e.g.:

s. Normative References

[n] ...

s+1. Informative References

[n+1] ...

Non-normative references to ESDS Drafts are allowed, but they must take the following restricted form: the author(s), the title, and the phrase "Work in Progress", for example:

[6]Doe, J., "The Deployment of IPv6", Work in Progress.

The use of URLs in references in RFCs is discouraged, because URLs are often not stable references. Exceptions will be made in certain cases where the World Wide Web is demonstrably the most stable reference available.

2.10 Authors Section

This required section lists those contributors who deserve significant credit for the document. When a long author list is replaced by a single Editor in the document header, the displaced authors can be properly and fully acknowledged in the Authors section. The name(s) and contact information for the primary author(s) of the RFC, as listed in the page header should be detailed here. Contact information must include at least one, and ideally would include all, of a postal address, a telephone number and/or FAX number, and a long-lived email address.

2.11 Appendix

A Glossary of Acronyms should be the first appendix. Additional appendices may contain other information.

3 Submission and Packaging Instructions

This section describes the packaging and file format instruction for all ESDS RFC submissions, from their initial submission until their final release as either an ESDS standard or a technical note. The intent of these instructions is to provide enough guidelines to make submission easy for all parties without being overly restrictive in any dimension. Authors should confer with the RFC editor regarding submission and packaging prior to submitting materials.

3.1 Submission Formats

All ESDS standards and technical notes will be made available as a single file in Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF). [4]. This will be the normative format submitted by the author and published on the SPG web site. ESDS RFCs should also be available in their source document format to facilitate subsequent updating and revision over the life cycle of the standard or technical notes.

ESDS RFCs shall be submitted electronically as Portable Document Format.

Both Word and HTML use the concept of styles to provide consistency within a document. As a courtesy to authors, the SPG has provided templates for these two common document formats.

All supporting materials (described in Section 3.4) will be made available in their original format or PDF as determined in consultation with the RFC Editor.

All ESDS process materials (described in Section 3.6) will be made available in formats determined by the RFC Editor.

3.2 Single vs. Multiple Files

RFC submissions can often include multiple files. This could include a standards track submission and its supporting materials as described in Section 3.4 .

Submissions that contain multiple files should be bundled using a mechanism such as tar format, gzip'ed tar format (tar.gz), or zip'ed format. Please consult with the RFC Editor for preferred formats.

Multi-file submissions should be organized such that all files are contained within one directory (folder) and any number of files and/or subdirectories.

3.3 File and/or Directory Naming

RFC authors must confer with the RFC Editor about naming the file or top-level directory prior to submission.

In the case of submissions requiring supporting materials, all supporting materials shall be named as directed by the RFC Editor.

3.4 Supporting Materials

Before an RFC can be approved as a standard, authors must provide evidence of at least two interoperable implementations and demonstrated operational readiness. Therefore, all standards track submissions will require supporting materials.

3.4.1 Evidence of Implementation and Operational Readiness

To become a standard, there must be evidence of at least two implementations or distinct instances of implementations of the standard along with evidence that the standard is being used in a significant way operationally or is operationally ready (e.g. can be used operationally).

An RFC may be submitted to the SPG with only one implementation or instance, and with limited operational use if others are in the process of being established. However, in this case, final approval of the standard will be delayed until more than one implementation or instance can be documented as being ready for operational use. Attention should be given to the short review cycle of the standards process.

3.4.1.1 Evidence of Implementation

Implementation of a specification means that there is a working set of software that implements that specification. To become an ESE standard, ideally a specification has been implemented in at least two independently developed software libraries, components, or programs, and that those two or more implementations interoperate. However, it is also acceptable to show that copies of the same implementation, deployed by independent users can interoperate.

The TWG is charged with verifying that there are at least two independent implementations or instantiations that are interoperating.

3.4.1.2 Operational Readiness

Demonstrated operational readiness means that the implementations of the specification are being used to support the actual operations of the users. In other words, the specification has become part of the normal workflow and is not just part of an experimental or trial use.

The TWG is charged with verifying the operational readiness of the specification.

3.4.1.3 Required Documentation

The “Evidence of Implementation” document will define the NASA community where the proposed standard is in use. For that reason, the “Evidence of Implementation” document should be as comprehensive as possible, containing an exhaustive list of implementations as known. The contacts listed in this document will be used as the starting point by the SPG to solicit reviews of the proposed standard. Having an incomplete list of implementations or a very short list of implementations will imply that the community is very small or the proposed standard is not widely used.

For at least two instances of implementation, be as specific as possible. Include a short description of how the standard is being used in each instance. Include names and contact information of people who are using the standard.

Descriptions should include information such as

- What kind of data is being served/transferred?
- A description of the server(s) or client(s) that use the specification
- A description of the kinds of data and amount of data being served, transferred, described, or encoded using the specification
- How extensively is the specification being used?
- What mechanisms, if any, are in place for the maintenance of the specification and its implementations?

3.4.2 Other Supporting Materials

Supporting materials for a submission may include database schemas, XML schemas, source code, copies of referenced specifications, and documentation of implementation or operational use of a proposed standard. Where supporting materials are intended to be used as source material by users of the RFC, they must be provided in the source format (e.g. XML schemas, header files). Where supporting materials are meant primarily to be read, they may be provided as PDF documents.

3.4.3 Note On Supporting Materials

RFC authors shall provide all required supporting materials together with the RFC submission, packaged as described above. As the submission is moved through the process, additional supporting materials may be required. These materials shall be supplied as soon as they are available, based on the same rules as the original submission. Thus, submissions that require supporting materials are by their nature multi-file submissions and RFC authors should plan accordingly.

Submissions of technical notes should generally be single-document submissions, as no supporting materials are required.

3.5 Submission Mechanism

Authors should contact the RFC Editor for submission instructions.

3.6 ESDS Process Materials

As a submission, particularly a standards track submission, is moved through the process, additional materials will be generated. This includes SPG notes, TWG notes, public comments, SPG decisions, evidence of implementation, and so on.

The RFC Editor shall collect these materials, package them, and maintain them as part of a collection that includes the submission and its supporting materials.

4 References

[1] ESDS-RFC-001, Charter RFC

[2] IETF Instructions to RFC Authors

[3] ESDS-RFC-002, Standards Process RFC

[4] <http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/adobepdf.html>

5 Authors

The SEEDS Standards Process Study Team.

Chair: Richard Ullman, NASA GSFC, richard.ullman@nasa.gov

Jean Bedet, SSAI Inc., bedet@daac.gsfc.nasa.gov

Helen Conover, University of Alabama in Huntsville, hconover@itsc.uah.edu

Allan Doyle, International Interfaces, adoyle@intl-interfaces.com

Yonsook Enloe, SGT Inc., yonsook@harp.gsfc.nasa.gov

John Evans, GST Inc., john.evans@gsfc.nasa.gov

R. Suresh, Mayurtech, suresh@mayurtech.com

Jingli Yang, ERT, Inc., jyang@ertcorp.com

Authors can be reached by email. However, if necessary, postal mail can be sent:

ESDSWG Standards Process Group

c/o Kathy Fontaine

Code 902

Goddard Space Flight Center

Greenbelt, MD 20771

6 Appendix A - Glossary

ESDS - Earth Science Data Systems

ESE - Earth Science Enterprise

FAX - Facsimile

FTP - File Transmission Protocol

HTML - Hypertext Markup Language

IETF - Internet Engineering Task Force

NASA - National Aeronautics and Space Administration

OGC - Open Geospatial Consortium

PDF - Portable Document Format [4]

RFC - Request for Comment

SPG - Standards Process Group

ESDS-RFC-003v2
Category: Technical Note
Updates: ESE-RFC-003

Earth Science Data Systems Standards Process Group
January 2007
Instructions to RFC Authors

tar - tape archive

TCP - Transmission Control Protocol

TWG - Technical Working Group

URL - Uniform Resource Locator

XML - eXtensible Markup Language