

RFC Editor's Checklist

Status of this Document

This document provides information to individuals taking on the role of RFC Editor in the EDSWG Standards Process. Distribution of this document is unlimited.

Change Explanation

Version 1 – Change from "ESE" (Earth Science Enterprise) to "ESDS" (Earth Science Data Systems) terminology.

Copyright Notice

Copyright © NASA (2006). All Rights Reserved. (TBD)

Abstract

The job of an RFC Editor is to act as a conduit between the RFC Authors and the Standards Process Group. The RFC Editor should be familiar with the Standards Process and should be able to work with the SPG and SPG Staff to advance the RFC through the process. This document provides a list of things that the RFC Editor should do.

Table of Contents

Status of this Document	1
Copyright Notice	1
Abstract	1
Table of Contents.....	1
1 Preparation.....	2
2 Initial document preparation.....	2
3 Quick review.....	2
4 Assign RFC number.....	2
5 Post document.....	2
6 Initial Review.....	2
7 Form TWG	3
8 Technical Review.....	3
9 SPG Decision.....	4
10 Operational Review.....	4
11 SPG Decision.....	4
12 NASA Decision.....	4

Appendix A Glossary of Acronyms.....4

1 Preparation

Make sure you have read

- ESDS-RFC-001 Charter of the ESDS Standards Process Group
- ESDS-RFC-002 The ESDS Standards Process
- ESDS-RFC-003 Instructions to Authors

If you have any questions about those three documents, ask the SPG Staff for clarification

2 Initial document preparation

Work with the RFC Author(s) to get the RFC into the proper format (see ESDS-RFC-003). Be relentless in asking for corrections. Be prepared to iterate. During the entire process, there will be little changes made to the document. If the changes are editorial, then the RFC Editor works with the Authors to publish a new version of the RFC. If the changes are substantive, the RFC Editor, TWG, and SPG have to decide how to proceed.

The reviews can begin before the RFC document is in final form as long as the technical content is complete. In particular, experience has shown that the Evidence of Implementation companion document is not complete when the reviews begin. Also, annexes and appendices tend to need further work.

3 Quick review

Once the new RFC is in good shape, ask the SPG Staff for a quick review to make sure it's ok.

4 Assign RFC number

Get an RFC number from the SPG Staff. This number should be used in the header of the document and in the file name.

5 Post document

Ask the SPG Staff to post the document on the SPG Web Site. The SPG Staff will do two things

Set up an RFC Folder at <http://spg.gsfc.nasa.gov/rfc/>

Add it to the RFC Index at <http://spg.gsfc.nasa.gov/docindexfolder/>

6 Initial Review

Start the Initial Review. Send an email to the SPG asking for people to review the document for readiness to enter the review process. The reviews need not delve into technical merit or operational merit. The review is strictly to make sure that the RFC is in a form that can be reviewed, and that the RFC is appropriate for the standards process.

Collect reviews (this may require personal emails to key people) and ask SPG staff to post them in a folder within the RFC folder.

SPG holds an initial review evaluation teleconference and decides whether to accept the RFC or not.

Any suggestions regarding changes to the document should be provided to the RFC authors. The RFC authors should evaluate the suggested changes and edit the RFC accordingly. The RFC Editor should ensure that the new document reflects the spirit of the changes recommended. If there is any question about this, the RFC Editor should consult with SPG Staff before proceeding.

New versions of the document should be posted on the SPG web site.

7 Form TWG

The SPG Staff will set up a Technical Working Group. This involves identifying key people who are familiar with the RFC contents from a technical or operational standpoint who are qualified to judge the merit of the document following public review.

The TWG can, at its discretion informally review the RFC and suggest editorial changes.

Any suggestions regarding changes to the document should be provided to the RFC authors. The RFC authors should evaluate the suggested changes and edit the RFC accordingly. The RFC Editor should ensure that the new document reflects the spirit of the changes recommended. If there is any question about this, the RFC Editor should consult with SPG Staff before proceeding.

New versions of the document should be posted on the SPG web site.

8 Technical Review

Together with the TWG, start the Technical Review. Formulate a set of technical review questions (you can use the questions from earlier RFCs as a starting point). Set a schedule for responses and followup meetings. When TWG agrees the questions are ready, SPG Staff will send the questions to a list of NASA data systems stakeholders.

Collect the responses. SPG Staff will set up a folder in the RFC folder to collect them.

Evaluate the responses with the TWG. It is possible that there will have to be an extension of the response deadline followed by additional efforts to get more reviews.

Once the TWG has enough reviews, convene a TWG telecon, and decide on a recommendation to the SPG about whether the RFC should move ahead, should be published as a Tech Note, or rejected. (Unless the RFC was for a tech note, in which case it is either published or rejected).

Any suggestions regarding changes to the document should be provided to the RFC authors. The RFC authors should evaluate the suggested changes and edit the RFC accordingly. The RFC Editor should ensure that the new document reflects the spirit of the changes recommended. If there is any question about this, the RFC Editor should consult with SPG Staff before proceeding.

New versions of the document should be posted on the SPG web site.

9 SPG Decision

The SPG convenes to make a decision based on the TWG recommendation.

10 Operational Review

Assuming the recommendation was to continue, together with the TWG, start the Operational Review. Formulate a set of operational review questions (you can use the questions from earlier RFCs as a starting point). Set a schedule for responses and followup meetings. When TWG agrees the questions are ready, SPG Staff will send the questions to a list of NASA data systems stakeholders.

Collect the responses. SPG Staff will set up a folder in the RFC folder to collect them.

Evaluate the responses with the TWG. It is possible that there will have to be an extension of the response deadline followed by additional efforts to get more reviews.

Once the TWG has enough reviews, convene a TWG telecon, and decide on a recommendation to the SPG about whether the RFC should be adopted or rejected.

Any suggestions regarding changes to the document should be provided to the RFC authors. The RFC authors should evaluate the suggested changes and edit the RFC accordingly. The RFC Editor should ensure that the new document reflects the spirit of the changes recommended. If there is any question about this, the RFC Editor should consult with SPG Staff before proceeding.

New versions of the document should be posted on the SPG web site.

11 SPG Decision

The SPG convenes to make a decision based on the TWG recommendation.

12 NASA Decision

Assuming the recommendation was to adopt the RFC, the SPG Staff forwards this recommendation to NASA Headquarters for final review.

13 References

13.1 Normative References

- [1] ESDS-RFC 001 - Charter of the Earth Science Data Systems Standards Process Group (SPG)
- [2] ESDS-RFC-002 The ESDS Standards Process
- [3] ESDS-RFC 003 - Instructions to RFC Authors

Appendix A Glossary of Acronyms

Acronym	Description
ESDS	Earth Science Data Systems

SPG-INF-001v1
Category: Informal note
Updates/Obsoletes: SPG-INF-001

ESDSWG Standards Process Group
December, 2007
RFC Editor's Checklist

ESDSWG	Earth Science Data Systems Working Groups
ESE	Earth Science Enterprise
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration: See http://www.nasa.gov
RFC	Request For Comment: See Section 2 of this document.
SPG	Standards Process Group: See ESDS-RFC 001 [1].
TWG	Technical Working Group: See Section 2.4 of this document.