# Handling Conflict Around IESG Notes per RFC 5742

# Section 1.1

The IESG may request the inclusion of an IESG note in an Independent Submission or IRTF stream document to explain the specific relationship, if any, to IETF work.  In case there is a dispute about the content of the IESG note, this document provides a dispute resolution process.

# Section 3

The IESG review of these Independent Submission and IRTF stream documents results in one of the following five types of conclusion, any of which may be accompanied by a request to include an IESG note if the document is published.

# Section 3

In exceptional cases, when the relationship of the document to the IETF standards process might be unclear, the IESG may request the inclusion of an IESG note to clarify the relationship of the document to the IETF standards process.  Such a note is likely to include pointers to related IETF RFCs.

The dispute resolution process in Section 4 is provided to handle situations in which the IRSG or RFC Editor is concerned with the content of the requested IESG note.

# Section 4

Experience has shown that the IESG and the RFC Editor have worked well together regarding publication recommendations and IESG notes. Where questions have arisen, they have been quickly resolved when all parties become aware of the concerns.  However, should a dispute ever arise, a third party can assist with resolution.  Therefore, this dispute procedure has an informal dialogue phase followed by an arbitration phase if the matter remains unresolved.

If the IESG requests the inclusion of an IESG note and the IRSG or the RFC Editor intends to publish the document without the requested IESG note, then they must provide a clear and concise description of the concerns to the IESG before proceeding.  A proposal for alternate IESG note text from the IRSG or the RFC Editor is highly encouraged.

# Section 4

If the IESG does not want the document to be published without the requested IESG note, then the IESG must initiate an informal dialogue. The dialogue should not take more than six weeks. This period of time allows the IESG to conduct an IETF Last Call concerning the content of the requested IESG note (and not on the document as a whole) to determine community consensus if desired. At the end of the dialogue, the IESG can reaffirm the original IESG note, provide an alternate IESG note, or withdraw the note altogether. If an IESG note is requested, the IRSG or the RFC Editor must state whether they intend to include it.

# Section 4

If dialogue fails to resolve IRSG or RFC Editor concerns with the content of a requested IESG note and they intend to publish the document as an RFC without the requested IESG note, then the IESG can formally ask the IAB to provide arbitration. The IAB is not obligated to perform arbitration and may decline the request. If the IAB declines, the RFC Editor decides whether the IESG note is included. If the IAB accepts, the IAB review will occur according to procedures of the IAB's own choosing. The IAB can direct the inclusion of the IESG note, direct the withdrawal of the IESG note, or leave the final decision to the RFC Editor. Unlike the IAB reviews specified in RFC 4846 [I3], if the IAB directs the inclusion or withdrawal the IESG note, the IAB decision is binding, not advisory.