Informational RFC Issues
(Thanks to Spencer for some material)
4.2.2 Informational

An "Informational" specification is published for the general information of the Internet community, and does not represent an Internet community consensus or recommendation. The Informational designation is intended to provide for the timely publication of a very broad range of responsible informational documents from many sources, subject only to editorial considerations and to verification that there has been adequate coordination with the standards process (see section 4.2.3).
Yet the majority of IETF stream informational RFCs were published with the “consensus:yes” flag, giving us this:

This document is not an Internet Standards Track specification; it is published for informational purposes.

This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has received public review and has been approved for publication by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Not all documents approved by the IESG are a candidate for any level of Internet Standard; see Section 2 of RFC 7841.
Issues

• The BCP does not represent current process. Which is correct? What does the community think informational means? Do we need to update the BCP?

• Does it ever make sense to set “consensus boilerplate: Yes” for informational? If so, when? Does an informational *sometimes* represent consensus?

• If we follow the BCP, what does it mean for people to object to the publication of an informational RFC?

• Would the wailing and tooth-gnashing over draft-mm-wg-effect-encrypt been better if the community understood the BCP?