RFC-NNNN: Human-readable title goes here

RFC Metadata

Authors (in alphabetical order):

- Author Name, @Author_GitHub_Handle
- Foo Bar, @Foo_Bar

Status (as defined here): `Provisional`

Creation Date: `YYYY-MM-DD`

Last Updated: `YYYY-MM-DD`

RFC Handle: `rfc-template` (should match the file name, as `NNNN-{rfc_handle}`, but without the `.md` suffix)

Initial Pull Request: racklet/racklet#NNNN

Tracking Issue: racklet/racklet#NNNN

Version Number: `v1.X.Y`

Summary

One paragraph explanation of the feature.

Motivation

Why are we doing this? What use cases does it support? What is the expected outcome?

Goals

What is in scope for this work?

Non-Goals

What is out of scope for this work?

Proposal

This is the technical portion of the RFC. Explain the design in sufficient detail that:

- Its interaction with other features is clear.
- It is reasonably clear how the feature would be implemented.
- Corner cases are dissected by example.

The section should return to the examples given in the guide-level explanation below, and explain more fully how the detailed proposal makes those examples work.

Values

Describe what values does the proposed feature reflect. See RFC-0001.

User stories

Explain what is the use case of the proposed feature and how it would benefit the user.

Guide-level explanation

Explain the proposal as if it was already a feature of the project and this would be the documentation for that feature.

- Introducing new named concepts.
- Explaining the feature largely in terms of examples.
- If applicable, provide sample error messages, deprecation warnings, or migration guidance.
- If applicable, describe the differences between teaching this to a Racklet administrator versus a Racklet end user.

Risks and Mitigations

What are the risks of this proposal and how do we mitigate. Think broadly. For example, consider both security and how this will impact the larger ecosystem.

Drawbacks

Why should we *not* do this? Consider at least one drawback.

Rationale and alternatives

- Why is this design the best in the space of possible designs?
- What other designs have been considered and what is the rationale for not choosing them?
- What is the impact of not doing this?

Prior art

Discuss prior art, both the good and the bad, in relation to this proposal. A few examples of what this can include are:

- For community proposals: Is this done by some other community and what were their experiences with it?

- For other teams: What lessons can we learn from what other communities have done here?
- Papers: Are there any published papers or great posts that discuss this? If you have some relevant papers to refer to, this can serve as a more detailed theoretical background.

This section is intended to encourage you as an author to think about the lessons from other projects and provide readers of your RFC with a fuller picture. If there is no prior art, that is fine - your ideas are interesting to us regardless of whether they are brand new or adaptations from other projects.

Unresolved questions

- What parts of the design do you expect to resolve through the RFC process before this gets merged?
- What parts of the design do you expect to resolve through the implementation of this feature before stabilization?
- What related issues do you consider out of scope for this RFC that could be addressed in the future independently of the solution that comes out of this RFC?

Future possibilities

Think about what the natural extension and evolution of your proposal would be and how it would affect the project as a whole in a holistic way. Try to use this section as a tool to more fully consider all possible interactions with the project in your proposal. Also consider how this all fits into the roadmap for the project.

This is also a good place to "dump ideas", if they are out of scope for the RFC you are writing but otherwise related.

If you have tried and cannot think of any future possibilities, you may simply state that you cannot think of anything.

Note that having something written down in the future-possibilities section is not a reason to accept the current or a future RFC; such notes should be in the section on motivation or rationale in this or subsequent RFCs. The section merely provides additional information.

Implementation History

Major milestones in the lifecycle of a RFC should be tracked here. Major milestones might include:

- The status of the RFC has been changed or another major change to the RFC has been accepted.
- The first Racklet version including an initial version of the RFC is released.
- The Racklet version where the RFC graduated to general availability is released.
- The RFC version number has been updated
- The RFC has been retired or superseded.

Found a bug? Edit this file on GitHub.