

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Obsoletes: RFC [3160](#) (if approved)  
Expires: November 2, 2006

P. Hoffman  
VPN Consortium  
S. Harris  
Merit Network  
May 2006

**The Tao of IETF - A Novice's Guide to the Internet Engineering Task  
Force  
draft-hoffman-taobis-08.txt**

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on November 2, 2006.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2006).

Abstract

This document describes the inner workings of IETF meetings and Working Groups, discusses organizations related to the IETF, and introduces the standards process. It is not a formal IETF process document but instead an informational overview.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">Acknowledgements . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">What Is the IETF? . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	<a href="#">Humble Beginnings . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	<a href="#">The Hierarchy . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">3.2.1.</a>	<a href="#">ISOC (Internet Society) . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">3.2.2.</a>	<a href="#">IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group) . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">3.2.3.</a>	<a href="#">IAB (Internet Architecture Board) . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">3.2.4.</a>	<a href="#">IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">3.2.5.</a>	<a href="#">RFC Editor . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">3.2.6.</a>	<a href="#">IETF Secretariat . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	<a href="#">IETF Mailing Lists . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">IETF Meetings . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	<a href="#">Registration . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	<a href="#">Take the Plunge and Stay All Week! . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	<a href="#">Newcomer Training . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">4.4.</a>	<a href="#">Dress Code . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">4.5.</a>	<a href="#">Seeing Spots Before Your Eyes . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">4.6.</a>	<a href="#">Terminal Room . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">4.7.</a>	<a href="#">Meals and Other Delights . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">4.8.</a>	<a href="#">Social Event . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">4.9.</a>	<a href="#">Agenda . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">4.10.</a>	<a href="#">EDU to the Rescue . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">4.11.</a>	<a href="#">Where Do I Fit In? . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">4.11.1.</a>	<a href="#">IS Managers . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">4.11.2.</a>	<a href="#">Network Operators and ISPs . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">21</a>
<a href="#">4.11.3.</a>	<a href="#">Networking Hardware and Software Vendors . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">21</a>
<a href="#">4.11.4.</a>	<a href="#">Academics . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">4.11.5.</a>	<a href="#">Computer Trade Press . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">4.12.</a>	<a href="#">Proceedings . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">4.13.</a>	<a href="#">Other General Things . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">Working Groups . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	<a href="#">Working Group Chairs . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	<a href="#">Getting Things Done in a Working Group . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">25</a>
<a href="#">5.3.</a>	<a href="#">Preparing for Working Group Meetings . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">26</a>
<a href="#">5.4.</a>	<a href="#">Working Group Mailing Lists . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">27</a>
<a href="#">5.5.</a>	<a href="#">Interim Working Group Meetings . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">28</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">BOFs . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">30</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">New to the IETF and Coming to a Meeting? STOP HERE!</a>	
	<a href="#">(Temporarily) . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">31</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	<a href="#">RFCs and Internet Drafts . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">32</a>
<a href="#">8.1.</a>	<a href="#">Getting an RFC Published . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">32</a>
<a href="#">8.2.</a>	<a href="#">Letting Go Gracefully . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">33</a>
<a href="#">8.3.</a>	<a href="#">Internet Drafts . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">34</a>
<a href="#">8.3.1.</a>	<a href="#">Recommended Reading for Writers . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">35</a>
<a href="#">8.3.2.</a>	<a href="#">Filenames and Other Matters . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">36</a>



<a href="#">8.4.</a>	Standards-Track RFCs . . . . .	<a href="#">37</a>
8.4.1.	Telling It Like It Is -- Using MUST and SHOULD and MAY . . . . .	<a href="#">38</a>
<a href="#">8.4.2.</a>	Normative References in Standards . . . . .	<a href="#">39</a>
<a href="#">8.4.3.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">40</a>
<a href="#">8.4.4.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">40</a>
<a href="#">8.4.5.</a>	Patents in IETF Standards . . . . .	<a href="#">40</a>
<a href="#">8.5.</a>	Informational and Experimental RFCs . . . . .	<a href="#">41</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	How to Contribute to the IETF . . . . .	<a href="#">43</a>
<a href="#">9.1.</a>	What You Can Do . . . . .	<a href="#">43</a>
<a href="#">9.2.</a>	What Your Company Can Do . . . . .	<a href="#">43</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	IETF and the Outside World . . . . .	<a href="#">45</a>
<a href="#">10.1.</a>	IETF and Other Standards Groups . . . . .	<a href="#">45</a>
<a href="#">10.2.</a>	Press Coverage of the IETF . . . . .	<a href="#">45</a>
<a href="#">11.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">48</a>
<a href="#">12.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">49</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	Other References . . . . .	<a href="#">51</a>
<a href="#">A.1.</a>	Why "The Tao"? . . . . .	<a href="#">51</a>
<a href="#">A.2.</a>	Useful Email Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">51</a>
<a href="#">A.3.</a>	Useful Documents and Files . . . . .	<a href="#">52</a>
<a href="#">A.4.</a>	Acronyms and Abbreviations Used in the Tao . . . . .	<a href="#">52</a>
<a href="#">Appendix B.</a>	IETF Guiding Principles . . . . .	<a href="#">54</a>
<a href="#">B.1.</a>	General . . . . .	<a href="#">54</a>
<a href="#">B.2.</a>	Management and Leadership . . . . .	<a href="#">54</a>
<a href="#">B.3.</a>	Process . . . . .	<a href="#">55</a>
<a href="#">B.4.</a>	Working Groups . . . . .	<a href="#">55</a>
<a href="#">B.5.</a>	Documents . . . . .	<a href="#">56</a>
<a href="#">Appendix C.</a>	Changes since <a href="#">RFC 3160</a> . . . . .	<a href="#">57</a>
<a href="#">C.1.</a>	Changes in -00 . . . . .	<a href="#">57</a>
<a href="#">C.2.</a>	Changes in -01 . . . . .	<a href="#">58</a>
<a href="#">C.3.</a>	Changes in -02 . . . . .	<a href="#">59</a>
<a href="#">C.4.</a>	Changes in -03 . . . . .	<a href="#">59</a>
<a href="#">C.5.</a>	Changes in -04 . . . . .	<a href="#">59</a>
<a href="#">C.6.</a>	Changes in -05 . . . . .	<a href="#">61</a>
<a href="#">C.7.</a>	Changes in -06 . . . . .	<a href="#">62</a>
<a href="#">C.8.</a>	Changes in -07 . . . . .	<a href="#">62</a>
<a href="#">C.9.</a>	Changes in -08 . . . . .	<a href="#">63</a>
Authors' Addresses	. . . . .	<a href="#">65</a>
Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements	. . . . .	<a href="#">66</a>



## **1. Introduction**

Since its early years, attendance at Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) face-to-face meetings has grown phenomenally. Many of the attendees are new to the IETF at each meeting, and many of those go on to become regular attendees. When the meetings were smaller, it was relatively easy for a newcomer to get into the swing of things. Today, however, a newcomer meets many more new people, some previously known only as the authors of documents or thought-provoking email messages.

This document describes many aspects of the IETF, with the goal of explaining to newcomers how the IETF works. This will give them a warm, fuzzy feeling and enable them to make the meeting and the Working Group discussions more productive for everyone.

Of course, it's true that many IETF participants don't go to the face-to-face meetings at all. Instead, they're active on the mailing list of various IETF Working Groups. Since the inner workings of Working Groups can be hard for newcomers to understand, this document provides the mundane bits of information that newcomers will need in order to become active participants.

The IETF is always in a state of change. While the principles in this document are expected to remain largely the same over time, practical details may well have changed by the time you read it; for example, a web-based tool may have replaced an email address for requesting some sort of action.

Many types of IETF documentation are mentioned in the Tao, from BCPs to RFCs and FYIs and STDs. BCPs make recommendations for Best Current Practices in the Internet; RFCs are the IETF's main technical documentation series, politely known as "Requests for Comments"; FYIs provide topical and technical overviews that are introductory or appeal to a broad audience; and STDs are RFCs identified as "standards". See [Section 8](#) for more information.

The acronyms and abbreviations used in this document are usually expanded in place, and are explained fully in [Appendix A](#).

This document is intended to obsolete FYI 17, [RFC 3160](#). See [Section 3.2.5](#) for information on what it means for one RFC to obsolete another.



## **2. Acknowledgements**

The original version of this document, published in 1994, was written by Gary Malkin. His knowledge of the IETF, insights, and unmatched writing style set the standard for this later revision, and his contributions to the current draft are also much appreciated. Paul Hoffman wrote significant portions of this revision and provided encouragement, expertise, and much-needed guidance. Other contributors include Brian Carpenter, Scott Bradner, Michael Patton, Donald E. Eastlake III, Tony Hansen, Pekka Savola, Lisa Dusseault, the IETF Secretariat, members of the User Services Working Group, and members of the PESCI design team.





### **3. What Is the IETF?**

The Internet Engineering Task Force is a loosely self-organized group of people who contribute to the engineering and evolution of Internet technologies. It is the principal body engaged in the development of new Internet standard specifications. The IETF is unusual in that it exists as a collection of happenings, but is not a corporation and has no board of directors, no members, and no dues; see [\[BCP95\]](#), "A Mission Statement for the IETF", for more detail.

Its mission includes:

- o Identifying, and proposing solutions to, pressing operational and technical problems in the Internet;
- o Specifying the development or usage of protocols and the near-term architecture to solve such technical problems for the Internet;
- o Making recommendations to the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) regarding the standardization of protocols and protocol usage in the Internet;
- o Facilitating technology transfer from the Internet Research Task Force (IRTF) to the wider Internet community;
- o Providing a forum for the exchange of information within the Internet community between vendors, users, researchers, agency contractors, and network managers.

The IETF meeting is not a conference, although there are technical presentations. The IETF is not a traditional standards organization, although many specifications are produced that become standards. The IETF is made up of volunteers, many of whom meet three times a year to fulfill the IETF mission.

There is no membership in the IETF. Anyone may register for and attend any meeting. The closest thing there is to being an IETF member is being on the IETF or Working Group mailing lists (see [Section 3.3](#)). This is where the best information about current IETF activities and focus can be found.

Of course, no organization can be as successful as the IETF is without having some sort of structure. In the IETF's case, that structure is provided by other organizations, as described in [\[BCP11\]](#), "The Organizations Involved in the IETF Standards Process." If you participate in the IETF and only read one BCP, this is the one you should read.



In many ways, the IETF runs on the beliefs of its members. One of the "founding beliefs" is embodied in an early quote about the IETF from David Clark: "We reject kings, presidents and voting. We believe in rough consensus and running code." Another early quote that has become a commonly-held belief in the IETF comes from Jon Postel: "Be conservative in what you send and liberal in what you accept."

The IETF is really about its members. Because of the unrestrictive membership policies, IETF members come from all over the world and from many different parts of the Internet industry. See [Section 4.11](#) for information about the ways that many people fit into the IETF.

One more thing that is important for newcomers: the IETF in no way "runs the Internet", despite what some people mistakenly might say. The IETF makes standards that are often adopted by Internet users, but it does not control, or even patrol, the Internet. If your interest in the IETF is because you want to be part of the overseers, you may be badly disappointed by the IETF.

### **3.1. Humble Beginnings**

The first IETF meeting was held in January, 1986, at Linkabit in San Diego, with 21 attendees. The 4th IETF, held at SRI in Menlo Park in October, 1986, was the first that non-government vendors attended. The concept of Working Groups was introduced at the 5th IETF meeting at the NASA Ames Research Center in California in February, 1987. The 7th IETF, held at MITRE in McLean, Virginia in July, 1987, was the first meeting with over 100 attendees.

The 14th IETF meeting was held at Stanford University in July 1989. It marked a major change in the structure of the IETF universe. The IAB (then Internet Activities Board, now Internet Architecture Board), which until that time oversaw many "task forces," changed its structure to leave only two: the IETF and the IRTF. The IRTF is tasked to consider long-term research problems in the Internet. The IETF also changed at that time.

After the Internet Society (ISOC) was formed in January, 1992, the IAB proposed to ISOC that the IAB's activities should take place under the auspices of the Internet Society. During INET92 in Kobe, Japan, the ISOC Trustees approved a new charter for the IAB to reflect the proposed relationship.

The IETF met in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, in July 1993. This was the first IETF meeting held in Europe, and the US/non-US attendee split was nearly 50/50. About one in three IETF meetings are now held in Europe or Asia, and the number of non-US attendees continues




to be high -- about 50%, even at meetings held in the US.

## **3.2. The Hierarchy**

### **3.2.1. ISOC (Internet Society)**

The Internet Society is an international, non-profit, membership organization that fosters the expansion of the Internet. One of the ways that ISOC does this is through financial and legal support of the other "I" groups described here, particularly the IETF. ISOC provides insurance coverage for many of the people in the IETF process, and acts as a public relations channel for the times that one of the "I" groups wants to say something to the press. The ISOC is one of the major unsung (and under-supported) heroes of the Internet.

Starting in spring 2005, the ISOC also became home base for the IETF's directly employed administrative staff. This is described in more detail in [[BCP101](#)], "Structure of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)". The staff initially includes only an Administrative Director (IAD) who works full-time overseeing IETF meeting planning, operational aspects of support services (the secretariat, IANA (the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority), and the RFC Editor, which are described later in this section), and the budget. He or she (currently it's a he) leads the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA), which takes care of tasks such as collecting meeting fees and paying invoices, and also supports the tools for the work of IETF working groups, the IESG, the IAB, and the IRTF (more about these later in this section.) As well as staff, the IASA comprises volunteers and ex officio members from the ISOC and IETF leadership. The IASA and the IAD are directed by the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC), which is selected by the IETF community. Here's how all this looks:



Neither the IAD or the IAOC have any influence over IETF standards development, which we turn to now.



### **3.2.2. IESG (Internet Engineering Steering Group)**

The IESG is responsible for technical management of IETF activities and the Internet standards process. It administers the process according to the rules and procedures that have been ratified by the ISOC Trustees. However, the IESG doesn't do much direct leadership, such as the kind you will find in many other standards organizations. As its name suggests, its role is to set directions rather than to give orders. The IESG ratifies or corrects the output from the IETF's Working Groups, gets WGs started and finished, and makes sure that non-WG drafts that are about to become RFCs are correct.

The IESG consists of the Area Directors ("ADs"), who are selected by the Nominations Committee (which is usually called "the Nomcom") and are appointed for two years. The process for choosing the members of the IESG is detailed in [[BCP10](#)], "IAB and IESG Selection, Confirmation, and Recall Process: Operation of the Nominating and Recall Committees."

The current areas and abbreviations are shown below.

Area	Description
-----	-----
Applications (APP)	Protocols seen by user programs, such as email and the web
General (GEN)	Catch-all for WGs that don't fit in other areas (which is very few)
Internet (INT)	Different ways of moving IP packets and DNS information
Operations and Management (OPS)	Operational aspects, network monitoring, and configuration
Real-time Applications and Infrastructure (RAI)	Delay-sensitive interpersonal communications
Routing (RTG)	Getting packets to their destinations
Security (SEC)	Authentication and privacy
Transport (TSV)	Special services for special packets

Because the IESG has a great deal of influence on whether Internet Drafts become RFCs, many people look at the ADs as somewhat godlike creatures. IETF participants sometimes reverently ask an Area





Director for their opinion on a particular subject. However, most ADs are nearly indistinguishable from mere mortals and rarely speak from mountaintops. In fact, when asked for specific technical comments, the ADs may often defer to members at large whom they feel have more knowledge than they do in that area.

The ADs for a particular area are expected to know more about the combined work of the WGs in that area than anyone else. On the other hand, the entire IESG reviews each Internet Draft that is proposed to become an RFC. Any AD may record a "DISCUSS" ballot position against a draft if he or she has serious concerns. If these concerns cannot be resolved by discussion, an override procedure is defined such that at least two IESG members must express concerns before a draft can be blocked from moving forward. These procedures help ensure that an AD's "pet project" doesn't make it onto the standards track if it will have a negative effect on the rest of the IETF protocols, and that an AD's "pet peeve" cannot indefinitely block something.

This is not to say that the IESG never wields power. When the IESG sees a Working Group veering from its charter, or when a WG asks the IESG to make the WG's badly designed protocol a standard, the IESG will act. In fact, because of its high workload, the IESG usually moves in a reactive fashion. It eventually approves most WG requests for Internet Drafts to become RFCs, and usually only steps in when something has gone very wrong. Another way to think about this is that the ADs are selected to think, not to just run the process. The quality of the IETF standards comes both from the review they get in the Working Groups, and the scrutiny that the WG review gets from the ADs.

The IETF is run by rough consensus, and it is the IESG that judges if a WG has come up with a result that has community consensus. (See [Section 5.2](#) for more information on WG consensus.) Because of this, one of the main reasons that the IESG might block something that was produced in a WG is that the result did not really gain consensus in the IETF as a whole, that is, among all of the Working Groups in all areas. For instance, the result of one WG might clash with a technology developed in a different Working Group. An important job of the IESG is to watch over the output of all the WGs to help prevent IETF protocols that are at odds with each other. This is why ADs are supposed to review the drafts coming out of areas other than their own.

### **[3.2.3.](#) IAB (Internet Architecture Board)**

The IAB is responsible for keeping an eye on the "big picture" of the Internet, and focuses on long-range planning and coordination among the various areas of IETF activity. The IAB stays informed about



important long-term issues in the Internet, and brings these topics to the attention of people they think should know about them. Their web site is at <http://www.iab.org/>.

IAB members pay special attention to emerging activities in the IETF. When a new IETF working group is proposed, the IAB reviews its charter for architectural consistency and integrity. Even before the group is chartered, the IAB members are more than willing to discuss new ideas with the people proposing them.

The IAB also sponsors and organizes the Internet Research Task Force, and convenes invitational workshops that provide in-depth reviews of specific Internet architectural issues. Typically, the workshop reports make recommendations to the IETF community and to the IESG.

The IAB also:

- o Approves Nomcom's IESG nominations
- o Acts as the appeals board for appeals against IESG actions
- o Appoints and oversees the RFC Editor
- o Approves the appointment of the IANA
- o Acts as an advisory body to ISOC
- o Oversees IETF liaisons with other standards bodies

Like the IESG, the IAB members are selected for multi-year positions by the Nomcom, and are approved by the ISOC Board of Trustees.

#### **3.2.4. IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority)**

The core registrar for the IETF's activities is the IANA. Many Internet protocols require that someone keep track of protocol items that were added after the protocol came out. Typical examples of the kinds of registries needed are for TCP port numbers and MIME types. The IAB has designated the IANA organization to perform these tasks, and the IANA's activities are financially supported by ICANN, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers.

Ten years ago, no one would have expected to ever see the IANA mentioned on the front page of a newspaper. IANA's role had always been very low key. The fact that IANA was also the keeper of the root of the domain name system forced it to become a much more public entity, one which was badly maligned by a variety of people who never looked at what its role was. Nowadays the IETF is generally no



longer involved in the IANA's domain name and IP address assignment functions, which are overseen by ICANN.

Even though being a registrar may not sound interesting, many IETF participants will testify to how important IANA has been for the Internet. Having a stable, long-term repository run by careful and conservative operators makes it much easier for people to experiment without worrying about messing things up. IANA's founder, Jon Postel, was heavily relied upon to keep things in order while the Internet kept growing by leaps and bounds, and he did a fine job of it until his untimely death in 1998.

#### **3.2.5. RFC Editor**

The RFC Editor edits, formats, and publishes Internet Drafts as RFCs, working in conjunction with the IESG. An important secondary role is to provide one definitive repository for all RFCs (see <http://www.rfc-editor.org>). Once an RFC is published, it is never revised. If the standard it describes changes, the standard will be re-published in another RFC that "obsoletes" the first.

One of the most popular misconceptions in the IETF community is that the role of the RFC Editor is performed by IANA. In fact, the RFC Editor is a separate job, although both the RFC Editor and IANA involved the same people for many years. The IAB approves the organization that will act as RFC Editor and the RFC Editor's general policy. The RFC Editor is funded by IASA and can be contacted by email at <mailto:rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org>.

#### **3.2.6. IETF Secretariat**

There are, in fact, a few people who are paid to maintain the IETF. The IETF Secretariat provides day-to-day logistical support, which mainly means coordinating face-to-face meetings and running the IETF-specific mailing lists (not the WG mailing lists). The Secretariat is also responsible for keeping the official Internet Drafts directory up to date and orderly, maintaining the IETF Web site, and for helping the IESG do its work. It provides various tools for use by the community and the IESG. The IETF Secretariat is under contract to IASA, which in turn is financially supported by the fees of the face-to-face meetings.

#### **3.3. IETF Mailing Lists**

Anyone who plans to attend an IETF meeting should join the IETF announcement mailing list, <mailto:ietf-announce@ietf.org>. This is where all of the meeting information, RFC announcements, and IESG Protocol Actions and Last Calls are posted. People who would like to



"get technical" may also join the IETF general discussion list, [ietf@ietf.org](mailto:ietf@ietf.org). This is where discussions of cosmic significance are held (Working Groups have their own mailing lists for discussions related to their work). Another mailing list, [<mailto:i-d-announce@ietf.org>](mailto:i-d-announce@ietf.org), announces each new version of every Internet Draft as it is published.

Subscriptions to these and other IETF-run mailing lists are handled by a program called "mailman". Mailman can be somewhat finicky about the format of subscription messages, and sometimes interacts poorly with email programs that make all email messages into HTML files. Mailman will treat you well, however, if you format your messages just the way it likes.

To join the IETF announcement list, for example, send email to [<mailto:ietf-announce-request@ietf.org>](mailto:ietf-announce-request@ietf.org). Enter the word 'subscribe' (without the quotes) in the Subject line of the message and in the message body. To join the IETF discussion list, send email to [<mailto:ietf-request@ietf.org>](mailto:ietf-request@ietf.org) and enter the word 'subscribe' as explained above. If you decide to withdraw from either list, use the word 'unsubscribe.' Your messages to mailman should have nothing other than the commands 'subscribe' or 'unsubscribe' in them. Both lists are archived on the IETF web site <http://www.ietf.org/maillist.html>.

Do not, ever, under any circumstances, for any reason, send a request to join a list to the list itself! The thousands of people on the list don't need, or want, to know when a new person joins. Similarly, when changing email addresses or leaving a list, send your request only to the "-request" address, not to the main list. This means you!!

The IETF discussion list is unmoderated. This means that anyone can express their opinions about issues affecting the Internet. However, it is not a place for companies or individuals to solicit or advertise, as noted in [\[BCP45\]](#), "IETF Discussion List Charter". It is a good idea to read the whole RFC (it's short!) before posting to the IETF discussion list. Actually, the list does have two "sergeants at arms" who keep an eye open for inappropriate postings, and there is a process for banning persistent offenders from the list, but fortunately this is extremely rare.

Only the Secretariat and certain IETF office holders can approve messages sent to the announcement list, although those messages can come from a variety of people.

Even though the IETF mailing lists "represent" the IETF membership at large, it is important to note that attending an IETF meeting does





not mean you'll be automatically added to either mailing list.

#### **4. IETF Meetings**

The computer industry is rife with conferences, seminars, expositions, and all manner of other kinds of meetings. IETF face-to-face meetings are nothing like these. The meetings, held three times a year, are week-long "gatherings of the tribes" whose primary goal is to reinvigorate the WGs to get their tasks done, and whose secondary goal is to promote a fair amount of mixing between the WGs and the areas. The cost of the meetings is paid by the people attending and by the corporate host for each meeting (if any), although IASA kicks in additional funds for things like the audio broadcast of some Working Group sessions.

For many people, IETF meetings are a breath of fresh air when compared to the standard computer industry conferences. There is no exposition hall, few tutorials, and no big-name industry pundits. Instead, there is lots of work, as well as a fair amount of time for socializing. IETF meetings are of little interest to sales and marketing folks, but of high interest to engineers and developers.

Most IETF meetings are held in North America, because that's where most of the participants are from; however, meetings are held on other continents about once every year. The past few meetings have had about 1,300 attendees. There have been more than 65 IETF meetings so far, and a list of upcoming meetings is available on the IETF web pages, <http://www.ietf.org/meetings/0mtg-sites.txt>.

Newcomers to IETF face-to-face meetings are often in a bit of shock. They expect them to be like other standards bodies, or like computer conferences. Fortunately, the shock wears off after a day or two, and many new attendees get quite animated about how much fun they are having. One particularly jarring feature of recent IETF meetings is the use of wireless Internet connections throughout the meeting space. It is common to see people in a WG meeting apparently reading email or perusing the web during presentations they find uninteresting. Remember, however, that they may also be consulting the drafts under discussion, looking up relevant material online, or following another meeting using instant messaging.

##### **4.1. Registration**

To attend an IETF meeting you have to register and you have to pay the registration fee. The meeting site and advance registration are announced about two months ahead of the meeting -- earlier if possible. An announcement goes out via email to the IETF-announce mailing list, and information is posted on the IETF web site, <http://www.ietf.org>, that same day.



To pre-register, you must submit your registration on the Web. You may pre-register and pre-pay, pre-register and return to the Web site later to pay with a credit card, pre-register and pay on-site at the meeting, or register and pay on-site. To get a lower registration fee, you must pay by the early registration deadline (about one week before the meeting). The registration fee covers all of the week's meetings, the Sunday evening reception (cash bar), daily continental breakfasts, and afternoon coffee and snack breaks.

Credit card payments on the web are encrypted and secure, or, if you prefer, you can use PGP to send your payment information to the Registrar (<<mailto:ietf-registrar@ietf.org>>).

Registration is open throughout the week of the meeting. However, the Secretariat highly recommends that attendees arrive for early registration, usually beginning at noon on Sunday and continuing throughout the Sunday evening reception. The reception is a popular event where you can get a small bite to eat and socialize with other early arrivals.

Registered attendees (and there aren't any other kind) receive a registration packet. It contains much useful information, including a general orientation sheet, the most recent agenda, and a name tag. Attendees who pre-paid will also find their receipt in their packet. It's worth noting that neither attendee names and addresses or IETF mailing lists are ever offered for sale.

In your registration packet is a sheet titled "Note Well". You should indeed read it carefully because it lays out the rules for IETF intellectual property rights.

If you need to leave messages for other attendees, you can do so at the cork boards that are often near the registration desk. These cork boards will also have last-minute meeting changes and room changes.

You can also turn in lost-and-found items to the registration desk. At the end of the meeting, anything left over from the lost and found will usually be turned over to the hotel or brought back to the Secretariat's office.

Incidentally, the IETF registration desk is often a convenient place to arrange to meet people. If someone says "meet me at registration", they almost always mean the IETF registration desk, not the hotel registration desk.



#### **4.2. Take the Plunge and Stay All Week!**

IETF meetings last from Monday morning through Friday lunchtime. Associated meetings often take place on the preceding or following weekends. It is best to plan to be present the whole week, to benefit from cross-fertilization between working groups and from corridor discussions. As noted below, the agenda is fluid, and there have been many instances of participants missing important sessions due to last-minute scheduling changes after their travel plans were fixed. Being present the whole week is the only way to avoid this annoyance.

If you cannot find meetings all week to interest you, you can still make the most of the IETF meeting by working between sessions. Most IETF attendees carry laptop computers, and it is common to see many of them in the terminal room or in the hallways working during meeting sessions. There is often good wireless Internet coverage in many places of the meeting venue (restaurants, coffee shops, and so on), so catching up on email when not in meetings is a fairly common task for IETFers.

#### **4.3. Newcomer Training**

Newcomers are encouraged to attend the Newcomer Training, which is especially designed for first-time attendees. The orientation is organized and conducted by the IETF EDU team, and is intended to provide useful introductory information. The session covers what's in the attendee packets, what all the dots on name tags mean, the structure of the IETF, and many other essential and enlightening topics for new IETFers.

Immediately following the Newcomers' Orientation is the IETF Standards Process Orientation. This session demystifies much of the standards process by explaining what stages a document has to pass through on its way to becoming a standard, and what has to be done to advance to the next stage.

There is usually ample time at the end for questions. The Secretariat provides hard copies of the slides of the "IETF Structure and Internet Standards Process" presentation -- these very useful slides are also available online at [www.ietf.org](http://www.ietf.org) under "Educational Materials".

The orientation is normally held on Sunday afternoon, along with tutorials of interest to newcomers and old-timers alike. Check the agenda for exact times and locations.





#### **4.4. Dress Code**

Since attendees must wear their name tags, they must also wear shirts or blouses. Pants or skirts are also highly recommended. Seriously though, many newcomers are often embarrassed when they show up Monday morning in suits, to discover that everybody else is wearing t-shirts, jeans (shorts, if weather permits) and sandals. There are those in the IETF who refuse to wear anything other than suits. Fortunately, they are well known (for other reasons) so they are forgiven this particular idiosyncrasy. The general rule is "dress for the weather" (unless you plan to work so hard that you won't go outside, in which case, "dress for comfort" is the rule!).

#### **4.5. Seeing Spots Before Your Eyes**

Some of the people at the IETF will have a little colored dot on their name tag. A few people have more than one. These dots identify people who are silly enough to volunteer to do a lot of extra work. The colors have the meanings shown here.

Color	Meaning
-----	
Blue	Working Group/BOF chair
Green	Host group
Red	IAB member
Yellow	IESG member
Orange	Nominating Committee member

(Members of the press wear orange-tinted badges.)

Local hosts are the people who can answer questions about the terminal room, restaurants, and points of interest in the area.

It is important that newcomers to the IETF not be afraid to strike up conversations with people who wear these dots. If the IAB and IESG members and Working Group and BOF chairs didn't want to talk to anybody, they wouldn't be wearing the dots in the first place.

#### **4.6. Terminal Room**

One of the most important (depending on your point of view) things the host does is provide Internet access for the meeting attendees. In general, wired and wireless connectivity is excellent. This is entirely due to the Olympian efforts of the local hosts, and their ability to beg, borrow and steal. The people and companies who donate their equipment, services and time are to be heartily congratulated and thanked.



While preparation far in advance of the meeting is encouraged, there may be some unavoidable "last minute" things that can be accomplished in the terminal room. It may also be useful to people who need to make trip reports or status reports while things are still fresh in their minds.

You need to be wearing your badge in order to get into the terminal room. The terminal room provides lots of power strips, lots of Ethernet ports for laptops, wireless (for the people who don't need Ethernet but want power), usually a printer for public use, and sometimes workstations. What it doesn't provide are terminals; the name is historical. The helpdesk in the terminal room is a good place to ask questions about network failures, although they might point you off to different networking staff.

#### **4.7. Meals and Other Delights**

Marshall Rose once remarked that the IETF was a place to go for "many fine lunches and dinners." While it is true that some people eat very well at the IETF, they find the food on their own; lunches and dinners are not included in the registration fee. The Secretariat does provide appetizers at the Sunday evening reception (not meant to be a replacement for dinner), continental breakfast every morning, and (best of all) cookies, brownies and other yummys during afternoon breaks.

If you prefer to get out of the hotel for meals, the local host usually provides a list of places to eat within easy reach of the meeting site.

#### **4.8. Social Event**

Another of the most important things organized and managed by the host is the IETF social event. Sometimes, the social event is a computer or high-tech related event. At one Boston IETF, for example, the social was dinner at the Computer Museum. Other times, the social might be a dinner cruise or a trip to an art gallery. Note, however, that not all IETF meetings have social events.

Newcomers to the IETF are encouraged to attend the social event. Everyone is encouraged to wear their name tags and leave their laptops behind. The social event is designed to give people a chance to meet on a social, rather than technical, level.

#### **4.9. Agenda**

The agenda for the IETF meetings is a very fluid thing. It is typically sent to the IETF announcement list a few times prior to the



meeting, and is also available on the web. The final agenda is included in the registration packets. Of course, "final" in the IETF doesn't mean the same thing as it does elsewhere in the world. The final agenda is simply the version that went to the printer. The Secretariat will post agenda changes on the bulletin board near the IETF registration desk (not the hotel registration desk). These late changes are not capricious: they are made "just in time" as session chairs and speakers become aware of unanticipated clashes. The IETF is too dynamic for agendas to be tied down weeks in advance.

Assignments for breakout rooms (where the Working Groups and BOFs meet) and a map showing the room locations are also shown on the agenda. Room assignments can change as the agenda changes. Some Working Groups meet multiple times during a meeting and every attempt is made to have a Working Group meet in the same room for each session.

#### **4.10. EDU to the Rescue**

If certain aspects of the IETF still mystify you (even after you finish reading the Tao), you'll want to drop in on the on-site training offered by the Education (EDU) Team. These informal classes are designed for newcomers and seasoned IETFers alike. In addition to the Newcomer Training, the EDU team offers workshops for document editors and Working Group chairs, plus an in-depth security tutorial that's indispensable for both novices and longtime IETF attendees. EDU sessions are generally held on Sunday afternoons. You'll find more about the EDU team at <http://edu.ietf.org/>.

#### **4.11. Where Do I Fit In?**

The IETF is different things to different people. There are many people who have been very active in the IETF who have never attended an IETF meeting. You should not feel obligated to come to an IETF meeting just to get a feel for the IETF. The following guidelines (based on stereotypes of people in various industries) might help you decide whether you actually want to come and, if so, what might be the best use of your time at your first meeting.

##### **4.11.1. IS Managers**

As discussed throughout this document, an IETF meeting is nothing like any trade show you have attended. IETF meetings are singularly bad places to go if your intention is to find out what will be hot in the Internet industry next year. You can safely assume that going to Working Group meetings will confuse you more than it will help you understand what is happening, or will be happening, in the industry.



This is not to say that no one from industry should go to IETF meetings. As an IS manager, you might want to consider sending specific people who are responsible for technologies that are under development in the IETF. As these people read the current Internet Drafts and the traffic on the relevant Working Group lists, they will get a sense of whether or not their presence would be worthwhile for your company or for the Working Groups.

#### **4.11.2. Network Operators and ISPs**

Running a network is hard enough without having to grapple with new protocols or new versions of the protocols with which you are already dealing. If you work for the type of network that is always using the very latest hardware and software, and you are following the relevant Working Groups in your copious free time, you could certainly find participating in the IETF valuable. A fair amount of IETF work also covers many other parts of operations of ISPs and large enterprises, and the input of operators is quite valuable to keep this work vibrant and relevant. Many of the best operations documents from the IETF come from real-world operators, not vendors and academics.

#### **4.11.3. Networking Hardware and Software Vendors**

The image of the IETF being mostly ivory tower academics may have been true in the past, but the jobs of typical attendees are now in industry. In most areas of the IETF, employees of vendors are the ones writing the protocols and leading the Working Groups, so it's completely appropriate for vendors to attend. If you create Internet hardware or software, and no one from your company has ever attended an IETF meeting, it behooves you to come to a meeting if for no other reason than to tell the others how relevant the meeting was or was not to your business.

This is not to say that companies should close up shop during IETF meeting weeks so everyone can go to the meeting. Marketing folks, even technical marketing folks, are usually safe in staying away from the IETF as long as some of the technical people from the company are at the meeting. Similarly, it isn't required, or likely useful, for everyone from a technical department to go, particularly if they are not all reading the Internet Drafts and following the Working Group mailing lists. Many companies have just a few designated meeting attendees who are chosen for their ability to do complete and useful trip reports. Additionally, many companies have internal coordination efforts and a standards strategy. If a company depends on the Internet for some or all of its business, the strategy should probably cover the IETF.





#### **4.11.4. Academics**

IETF meetings are often excellent places for computer science folk to find out what is happening in the way of soon-to-be-deployed protocols. Professors and grad students (and sometimes overachieving undergrads) who are doing research in networking or communications can get a wealth of information by following Working Groups in their specific fields of interest. Wandering into different Working Group meetings can have the same effect as going to symposia and seminars in your department. Researchers are also, of course, likely to be interested in IETF activities.

#### **4.11.5. Computer Trade Press**

If you're a member of the press and are considering attending IETF, we've prepared a special section of the Tao just for you -- please see [Section 10.2](#).

#### **4.12. Proceedings**

IETF proceedings are compiled in the two months following each meeting, and are available on the web and on CD. Be sure to look through a copy -- the proceedings are filled with information about IETF that you're not likely to find anywhere else. For example, you'll find snapshots of most WG charters at the time of the meeting, giving you a better understanding of the evolution of any given effort.

The proceedings sometimes start with an informative (and highly entertaining) message. Each volume contains the final (hindsight) agenda, an IETF overview, area and Working Group reports, and slides from the protocol and technical presentations. The Working Group reports and presentations are sometimes incomplete, if the materials haven't been turned in to the Secretariat in time for publication.

An attendee list is also included, and contains names and affiliations as provided on the registration form. For information about obtaining copies of the proceedings, see the Web listing at <http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/directory.html>.

#### **4.13. Other General Things**

The IETF Secretariat, and IETFers in general, are very approachable. Never be afraid to approach someone and introduce yourself. Also, don't be afraid to ask questions, especially when it comes to jargon and acronyms!

Hallway conversations are very important. A lot of very good work



gets done by people who talk together between meetings and over lunches and dinners. Every minute of the IETF can be considered work time (much to some people's dismay).

A "bar BOF" is an unofficial get-together, usually in the late evening, during which a lot of work gets done over drinks. Bar BOFs spring up in many different places around an IETF meeting, such as restaurants, coffee shops, and (if we are so lucky) pools.

It's unwise to get between a hungry IETFer (and there isn't any other kind) and coffee break brownies and cookies, no matter how interesting a hallway conversation is.

IETFers are fiercely independent. It's safe to question opinions and offer alternatives, but don't expect an IETFer to follow orders.

The IETF, and the plenary session in particular, are not places for vendors to try to sell their wares. People can certainly answer questions about their company and its products, but bear in mind that the IETF is not a trade show. This does not preclude people from recouping costs for IETF-related t-shirts, buttons and pocket protectors.

There is always a "materials distribution table" near the registration desk. This desk is used to make appropriate information available to the attendees (e.g., copies of something discussed in a Working Group session, descriptions of online IETF-related information, etc.). Please check with the Secretariat before placing materials on the desk; the Secretariat has the right to remove material that they feel is not appropriate.

If you rely on your laptop during the meeting, it is a good idea to bring an extra battery. It is not always easy to find a spare outlet in some meeting rooms, and using the wireless access can draw down your battery faster than you might expect. If you are sitting near a power-strip in a meeting room, expect to be asked to plug and unplug for others around you. Many people bring an extension cord with spare outlets, which is a good way to make friends with your neighbor in a meeting. If you need an outlet adapter, you should try to buy it in advance because the one you need is usually easier to find in your home country.



## **5. Working Groups**

The vast majority of the IETF's work is done in many "Working Groups;" at the time of this writing, there are about 115 different WGs. (The term "Working Group" is often seen capitalized, but probably not for a very good reason.) [[BCP25](#)], "IETF Working Group Guidelines and Procedures," is an excellent resource for anyone participating in WG discussions.

A WG is really just a mailing list with a bit of adult supervision. You "join" the WG by subscribing to the mailing list; all mailing lists are open to anyone. Anyone can post to a WG mailing list, although most lists require non-subscribers to have their postings moderated. Each Working Group has one or two chairs.

More importantly, each WG has a charter that the WG is supposed to follow. The charter states the scope of discussion for the Working Group, as well as its goals. The WG's mailing list and face-to-face meetings are supposed to focus on just what is in the charter, and not to wander off on other "interesting" topics. Of course, looking a bit outside the scope of the WG is occasionally useful, but the large majority of the discussion should be on the topics listed in the charter. In fact, some WG charters actually specify what the WG will not do, particularly if there were some attractive but nebulous topics brought up during the drafting of the charter. The list of all WG charters makes interesting reading for folks who want to know what the different Working Groups are supposed to be doing.

### **5.1. Working Group Chairs**

The role of the WG chairs is described in both [[BCP11](#)] and [[BCP25](#)]. The IETF EDU team also offers special training for WG chairs on Sunday afternoons preceding IETF.

As volunteer cat-herders, a chair's first job is to determine the WG consensus goals and milestones, keeping the charter up to date. Next, often with the help of WG secretaries or document editors, the chair must manage WG discussion, both on the list and by scheduling meetings when appropriate. Sometimes discussions get stuck on contentious points and the chair may need to steer people towards productive interaction and then declare when rough consensus has been met and the discussion is over. Sometimes chairs also manage interactions with non-WG participants or the IESG, especially when a WG document approaches publication. Chairs have responsibility for the technical and non-technical quality of WG output. As you can imagine given the mix of secretarial, interpersonal and technical demands, some Working Group chairs are much better at their jobs than others.



When a WG has fulfilled its charter, it is supposed to cease operations. (Most WG mailing lists continue on after a WG is closed, still discussing the same topics as the Working Group did.) In the IETF, it is a mark of success that the WG closes up because it fulfilled its charter. This is one of the aspects of the IETF that newcomers who have experience with other standards bodies have a hard time understanding. However, some WG chairs never manage to get their WG to finish, or keep adding new tasks to the charter so that the Working Group drags on for many years. The output of these aging WGs is often not nearly as useful as the earlier products, and the messy results are sometimes called "degenerative Working Group syndrome."

There is an official distinction between WG drafts and independent drafts, but in practice, sometimes there is not much procedural difference. For example, many WG mailing lists also discuss independent drafts (at the discretion of the WG chair). Procedures for Internet Drafts are covered in much more detail later in this document.

WG chairs are strongly advised to go to the WG leadership training that usually happens on the Sunday preceding the IETF meeting. There is also usually a WG chairs lunch mid-week during the meeting where chair-specific topics are presented and discussed. If you're interested in what they hear there, take a look at the slides at <http://edu.ietf.org/>.

## **5.2. Getting Things Done in a Working Group**

One fact that confuses many novices is that the face-to-face WG meetings are much less important in the IETF than they are in most other organizations. Any decision made at a face-to-face meeting must also gain consensus on the WG mailing list. There are numerous examples of important decisions made in WG meetings that are later overturned on the mailing list, often because someone who couldn't attend the meeting pointed out a serious flaw in the logic used to come to the decision. Finally, WG meetings aren't "drafting sessions", as they are in some other standards bodies: in the IETF, drafting is done elsewhere.

Another aspect of Working Groups that confounds many people is the fact that there is no formal voting. The general rule on disputed topics is that the Working Group has to come to "rough consensus," meaning that a very large majority of those who care must agree. The exact method of determining rough consensus varies from Working Group to Working Group. Sometimes consensus is determined by "humming" -- if you agree with a proposal, you hum when prompted by the chair; if you disagree, you keep your silence. Newcomers find it quite





peculiar, but it works. It is up to the chair to decide when the Working Group has reached rough consensus.

The lack of formal voting has caused some very long delays for some proposals, but most IETF participants who have witnessed rough consensus after acrimonious debates feel that the delays often result in better protocols. (And, if you think about it, how could you have "voting" in a group that anyone can join, and when it's impossible to count the participants?) Rough consensus has been defined in many ways; a simple version is that it means that strongly held objections must be debated until most people are satisfied that these objections are wrong.

Some Working Groups have complex documents or a complex set of documents (or even both!). Shaking all the bugs out of one or more complex documents is a daunting task. In order to help relieve this problem, some working groups use "issue trackers", which are online lists of the open issues with the documents, the status of the issue, proposed fixes, and so on. Using an issue tracker not only helps the WG not to forget to do something important, it helps when someone asks a question later about why something was done in a particular fashion.

Another method that some Working Groups adopt is to have a Working Group "secretary" to handle the juggling of the documents and the changes. The secretary can run the issue tracker if there is one, or can simply be in charge of watching that all of the decisions that are made on the mailing list are reflected in newer versions of the documents.

One thing you might find helpful, and possibly even entertaining, during Working Group sessions is to follow the running commentary on the Jabber room associated with that Working Group. The running commentary is often used as the basis for the minutes of the meeting, but it can also include jokes, sighs, and other extraneous chatter. Jabber is a free, streaming XML technology mainly used for instant messaging. You can find pointers to Jabber clients for many platforms at <http://www.jabber.org>. The Jabber chatrooms have the name of the Working Group followed by "@jabber.ietf.org". Those rooms are, in fact, available year-round, not just during IETF meetings, and some are used by active Working Group participants during protocol development.

### **5.3. Preparing for Working Group Meetings**

The most important thing that everyone (newcomers and seasoned experts) should do before coming to a face-to-face meeting is to read the Internet Drafts and RFCs ahead of time. WG meetings are



explicitly not for education: they are for developing the group's documents. Even if you do not plan to say anything in the meeting, you should read the group's documents before attending so you can understand what is being said.

It's up to the WG chair to set the meeting agenda, usually a few weeks in advance. If you want something discussed at the meeting, be sure to let the chair know about it. The agendas for all the WG meetings are available in advance (see [http://www.ietf.org/meetings/wg\\_agenda\\_xx.html](http://www.ietf.org/meetings/wg_agenda_xx.html), where 'xx' is the meeting number), but many WG chairs are lax (if not totally negligent) about turning them in.

The Secretariat only schedules WG meetings a few weeks in advance, and the schedule often changes as little as a week before the first day. If you are only coming for one WG meeting, you may have a hard time booking your flight with such little notice, particularly if the Working Group's meeting changes schedule. Be sure to keep track of the current agenda so you can schedule flights and hotels. But, when it comes down to it, you probably shouldn't be coming for just one WG meeting. It's likely that your knowledge could be valuable in a few WGs, assuming that you've read the drafts and RFCs for those groups.

If you are on the agenda at a face-to-face meeting, you should probably come with a few slides prepared. But don't come with a tutorial; people are supposed to read the drafts in advance. Projectors for laptop-based presentations are available in all the meeting rooms.

And here's a tip for your slides in WG or plenary presentations: don't put your company's logo on every one, even though that is a common practice outside the IETF. The IETF frowns on this kind of corporate advertising (except for the meeting sponsor in the plenary presentation), and most presenters don't even put their logo on their opening slide. The IETF is about technical content, not company boosterism. Slides are often plain black and white for legibility, with color used only when it really adds clarity. Again, the content is the most important part of the slides, not how it's presented.

#### **5.4. Working Group Mailing Lists**

As we mentioned earlier, the IETF announcement and discussion mailing lists are the central mailing lists for IETF activities. However, there are many other mailing lists related to IETF work. For example, every Working Group has its own discussion list. In addition, there are some long-term technical debates that have been moved off of the IETF list onto lists created specifically for those topics. It is highly recommended that everybody follow the



discussions on the mailing lists of the Working Groups that they wish to attend. The more work that is done on the mailing lists, the less work that will need to be done at the meeting, leaving time for cross pollination (i.e., attending Working Groups outside one's primary area of interest in order to broaden one's perspective).

The mailing lists also provide a forum for those who wish to follow, or contribute to, the Working Groups' efforts, but can't attend the IETF meetings. That's why IETF procedures require all decisions to be confirmed "on the list" and you will often hear a WG chair say "Let's take it to the list" to close a discussion.

Many IETF discussion lists use either mailman or another list manager, Majordomo. They usually have a "-request" address which handles the administrative details of joining and leaving the list. (See [Section 3.3](#) for more information on mailman.) It is generally frowned upon when such administrivia appears on the discussion mailing list.

Most IETF discussion lists are archived. That is, all of the messages sent to the list are automatically stored on a host for anonymous HTTP or FTP access. Many such archives are listed online at [ftp://ftp.ietf.org/ietf-mail-archive/](http://ftp.ietf.org/ietf-mail-archive/) or they are in a Web-based archive. If you don't find the list you're looking for, send a message to the list's "-request" address (not to the list itself!). The working group charter listings at <http://www.ietf.org/html.charters/wg-dir.html> are a useful source; note that the page has links to old, concluded WGs.

Some WG lists apply size limits on messages, particularly to avoid large documents or presentations landing in everyone's mailbox. It is well worth remembering that participants do not all have broadband connections (and even those with broadband connections sometimes get their mail on slow connections when they travel), so shorter messages are greatly appreciated. Documents can be posted as Internet-Drafts; presentation material can be posted to a web site controlled by the sender or sent personally to people who ask for it. Some WGs set up special sites to hold these large documents so that senders can post there first, then just send to the list the URL of the document.

### **5.5. Interim Working Group Meetings**

Working groups sometimes hold interim meetings between IETFs. Interim meetings aren't a substitute for IETF meetings, however -- a group can't decide to skip a meeting in a location they're not fond of and meet in Cancun (or even someplace mundane) three weeks later, for example. Interim meetings require AD approval, and need to be announced at least one month in advance. Location and timing need to



allow fair access for all participants. Like regular IETF meetings, someone needs to take notes and send them to <mailto:proceedings@ietf.org>, and the group needs to take attendance. Decisions tentatively made during an interim WG meeting still must be ratified on the mailing list.

## **6. BOFs**

In order to form a Working Group, you need a charter and someone who is able to be chair. In order to get those things, you need to get people interested so that they can help focus the charter and convince an Area Director that the project is worthwhile. A face-to-face meeting is useful for this. In fact, very few WGs get started by an Area Director; most start after a face-to-face BOF because attendees have expressed interest in the topic.

A BOF meeting has to be approved by the Area Director in the relevant area before it can be scheduled. If you think you really need a new WG, approach an AD informally with your proposal and see what they think. The next step is to request a meeting slot at the next face-to-face meeting. Of course, you don't need to wait for that meeting to get some work done, such as setting up a mailing list and starting to discuss a charter.

BOF meetings have a very different tone than WG meetings. The purpose of a BOF is to make sure that a good charter with good milestones can be created, and that there are enough people willing to do the work needed in order to create standards. Some BOFs have Internet Drafts already in process, while others start from scratch.

An advantage of having a draft before the BOF is to help focus the discussion. On the other hand, having a draft might tend to limit what the other folks in the BOF want to do in the charter. It's important to remember that most BOFs are held in order to get support for an eventual Working Group, not to get support for a particular document.

Many BOFs don't turn into WGs for a variety of reasons. A common problem is that not enough people can agree on a focus for the work. Another typical reason is that the work wouldn't end up being a standard -- if, for example, the document authors don't really want to relinquish change control to a WG. (We'll discuss change control later in this document.) Only two meetings of a BOF can be scheduled on a particular subject; either a WG has to form, or the topic should be dropped.





**7. New to the IETF and Coming to a Meeting? STOP HERE! (Temporarily)**

If you're new to the IETF and this is the only reference you plan to read before coming to the meeting, stop here -- at least temporarily. Then, on your flight home, read the rest of the Tao. By that time you'll be ready to get actively involved in the Working Groups that interested you at the meeting, and the Tao will get you started on your way.

If you're planning to participate in the IETF remotely, through reading email lists and the proceedings, read on!

## **8. RFCs and Internet Drafts**

If you're a new IETF participant and are looking for a particular RFC or Internet Draft, go to the RFC Editor's Web pages, <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc.html>. That site also has links to other RFC collections, many with search capabilities. If you know the number of the RFC you're looking for, go to the IETF RFC pages, <http://www.ietf.org/rfc.html>. For Internet Drafts, the best resource is the IETF web site, <http://www.ietf.org/ID.html>, where you can search by title and keyword.

### **8.1. Getting an RFC Published**

One of the most common questions seasoned IETFers hear from newcomers is, "How do I get an IETF standard published?" A much better question is, "Should I write an IETF standard?" since the answer is not always "yes." If you do decide to try to write a document that becomes an IETF standard, be warned that the overall process may be arduous, even if the individual steps are fairly straightforward. Lots of people get through the process unscathed, though, and there's plenty of written guidance that helps authors emerge with their ego more or less intact.

Every IETF standard is published as an RFC (a "Request For Comments," but everyone just calls them RFCs), and every RFC starts out as an Internet Draft (often called an "I-D"). The basic steps for getting something published as an IETF standard are:

1. Publish the document as an Internet Draft
2. Receive comments on the draft
3. Edit your draft based on the comments
4. Repeat steps 1 through 3 a few times
5. Ask an Area Director to take the draft to the IESG (if it's an individual submission). If the draft is an official Working Group product, the WG chair asks the AD to take it to the IESG.
6. Make any changes deemed necessary by the IESG (this might include giving up on becoming a standard)
7. Wait for the document to be published by the RFC Editor

A much more complete explanation of these steps is contained in [BCP9], "The Internet Standards Process." Anyone who writes a draft that they hope will become an IETF standard must read [BCP 9](#) so that



they can follow the path of their document through the process. [BCP 9](#) (and various other documents that update it) goes into great detail on a topic that is very often misunderstood, even by seasoned IETF participants: different types of RFCs go through different processes and have different rankings. There are six kinds of RFCs:

- o Proposed standards
- o Draft standards
- o Internet standards (sometimes called "full standards")
- o Informational documents
- o Experimental protocols
- o Historic documents

Only the first three (proposed, draft, and full) are standards within the IETF. A good summary of this can be found in the aptly titled [\[RFC1796\]](#), "Not All RFCs are Standards."

There are also three sub-series of RFCs, known as FYIs, BCPs, and STDs. The For Your Information RFC sub-series was created to document overviews and topics which are introductory or appeal to a broad audience; however, that series has not been added to in a long time. Best Current Practice documents describe the application of various technologies in the Internet. The STD RFC sub-series was created to identify RFCs that do in fact specify Internet standards. Some STDs are actually sets of more than one RFC, and the "standard" designation applies to the whole set of documents.

## **[8.2.](#) Letting Go Gracefully**

The biggest reason some people do not want their documents put on the IETF standards track is that they must give up change control of the protocol. That is, as soon as you propose that your protocol become an IETF standard, you must fully relinquish control of the protocol. If there is general agreement, parts of the protocol can be completely changed, whole sections can be ripped out, new things can be added, and the name can be changed.

Some authors find it very hard to give up control of their pet protocol. If you are one of those people, don't even think about trying to get your protocol to become an IETF standard. On the other hand, if your goal is the best standard possible with the widest implementation, then you might find the IETF process to your liking.



Incidentally, the change control on Internet standards doesn't end when the protocol is put on the standards track. The protocol itself can be changed later for a number of reasons, the most common of which is that implementors discover a problem as they implement the standard. These later changes are also under the control of the IETF, not the editors of the standards document.

IETF standards exist so that people will use them to write Internet programs that interoperate. They don't exist to document the (possibly wonderful) ideas of their authors, nor do they exist so that a company can say "we have an IETF standard." If a standards-track RFC only has one implementation (whereas two are required for it to advance on the standards track), it was probably a mistake to put it on the standards track in the first place.

### **8.3. Internet Drafts**

First things first. Every document that ends up in the RFC repository starts life as an Internet Draft. Internet Drafts are tentative documents -- they're meant for readers to comment on, so authors can mull over those comments and decide which ones to incorporate in the draft. In order to remind folks of their tentativeness, Internet Drafts are automatically removed from the online directories after six months. They are most definitely not standards or even specifications. As [BCP9] says:

"An Internet Draft is NOT a means of "publishing" a specification; specifications are published through the RFC mechanism ... Internet Drafts have no formal status, and are subject to change or removal at any time. Under no circumstances should an Internet Draft be referenced by any paper, report, or Request-for-Proposal, nor should a vendor claim compliance with an Internet Draft."

You can always tell a person who doesn't understand the IETF (or is intentionally trying to fool people) when they brag about having published an Internet Draft; it takes no significant effort.

When you submit an Internet Draft, you give some publication rights to the IETF. This is so that your Internet Draft is freely available to everyone who wants to read and comment on it. The rights you do and don't give to the IETF are described in [BCP78] "IETF Rights in Contributions".

There is a very useful checking tool at <http://tools.ietf.org/tools/idnits/idnits.pyht>. Using this tool before you turn in an Internet Draft will help prevent the draft from being rejected due to errors in form and formatting.





An I-D should have approximately the same format as an RFC. Contrary to many people's beliefs, an I-D does not need to look exactly like an RFC, but if you can use the same formatting procedures used by the RFC Editor when you create your I-Ds, it will simplify the RFC Editor's work when your draft is published as an RFC. [RFC2223], "Instructions to RFC Authors," describes the nroff formatting used by the RFC Editor. There is also a tool called "xml2rfc", available from <http://xml.resource.org/>, that takes XML-formatted text and turns it into a valid Internet Draft.

An Internet Draft can be either a Working Group draft or an individual submission. Working Group drafts are usually reviewed by the Working Group before being accepted as a WG item, although the chairs have the final say.

If you're interested in checking the status of a particular draft, or can't remember its exact name, or want to find out which drafts a WG is working on, two handy tools are available. The "Internet-Drafts Database Interface," at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/public/idindex.cgi>, lets you search for a draft by author, Working Group, date, or filename. The "I-D Tracker," at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/public/pidtracker.cgi>, is especially useful for authors who want to track the progress of their draft as it makes its way through the publication process.

There are some informal rules for Internet Draft naming that have evolved over the years. Internet Drafts that revise existing RFCs often have draft names with "bis" in them, meaning meaning "again" or "twice"; for example, a draft might be called "[draft-someone-rfc2345bis-00.txt](#)".

### **8.3.1. Recommended Reading for Writers**

Before you create the first draft of your Internet Draft, you should read four documents:

- o More important than just explaining formatting, [RFC2223] also explains what needs to be in an Internet Draft before it can become an RFC. This document describes all the sections and notices that will need to be in your document, and it's good to have them there from the beginning so that readers aren't surprised when you put them in later versions.
- o [BCP22], "Guide for Internet Standards Writers," provides tips that will help you write a standard that leads to interoperability. For instance, it explains how to choose the right number of protocol options, how to respond to out-of-spec behavior, and how to show state diagrams.



- o The online "Guidelines to Authors of Internet Drafts," <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-guidelines.txt>, has up-to-date information about the process for turning in Internet Drafts, as well as the most current boilerplate information that has to be included in each Internet Draft.
- o When you think you are finished with the draft process and are ready to request that the draft become an RFC, you should definitely read "Checklist for Internet-Drafts (IDs) Submitted for RFC Publication," <http://www.ietf.org/ID-Checklist.html>, a list of common issues that have been known to stop documents in the IESG. In fact, you should probably read that document well before you are finished, so that you don't have to make a bunch of last-minute changes.

Also, you should visit the IETF Tools web pages, <http://tools.ietf.org>, where you'll find pointers to other tools that will automate some of your work for the IETF.

### **8.3.2. Filenames and Other Matters**

When you're ready to turn in your Internet Draft, send it to the Internet Drafts administrator at <<mailto:internet-drafts@ietf.org>>. There is a real person at the other end of this mail address -- their job is to make sure you've included the minimum items you need for the Internet Draft to be published. When you submit the first version of the draft, you also tell the draft administrator your proposed filename for the draft. If the draft is an official Working Group product, the name will start with "[draft-ietf-](#)" followed by the designation of the WG, followed by a descriptive word or two, followed by ".txt".

For example, a draft in the S/MIME WG about creating keys might be named "[draft-ietf-smime-keying-00.txt](#)". If it's not the product of a Working Group, the name will start with "draft-" and the last name of one of the authors followed by a descriptive word or two, followed by ".txt". For example, a draft that someone named Smith wrote might be named "[draft-smith-keying-00.txt](#)". If a draft is an individual submission but relates to a particular working group, the author sometimes follows their name with the name of the working group, such as "[draft-smith-smime-keying-00.txt](#)". You are welcome to suggest names; however, it is up to the Internet Drafts administrator (and, if it is an official WG draft, the WG chair) to come up with the filename. If you follow the naming guidelines given at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-guidelines.txt>, chances are quite good that your suggested filename will be fine.

After the first edition of a draft, the number in the filename is



incremented; for instance, the second edition of the S/MIME draft named above would be "[draft-ietf-smime-keying-01.txt](#)". Note that there are cases where the filename changes after one or more versions, such as when a personal effort is pulled into a Working Group; when a draft has its filename changed, the number reverts to -00. Be sure to let the Internet Drafts administrator know the previous name of the draft when such a name change occurs so that the databases can be kept accurate.

#### **8.4. Standards-Track RFCs**

The procedure for creating and advancing a standard is described in [[BCP9](#)]. After an Internet Draft has been sufficiently discussed and there is rough consensus that what it says would be a useful standard, it is presented to the IESG for consideration. If the draft is an official WG draft, the WG chair sends it to the appropriate Area Director after it has gone through Working Group last call. If the draft is an individual submission, the draft's author or editor submits it to the appropriate Area Director. [BCP 9](#) also describes the appeals process for people who feel that a Working Group chair, an AD, or the IESG has made the wrong decision in considering the creation or advancement of a standard.

After the I-D is submitted to the IESG, the IESG announces an IETF-wide last call. This helps get the attention of people who weren't following the progress of the draft, and can sometimes cause further changes to the draft. It is also a time when people in the WG who feel that they weren't heard can make their comments to everyone. The IETF last call is two weeks for drafts coming from WGs and four weeks for individual submissions.

If the IESG approves the draft to become an Internet Standard, they ask the RFC Editor to publish it as a Proposed Standard. After it has been a Proposed Standard for at least six months, the RFC's author (or the appropriate WG chair) can ask for it to become a Draft Standard. Before that happens, however, someone needs to convince the appropriate Area Director that there are at least two independent, interoperable implementations of each part of the standard. This is a good test of the usefulness of the standard as a whole, as well as an excellent way to check if the standard was really readable.

A few things typically happen at this point. First, it's common to find that some of the specifications in the standard need to be reworded because one implementor thought they meant one thing while another implementor thought they meant something else. Another common occurrence is that none of the implementations actually tried to implement a few of the features of the standard; these features



get removed not just because no one tested them, but also because they weren't needed.

Don't be surprised if a particular standard doesn't progress from Proposed to Draft. In fact, most of the standards in common use are Proposed Standards and never move forward. This may be because no one took the time to try to get them to Draft, or some of the normative references in the standard are still at Proposed Standard, or it may be that everyone found more important things to do.

A few years after a document has been a Draft Standard, it can become an Internet Standard, also known as "full standard" (it can happen in as little as four months, but this is rare). This doesn't happen often, and is usually reserved for protocols that are absolutely required for the Internet to function. The IESG goes over the document with a fine-tooth comb and looks for evidence of widespread deployment before making a Draft Standard an Internet Standard.

#### **[8.4.1](#). Telling It Like It Is -- Using MUST and SHOULD and MAY**

Writing specifications that get implemented the way you want is a bit of an art. You can keep the specification very short, with just a list of requirements, but that tends to cause implementors to take too much leeway. If you instead make the specification very wordy with lots of suggestions, implementors tend to miss the requirements (and often disagree with your suggestions anyway). An optimal specification is somewhere in between.

One way to make it more likely that developers will create interoperable implementations of standards is to be clear about what's being mandated in a specification. Early RFCs used all kinds of expressions to explain what was needed, so implementors didn't always know which parts were suggestions and which were requirements. As a result, standards writers in the IETF generally agreed to limit their wording to a few specific words with a few specific meanings.

[[STD3](#)], "Requirements for Internet Hosts -- Application and Support," written way back in 1989, had a short list of words that had appeared to be useful, namely "must", "should", and "may". These definitions were updated and further refined in [[BCP14](#)], "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels," which is widely referenced in current Internet standards. [BCP 14](#) also specifically defines "must not" and "should not", and lists a few synonyms for the words defined.

In a standard, in order to make it clear that you're using the definitions from [BCP 14](#), you should do two things. First, refer to [BCP 14](#) (although most people refer to it as [RFC 2119](#), because that's





what [BCP 14](#) tells you to do), so that the reader knows how you're defining your words. Second, you should point out which instances of the words you are using come from [BCP 14](#). The accepted practice for this is to capitalize the words. That is why you see "MUST" and "SHOULD" capitalized in IETF standards.

[BCP 14](#) is a short document, and should be read by everyone who is reading or writing IETF standards. Although the definitions of "must" and "must not" are fairly clear, the definitions of "should" and "should not" cause a great deal of discussion in many WGs. When reviewing an Internet Draft, the question is often raised, "should that sentence have a MUST or a SHOULD in it?" This is, indeed, a very good question, because specifications shouldn't have gratuitous MUSTs, but also should not have SHOULDs where a MUST is needed for interoperability. This goes to the crux of the question of over-specifying and under-specifying requirements in standards.

#### [8.4.2](#). Normative References in Standards

One aspect of writing IETF standards that trips up many novices (and quite a few long-time IETF folk) is the rule about how to make "normative references" to non-IETF documents or to other RFCs in a standard. A normative reference is a reference to a document that must be followed in order to implement the standard. A non-normative reference (sometimes called an "informative reference") is one that is helpful to an implementor but is not needed.

An IETF standard may make a normative reference to any other standards-track RFC that is at the same standards level or higher, or to any "open standard" that has been developed outside the IETF. The "same level or higher" rule means that before a standard can move from Proposed to Draft, all of the RFCs for which there is a normative reference must also be at Draft or Internet Standard. This rule gives implementors assurance that everything in a Draft Standard or Internet Standard is quite stable, even the things referenced outside the standard. This can also delay the publication of the Draft or Internet Standard by many months (sometimes even years) while the other documents catch up.

There is no hard and fast rule about what is an "open standard," but generally this means a stable standard that anyone can get a copy of (although they might have to pay for it) and that was made by a generally recognized standards group. If the external standard changes, you have to reference the particular instantiation of that standard in your specification, as with a designation of the date of the standard. Some external standards bodies don't make old standards available, which is a problem for IETF standards that need to be used in the future. When in doubt, a draft author should ask



the WG chair or appropriate Area Director if a particular external standard can be used in an IETF standard.

#### **8.4.3. IANA Considerations**

More and more IETF standards require the registration of various protocol parameters, such as named options in the protocol. As we noted in [Section 3.2.4](#), the main registry for all IETF standards has long been IANA. Because of the large and diverse kinds of registries that standards require, IANA needs to have specific information about how to register parameters, what not to register, who (if anyone) will decide what is to be registered, and so on.

Anyone writing an Internet standard that may need a new IANA registry or new values in a current IANA registry needs to read [[BCP26](#)], "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs," which describes how RFC authors should properly ask for IANA to start or take over a registry. IANA also maintains registries that were started long before [BCP 26](#) was produced.

#### **8.4.4. Security Considerations**

One thing that's required in every RFC and Internet Draft is a "Security Considerations" section. This section should describe any known vulnerabilities of the protocol, possible threats, and mechanisms or strategies to address them. Don't gloss over this section -- in particular, don't say "here's our protocol, if you want security, just use IPsec". This won't do at all, because it doesn't answer the question of how IPsec interacts with your protocol, and vice versa. Be sure to check with your Working Group chair if you're not sure how to handle this section in your draft. See [[BCP72](#)], "Guidelines for Writing RFC Text on Security Considerations", for more information on writing good security considerations sections.

#### **8.4.5. Patents in IETF Standards**

The problems of intellectual property have cropped up more and more often in the past few years, particularly with respect to patents. The goal of the IETF is to have its standards widely used and validated in the marketplace. If creating a product that uses a standard requires getting a license for a patent, people are less likely to implement the standard. Not surprisingly, then, the general rule has been "use good non-patented technology where possible."

Of course, this isn't always possible. Sometimes patents appear after a standard has been established. Sometimes there's a patent on something that is so valuable that there isn't a non-patented



equivalent. Sometimes, the patent holder is generous and promises to give all implementors of a standard a royalty-free license to the patent, thereby making it almost as easy to implement as it would have been if no patent existed.

The IETF's methods for dealing with patents in standards are a subject of much debate. The official rules for all intellectual property rights in IETF documents (not just patents) are covered in [\[BCP78\]](#) and [\[BCP79\]](#), "Intellectual Property Rights in IETF Technology". Everyone who participates in IETF Working Groups will probably find these documents interesting because they lay out the rules that everyone agrees to follow.

Patent holders who freely allow their patents to be used by people implementing IETF standards often get a great deal of good will from the folks in the IETF. Such generosity is more common than you might think. For example, [RFC 1822](#) is a license from IBM for one of its security patents, and the security community has responded very favorably to IBM for this (whereas a number of other companies have made themselves pariahs for their intractability on their security patents).

If you are writing an Internet Draft and you know of a patent that applies to the technology you're writing about, don't list the patent in the document. Instead, consult the IETF IPR Disclosure Page linked off the main IETF web site to determine how to proceed. Intellectual property rights aren't mentioned in RFCs because RFCs never change after they are published, but knowledge of IPR can change at any time. Therefore, an IPR list in a RFC could be incomplete and mislead the reader. [\[BCP9\]](#) provides specific text that should be added to RFCs where the author knows of IPR issues.

### **[8.5.](#) Informational and Experimental RFCs**

As we noted earlier, not all RFCs are standards. In fact, plenty of important RFCs are not on the standards track at all. Currently, there are two designations for RFCs that are not meant to be standards: Informational, like the Tao, and Experimental. (There is actually a third designation, Historic, but that is reserved for documents that were on the standards track and have been removed due to lack of current use, or that more recent thinking indicates the technology is actually harmful to the Internet.)

The role of Informational RFCs is often debated in the IETF. Many people like having them, particularly for specifications that were created outside the IETF but are referenced by IETF documents. They are also useful for specifications that are the precursors for work being done by IETF Working Groups. On the other hand, some people



refer to Informational RFCs as "standards" even though the RFCs are not standards, usually to fool the gullible public about something that the person is selling or supporting. When this happens, the debate about Informational RFCs is renewed.

Experimental RFCs are for specifications that may be interesting, but for which it is unclear if there will be much interest in implementing them, or whether they will work once deployed. That is, a specification might solve a problem, but if it is not clear that many people think that the problem is important, or think that they will bother fixing the problem with the specification, the specification might be labeled an Experimental RFC. If, later, the specification becomes popular (or proves that it works well), it can be re-issued as a standards-track RFC. Experimental RFCs are also used to get people to experiment with a technology that looks like it might be standards track material, but for which there are still unanswered questions.

The IESG has created guidelines on how they choose between Informational and Experimental status:

<http://www.ietf.org/u/ietfchair/info-exp.html>. If you are creating a document that you think might become an Experimental RFC, knowing their current thinking will help you justify your proposed choice.





## **9. How to Contribute to the IETF**

### **9.1. What You Can Do**

**\*Read\*** -- Review the Internet Drafts in your area of expertise, and comment on them in the Working Groups. Participate in the discussion in a friendly, helpful fashion, with the goal being the best Internet standards possible. Listen much more than you speak. If you disagree, debate the technical issues: never attack the people.

**\*Implement\*** -- Write programs that use the current Internet standards. The standards aren't worth much unless they are available to Internet users. Implement even the "minor" standards, since they will become less minor if they appear in more software. Report any problems you find with the standards to the appropriate Working Group so that the standard can be clarified in later revisions. One of the oft-quoted tenets of the IETF is "running code wins," so you can help support the standards you want to become more widespread by creating more running code.

**\*Write\*** -- Edit or co-author Internet Drafts in your area of expertise. Do this for the benefit of the Internet community, not to get your name (or, even worse, your company's name) on a document. Draft authors are subject to all kinds of technical (and sometimes personal) criticism; receive it with equanimity and use it to improve your draft in order to produce the best and most interoperable standard.

### **9.2. What Your Company Can Do**

**\*Share\*** -- Avoid proprietary standards. If you are an implementor, exhibit a strong preference for IETF standards. If the IETF standards aren't as good as the proprietary standards, work to make the IETF standards better. If you're a purchaser, avoid products that use proprietary standards that compete with the open standards of the IETF, and tell the companies you buy from that you are doing so.

**\*Open Up\*** -- If your company controls a patent that is used in an IETF standard, convince them to make the patent available at no cost to everyone who is implementing the standard. In the past few years, patents have caused a lot of serious problems for Internet standards because they prevent some companies from being able to freely implement the standards. Fortunately, many companies have generously offered unlimited licenses for particular patents in order to help the IETF standards flourish. These companies are usually rewarded with positive publicity for the fact that they are not as greedy or short-sighted as other patent-holders.



\*Join\* -- Become a member of ISOC. More importantly, urge any company that has benefited from the Internet to become a corporate member of ISOC, since this has the greatest financial benefit for the group. It will, of course, also benefit the Internet as a whole.

## **10. IETF and the Outside World**

### **10.1. IETF and Other Standards Groups**

As much as many IETF participants would like to think otherwise, the IETF does not exist in a standards vacuum. There are many (perhaps too many) other standards organizations whose decisions affect the Internet. There are also a fair number of standards bodies who ignored the Internet for a long time and now want to get a piece of the action.

In general, the IETF tries to have cordial relationships with other significant standards bodies. This isn't always easy, since many other bodies have very different structures than the IETF, and the IETF is mostly run by volunteers who would probably prefer to write standards rather than meet with representatives from other bodies. Even so, some other standards bodies make a great effort to interact well with the IETF despite the obvious cultural differences.

At the time of this writing, the IETF has some liaisons with large standards bodies, including the ITU (International Telecommunication Union), the W3C, the Unicode Consortium, and ISO/IEC JTC1 (The Joint Technical Committee of the International Organization for Standardization and International Electrotechnical Commission). As stated in the IAB Charter [[BCP39](#)], "Liaisons are kept as informal as possible and must be of demonstrable value in improving the quality of IETF specifications. " In practice, the IETF prefers liaisons to take place directly at Working Group level, with formal relationships and liaison documents in a backup role.

Some of these liaison tasks fall to the IESG, while others fall to the IAB. Detail-oriented readers will learn much about the formal methods for dealing with other standards bodies in [[BCP102](#)], "IAB Processes for Management of IETF Liaison Relationships," and [[BCP103](#)], "Procedures for Handling Liaison Statements to and from the IETF." The best place to check to see if the IETF has any formal liaison at all is the list of IETF liaisons, [www.ietf.org/liaisonActivities.html](http://www.ietf.org/liaisonActivities.html). The list shows that there are many different liaisons to ISO/IEC JTC1 subcommittees.

### **10.2. Press Coverage of the IETF**

Given that the IETF is one of the best-known bodies that is helping move the Internet forward, it's natural for the computer press (and even the trade press) to want to cover its actions. In recent years, a small number of magazines have assigned reporters and editors to cover the IETF in depth over a long period of time. These reporters have ample scars from articles that they got wrong, incorrect



statements about the status of Internet Drafts, quotes from people who are unrelated to the IETF work, and so on.

Major press errors fall into two categories: saying that the IETF is considering something when in fact there is just an Internet Draft in a Working Group, and saying that the IETF approved something when all that happened was that an Informational RFC was published. In both cases, the press is not fully to blame for the problem, since they are usually alerted to the story by a company trying to get publicity for a protocol that they developed or at least support. Of course, a bit of research by the reporter would probably get them in contact with someone who could straighten them out, such as a WG chair or an Area Director. The default press contact for the IETF is the IAD, who can be reached at [<mailto:iad@ietf.org>](mailto:iad@ietf.org).

The fact that those reporters who've gotten it wrong once still come back to IETF meetings shows that it is possible to get it right eventually. However, IETF meetings are definitely not for reporters who are naive about the IETF process (although if you are a reporter the fact that you are reading this document is a very good sign!). Further, if you think that you'll get a hot story from attending an IETF meeting, you are likely to be disappointed.

Considering all this, it's not surprising that some IETFers would prefer to have the press stay as far away from meetings as possible. Having a bit of press publicity for protocols that are almost near completion and will become significant in the industry in the next year can be a good thing. However, it is the rare reporter who can resist over-hyping a nascent protocol as the next savior for the Internet. Such stories do much more harm than good, both for the readers of the article and for the IETF.

The main reason why a reporter might want to attend an IETF meeting is not to cover hot technologies (since that can be done in the comfort of your office by reading the mailing lists), but to meet people face to face. Unfortunately, the most interesting people are the ones who are also the busiest during the IETF meeting, and some folks have a tendency to run away when they see a press badge. However, IETF meetings are excellent places to meet and speak with document authors and Working Group chairs; this can be quite valuable for reporters who are covering the progress of protocols.

Reporters who want to find out about "what the IETF is doing" on a particular topic would be well-advised to talk to more than one person who is active on that topic in the IETF, and should probably try to talk to the WG chair in any case. It's impossible to determine what will happen with a draft by looking at the draft or talking to the draft's author. Fortunately, all WGs have archives



that a reporter can look through for recent indications about what the progress of a draft is; unfortunately, few reporters have the time or inclination to do this kind of research. Because the IETF doesn't have a press liaison, a magazine or newspaper that runs a story with errors won't hear directly from the IETF and therefore often won't know what they did wrong, so they might easily do it again later.



## **11. Security Considerations**

[Section 8.4.4](#) explains why each RFC is required to have a Security Considerations section, and gives some idea of what it should and should not contain. Other than that information, this document does not touch on Internet security.

## **12. Informative References**

- [BCP9] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", [BCP 9](#), [RFC 2026](#), October 1996.
- [BCP10] Galvin, J., "IAB and IESG Selection, Confirmation, and Recall Process: Operation of the Nominating and Recall Committees", [BCP 10](#), [RFC 3777](#), June 2004.
- [BCP11] Hovey, R. and S. Bradner, "The Organizations Involved in the IETF Standards Process", [BCP 11](#), [RFC 2028](#), October 1996.
- [BCP14] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [BCP22] Scott, G., "Guide for Internet Standards Writers", [BCP 22](#), [RFC 2360](#), June 1998.
- [BCP25] Bradner, S., "IETF Working Group Guidelines and Procedures", [BCP 25](#), [RFC 2418](#), September 1998.
- [BCP26] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 2434](#), October 1998.
- [BCP39] Internet Architecture Board and B. Carpenter, "Charter of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB)", [BCP 39](#), [RFC 2850](#), May 2000.
- [BCP45] Harris, S., "IETF Discussion List Charter", [BCP 45](#), [RFC 3005](#), November 2000.
- [BCP72] Rescorla, E. and B. Korver, "Guidelines for Writing RFC Text on Security Considerations", [BCP 72](#), [RFC 3552](#), July 2003.
- [BCP78] Bradner, S., "IETF Rights in Contributions", [BCP 78](#), [RFC 3978](#), March 2005.
- [BCP79] Bradner, S., "Intellectual Property Rights in IETF Technology", [BCP 79](#), [RFC 3668](#), November 2004.
- [BCP95] Alvestrand, H., "A Mission Statement for the IETF", [BCP 95](#), [RFC 3935](#), October 2004.
- [BCP101] Austein, R. and B. Wijnen, "Structure of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)", [BCP 101](#),



[RFC 4071](#), April 2005.

- [BCP102] Daigle, L. and Internet Architecture Board, "IAB Processes for Management of IETF Liaison Relationships", [BCP 102](#), [RFC 4052](#), April 2005.
- [BCP103] Trowbridge, S., Bradner, S., and F. Baker, "Procedures for Handling Liaison Statements to and from the IETF", [BCP 103](#), [RFC 4053](#), April 2005.
- [RFC1796] Huitema, C., Postel, J., and S. Crocker, "Not All RFCs are Standards", [RFC 1796](#), April 1995.
- [RFC2223] Postel, J. and J. Reynolds, "Instructions to RFC Authors", [RFC 2223](#), October 1997.
- [STD3] Braden, R., "Requirements for Internet Hosts - Application and Support", STD 3, [RFC 1123](#), October 1989.



## [Appendix A](#). Other References

### [A.1](#). Why "The Tao"?

Pronounced "dow", Tao is the basic principle behind the teachings of Lao-tse, a Chinese master. Its familiar symbol is the black and white Yin-Yang circle. Taoism conceives the universe as a single organism, and human beings as interdependent parts of a cosmic whole. Tao is sometimes translated "the way," but according to Taoist philosophy the true meaning of the word cannot be expressed in words.

### [A.2](#). Useful Email Addresses

Some useful email addresses are listed here. These addresses may change from time to time, and it's a good idea to check the IETF Web pages for the correct address before sending your mail.

Address	Description
-----	-----
<a href="mailto:agenda@ietf.org">agenda@ietf.org</a>	Requests for agenda slots at IETF meetings
<a href="mailto:ietf-action@ietf.org">ietf-action@ietf.org</a>	Requests for things to be done when you don't know exactly where to send the request
<a href="mailto:ietf-info@ietf.org">ietf-info@ietf.org</a>	General questions about the IETF
<a href="mailto:ietf-registrar@ietf.org">ietf-registrar@ietf.org</a>	Questions about registration, meeting locations, and fees
<a href="mailto:ietf-request@ietf.org">ietf-request@ietf.org</a>	Requests to join/leave IETF lists
<a href="mailto:ietf-secretary@ietf.org">ietf-secretary@ietf.org</a>	Questions for the Secretariat
<a href="mailto:ietf-web@ietf.org">ietf-web@ietf.org</a>	Questions or comments about the IETF web site
<a href="mailto:internet-drafts@ietf.org">internet-drafts@ietf.org</a>	Internet Draft submissions and queries
<a href="mailto:proceedings@ietf.org">proceedings@ietf.org</a>	Where to send Working Group minutes and slides for the IETF Proceedings
<a href="mailto:iana@iana.org">iana@iana.org</a>	Internet Assigned Numbers Authority
<a href="mailto:rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org">rfc-editor@rfc-editor.org</a>	RFC Editor
<a href="mailto:statements@ietf.org">statements@ietf.org</a>	Incoming liaison statements from other



organizations

Online upload pages are planned for the future to facilitate submission of Internet Drafts, Proceedings, and Liaison statements.

### **A.3. Useful Documents and Files**

The IETF web site, <http://www.ietf.org>, is the best source for information about meetings, Working Groups, Internet Drafts, RFCs, IETF email addresses, and much more. Click on "Additional Information" to find a variety of helpful links. Internet Drafts and other documents are also available in the "ietf" directory on anonymous FTP sites worldwide. For a listing of these sites, see: <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

Check the IESG web pages, <http://www.ietf.org/iesg.html>, to find up-to-date information about drafts processed, RFCs published, and documents in Last Call, as well as the monthly IETF status reports.

### **A.4. Acronyms and Abbreviations Used in the Tao**

Some of the acronyms and abbreviations from this document are listed below.





Term	Meaning
-----	
AD	Area Director
BCP	Best Current Practice
BOF	Birds Of a Feather
FAQ	Frequently Asked Question(s)
FYI	For Your Information (RFC)
IAB	Internet Architecture Board
IAD	IETF Administrative Director
IANA	Internet Assigned Numbers Authority
IAOC	IETF Administrative Oversight Committee
IASA	IETF Administrative Support Activity
ICANN	Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, <a href="http://www.icann.org/">http://www.icann.org/</a>
<a href="#">I-D</a>	Internet Draft
IESG	Internet Engineering Steering Group, <a href="http://www.ietf.org/iesg.html">http://www.ietf.org/iesg.html</a>
IETF	Internet Engineering Task Force, <a href="http://www.ietf.org/">http://www.ietf.org/</a>
<a href="#">INET</a>	Internet Society Conference, <a href="http://www.isoc.org/isoc/conferences/inet/">http://www.isoc.org/isoc/conferences/inet/</a>
<a href="#">IPR</a>	Intellectual property rights
IRTF	Internet Research Task Force, <a href="http://www.irtf.org/">http://www.irtf.org/</a>
<a href="#">ISO</a>	International Organization for Standardization, <a href="http://www.iso.ch/">http://www.iso.ch/</a>
<a href="#">ISO-IEC/JTC1</a>	Joint Technical Committee of the International Organization for Standardization and International Electrotechnical Commission, <a href="http://www.jtc1.org/">http://www.jtc1.org/</a>
<a href="#">ISOC</a>	Internet Society, <a href="http://www.isoc.org">http://www.isoc.org</a>
ITU	International Telecommunication Union, <a href="http://www.itu.int">http://www.itu.int</a>
RFC	Request For Comments
STD	Standard (RFC)
W3C	World Wide Web Consortium, <a href="http://www.w3.org/">http://www.w3.org/</a>
<a href="#">WG</a>	Working Group



## **Appendix B. IETF Guiding Principles**

If you've gotten this far in the Tao, you've learned a lot about how the IETF works. What you'll find in this appendix summarizes much of what you've read and adds a few new points to ponder. Be sure to read through all the principles; taken as a whole, they'll give you a new slant on what makes the IETF work.

### **B.1. General**

- P1. The IETF works by an open process and by rough consensus. This applies to all aspects of the operation of the IETF, including creation of IETF documents and decisions on the processes that are used. But the IETF also observes experiments and running code with interest, and this should also apply to the operational processes of the organization.
- P2. The IETF works in areas where it has, or can find, technical competence.
- P3. The IETF depends on a volunteer core of active participants.
- P4. Membership of the IETF or of its WGs is not fee-based, nor organizationally defined, but is based upon self-identification and active participation by individuals.

### **B.2. Management and Leadership**

- P5. The IETF recognizes leadership positions and grants power of decision to the leaders, but decisions are subject to appeal.
- P6. Delegation of power and responsibility are essential to the effective working of the IETF. As many individuals as possible will be encouraged to take on leadership of IETF tasks.
- P7. Dissent, complaint, and appeal are a consequence of the IETF's nature and should be regarded as normal events, but ultimately it is a fact of life that certain decisions cannot be effectively appealed.
- P8. Leadership positions are for fixed terms (although we have no formal limitation on the number of terms that may be served).
- P9. It is important to develop future leaders within the active community.



- P10. A community process is used to select the leadership.
- P11. Leaders are empowered to make the judgement that rough consensus has been demonstrated. Without formal membership, there are no formal rules for consensus.

### **B.3. Process**

- P12. While the IETF needs clear and publicly documented process rules for the normal cases, there should be enough flexibility to allow unusual cases to be handled according to common sense. We apply personal judgment and only codify when we're certain. (But we do codify who can make personal judgments.)
- P13. Technical development work should be carried out by tightly chartered and focused Working Groups.
- P14. Parts of the process that have proved impractical should be removed or made optional.

### **B.4. Working Groups**

- P15. Working Groups (WGs) should be primarily responsible for the quality of their output, and therefore for obtaining early review; WG Chairs as WG leaders, backed up by the IETF leadership, should act as a quality backstop.
- P16. WGs should be primarily responsible for assessing the negative impact of their work on the Internet as a whole, and therefore for obtaining cross-area review; the IETF leadership should act as a cross-area backstop.
- P17. Early review of documents is more effective in dealing with major problems than late review.
- P18. Area Directors (ADs) are responsible for guiding the formation and chartering of WGs, for giving them direction as necessary, and for terminating them.
- P19. WG Chairs are responsible for ensuring that WGs execute their charters, meet their milestones, and produce deliverables that are ready for publication.
- P20. ADs are responsible for arranging backstop review and final document approval.



### **B.5. Documents**

- P21. IETF documents often start as personal drafts, may become WG drafts, and are approved for permanent publication by a leadership body independent of the WG or individuals that produced them.
- P22. IETF documents belong to the community, not to their authors. But authorship is recognized and valued, as are lesser contributions than full authorship.
- P23. Technical quality and correctness are the primary criteria for reaching consensus about documents.
- P24. IETF specifications may be published as Informational, Experimental, Standards Track, or Best Current Practice.
- P25. IETF Standards Track specifications are not considered to be satisfactory standards until interoperable independent implementations have been demonstrated. (This is the embodiment of the "running code" slogan.) But, on legal advice, the IETF does not take responsibility for interoperability tests and does not certify interoperability.
- P26. IETF processes are currently published as Best Current Practice documents.
- P27. Useful information that is neither a specification nor a process may be published as Informational.
- P28. Obsolete or deprecated specifications and processes may be downgraded to Historic.
- P29. The standards track should distinguish specifications that have been demonstrated to interoperate.
- P30. Standards Track and Best Current Practice documents must be subject to IETF wide rough consensus (Last Call process). WG rough consensus is normally sufficient for other documents.
- P31. Substantive changes made after a document leaves a WG must be referred back to the WG.
- P32. The IETF determines requirements for publication and archival of its documents.





## **Appendix C. Changes since RFC 3160**

[[ This section is to be eliminated before publication as an RFC. ]]

### **C.1. Changes in -00**

General changes:

- o Everything was renumbered due to the new use of xml2rfc. Many things were reformatted as well.
- o Updated some of the references, changing their designations as BCPs and STDs.
- o Fixed some links that had broken over time.

New and changed content:

- o Added the text to the intro about this document being intended to obsolete FYI 17.
- o Removed names of individuals no longer associated with their previous roles.
- o Added note that not all IETF meetings have social events.
- o Removed the discussion of agendas for previous meetings, because they are not kept around.
- o Removed discussion of the User Services Area, since it has been closed.
- o Added the paragraph about meeting at the IETF registration area.
- o Changed "Only the Secretariat can send messages to the announcement list." to "Only the Secretariat can approve messages sent to the announcement list, although those messages can come from a variety of people."
- o Added ietf-action@ietf.org to the useful email address list
- o Changed the "Newcomer Training" section title and text to reflect the new name for the "Newcomer's Orientation"
- o Added section "EDU to the Rescue" about the EDU Team.
- o Changed the first sentence to mention the EDU team in the "Working Group Chairs" section.



- o Changed the title of the "Tao" subhead to Why "The Tao?" because "Tao" by itself looked peculiar in the Table of Contents.
- o Added text at the beginning of "Patents in IETF Standards" to note that it'll be updated in -01.
- o Changed the "Newcomer Training" section title and text to reflect the new name for the "Newcomer's Orientation".

## **C.2. Changes in -01**

- o There have been more than 60 meetings now.
- o Changed "get a bite to eat" to "get a small bite to eat" at the reception.
- o Using the registration desk for leaving messages for other attendees, and as the lost and found center.
- o Updated the section on the terminal room to reflect current practice.
- o Removed mention of the print version of the proceedings.
- o Added laptop hints in the "other general things" section.
- o Updated the list of email addresses in A.2 to match Secretariat
- o Added text about humming and Jabber in [section 5.2](#)
- o Added text about I-D Tracker in [section 8.3](#)
- o Added a new section, 3.3, about potential IETF changes
- o Talked about mailman in addition to Majordomo.
- o Added paragraph near the end of the IETF section affirming that the IETF does not run the Internet
- o Added a paragraph about draft naming with -bis.
- o Added lots of things to the "Getting Things Done in a Working Group" section.



### **C.3. Changes in -02**

- o Modified [section 3.2.2](#) on the IESG to add forward reference to more info on rough consensus.
- o Added [section 4.2](#), urging attendees to stay for the whole week.
- o Modified [section 7.0](#), "Stop Here!" to to make it clear you don't have to attend a meeting to participate.
- o Modified [section 8.3](#), "Internet Drafts," to mention the Secretariat's new Internet-Drafts Database Interface.
- o Modified [section 8.4](#), "Recommended Reading," to substitute the new name for "I-D Nits".
- o Modified "Informative References" to add 2 new IPR BCPs

### **C.4. Changes in -03**

- o Modified [section 3.2.1](#) to add text about the new administrative structure.
- o Deleted [section 3.3](#) ("Are Changes Coming?").
- o Added [RFC4071](#) to [section 12](#).
- o Made minor edits to [section 5.2](#).
- o Added a paragraph in [Section 8.3](#) about copyrights in Internet Drafts, pointing to [BCP 78](#).
- o Added a paragraph about PROTO to [section 8.6](#).
- o Updated [section 8.11](#) to point to [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#) .
- o Added the IAD, IASA, and IAOC to [Appendix A.4](#).

### **C.5. Changes in -04**

This revision comes mostly from Brian Carpenter.

- o Said that the FYI series has not been added to in a long time.
- o Changed "dweebfests" to "gatherings of the tribes".
- o Started a section on BCPs, need to fill it in more.



- o Futzed with the some of the ASCII art to make it more readable.
- o Added Brian Carpenter to the acknowledgments because of the large number of additions he suggested on this round.
- o Added reference to [BCP 95](#) in the section on what the IETF is.
- o Said that about one in three IETF meetings are now held in Europe or Asia.
- o Said that the IESG's role is to set directions rather than to give orders.
- o Added text about the IETF mailing list's "sergeants at arms".
- o Talked about how people in a WG meeting who are busy on their laptops might be doing relevant IETF work.
- o Said that the terminal room doesn't have terminals.
- o Talked about why the IETF schedule sometimes changes at the last minute.
- o Talked about why companies might want to be formally covering IETF activities.
- o Mentioned that researchers might be interested in the IRTF
- o Talked about bringing your own multi-output extension cord.
- o Explained that WG meetings aren't "drafting sessions".
- o Defined "rough consensus" as "strongly held objections must be debated until most people are satisfied that these objections are wrong".
- o Added text about the Jabber chat rooms for WGs.
- o Explained "take it to the list".
- o Pointed to the WG charters page, and mentioned that it has pointers to old charters.
- o Added a bit about xml2rfc.
- o Added a pointer to the idnits checking tool.





- o Added that the IESG looks for deployment history before moving a protocol to Internet Standard.
- o Talked about [BCP 72](#) in the section on writing security considerations.
- o Added a stub section on BCPs. This will get filled in in the next version of this document.
- o Talked about debating technical issues, not attacking people.
- o Changed the press contact for the IETF to be the IAD.
- o Said that various web forms for submittal are coming.
- o Many minor editorial changes.
- o Replaced references to [RFC 3774](#) and 3844 with [BCP 101](#).
- o Removed old [Appendix B](#) (things that were to be added).
- o Added new [Appendix B](#) on IETF Principles.

#### **[C.6.](#) Changes in -05**

This revision comes mostly from Brian Carpenter. Minor wording changes are not noted here.

- o Added to the abstract to indicate that this is not a formal IETF process document.
- o Said in [Section 1](#) that the facts in the document are likely to change over time.
- o Added RAI to the list of areas.
- o Changed the RFC Editor's funding from ISOC to IASA.
- o Explained the Secretariat's new role and funding.
- o Changed the average attendance of IETF meetings back to 1,300.
- o Changed the places where WG chairs can find information.
- o Added a paragraph about large attachments on WG mailing lists.
- o Removed the stub section on BCPs.



- o Pointed to the IESG guidelines on Informational vs. Experimental RFCs.
- o Removed the ATM Forum from the list of liaisons because they no longer exist (although ATM still lingers...).

#### **C.7. Changes in -06**

- o In [section 1](#), clarified first reference to RFCs obsoleting each other.
- o In [section 3](#), added the often-held beliefs paragraph with the quotations from David Clark and Jon Postel.
- o In [section 3.2.1](#), clarified the role of the IAOC and simplified the diagram.
- o In [section 4.2](#), added a paragraph about bringing your laptop.
- o Updated the jabber room address in [section 5.2](#).
- o In [section 5.3](#), extended the suggestion against logos to presentations in the plenary, except for the meeting sponsor's presentation.

#### **C.8. Changes in -07**

- o Added text about STDs in the introduction.
- o Added a forward reference to section 4.11 in [section 3](#).
- o In 3.2.2, changed "a real consensus" to "community consensus".
- o Added a paragraph about the "Note Well" page in the registration packet in 4.1.
- o In 4.3, removed the length of the newcomer's orientation.
- o Clarified about WG list posting in 5.
- o In 5.2, added "It is up to the chair to decide when the Working Group has reached rough consensus."
- o In 5.2, mentioned that the Jabber rooms are for WGs.
- o In 5.2, changed the name of the Jabber rooms to jabber.ietf.org.



- o In 5.4, added HTTP access.
- o In 5.5, added that decisions in interim meetings need to be ratified on the list.
- o Changed "Historic standards" to "Historic documents" in 8.1.
- o In 8.3, clarified how drafts become WG items.
- o In 8.3, corrected the definition of "bis".
- o In 8.3.2, added a note about number reverting to -00 when the filename changes.
- o In 8.3.2, added a note about telling the I-D secretary when a draft becomes a WG item.
- o Added text about changing an IANA registry, not just creating a new one in 8.4.3.
- o Expanded the types of things that might become Experimental RFCs in 8.5.
- o Added "IPR" in A.4.

#### **C.9. Changes in -08**

- o Added Pekka Savola and Lisa Dusseault to the acknowledgements.
- o Added "and certain IETF office holders" in 3.3.
- o Expanded 5.1 to include more roles of WG chairs.
- o Thought [section 8](#), changed "Internet Drafts editor" to "Internet Drafts administrator".
- o Changed the section heading for 8.1 from "Getting a Standard Published" to "Getting an RFC Published".
- o Moved the sentence about the idnits checker from 8.3.1 to 8.3 and added a bit of background.
- o Clarified who does the initial file naming in 8.3.2.
- o Clarified the sentence in 8.4 about the length of time to become a full standard.



- o Added "and Internet Draft" in 8.4.4.
- o Added text from the IAB charter and a bit of background in 10.1.



Authors' Addresses

Paul Hoffman  
VPN Consortium  
127 Segre Place  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
US

Email: paul.hoffman@vpnc.org

Susan Harris  
Merit Network  
1000 Oakbrook Drive, Suite 200  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104  
US

Email: srh@merit.edu



## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2006).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

## Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at [ietf-ipr@ietf.org](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

## Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.

