

Proto
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: August 12, 2007

H. Levkowitz
Ericsson
A. Mankin
February 8, 2007

Requirements on I-D Tracker Extensions for Working Group Chairs
draft-ietf-proto-wgchair-tracker-ext-03

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/lid-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 August 12, 2007.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

Abstract

This document describes the changes required to make it possible for working group chairs to update the I-D tracker during document shepherding, after the request for publication. It also describes additional requirements for the chairs to use the I-D tracker for managing WG documents from their earliest stages. Having the tracker support the working groups more fully is a primary benefit, but in addition, this moves towards the goal of providing an integrated view of document states from -00 to RFC publication.

Internet-Draft

WG Chair Tracker Requirements

February 2007

1. Introduction

In order to make it possible for working group chairs acting as document shepherds to do the full duties of shepherding it is necessary for them to be able to enter document state changes and issue resolutions into the I-D tracker. However, at the time of writing, only area directors have the necessary write access to the tracker. In order to take over the full duties of shepherding, sufficient write access has to be provided also for working group chairs.

Another deficiency of the current I-D tracker is that although it accurately reflects document states from the time publication has been requested for a document, there is no state information available for documents which have been adopted as working group documents, but not yet submitted for publication. In order to make it possible for the tracker to reflect this information, new states and annotation possibilities are necessary, in addition to the ability for working group chairs to change document state in the tracker.

The need for new states also exist for documents which go through a different publication process than that used for documents approved by the IESG, such as IAB and IRTF documents. In order to do the necessary updates for such documents, write access to the tracker also needs to be provided to IAB and IRTF people. Specification of additional states for IAB and IRTF documents is left out of this document, and instead specified in [draft-ietf-proto-iab-irtf-tracker-ext](#).

Note that although the proposed changes introduce write access to the tracker for groups of IETF participants which does not currently have write access, such as working group chairs, they does not introduce general write access to the tracker for everybody.

1.1. Terminology

In this document, several words are used to signify the requirements of the specification. These words are often capitalised. The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [[RFC2119](#)].

The requirements in this document are specified as English phrases ending with an "(R-*nnn*)" indication, where "*nnn*" is a unique requirement number.

[2.](#) I-D Tracker Write Access

Providing write access for working group chairs and other non-IESG people to the tracker requires:

- * Having a 'groups' attribute associated with each user. This attribute should contain a list of groups of which the user is a member (R-001).
- * For the mentioned group attribute, there should at least be values defined corresponding to 'AD', 'Chair', 'Shepherd', 'IAB' and 'IRTF', permitting per-group access control of actions and features with this granularity (R-011).
- * Identification of the actions and information which may require verification of the user's access rights (R-002). Such actions and information will be called 'restricted features' in the following. Some known restricted features are:
 - Requesting IETF last call
 - Setting Document Approved states
 - Access to the tool which places documents on the IESG Agenda

Access to the document comment log is not a restricted feature.

- * An additional state table for WG state ([Section 3.1](#)), and additional tables for WG state annotation tags ([Section 3.2](#)), planned next state, and date of next state ([Section 3.3](#)) (R-010).
- * Addition of checks for appropriate group membership in the tracker code before the code provides access to restricted features (R-003).
- * Assignment of appropriate group memberships to existing users (R-004).

- * Establishment of new users, with appropriate group memberships and passwords (R-005).

3. New Document States

In order to be able to provide appropriate document state indications for documents which are working group documents, and have not yet been submitted for publication as RFC, one additional state variable (see [Section 3.1](#)), and two additional fields (see [Section 3.2](#) and [Section 3.4](#)) is needed in the tracker. These are described in the following sections.

3.1. WG Document States

A new state variable or field to hold WG Document states will be added to the tracker. This field will track the working group state of the document, and will be updated by the working group chairs once a document has been adopted as a WG document.

The reason why this is a different field rather than the existing IESG state field is that there are cases where a document has been passed to the IESG, and has reached a certain point in the IESG's handling, but is then sent back to the WG for a brief time. It is beneficial to be able to keep the IESG state visible, rather than have it overwritten by the WG state.

Defined WG States:

- * Candidate WG Document

This document is under consideration for becoming a working group document. A document being in this state does not imply any consensus, and does not imply any precedence or selection. It's simply a way to indicate that somebody has asked for a document to be considered for adoption.
(R-009)

- * Active WG Document

This document has been adopted by a working group, and is being actively developed.
(R-006)

* Parked WG Document

This document has lost its author or editor, is waiting for another document to be written, or cannot currently be worked on by the working group for some other reason.

(R-007)

* In WG Last Call

A working group last call has been issued for this document, and is in progress. When the last call has completed, a document would normally enter either the "Active WG Document" or the "Waiting for Document Shepherd Write-up" state, depending on the nature of the WG Last Call comments received. In both cases, an annotation of "Revised ID Needed" might also be appropriate, based on the comments received.

(R-008)

* Waiting for Document Shepherd Writeup

The Working group last call has been completed, and the document is waiting for the Document Shepherd to complete his write-up.

(R-030)

The naming of this state is very close to one of the current IESG states, "Waiting for Document Writeup". This IESG state should be renamed to "Waiting for Area Director Writeup" for clarity

(R-031).

* Submitted WG Document

The document has been submitted to the IESG for publication (and not returned to the WG for further action). The document may be under consideration by the IESG, it may have been approved and in the RFC Editor's queue, or it may have been published as an RFC; this state doesn't distinguish between different states occurring after the document has left the working group.

(R-008)

* Dead WG Document

This document has been a WG document, but has been killed or abandoned. This does not have to be a final state; if there is

consensus in the workgroup, a Dead document can be resurrected.
(R-025)

★ Not a WG Document

This document is not a WG document. This means that the IESG state for the document is either "I-D Exists" or "AD is watching". The document may have various other states set, such as various IAB or IRTF document states; but if so it is not reflected in the WG document state which simply will indicate "Not a WG Document".
(R-014)

[3.2.](#) WG State Annotation Tags

The use of a separate tagging or annotation field makes it possible to capture a number of specific conditions for a draft, where these conditions can exist in parallel. These conditions also does not really change the WG state of the document, but are still useful to show for instance what action is needed next for the document. The tracker should provide a means to set one or more of these annotation tags for a document, for instance by use of a multiple-choice selection box in a web interface (R-012).

These annotation tags are similar to the existing sub-states of the IESG state, but may be a more appropriate mechanism to show additional information which is not directly related to the document state.

Defined WG state annotation tags (R-013):

- ★ "Editor Needed"
- ★ "Held for Dependency on other Document"
- ★ "Awaiting MIB Doctor Review"
- ★ "Awaiting Cross-Area Review"
- ★ "Awaiting Security Review"
- ★ "Awaiting Other Reviews"
- ★ "Revised ID Needed"
- ★ "Doc Shepherd Followup"
- ★ "Other - see Comment Log"

When a document is in the WG state "In WG Last Call" with the annotation "Revised ID Needed", the WG annotation tag "Doc Shepherd Followup" should be automatically assigned by the tracker when the

document is updated (R-023). This is analogous to the automatic transition described below in [Section 4](#).

The annotation tag "Revised ID Needed" should be automatically cleared when a new revision of a document is made available (R-024).

[3.3.](#) Next WG Document State Field

As part of the WG status handling, a field should be available to indicate the next planned state of a draft, and the planned date for that state. The Next WG Document State field has the same possible values as the WG Document State ([Section 3.1](#)) field (R-027).

The Next Doc-State Date field is not a free-text field, but uses a well-known date representation form (R-028). (Example: "2007-01-19".) Any web-page providing input to this field should accept input in the form of a number of days and / or a pull-down list with a number of choices such as for instance "1 Day", "2 Days", ... "1 Week", "2 Weeks", ... "1 Month", "2 Months" etc. (R-029). This information is then converted to the chosen date format and stored. The Next Doc-State Date field may also be left blank.

[3.4.](#) Intended Status Field

As part of the WG status handling, a field should be available to indicate the intended status of a draft, with the possible values being (R-026):

- * "Informational"
- * "Experimental"
- * "Best Current Practice"

- * "Proposed Standard"
- * "Draft Standard"
- * "Full Standard"
- * "Historic"

When possible (for instance, when a draft is submitted through automated mechanisms, and contains a line in the first page document header which indicates the intended status, such as for instance

"Intended status: Informational") this field should be automatically set by the submission tool.

[3.5.](#) Document States for External Bodies

It would be highly desirable to have document states also for RFC editor queue states and IANA queue states. These could be automatically set through interaction with RFC Editor and IANA support tools, or could be fetched from the RFC Editor state information (now available in XML format) and IANA state information when available. That work is however out of scope for this document, but will be considered as part of future tracker enhancements.

[4.](#) Modification of Existing Fields

One existing sub-state in the tracker should be modified to reflect the role of the WG document shepherds.

The IESG sub-state "AD Followup" is defined as generic and may be used for many purposes by an Area Director. However, the tracker automatically assigns this sub-state when a document which has been in the "Revised ID Needed" sub-state is updated. The "AD Followup" sub-state shall continue to exist for the first purpose, but when a working group document is in "IESG Evaluation - Revised ID Needed" and an update arrives, it shall receive an automatic state change to a new sub-state instead: "Doc Shepherd Followup" (R-022). Non-WG documents continue to change state to "AD Followup" as before.

[5.](#) IANA Considerations

This document does not require any new number assignments from IANA, and does not define any new numbering spaces to be administered by IANA.

RFC-Editor: Please remove this section before publication.

[6.](#) Security Considerations

This document does not propose any new internet mechanisms, and has no security implications for the internet.

However, security of tracker access and security of private tracker comments need to be safeguarded, which requires care in handling, assignment and re-assignment of passwords. Auto-generated passwords **MUST** be generated with adequate strength, and if it is possible for users to change their passwords, strength assessment of the new password **SHOULD** be provided.

The mechanism to limit access to private comments and restricted actions **MUST** be tested and verified as functional after all the changes have been coded which are needed to implement the functionality described in this document, and before the changes are made available to the new set of users.

7. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

Authors' Addresses

Henrik Levkowetz
Ericsson
Torsgatan 71
Stockholm
SWEDEN

Phone: +46 708 32 16 08
Email: henrik@levkowetz.com

Allison Mankin

Phone: +1 301 728 7199
Email: mankin@psg.com

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

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, THE IETF TRUST 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.

