

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Expires: May 26, 2004

M. Rose  
Dover Beach Consulting, Inc.  
November 26, 2003

A Practice for Revoking Posting Rights to IETF mailing lists  
draft-mrose-ietf-posting-04

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

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 May 26, 2004.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

All self-governing bodies have ways of managing the scope of participant interaction. The IETF uses a consensus-driven process for developing computer-communications standards in an open fashion. An important part of this consensus-driven process is the pervasive use of mailing lists for discussion. Notably, in a small number of cases, a participant has engaged in a "denial-of-service" attack to disrupt the consensus-driven process. Regrettably, as these bad faith attacks become more common, the IETF needs to establish a practice that reduces or eliminates these attacks. This memo recommends such a practice for use by the IETF.

---

Internet-Draft      Revocation Practice: IETF Mailing Lists      November 2003

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	A Revocation Practice . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
	Author's Address . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">A.</a>	Q & A . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>

---

Internet-Draft      Revocation Practice: IETF Mailing Lists    November 2003

## 1. Introduction

All self-governing bodies have ways of managing the scope of participant interaction. For example, deliberative assemblies often employ "rules of order" for determining who gets to speak, when, and for how long. Similarly, there is widespread agreement in so-called "liberal" societies that the right to free speech is not absolute, e.g., political speech is given more leeway than commercial speech, and some forms of speech (e.g., egregious libel or incitement to violence) are considered unacceptable.

The IETF uses a consensus-driven process for developing computer-communications standards in an open fashion. An important part of this consensus-driven process is the pervasive use of mailing lists for discussion. Unlike many other organizations, anyone may post messages on those IETF mailing lists, and in doing so, participate in the IETF process. Historically, this approach has worked very well in the IETF, as it fosters participation from a wide range of stakeholders. (For the purposes of this memo, the term "IETF mailing list" refers to any mailing list functioning under IETF auspices, such as the IETF general discussion list,, or a working group or design team mailing list.)

Notably, in a small number of cases, a participant has engaged in what amounts to a "denial-of-service" attack to disrupt the consensus-driven process. Typically, these attacks are made by repeatedly posting messages that are off-topic, inflammatory, or otherwise counter-productive. In contrast, good faith disagreement is a healthy part of the consensus-driven process.

For example, if a working group is unable to reach consensus, this is an acceptable, albeit unfortunate, outcome; however, if that working group fails to achieve consensus because it is being continuously disrupted, then the disruption constitutes an abuse of the consensus-driven process. Interactions of this type are fundamentally

different from "the lone voice of dissent" in which a participant expresses a view that is discussed but does not achieve consensus. In other words, individual bad faith should not trump community goodwill.

Internet-Draft      Revocation Practice: IETF Mailing Lists      November 2003

Guidelines have been developed for dealing with abusive behavior (c.f., Section 3.2 of [[1](#)] and [[2](#)]). Although not exhaustive, examples of abusive or otherwise inappropriate postings to IETF mailing lists include:

- o unsolicited bulk e-mail;
- o discussion of subjects unrelated to IETF policy, meetings, activities, or technical concerns;
- o unprofessional commentary, regardless of the general subject; and,
- o announcements of conferences, events, or activities that are not sponsored or endorsed by the Internet Society or IETF.

In practice, the application of those guidelines has included the temporary suspension of posting rights to a specific mailing list. If necessary, the length of the suspension has been increased with each successive suspension. In many cases, applying those guidelines will produce the desired modification in behaviour. However, when those guidelines fail to provide the desired modification in behaviour, more drastic measures should be available to reduce or eliminate these attacks' impact on the IETF process.

This document describes one such drastic measure.

---

Internet-Draft      Revocation Practice: IETF Mailing Lists      November 2003

## [2.](#) A Revocation Practice

Please refer to [\[3\]](#) for the meaning conveyed by the uppercase words in this section.

As a part of its activities, the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) makes decisions about "actions". Typically, an action refers to the publication of a document on the standards-track, the chartering of a working group, and so on. This memo recommends that the IESG also undertake a new type of action, termed a PR-action ("posting rights" action).

A PR-action identifies one or more individuals, citing messages posted by those individuals to an IETF mailing list, that appear to be abusive of the consensus-driven process. If approved by the IESG, then:

- o those identified on the PR-action have their posting rights to that IETF mailing list removed; and,
- o maintainers of any IETF mailing list may, at their discretion,

also remove posting rights to that IETF mailing list.

Once taken, this action remains in force until explicitly nullified and SHOULD remain in force for at least one year.

One year after the PR-action is approved, a new PR-action MAY be introduced which restores the posting rights for that individual. The IESG SHOULD consider the frequency of nullifying requests when evaluating a new PR-action. If the posting rights are restored the individual is responsible for contacting the owners of the mailing lists to have them restored.

Regardless of whether the PR-action revokes or restores posting rights, the IESG follows the same algorithm as with its other actions:

1. it is introduced by an IESG Area Director (AD), who, prior to doing so, may choose to inform the interested parties;
2. is published as an IESG last call on the IETF general discussion list;
3. it is discussed by the community;
4. it is discussed by the IESG; and, finally,
5. using the usual consensus-based process, it is decided upon by

the IESG.

Of course, as with all IESG actions, the appeals process outlined in [\[4\]](#) may be invoked to contest a PR-action approved by the IESG.

Working groups SHOULD ensure that their associated mailing list is manageable. For example, some may try to circumvent the revocation of their posting rights by changing email addresses; accordingly it should be possible to restrict the new email address.

Finally, note that the scope of a PR-action deals solely with posting rights. Consistent with the final paragraph of Section 3.2 of [\[1\]](#), no action may be taken to prevent individuals from receiving messages sent to a mailing list.

### [3.](#) Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges the contributions of: Brian Carpenter, Jim Galvin, Jeff Haas, Ted Hardie, Russ Housley, Thomas Narten, Jon Peterson, Margaret Wasserman, and Bert Wijnen.





#### [4.](#) Security Considerations

This memo deals with matters of process, not protocol.

A reasonable person might note that this memo describes a mechanism to throttle active denial-of-service attacks against the consensus-drive process used by the IETF.

---

Internet-Draft      Revocation Practice: IETF Mailing Lists    November 2003

#### Normative References

- [1] Bradner, S., "IETF Working Group Guidelines and Procedures", [BCP 25](#), [RFC 2418](#), September 1998.
- [2] Harris, S., "IETF Discussion List Charter", [BCP 45](#), [RFC 3005](#), November 2000.
- [3] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [4] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", [BCP 9](#), [RFC 2026](#), October 1996.

#### Author's Address

Marshall T. Rose  
Dover Beach Consulting, Inc.  
POB 255268  
Sacramento, CA 95865-5268  
US

Phone: +1 916 483 8878  
EMail: [mrose@dbc.mtview.ca.us](mailto:mrose@dbc.mtview.ca.us)

---

Internet-Draft      Revocation Practice: IETF Mailing Lists      November 2003

[Appendix A](#). Q & A

Q: Isn't a year too long?

A: No.

An initial PR-action is not undertaken lightly. It is approved only after a period of substantive consideration and community review. If a PR-action is approved, then this indicates that a serious situation has arisen.

Q: Why not require one PR-action per IETF mailing list?

A: To do so would enable a prolonged series of denial-of-service attacks.

If someone is poorly-behaved on one IETF mailing list, but well-behaved on another, then the maintainer for the second IETF mailing list needn't revoke posting rights. However, the more likely scenario is that someone who behaves poorly on one IETF mailing list is unwilling to be well-behaved on any IETF mailing list.

Q: Should the initiation of a PR-action come from outside the IESG?

A: Informally, sure; formally, no.

Under the IETF's consensus-driven process, IESG actions are always formally initiated by an IESG Area Director (AD). In practice, the motivation for an IESG member to initiate an action almost always comes from outside the IESG. For example, when a working group (WG) reaches consensus on a document, the WG chair informs the relevant AD that the document is ready for the AD to consider it for a document action. In the case of this document -- an IETF individual submission -- the author will iteratively circulate the document for wide discussion and make revisions. At some point,

the author will contact an AD and ask for a document action to publish this document as a Best Current Practice (BCP).

Q: Is this censorship?

A: Only if you believe in anarchy.

What is important is that the rules surrounding PR-actions exhibit the same properties used by the rest of the consensus-based process.

Rose

Expires May 26, 2004

[Page 10]

---

Internet-Draft      Revocation Practice: IETF Mailing Lists    November 2003

Q: C'mon! You really are a closet fascist.

A: No, I'm a libertarian.

Frankly, I would prefer that people behave reasonably and act in good faith. Since my first involvement with the IETF (nee GADS, circa 1983), everyone understood that reasonable behavior was a good thing. After 20 years, I regret to inform you that this step is inevitable.

---

Internet-Draft      Revocation Practice: IETF Mailing Lists    November 2003

#### Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property 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; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in [BCP-11](#). Copies of claims of rights made available for publication 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 implementors or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to practice this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assignees.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION

Rose

Expires May 26, 2004

[Page 12]

---

Internet-Draft      Revocation Practice: IETF Mailing Lists      November 2003

HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

## Acknowledgment

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

