

Process Discussion
November 16, 2019
IETF106 – Collyer – 8:30am

Agenda

Call Read out
Shape of the proposal

- Heather covered the meeting read outs, meeting by meeting (virtual meeting 1, 2, 3)
- 24 people at Meeting 1, 12 people at Meeting 2, 6 people at Meeting 3
- Proposal: New IAB Program (see slides for details)
- How to run the meeting/discussion

Bob Hinden: We have an RFC that describes the RFC editor model – is the outcome of what you're proposing a change to that?

Heather: Yes, I would expect that.

Bob: There are some things in the current RFC that don't match reality, would you change these here?

Heather: yes

Ted: We're happy to do whatever the community wants, according to how the draft suggests

Brian Carpenter: It's my fault the IAB Charter doesn't describe the RFC Editor. One outcome of this process is that the IAB updates its own charter to reflect reality (or vice versa). I'd request that the IAB affirms the independent status of the RFC Editor.

Sue Hares: Finds trust lacking currently – the person described in the docs is a highly trained professional and should be treated as such – wants to see respect for the professional, they equal standards, and she doesn't see this reflected in the document

Ted: Back to the process issue that Brian raised, that he requested the IAB adjust its charter. While that might be a valid outcome, it can't be through an IAB program, due to BCP (it needs an IETF outcome). The IAB doesn't update its own charter – it doesn't have that right.

Leslie Daigle: In talking about the process and the How, we need to talk about the What. Maybe part of the How is to articulate the top level problems to solve.

Eric: General proposal seems sound, IETF Chairs hosting this might not be the best plan. The overall question is what best serves the community

Mike St Johns: One of the problems we're having is who gets to call consensus. Having chairs, and knowledgeable chairs, would help solve the "who calls consensus". Output of this process, we're looking for a BCP, and needs community consensus, not IAB consensus. IAB should think

about what it wants its role to be in this process and produce a document that describes their role.

Suzanne: Agrees with Mike, the critical point here is who calls consensus. We need a forcing function, and figure out how to reuse legitimate existing process seems important.

Leslie: Following up on my comment about Ted's comment – RFC2850 is subject to IESG approval, it's a question of getting community consensus on any changes. It sounded like he said "we'd like to do that, but we can't".

Ted: The point was a process point. Brian's point was that he wanted to see a change to the IAB charter to reflect the reality that comes out of this process. I'm happy to agree that that's a valuable output, but once it's come out of this process, that output has to go through the IETF process, because it's updating a BCP. If you want to make that as IESG approval, OK, but it needs to go through the IETF last call process. If folks agree with Mike, that the output is a BCP, then running an IETF process in the IAB and then bringing it over to the IETF is an extra step – you'll still need the IESG to come to consensus in order to become a BCP. Do you want the process to be IETF-like, or IETF?

Mike: The outcome of this is BCP, community consensus – but I want the IAB to define what it wants its role to be.

Aaron: There should be some sort of guide posts for this activity, and what the group supports as principals. A nit: in one of the calls, the 3rd call, the group should come up with the process for the long term (6-8 years), someone added on (10 years). We should design something that'll survive at least 10 years – anything less is too short.

Harold: You cannot solve problems by the same means you used to create them. Our actions showed that there was a disconnect between leadership and the community and what we should do. The process to come up with a solution should be outside the current established procedures. A WG with chairs approved by the IESG isn't it. However, when that process concludes, we will run the standard process of the IETF to have the resulting documents stamped with whatever stamps they need to have.

Brian: I want to reiterate what Aaron set – split the principles from the process. Let's agree on what we want to do and then argue the process. This doc is a recommendation to the IAB that they should make a program. Noted that the community has some distrust of the IAB – this may or may not be enough for the community. I'd caution in making the doc anything higher than status == Informational.

Leslie: Agree with Brian. Is the RFC Series an IETF document publication vehicle only? Unless it's been decided that this is the case, the location for the discussions for what is necessary should

not be uniquely within the IETF, which is why the IETF is not the appropriate place for this discussion to happen.

Ted: Key question: who has to approve the document that'll describe the new stated plan. The result of that may be something we want to delay in deciding until we see the outcome here.

Wes: I like what Ted just said – we need to have the initial design discussion before we discuss the outcome or how the outcome is stated. I'm happy to change the IAB Charter if that's what the community wants. Consensus is important – maybe not everyone agreed, but we agree that the majority of the people went in that direction.

Eric: what is the form for discussion, and what is the minimum threshold of people who must consent to the changes. I agree with Ted as well. It seems clear that the IESG will have to sign off on this. Who appoints the chairs? I'd like this to be run somewhat like an IETF process, to the extent we can.

Rich: I share the concern of the previous 5 people, let's not get ramped up in the process. This is bigger than the IETF. Let's get some documents written.

Colin: Echoing some of the previous comments. RFC Series publishes more than just IETF documents, it shouldn't be an IETF WG.

Aaron: Q for Heather and the room: we have the RSOC, we are acquiring a temporary caretaker or manager, as part of your proposal, do you have thoughts on how those roles interact with the process.

Heather: RSOC should focus on operational issues, and while the RSOC members should be a part of the discussion

Sarah: Do you have a concern with the RSOC members being a part of the conversation?

Aaron: No, but I do think they shouldn't be chairs

Sarah: Does that extend to the IAB members as well?

Aaron: yes

Martin: I agree, and further more, if there were a need to appeal, we can't have an IAB member chairing the group that's being appealed. This is why we don't have Area Directors as chairs of a group they'd oversee. This brings us to to who will chair this group.

Heather: IAB would appoint the chairs, after sending out a call for volunteers and feedback to the community.

Martin: that would be a responsible thing to do.

Stephen Farrell: I agree with everyone about the chairs thing. It would be good to give an idea on when you'd like that to happen – we don't want it to be a surprise to the community

Randy: I don't think engineers are fungible, and I think that assumption is what got us into this situation in the first place.

Mark: The general approach outlined is fine. I'm a little nervous about the proposal, in that it's a program of the IAB, run on rough consensus based on a process that is Informational track. It puts a lot of power in the chairs hand, and the appeals chain is fuzzy. Concerned we'll come to rough consensus, and someone will file an appeal, and because it's an IAB program it gets taken to the IAB, and past that, it gets even fuzzier.

Heather: When consensus is called by the chairs, if there was a problem, that's where the IAB steps in and says something broke.

Mark: Good, let's say that. If there's a role beyond that, say so, and if not, say so.

Martin: The room seems to be saying that the proposal/doc you have is sound, but the process is based on the process we're supposed to be maybe updating. The document shouldn't be published as an RFC

Heather: I agree.

Eric: I don't want the document to be published either.

Sarah: I +1 to what Mark said – if we're going to put things back into the hands of the IAB, we should be crystal clear as to what the role of the IAB is, and isn't.

Ted: We're happy to do what the community wants

Wes: I'd like to propose that all meeting rooms have 1 microphone so I know where to go to. (hah). Bias – everyone has a notion of where they're coming from. We haven't talked about number of chairs – used the example of supreme courts (US has 9) – I don't know what the right number is, but one of the ways around the process and bias is to have a larger number of biases included.

Mike: There's a model used for mediation where the vote is amongst 3 people

Harold: Chairs are supposed to be facilitators of consensus, not voting members, and this would be a new process that the IETF hasn't seen before.

Heather: We can document our concerns. I've got some work to do in the draft to outline what the process will be. I will try to have this done by the end of this week.