Status of
draft-irtf-hrpc-political

HRPC @ ICANN106

Avri Doria

Current State

- Author and a few others believe the doc is ready for RG last call.

- While many think it is valuable work and should eventually be published, some do not seem so sure and a few seem against

- Author has done an admirable job of turning around various versions of the doc in an attempt to respond to the comments.

Thanks to those who put considerable effort and thought into comments, in the next slides, I do not claim to have covered all of the reasoning given, but hope I have brought out the issues that remain in the doc as seen in those comments.

Some of the Issues

- Picked up on list
  - Clarity needed on the research question
  - Consistency between the sections of the document and the questions being asked
    - "(1) Do networking standards have political use and/or impact?
    - "(2) Is there politics in the development of networking standards?
    - "(3) "Are protocols political?""
  - Are all statements sufficiently substantiated with argument or references?
  - Should access to IETF be included in the discussion?
  - Issues with definitions. Especially the term 'political'
  - Use of 'standard' without definition, question of de-facto / de-jure and normative / voluntary.
  - Difference between non standard protocols &c, and standards track protocols.
  - Questions about the logic of the argument.
  - For whom is the document written and does it achieve its purpose?

Issues cont'd

- Others (mine)
  - Abstract speaks of general agreement as opposed to an open discussion.
  - Inconsistent referencing – better on issues supported by author
  - Reference on term 'affordance'
  - Are terms used in draft consistent with definition in RFC8280. Should at least be mentioned.
  - Section 5 Discussion, is one sided and does not present the opposing views.
    It seems more of an assertion than a discussion.
  - Lots of typos

Possible next steps

- Unless there is a request that I be replaced, am acting as shepherd for the doc through the IRSG process with the following perspective:
  - I view the doc as needing to provide a strong basis for ongoing discussion and future research.
  - I am looking for consensus that the doc is a balanced expression of views, even if it concludes with a view on which there is not consensus.
- Add an editor
  - No volunteers yet
    - I hope at least one of those who wrote extensive comments volunteers
- Replace editor
  - No ideas yet