# PROCESS DISCUSSION

How to make decisions about the future of the RFC Editor Model

# IETF NOTE WELL

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

- By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
- If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
- As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
- Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
- As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

- BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
- BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
- BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
- BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
- BCP 78 (Copyright)
- BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)
- https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/ (Privacy Policy)

# AGENDA

- **Administrivia**

- Read out from Virtual Meetings

- **Shape of the current proposal**

# THIS IS A PROCESS CONVERSATION

## Meeting Goals

- **Who manages the community discussion?**
  - **Who needs to be invited to the table?**
    - **Who calls consensus?**

# ACKNOWLEDGING DIFFERENT POSSIBLE MODELS

- The RFC Editor as a wholly independent entity

- The RFC Editor as an IAB/RSOC managed function

- The RFC Editor as an IETF LLC managed function

- …

These options are mentioned here only because the seeing the breadth of possibilities is useful to help understand why the question of "who gets to decide" is not simple.

# READ OUT: VIRTUAL MEETING #1

- Group would be run like an IETF Working Group (but not actually be an IETF Working Group.

- Stream managers and and a small number of community at-large members would form something like a  design team within the group.

- The group should be outside the IAB/IETF (though much participation is expected from within the IETF community).

- Chair(s) must clearly identify whether they have any potential Conflicts of Interest.

- A key characteristic and requirement of the working group is openness of participation and process.

- It is critical to engage external stakeholders.

# READ OUT: VIRTUAL MEETING #2

- IAB is the correct home, from a logical and organizational architecture perspective, to host the discussion for the RFC Editor model.

- IAB should organize a program that follows the principles of open participation (e.g., the model of an IETF working group), and run a community-wide call for volunteers to both find chairs for this group and to invite participation.

  - Program should have a clear, concrete, and objective charter that can be published as an Internet-Draft.

  - Organizations external to the IETF should be invited to participate at multiple points in the process

# READ OUT: VIRTUAL MEETING #3

- At least some IAB involvement is critical

  - Suggestion was to bring in past IAB and IETF chairs as core membership to the group

- Group must look to the long-term structure of the RFC Editor (as opposed to looking at short-term, tactical matters)

- Long-term structural issues include:

  - business (where to get funding),

  - administration (how to handle hiring/firing),

  - editorial control (who gets to say no to publishing something).

- Model cannot be designed around one individual or entity; roles themselves have to be more clearly described

# VIRTUAL MEETING SUMMARY

## KEY POINTS – MEETING 1

- Open participation

- Based on an IETF WG model, including initial design team

- Design team = stream managers, appointed community-at-large

## KEY POINTS – MEETING 2

- Oversight by the IAB

- Open participation, open call for chair(s)

- OK to follow an IETF WG model (as long as it is not an IETF WG)

## KEY POINTS – MEETING 3

- Some involvement of the IAB

- Focus on long-term structural concerns

# PROPOSAL

- New IAB program

  - Open membership; support remote participation; produce regular meeting minutes and community updates

- Scope

  - Determining the full scope of responsibilities and authority within the RFC Editor (in particular, those for the RFC Series Editor)

  - Considering and proposing business and administrative requirements to support proposed changes (e.g., funding, administration)

  - Soliciting input from organizations that are expected to be directly impacted by any changes to the RFC Editor model (e.g., SDOs with liaison relationships to the IETF, NOGs, etc)

https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-flanagan-rseme/

# DISCUSSION