

IETF 108 Plenary Minutes

29 July 2020, Online

1. Welcome

Slides: [IETF 108 Welcome and IETF Chair Report](#), Slides 1-6

2. Updates

Note: Reports available in the [Datatracker](#)

2.1. IETF Chair Update

Slides: [IETF 108 Welcome and IETF Chair Report](#), Slides 7-13

2.2. IAB Chair Update

Slides: [Internet Architecture Board \(IAB\) Report, IETF 108](#)

2.3. IRTF Chair Update

Slides: [Internet Research Task Force Plenary Report](#)

2.4. NomCom Update

Slides: [NomCom 2020-21, IETF 108 Plenary](#)

2.5. IETF LLC Board Update

Slides: [IETF LLC Briefing for IETF 108](#)

3. IETF Administration LLC Open Mic Session

Pete Resnick: How many people were able to use the fee waiver this time? Is it burdensome to do so, or did it turn out really well?

Jay Daley: We're at about 175 or so. We'd budgeted for 115, thanks to our sponsors. It's been a noticeable chunk of registrations, but in terms of numbers it feels like we still have a very large number of people participating. It's not as though we've lost anything by people switching to fee waivers. And it's been fine to administer and reasonably straightforward. We haven't done any

form of checking or analysis to see if anybody could have done something else. We've just accepted people on their word.

Jason Livingood: It'll be interesting as we do the post-meeting survey to see if there are any questions that might be interesting, especially are those new participants to the IETF and so on.

* * *

Jim Reid: If the meeting goes ahead in Bangkok, will you be projecting that on lower attendance rates than we would normally expect to physically show up for the meeting?

Jay Daley: It's a good question. Our assessment process is effectively a two-step one, where we determine whether or not it's viable for the meeting to go ahead, and then the IESG determines if there are sufficient numbers to go ahead. I haven't done extensive work on what the numbers would be if we went ahead with an in-person meeting yet. That's part of the assessment process I'll do at the end of August, and that's when I'll have a better answer to that question. That's when we'll look at travel bans and other things like that.

Jim Reid: It would be good to get a survey of how many people would be prepared to go to Bangkok, assuming their employer would let them.

Jay Daley: That's our second stage, if the first stage is that we think it is viable to hold a meeting there, then we'd probably go to that as a second stage. You can make your own judgment on what the first state is likely to deliver.

Jason Livingood: Good point about employer travel. I know many companies that send IETF participants to meetings have travel restrictions in place, so that may be a factor, and of course, we're seeing a lot of resurgence globally. We'll see.

* * *

Andrew Campling: This is also related to IETF 109. Two quick points; first to add to Jim's point, at the moment I'm concerned about the availability of travel insurance, so even if it's possible to go, it might be quite challenging to get travel insurance, which I think will be an issue for some of us. I've also noticed that we've started to see high profile events for early next year moving to virtual. You've seen, I'm sure, the notice about CES in January going virtual. Personal view, I think the practicalities of doing face-to-face events in November are extremely questionable. That's just my opinion.

Jason Livingood: Very good point, thanks for the input.

* * *

Allison Mankin: I do love this Meetecho tool. My question is, let's assume we have uncertainty about different peoples' travel, or maybe some people just like the really intensive online. Can we consider having a full-on Meetecho presence that empowers the remote people as well as in person?

Jay Daley: That's probably tied up in the work going on in SHMOO about what people want in online meetings, even though it's related to in-person. I'm not convinced that it's sensible for us in the LLC to start making decisions about the meeting experience in that way; that's something more for the IESG and others to do, and that's the process currently. Tweaks and other things, yes, but if you're talking about a major overhaul about the way that the interaction between in-person and online takes place, that requires community guidance to help us understand how to deliver it.

Jason Livingood: Just to add to that, I think it's certainly the case whether you look at our online meeting tools or other online collaboration tools, everyone's expectations, as a result of working remotely in the pandemic, have really increased quite a bit. It's important for us to step up our tooling, and I do want to make a mention here of our Meetecho team. The work they've done here is phenomenal and I really really appreciate the quick development and turnaround on a lot of the features. Really nice work.

Alissa Cooper: There's a really wide array of opinions about this question, which is why the SHMOO process is so important. There are some people who never want to have a plenary meeting again, all the way to emphasizing the face-to-face and the model we were going with before, and everything in between. We really need to try to coalesce around the model that the bulk of the community is interested in, because in the absence of that we just have to guess or make a choice one way or the other without having a good sense of what the community wants.

* * *

Jason Livingood: Thank you very much.

4. Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) Open Mic Session

[Introductions]

Greg Mirsky: I have a question about IPR disclosures. I have a problem and I am trying to solve it. Who can I turn to?

Alissa Cooper I think it depends on the nature of the problem.

Greg Mirsky: The problem is with the current information of the email of the person who submits the disclosure.

Alissa Cooper Ah, yes, I apologise I wasn't able to respond before the meeting. That is being actively investigated, and we're trying to figure out what the problem is on our side.

Greg Mirsky: I have a suspicion if someone who registered contacted me directly I can give a clue and we can go on from there.

Alissa Cooper I'll get back to you after the IETF. I apologise for not responding earlier. I think Pete is next.

* * *

Pete Resnick: Hello. So I noticed a thread on the IETF list that has gotten kind of long, I don't know if anyone else has noticed that thread. A couple of quick things. John made a comment on the list about the last-minute nature of the IESG statement is probably a little problematic. Lesson learned, that the timing should be a little while before the meeting. A request that folks participating take a beat and remain a little calm. It's a controversial topic and it's bound to get snippy, so be more empathetic with others and talk to folks offline and not assume they are just being idiots. A request to the IESG: if you've got a controversial thing coming out--and I don't think anyone was surprised this would be controversial--it would be really good to have someone from the IESG managing the discussion. Without that, people repeat themselves. It has become non-useful and for some folks unreadable. And I hope we can do differently in the future. Thanks.

Alissa Cooper I will give my own response, and let others chime in. From my perspective, I've not seen the message about the statement being last-minute, but I think it's decades overdue. I don't find it to be last-minute at all. We should have done it a long time ago. It wasn't in relation to the meeting.

Pete Resnick: A comment on that, Alissa, it wasn't a comment on sooner or later, but more that, three days before the IETF meeting made it so it blew up when there were a lot of other things going on. Not that it shouldn't have been as soon as possible, that's exactly right. Just that timing it near the meeting made it tricky, and made IESG involvement in that conversation harder, that's all.

Alissa Cooper Okay. I feel that people may need to reread the statement. The first paragraph is what the IESG believes. I understand there is effort to influence what we believe, but it's just a statement of our belief. If people want to comment, that's fine. But it's just a statement of belief by the IESG. The second paragraph is welcoming further discussion from the community in the structured way we have in the IETF inviting people to comment on the draft in GENDISPATCH. I can appreciate that there is nothing we can do to prevent people from starting a thread on

ietf@ietf, but if you read the words in the statement, they tell you something different from what people have been reading into them.

* * *

Andrew Campling: I want to go back to the point Pete made. The timing of putting out the statement a few days before an IETF meeting was unhelpful given the volume of responses it generated. The noise coming from the various lists quickly became unmanageable and it became a distraction, rather than having much more constructive discussion. I think the timing was at best unfortunate. And it would be better to have such announcements not put out just before an IETF meeting.

Alissa Cooper Thank you. Rich?

* * *

Rich Salz: I think it's going to be a noise fest no matter when it happens. Having it happen when people's minds are focused on the IETF and publications of documents seems reasonable to me. It will be unfortunate whenever it is. I speak from experience.

Alissa Cooper Okay. Thank you. Any other questions for the IESG?

* * *

Dan York: Two questions in the jabber chat room [from "kha"]: The RFC Editor has a long backlog; who will fix that? And a question about the NomCom; are any of the incumbents running again?

Alissa Cooper Barry, would you like to respond?

Barry Leiba: Generally, by the time the request goes out for the solicitation of volunteers for nomination of the positions, some of us have declared whether we will be standing again or not. And the NomCom will know who is willing to stand again or not. Generally the NomCom chair will announce that with the solicitation of volunteers. Sometimes people decide after people have started to put their names in. But the NomCom Chair lets the community know as soon as the incumbents have declared they'll be standing again. And I'll say for me, I do not intend to stand for ART AD again, and I hope the ART Area will put forth a number of good candidates, including the ones who stood last time.

Alissa Cooper Thanks, Barry. So to the first question. There are a few compounding factors that have affected the length of the RFC Editor's queue. The main one still in play right now is called cluster 238, which is a group of forty or so documents that have a web of interdependencies that have caused them to all hit the publication queue at once. About half are finished through

AUTH48, and half still need to complete AUTH48. So hopefully when that cluster is done, the length of the queue in terms of the number of documents will be dramatically shortened. Optimistically, by the end of the year. That will be a significant help. The other thing that is affecting the time in the queue is the transition to the v3 format that started in October of last year. The bulk of the issues that surfaced have been ironed out. If John is with us he can give more of an update when the IAB comes on. But we're getting to the place where we know the editing time of a v3 document is getting smoothed out. So next in the queue is Ron.

* * *

Ron Bonica: I'd like to recommend draft authors run their text through a tool like [Grammarly](#) or [Hemingway](#) to get it in pretty good shape when it's being reviewed, so the RFC Editor doesn't have to go crazy with grammatical stuff that could have been taken care of by a piece of software. It might even be a good idea if the IESG can recommend some tools to get to a style they like to see.

Alissa Cooper That's a good suggestion. Thank you. Barbara is next.

* * *

Barbara Stark: I wanted to say as the NomCom chair, independent of whether any of these wonderful people will be running again for any position, I would love to see people running against them. Competition in things like this is really a good thing. I think it encourages us all to be our better selves and try to do better. I don't think people should ask whether or not someone else is running before they put their name in the hat, and even if they don't get the position, again, the experience is really good to have. Thanks.

Alissa Cooper Thank you, Barbara. Michael is next.

* * *

Michael Richardson: Scribing for Kathleen [Moriarty] "Is anything being done to increase the rate of output for documents in the IESG queue for publication (AD review expectations, understanding that holding documents up hold up real work/progress, etc.?)" And John also said some of the RFC Editor questions will happen in the IAB part.

Ben Kaduk: I know for me, the queue of documents for AD review is getting pretty long. We have been trying to do some things to speed that up. I was able to request for some documents that my IESG colleagues take over a few documents that were sent to me--pretty shortly after they were sent to me--to short circuit my very long queue and get it to someone who could handle it a lot quicker. That seems to have been pretty effective. I think we're going to keep in mind the ability to do that in the future. We have a standing item on our informal telechats to ask

if there are any documents that need to be switched around. I expect to be making better progress with my own queue in coming months.

Alissa Cooper Barry?

Barry Leiba: It's helpful for the document shepherds to keep up with this also, and if we are not responding quickly enough, that is part of what the shepherds are supposed to be doing, to ping us and ask what the delay is. Sometimes just a reminder will help push it up the queue and get it going.

Warren Kumari: I agree with what Barry said. If you're a draft author, please integrate comments when you get comments back. And if you are waiting on an AD to do something, please ping them. Often we get huge numbers of emails in the inbox and we might miss one. If you are waiting on an AD to do something, please just ping them to make sure they have not lost track of it.

Alissa Cooper David?

* * *

David Schinazi: On the length of lengthy reviews for the IESG. I would like to offer a suggestion. I had the experience of a bunch of documents where we've gotten a very long and thorough review from the IESG, which is great and helpful, but I'm thinking it's maybe not in the best interest of the IESG to spend so much time on editorial comments on documents. For instance, I've had one of the IESG make editorial comments, I've made the changes and another AD made editorial comments that directly contradicted those changes. Maybe shorten the reviews and not nitpick everything editorial. We have the RFC Editor that can do this. Just a thought.

Ben Kaduk: Just my own response to David, I asked the RFC Editor directly a couple of years ago on meeting editorial issues with the RFC Editor. And the response I got was, please report editorial issues with the document as early as possible. For many of these documents, I'm not reading them until IESG Evaluation, so that's the earliest chance I have to make those sorts of comments. And to reiterate, the IESG ballots have a Comment section which is explicitly non-blocking comments. There is the Discuss section that is for blocking comments. But by putting comments in the comments section, we are saying we're okay if you completely ignore this, but this is what I found, it is just a comment.

Warren Kumari: Ideally typos and editorial things would be caught in the Working Group Last Call, or before Last Call or during Last Call, before it hits the IESG. My ADHD/OCD won't let me just ignore a bunch of typos and editorial things without mentioning them. As Ben said, most of them end up in the comment section unless it's a significant enough issue to be a Discuss. The RFC Editor has a lot of work to do; if we can make the document not have 27 typos before it gets to them, it's a good thing. There are a lot of documents that show up with typos.

Roman Danyliw: Absolutely. One of the things we can do better as the IESG is, we should try not to duplicate feedback. Whether it is a Discuss or a Comment, if there is nothing new to add. Different ADs have different workflows, whether or not they read others' comments before they provide theirs. But we can try harder at that; that's fair. Thanks.

* * *

Mark Nottingham: I want to follow on to the last discussion. Ben, you said you talked to the RFC Editor; I'd encourage you to talk to the authors. The experience of an author putting a document together, going through WG Last Call, then going through IETF Last Call, and then going through the RFC Editor is onerous. When they get a tremendous amount of very detailed feedback from the IESG that sometimes conflicts with what the RFC Editor says. And then they have to go through the same process with the RFC Editor, it's not really a great experience. Especially when the feedback comes in the huge email and you have to go find the right part of the document to edit. At least with the RFC Editor, it's much more automated and they do the work for you. I'd really encourage you to think about what editor experience is here. Especially since so many Working Groups are using more modern tools like GitHub, where you can give them a pull request for example. And the statement about "comments can be ignored," I don't think that's true. If we're really to save time and money from the RFC Editor, there is something broken going on.

Ben Kaduk: Thanks Mark. I think those are great points. I'm glad you mentioned people who are using GitHub. I do try to check if there is a document using GitHub and I make a pull request for the boring editorial stuff. I do that more when a document is in AD review than in IESG Evaluation. Speaking for myself, I don't think it's a question of saving money or time from the RFC Staff, but more I have this problem where I notice things. Once I've noticed it and gotten past it when reading for my own comprehension, the time to note it to get it fixed is not very much for me. But I will try to consider the effect on authors in the future.

Warren Kumari: Once I've noticed a nit, it's hard to not comment on it and just let it lie. But also, you may be making a generalization there, Mark. I recently published a document and I got a bunch of editorial comments back from the IESG review. I found them really helpful and friendly. I went through and integrated them; as always, there is other stuff to integrate after the IESG review. So while I have the document open going through and fixing the typos I accidentally left in, and changing things like "DNS Revolver" to "DNS Resolver," I think is really helpful and it's the sort of thing that the RFC Editor might miss. I'd rather fix them when the document is open than have an errata because of a typo.

* * *

John Klensin: To repeat a comment from the chat. When it's coming from the IESG, treating comments that show up in the post Last Call process as just comments is hard for experienced

participants, and probably impossible for newcomers. I want to make a vague suggestion for the IESG to think about. Twenty-five years ago when I was on the IESG, we used to view the IESG catching problems that survived Working Groups and Last Calls and document shepherds. When something got that far and no comments or issues were raised, we treated it as a process failure. Not something to scream at someone about, but something to think about what could have been done differently, which would have prevented the IESG from needing to deal with those comments last minute. If the IESG feels they need to lodge a Discuss against a document, that's an indication that something somewhere along the line in the process failed. I'm not suggesting that you don't act as a final check in that regard, but I am suggesting that maybe it's time to go back and think about ways of doing a post mortem. A reexamination of what caused the document to get to the IESG in the shape in which the IESG feel like they need to make a serious protest. And that applies to editorial issues, to language we no longer approve of, or a technical problem. Something to think about. Thanks.

Alissa Cooper Thank you. Toerless?

* * *

Toerless Eckert: We have a discussion on the length of the Meetecho time slots on the WG Chairs mailing list. I think it would be good to think about the time limits. I think it would be good for the IESG to think about how in future virtual meetings to manage the time there. Right now, it starts on the clock and ends on the clock and people start to argue for five more minutes. I think we have more leeway on that, so WG Chairs can ask if people can stay over. It's not as if the next group rushes in. I think we have more flexibility these days, but on the tooling side we're going the opposite way. Would be great if the IESG could get involved given how it's probably a good part of your responsibility to manage that.

Alissa Cooper Thanks. I agree. I think this is a place we can make a lot of improvement. I think that having the start times fairly strict is important in terms of making sure that everyone who wants to get to a session can get to it. So, I don't think we want the sessions to bleed into each other, even if there is a core group that can keep talking. That's sort of exclusionary towards other people who have another commitment. But the lead times on the other side is something we need to work on. We may add something to the meeting survey to get a sense from people what they are looking for.

Toerless Eckert: I think it's the point that fifteen minutes before the rooms are open and people can come in and there is no official program and there is side discussion before. If we can stay afterwards, at least until the next meeting is officially scheduled, like when there are breaks. There is a total miss of using the same tooling ad hoc for WG side meetings when you see you are running over. We have had those easily in the past when there were rooms available. There are always more options that we currently don't have with Meetecho.

Alissa Cooper Point taken, thank you.

* * *

Samuel Weiler: I wanted to go back to document editing. As I think about my own RFCs, the RFC Editor edits with an extremely light touch. When I think about the documents I've reviewed at Last Call, I think that many would benefit from far more significant editing than I typically see the RFC Editor do. If authors don't want those comments to come in during Last Call or during IESG review, my suggestion is they or their Working Groups send us better documents. And do a stronger editing pass at the Working Group, even if it means assigning an additional person to edit the document.

Alissa Cooper That's a good suggestion.

* * *

Jonathan Lennox: The in-person meetings are an hour, hour-and-a-half, two hours, and in this meeting it was fifty minutes or a hundred minutes instead, and I feel like given the friction of A/V troubles, that's a little tight. My group didn't need a full hour and a half, so I thought, I guess I'll have to do fifty minutes, but it's turned out to be sort of tight for me. So I think that going forward, if we're still going to do virtual, then a half-hour quanta instead of twenty-five minutes would work better, in my personal opinion.

Alissa Cooper Thank you, that's good feedback. It's a little tricky since we're trying to keep the whole day short due to time zones.

* * *

Barry Leiba: Question in Jabber from KHA, "I request IESG to also consider what new terminology drafts/RFCs are introduced and is it necessary? Preference should not be to add new pixie dust all the time to make contributions look cool."

Alissa Cooper I'm not sure I really follow that. If someone else did and wants to respond? If this is about the terminology draft, maybe send email to GENDISPATCH and we can follow up.

Ben Kaduk: If I understood the question correctly, it was to say every time we have a new technology draft in front of us, we should take a closer look to see if it is defining new terms that are not needed. If there are existing terms that can be used just fine. We should not define new terms just because we can, only when there is a particular need for it. Also it looks like Ted Lemon managed to put into the jabber what he was intending to say at the mic. He was going to say "We have a process to announce interim meetings, and having the WG meetings go long without being on schedule it would violate the two week notice process."

Alissa Cooper That's just a statement?

Ben Kaduk: Yes.

Alissa Cooper That seems true. John is next.

* * *

John Klensin: With regard to that terminology comment, I agree. And I agree with the summary that we should not add terms we don't need to. This is something that shouldn't fall on the IESG. If IETF Last Call is meaningful, people should be reading these documents during Last Call and raising these terminology objections long before it falls on the IESG to notice these things and sort them out. I think we're putting too much responsibility on the IESG, which is making things too burdensome. And it is vastly increasing the stress on authors, rather than catching these things earlier in the course of document development.

Ben Kaduk: I wanted to respond back with a question. There was some discussion in the chat as well about hoping we did not have to go to a place where we had explicit signed reviews of the document to confirm the document actually got read. My question back to John would be, do you think the IESG should be putting in Discusses on documents due to process failures? If it seems the document wasn't reviewed during IETF Last Call?

John Klensin: Especially for Working Group documents. If it looks like those documents got into Last Call without review, I would expect a responsible Area Director to bounce that document back to the WG before it goes into IESG Review. It's an answer to a little different question, but yes, I think we are--the whole community is--taking IETF Last Call much less seriously than we did even a decade ago. I think we need to find a way to ameliorate that. If the community doesn't care enough about a document to carefully review it, then we don't have IETF consensus for that document, no matter what IESG reviews or other rituals we go through, and we really need to start taking that seriously.

Ben Kaduk: That's a fair point, I don't think I can disagree with that. Hopefully we can get consensus in the community about the right approach.

John Klensin: I'd much rather have a discussion in the community about what that right approach is, rather than work it out on this call. I don't think I have ideas better than anybody else's, but I am certainly noticing the problem.

Barry Leiba: John, back when dinosaurs roamed the Internet, we had lots fewer documents going into Last Call, and we had more people who were more broadly scoped. We have a much more focused group of people now and it has been difficult to get a lot of Last Call comments. I would love to see many more reviews. Directorates and Area review teams have helped somewhat in that regard, because we at least push a few reviews. We hope that most of the work will be done in the Working Groups and that Last Call will surface a relatively small number

of comments. That gives us the cross-Area review, but it is a very difficult problem, and I'd love to see much more engagement in the community with Last Call.

John Klensin: I don't think I disagree with anything you said, speaking as one of the residual dinosaurs. At the same time, if we make very broad claims for IETF consensus, that presumes an informed review somewhere. And to the extent we're not getting it, we're risking the IETF's credibility, as well as putting far more pressure on the IESG members to act as overall supervisors of the technical quality of work, which we can't reasonably expect them to all understand all the time. We need to figure out a way to work on that a little bit.

Warren Kumari: I agree with Barry and John. The problem is looking at the consensus process is you have to make sure that all of the outstanding comments are addressed. There is very little that says there has to be a good strong show of support. Or how one judges that level of support. I tried to find a document that said at least n people said this was a good idea. Or strong levels of support. And I couldn't find that document to point at. So a) if someone has that, it would be really helpful. And b) maybe we need to change our world view. So there is consensus when you've addressed all of the outstanding comments and everyone stopped complaining. We need much stronger shows of support from the Working Group before the chairs are willing to send a document forward. A lack of comments in IETF Last Call does not mean there is consensus. It either means nobody has read the document, or that maybe everyone agrees but that seems unlikely. We should take the conversation to a mailing list so hopefully people will comment and review.

* * *

Dominique Lazanski: The Meetecho meetings have been going really well. I've been very impressed with them. A question about the virtual hum; is there a minimum number of people that need to participate, or a minimum volume? And how are people finding it, in general? There have been a couple where people are not quite sure what to do.

Martin Duke: [audio issues] --There is a draft about this in SHMOO, if you want to talk about the spec. It will show up as niente--[audio cuts off]

Alissa Cooper I think we lost Martin. I think what he was trying to say is, if there are no hums, it will show up as niente, as the bucket that captures very low or no humming. If you have feedback about the tool, please send it to tools-discuss at ietf. That's where we are having discussion about it, and I think opinions vary, so please bring yours to the discussion list.

* * *

Toerless Eckert: With regards to the Last Call, it is up to the document shepherds and the WG chairs try to initiate before the end of the Last Call with review and wherever the most useful

additional feedback. Or even earlier than the Last Call end. I think that needs to be exercised more, from my own experience, I think I'm to blame there as well for not doing enough.

Warren Kumari: I think one of the problems is there are authors who push really strongly for their document to go to WGLC. And chairs are willing to push back for a while, after six or seven times of the document being put forward as "ready for WG last call" but no one has read it. Eventually, it becomes easier for the chairs to say "whatever" and just to push it to the IESG. I don't know how we can fight that. Chairs are volunteers, and after a number of times shouted at by authors it just becomes easier to say whatever, I'll kick this to someone else. At some point I think the only legitimate way is if everyone who participates is willing to read and comment on drafts even if they don't find them interesting, or to provide support to the chairs when they say author X has said seventeen times now they think the document has consensus, can people please read it and comment? I think it's a problem that lies with all of us. Chairs need support as well, so if authors are pushing on chairs and you're a participant, please feel free to help the chair push back. Not all need it, but sometimes it is helpful.

Toerless Eckert: So, my experience with a document that had many pieces of expertise from different areas was that if we could have asked for expert review earlier for the specific parts, it could have sped up the process. So it's all during IESG review and IEEE review that it's all deluge. We could attempt to have these out of WG reviews earlier on. I think you're right there will not be more review from the working group itself. But if the review from people outside the group comes before Last Call, there is probably a better chance to get a better resolution than the "rush and publish phase" that IETF and IESG review often is.

Warren Kumari: I wasn't speaking of any specific draft.

Alissa Cooper Phill?

* * *

Phillip Hallam-Baker: I was going to address John's point earlier. Yes, things were different twenty-five years ago, and so were the documents we were producing then, and since then we've got strong security requirements, strong IANA requirements. We've got a whole list of requirements to improve the quality of the draft. But the other thing we've done which possibly changed the process is, a lot of cases where you need to get a registration and are RFC required or documentation required where you've got to be made an RFC. And when we discuss things like making Internet-Drafts permanent, etc. And we have that whole RFC process. One of the things I don't think was clearly addressed there was, if you're going to make the threshold an RFC is required, then what you end up doing is forcing a lot of stuff to go through the IESG that perhaps never needed to go there in the first place. Because all someone wanted was a code point. And maybe if we just gave them a code point and they went away and it died afterwards, it wouldn't have bothered anybody. So we're creating work by insisting on processes.

Alissa Cooper There is a lot of truth in that. We'll move on to the IAB Open Mic session.

5. Internet Architecture Board (IAB) Open Mic Session

5. Internet Architecture Board (IAB) open mic session

[Mirja Kühlewind, IAB Chair, asks IAB members to introduce themselves via Meetecho.]

Mirja Kühlewind: Okay, John.

John Levine [Temporary RFC Series Project Manager]: Just, apropos of some of the questions that were asked in the last round, about slow documents. I don't have a whole lot to add to what Alissa and the other people said. Cluster 238 totally screwed up our schedule, because essentially, 45 documents were basically thrown into a bucket over the last four years, and then dropped all back into the queue at the same time, which caused a huge backlog in the last couple of months. The production people have been working diligently. They are mostly all in AUTH48 or better, and it seems likely that most of them will be published by next month. Beyond that, the switch to XML documents was very disruptive. I mean, like, part of it meant that everybody had to learn new tools, part of it means we have new, permanent jobs we have to do. In particular, in the v3 XML, it's full of semantic tagging, which is great, but it means that somebody actually has to do the semantic tagging. And if the authors don't do it--which at this point, many are not--the RPC has to go through and do the semantic tagging, too. I am attempting to look at how we can make our tools better, and also to encourage people to submit things in v3 with the tags pretty much in place, which will save a fair amount of time. And also on the back end, I know a lot of people want to use GitHub for AUTH48 and other stuff. We have an experiment doing that. None of us are opposed to it, but we're just worried that using GitHub can subject people to an enormous blizzard of comments and remarks and pull requests and issues and stuff, and we're trying to figure out how to do this in a disciplined way so that the editors get the notices that they need to respond to without having to wade through a lot of stuff that they don't. The current experiment looks really promising, but I think we have a fair amount of work to do. Finally, just in my personal viewpoint, I think I would want to be willing to push back a little bit more when a document shows up that clearly needs a lot of work. I would like the RFC Editor, whoever it turns out to be, to continue to have the realistic authority to say, "This document needs to go back and have more work from the Working Group before it's ready to edit." Just because, you know, it's not well enough written, or there's too much, obvious changes that it needs. So, we have plenty of work to do, and I look forward to doing it all with you.

Mirja Kühlewind: Thank you for the more extensive report here. We still have the opportunity for questions for the IAB, or for John. [Pause.] I don't think I see anybody, so that means we are only 10 minutes over, which is pretty good, I think. And, I will hand it back to Alissa for final words.

Alissa Cooper: No final words, I think we are done. Thanks, everyone.

Mirja Kühlewind: Thank you, bye!