

RFC Editor Future Development Program

Brian Rosen

Eliot Lear

(chairs)

IETF 109

Note Well (Break out the reading glasses)

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

1. Note Well
2. Bash
3. Review Issues
4. Getting to a draft
5. Meeting timing and operating methods
6. AOB

Issue 10: Is there a figurehead and thought leader of some kind?

Brian proposed that we continue with two separate questions:

- do we need a person with specialized expertise?

My impression is that most people believe this to be the case. But linked to other issues (EKR, others). We will call this question later.

Please tell me if you think I am wrong, given this:

- does that person act as a thought leader?

Nobody likes this term. More advisor or leader (issue 12). Solve this in a bit.

Issue 11: If there is a figurehead, is this person a paid expert in technical publishing?

- Is the person paid?
- Does the person have expertise in technical publishing?

We think we have general consensus on both, if we have someone.

Issues 12, 24: Is the expert an advisor (RSA) vs an executive editor (RSE)

- Lots of discussion from lots of people
- Brian has put forth some text (next slide)
- Joel and Sarah have raised concerns about being able to hire someone, and whether person can raise issues on their own initiative.
- **We think we have consensus that that person can raise issues**
- **We think that everybody agrees that there is some strategic body that makes strategic decisions**
 - We think those are the ones that get documented in RFCs
- **We think the question is whether the person is advisor or decision maker**
- **Question: what if this person is viewed as a senior member of the RPC/Tooling team/...?**

Brian's Text

Role of the RFC Series **Editor**

This person will be a senior professional with deep knowledge of technical publishing.

The RSE will operate by providing expert advice to the RSAWG, and if requested, to the RPC, on any relevant matters. For example, the RSA might be consulted about proposed changes to the style guide, RFC formatting in general, web presence, copyright matters, or archiving policy.

The RSE is expected to attend **and facilitate** all RSAWG meetings, and to participate in **and facilitate** RSAWG on-line discussions.

Further, the RSE is expected to ensure that RSAWG consensus is well documented and communicated to the community, the LLC, and the REP. This may include document authorship.

The RSE is expected to be active in proposing improvements to the RFC Series, in developing vision and policy documents, and in establishing community consensus for them.

Issue 13: Is decision making in the strategy body is open to all?

- No disagreement about having public access to meetings (Issue 9)
 - (Perhaps with the exception of personnel discussions in the case of the RSEB)
- Open Membership
 - Community drives change
 - Potential for lack of rough consensus (analysis paralysis)
 - Decision making by non-experts, potentially little skin in the game
 - (same risk as any IETF activity)
 - Accountability is diffused at this point
- Closed membership
 - Expert selection
 - Skin in the game
 - Accountability **can** be had, depending on distance from community selection
 - (some people view this as a good thing, some as a bad thing)
- Definition of “community” comes into question

Getting to a draft

- Need a skeleton
- Need to capture issues where we have consensus
- Need an editor to do all of this

Meeting Timing and Operating Methods

- We had said:
 - Issues get aired in at least one meeting
 - Meetings take place roughly every four weeks, varying times
 - Everything confirmed on list (per usual)
- Should we try to gain consensus on some issues in email?
 - 3 week discussion period?
 - If no consensus, it comes up at the next meeting
 - Chairs will be conservative about calling consensus
- Next proposed meeting date: December 17 23.00 GMT

AOB