

draft-rsalz-2026bis
draft-rsalz-2418bis

Rich Salz, Scott Bradner

Why do this?

- 2026 and 2418 (together) have had dozens of updates and errata
- Want to get two documents that reflect all IETF consensus changes
- Unclear if IETF wants to do another POISED
 - Even if it does, unified docs are the required first step
- Note that 2026bis is "more current" than 2418bis
 - More on that later

Acknowledgements

- Robert Wilton - "Gee it'd be nice if someone..."
- Sandy Ginoza - Emailed me the nroff sources
- Mark Nottingham - Suggested doing one draft/update
- John Klensin - Suggested enlisting Scott, helpful kibbitzing
- Tim "DNS" Wicinski - filing issues against 2418

2026bis: What we did

- Convert to markdown, post a draft
- Filter out outdated RFCs, and for those that remained:
 - Apply the changes
 - Post a new draft

- Remove Section 10 (IPR)
 - Text just points to RFC 5378 and RFC 8179 instead
 - Post a new draft
- Review the errata
 - Apply the changes that are still relevant
 - Post a new draft

2026bis: Feedback and next steps

- Got one email from Tim McSweeney; available at <https://github.com/richsalz/draft-rsalz-2026bis/issues/16>
 - All about terminology section
- Next steps
 - It would be nice if someone verified our work
 - AD-sponsor, run the process (to get consensus on the last two parts), and publish

2418bis: What we did

- Convert to markdown, submitted draft
- For all updating RFCs:
 - Apply the changes*
 - Post a new draft
- Review the errata
 - Apply the changes that are still relevant
 - Post a new draft

* 7776 (ombudsteam) needing wording; got help from co-author Adrian Farrel

2418bis: Needs more work

- Charter doesn't have Privacy and Security considerations
- Clarification needed around "WG facilitator," etc. (but see 9381)
- Still talks about email agenda@ietf.org
 - The tools have changed; how much to update for that that or just remove?
- 8717 says to use "Managing Director, Secretariat" *everywhere*, but that's wrong
- Internet-draft section is outdated
- Reference to non-existent "conflict of interest" RFC section

2418bis: Next steps

- Those points are important; probably others
- IETF Consensus on their resolution is important
- MODPOD will be a black hole
- AD-sponsored with a design team?