Deployability

Not a new discussion, but still a worthy one

Assertions: True or False?

- The IETF cares about seeing our work deployed. We celebrate it.
- The IETF cares about “running code”.
- The IETF cares about only taking on work that results in deployment.

Assertions: True or False?

- The IETF cares about seeing our work deployed. We celebrate it.
  - True

- The IETF cares about “running code”.
  - True. Maybe?

- The IETF cares about only taking on work that results in deployment.
  - Hahahahahahaha

Aspirations

- The IETF should care about seeing our work deployed.
- The IETF should care about “running code”.
- The IETF should only take on work that has a viable deployment plan.

~~Running~~ Deployed Code

- Running on your laptop is not enough. Multiple interoperable implementations running on your laptop is not enough. What we want is “Rough Consensus and Deployed Code”.

- This has always been a desire, but the gap between Running Code and Deployed Code has gotten much higher over time.

- If we care about deployment, we should make it a constraint to work we take on. Or at least require a plan for deployment.

Discussion seeds

- How can the IETF pursue deployment as a part of work we take on, beyond publication of RFCs?

- Can we bring a deployment plan into requirements for accepting new work?

- What are the pitfalls of thinking about deployment as critical to work?