

IETF WORKING GROUP GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

[draft-ietf-procon-2418bis](#)

PROCON

IETF 125 – 2026-03-16

Rich Salz – rsalz@akamai.com

David Schinazi – dschinazi.ietf@gmail.com

Scott Bradner – sob@sobco.com

Previously, on 2418bis...

2026bis / 2418bis effort started in August 2024

PROCON WG started in July 2025

2418bis adopted in September 2025

Goal is to have our foundational documents match reality

In November 2025, we discussed -01 in Montreal

We'll now review changes since then

And open issues

Change since -01: [#33](#) Mention moderator

Next to Facilitator

That wasn't the right fix though – see discussion of issue [#48](#) later

Change since -01: [#34](#) Remove RFC 7322 reference

We describe the role of the RFC editor

We don't need to rely on RFC 7322 "RFC Style Guide" for that

They are only guidelines anyway

Change since -01: [#38](#) Description of I-Ds

Remove description of individual drafts and instead reference 2026bis.

Change since -01: [#39](#) agenda@ietf.org

Remove references to agenda@ietf.org

That's not how we schedule meetings anymore

New text just mentions the secretariat

Change since -01: [#40](#) Privacy in Charters

Morally descending from RFC 6973

- Architecture
- Operations
- Security
- **Privacy**
- Network management
- Scaling
- Transition (where applicable)

Change since -01: [#42](#) Remove word "staff"

Roles like WG chair aren't paid

"staff" might imply the contrary

Use word "role" instead

Change since -01: [#43](#) Remove draft standard

Deprecated long ago, has been removed from 2026bis

Also removed text saying that WGs can become dormant until they want to increase the maturity level of standards track specs

Followup [PR#53](#): mention that list can stay open after WG is closed

Change since -01: [#44](#) Rough consensus

2418 had confusing text mentioning 51% and 99%

Instead reference RFC 7282 "On Consensus and Humming in the IETF"

Change since -01: [#45](#) Loosely define WG adoption

Working Groups MAY formally adopt an Internet-Draft to indicate that it is being considered as a candidate for publication as an RFC. The main difference between a draft owned by an individual and one adopted by a working group is that the adoption process hands over change control to the working group. Once a document is adopted, Document Editors are tasked with documenting the consensus of the Working Group.

Change since -01: [#46](#) Design Teams

Were defined in 2418. Added requirement to document contribution:

Design teams MUST produce public records of their contributions and members to the Working Group, to ensure that any contributions made within design teams properly follow IETF procedures. For example, any contribution made within a design team is still considered an IETF contribution, and is therefore subject to the IETF's Intellectual Property Rights policies (BCP79).

Change since -01: [#47](#) Defer to MODPOD

Remove text about how chairs address disruptive behavior

Instead reference MODPOD (BCP 245 / RFC 9945):

The chairs and moderators have a range of tools at their disposal to handle such cases, as documented in [BCP245].

Open Issues: [#20](#) [#36](#) [#48](#) [#51](#) Chair Delegation

Facilitators, Moderators, Administrators, Technical Advisors, Consultants, Secretaries

Some roles unused, some changed, some new online fora (GitHub, etc)

Proposed [PR#55](#): Consolidate into "WG Chair Delegation" subsection

Combines previous subsection about Facilitator, Secretary

Includes new fora

References BCP245

PR#55: Part 1

- Moderate **public fora**

The Chair should attempt to ensure that the discussions on **public fora** (such as the WG email list, chat groups, other **collaborative tools such as GitHub or GitLab, etc**) are relevant and that they converge to consensus agreements. The Chair should make sure that discussions on **these fora** are summarized and that the outcome is well documented (to avoid repetition). They may need to consult with the Ombudsteam (see `{{ombudsteam}}`) if they feel harassment is involved. **The process for handling disruptive behavior on online fora is documented in `{{BCP245}}`.**

PR#55: Part 2

Chair Delegation

Working chairs can delegate portions of their authority.

Taking minutes and editing working group documents often is performed by a specifically-designated participant or set of participants. They are named "WG Secretary". In this role, the Secretary's job is to record WG decisions, rather than to perform basic specification.

PR#55: Part 3

When meetings tend to become distracted or divisive, it often is helpful to assign the task of "process management" to one participant. This can be achieved by naming a "WG facilitator". Their job is to oversee the nature, rather than the content, of participant interactions. That is, they attend to the style of the discussion and to the schedule of the agenda, rather than making direct technical contributions themselves. They can be called upon in online fora as well as in-person meetings.

Similarly, chairs can delegate the role of administrator for online fora; see `{{BCP245}}`.

PR#55: Part 4

Working Group Consultant

At the discretion of the Area Director, a Consultant (sometimes also named "Technical Advisor") may be assigned to a working group. Consultants have specific technical background appropriate to the WG and experience in Internet architecture and IETF process.

Open Issues: [#20](#) [#36](#) [#48](#) [#51](#) Chair Delegation

Facilitators, Moderators, Administrators, Technical Advisors, Consultants, Secretaries

Some roles unused, some changed, some new online fora (GitHub, etc)

Proposed [PR#55](#): Consolidate into "WG Chair Delegation" subsection

Combines previous subsection about Facilitator, Secretary

Includes new fora

References BCP245

Open Issue: [#27](#) Virtual BoFs

2418 had strict rules about BoFs

one encouraged, two acceptable, three is right out

Those rules specifically mention plenary meetings

But now we allow interim BoFs... Do those count?

Proposed [PR#41](#):

In general, a BOF on a particular topic is held only once (ONE slot at one IETF Plenary meeting). Under unusual circumstances Area Directors may, at their discretion, allow a BOF to meet for a second time. BOFs are not permitted to meet three times.