Independent Track

- Part of the process to 'RFP' the RFC-editor's task
- Documenting the policy and procedure
  - Procedure is important for the RFP
- Looking for input from community and/or stakeholders, not exclusively IETF input.
  - Albeit the room is full of IETF-ers
  - The list has been 'advertised' in several venues such as RIR lists
  - IAB has specific role in finding community consensus

Independent Track, Community Plenary @ IETF 66

Today's goal

- draft-klensin-rfc-independent-02.txt
- According to the independent list the document as a whole provides a good description of the current process and procedures
- Issues; agreement on the general principles.
  - Possibly/probably solved in another documents
  - We'll get back to the issues later
- We will not hum, folk that make comments should repeat these on the list

After today

- Update of the klensin draft
- There will not be an IETF last call: rough consensus will be determined from the independent list
- Publication as an IAB document

The Issues

- There are differences in interpretation of *"The IESG and RFC Editor Documents: Procedures"* (RFC3932)

- On what principles does the community agree
  - Once we nail this down we proceed in publishing the draft and possibly update RFC3932

I

Issue 1:
Truth in Advertising

- If the IETF has not formally reviewed a document, say so
  - Absence of a Last Call and evidence of consensus does not imply that document has not been reviewed in the IETF
  - It doesn't imply that the document is defective either.

It just implies that the document is not an IETF product.

Issue 2: IETF Statements

- Principle: No one makes "*The IETF { says/ believes/ has concluded }*" statements unless there is clear evidence of rough consensus

- Conclusion
  - Correct: "*This is not the result of an IETF process*"
  - Correct: "*The IETF believes this is hazardous*" after Last Call and consensus

Issue 3: Ultimate Control

- Two models (both stated extremely)
  - Independent submissions are independent of the IETF process
  - The all-seeing IESG should ultimately control any publication series that the IETF uses. Dissent will not be tolerated

- A balance point
  - Do what 3932 seems to intend: review for conflicts only; temporary holds not "DNP"; no mechanism for stalling document indefinitely.

Issue 4:
The Editorial Board

- Where is the accountability of the board?
  - To RFC Editor (only)?
  - Or…?
- What is the procedure to hire and fire Editorial Board members
  - RFC editor
    - As an independent body
  - IAB
    - In its role as "oversight"
  - Somewhere in the middle
    - RFC hires and fires, IAB acts as advisory committee

Issue 5: Independent and the RFC brand

- Many people think that if it's an RFC its an IETF standard
  - Somewhat related to Issue 1

- Possible solutions include
  - Boilerplate text
  - Other naming schemes -- for RFCs or IETF documents
  - Status quo

Issue 5 continued

- Now is not the time for that debate
  - We don't have all the data
  - Need more time, thought & care to get a right answer… a wrong answer would be disastrous
  - Now we are setting up a structure that will allow us to come back to that when we are ready & able

Conclusions

- The independent track is a functioning and supported publication mechanism

- The issues we are dealing with are certainly solvable

- We need a method to publish those April 1 RFCs

Open Mike

Independent Track, Community Plenary @ IETF 66