

The Story so far...

- rfc3427bis is now in IETF Last Call
 - Received some comments, could use more
- SIPCORE and DISPATCH charters now in external review
 - This is the right time to comment on the charters!
- Discussions on rai@ietf.org or mail ye ADs
- This is our high-bandwidth channel

- Consistent feedback that SIP's job was still too big and complicated
 - Long-suffering chairs
- Scope of RFC3261-RFC3265 is a bit arbitrary
 - What it means: if you Update any of those specifications, work must be Standards Track and must be in SIPCORE
 - Does not explicitly bar other work... should it?
 - This could lead to absurdities – work splits and spreads
- This group should be more manageable

DISPATCH

- A lot of the questions and discussions have focused on DISPATCH
- The idea: a forum that helps good work in RAI find a chartered home
- What kind of deliverables?
 - Charters, problem statement -00s, radioactivity assessments
- Double jeopardy? If not, why not?
 - If implemented correctly, DISPATCH needn't be a BoF to decide to have a BoF
 - More like an Open Area meeting
 - DISPATCH discussion may lead to BoFs without WGs
 - RTPSEC is an example of this approach
 - May merely point work to existing WGs and charters
 - Even for intended WGs, pre-BoF adhoc meetings are now the norm
 - This could provide communal meeting time for that purpose
 - Not radically novel

- Elimination of the P- header process
 - Now Informational headers can exist without a “P-” and can be produced *anywhere*
 - Some provisos: not related to security, purely informational in nature
 - But what is “informational”, really...?
- Leaves many things untouched:
 - option-tags, event packages, URI and header parameters
 - Should we change those? Maybe. Let’s do this first.

Disposition of Existing Work

- Short version: work will find new homes
 - Some existing work may be grandfathered into SIPCORE/DISPATCH milestones
 - But after the transition all *new* deliverables will conform to the new charters
 - Some existing work will be farmed out to other groups
 - Some existing work may be entered into the DISPATCH process
 - Cases where we're having problems, or work is new and shiny

Is that it?

- Certainly this will not solve all our problems
 - Intention is to reorganize around smaller, more focused efforts
 - Reducing interworking between work groups and with other standards bodies
- Ongoing work looking at other methods of reducing delays
 - Helpful work by Henning, Hannes and Markus
- We need community input on other changes we should make