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Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- the IETF plenary session,
- any IETF working group or portion thereof (including this BoF),
- the IESG or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG,
- the IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB,
- any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices,
- the RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice. Please consult RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.
Agenda

- Administrivia (5 min):
  - Jabber scribe for wgdtspec@jabber.ietf.org
  - Note taker (for Minutes)
  - Agenda Bashing

- BoF scope and goals (10 min)

- WG document states (45 min)
  - draft-ietf-proto-wgdocument-states-02.txt

- Requirements to extend the IETF Datatracker for I-D authors and WG chairs (45 min)

- Next steps & any other business (15 min)
Current Datatracker states …

- The state displayed for every submitted I-D for which the Datatracker has no other status information.

- The state of every I-D which is more than 6 months old and which has not been submitted to the IESG or otherwise artificially kept alive by an AD.

- There are many “IESG document” states (e.g. AD is Watching, In Last Call, IESG Evaluation …).
Focus of WGDTspec work

https://datatracker.ietf.org/images/state_diagram.gif
Scope of this BoF

Adapted from RFC 5620, Figure 1: Ordinary RFC Series production and process
Source: IETF77 Newcomers Tutorial slides
Goals for today’s BoF

- Discuss revisions to strawman WG document states proposed in:
  
draft-ietf-proto-wgdocument-states-02.txt

- Review strawman “state diagram” and discuss its applicability to IETG WGs;

- Identify requirements for extending the IETF Datatracker for I-D authors and WG chairs; and

- Discuss next steps and any other business.
IETF Document Lifecycle

Diagram taken from Scott Bradner’s Newcomer’s Tutorial

WG documents go through the WG process...
Datatracker visibility of I-Ds

- A typical starting point for I-Ds adopted by IETF working groups.

WG Process

- A desired end point for many working group drafts.

I-D Exists

Publication Requested
Current Datatracker states...

Security Best Practices Efforts and Documents

draft-ietf-opsec-efforts-11

Document type: Active Internet-Draft (OPSEC WG document)
Last updated: 2009-11-15
State: I-D Exists
Intended status: -
Responsible AD: -
Other versions: plain text, pdf, html

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Expires: May 19, 2010

C. Lonvick
D. Spak
Cisco Systems
November 15, 2009

Security Best Practices Efforts and Documents
draft-ietf-opsec-efforts-11.txt

Abstract

This document provides a snapshot of the current efforts to define or apply security requirements in various Standards Developing Organizations (SDO).
Current Datatracker states...

I-D Exists
### Common WG I-D States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidate WG Document</strong></td>
<td>An I-D under consideration for becoming a WG document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active WG Document</strong></td>
<td>An I-D which has been adopted by a WG and is actively being developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parked WG Document</strong></td>
<td>A WG document which cannot be progressed for some reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waiting for Doc Shepherd Writeup</strong></td>
<td>An I-D which has been finalized by a WG and is waiting for the Document Shepherd to submit his/her writeup.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next state = “Publication Requested”
Common WG I-D States

WG Process “Black Box”

- I-D Exists
- Candidate WG Doc
- Active WG Doc
- Parked WG Doc
- Waiting for Doc Shepherd Writeup
- Publication Requested
## More WG Document States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dead WG Document</td>
<td>An I-D which used to be an active WG document but has been abandoned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a WG Document</td>
<td>An I-D which was considered for adoption by a WG, but was rejected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In WG Last Call*</td>
<td>An I-D for which a WGLC has been issued and is still in progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGLC* Completed</td>
<td>An I-D for which a WGLC was completed and some action (e.g. to resolve comments) is required before the I-D can progress to another state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: WGLCs are optional.
More WG Document States

- Not a WG Doc
- I-D Exists
- Candidate WG Doc
- Active WG Doc
- Dead WG Doc
- Waiting for Doc Shepherd Writeup
- Parked WG Doc
- In WGLC
- WGLC Completed
- Publication Requested

WG Process “Black Box”
To provide additional visibility into WG document status, “substate” annotations would be useful:

- Awaiting (Cross-area, MIB Doctor, Security, Other) Review
- Awaiting Merge with Other Document
- Author or Editor Needed
- Held due to Dependency on Other Document
- Held due to IESG concerns
- Revised I-D needed based on (WG or WGLC) comments
- Document shepherd follow-up
- See comment log
And perhaps 2 more states?

- Feedback from the code sprint on March 20th suggests we may want two more WG doc states:

  - An existing I-D which its authors want to become a “Candidate WG Doc”.
  - An I-D previously sent to the IESG for publication which has been returned to the WG for revision;
Two more states for WG Docs?

- **I-D Exists**
  - Not a WG Doc
  - WG Adoption Requested
    - Candidate WG Doc
      - Dead WG Doc
      - Active WG Doc
        - In WGLC
          - WGLC Completed
          - Waiting for Doc Shepherd Writeup
        - Parked WG Doc
  - Revision Requested by AD
    - Publication Requested

Publication Requested

Revision Requested by AD

Waiting for Doc Shepherd Writeup

In WGLC

WGLC Completed

Active WG Doc

Candidate WG Doc

WG Adoption Requested

Not a WG Doc

I-D Exists
Discussion

- Are the proposed states fairly clear and unambiguous?
- Do most WGs follow a process involving most or all of the proposed states?
- Is anything missing?
- Are there any WGs for which the proposed states and state machine absolutely would not work?
Agenda

- Administrivia (5 min):
- BoF scope and goals (10 min)
- Definition of WG document states (45 min)

- Requirements to extend the IETF Datatracker for I-D authors and WG chairs (45 min)

- Next steps & any other business (15 min)
WGDTspec Requirements

R1: A new state variable or field to hold WG Document states shall be added to the IETF Datatracker.

R2: The new field specified in R1 shall track the working group state of WG documents and be updated by the working group chairs (or their delegates) once an I-D has been adopted as a WG document.

R3: WG chairs, or their delegates, shall update the status for all of their WG documents, or opt out of doing so entirely. Updates must be for “all documents in a WG, or for none”. There shall be no partial updates.
WGDTspec Requirements

R4: WG chairs shall be able to delegate the updating of WG document status information (e.g. to a WG secretary).

R5: The IETF Secretariat shall also have the ability to update the status information for WG documents.

R6: The updating of WG document status information shall not delete status information in the dB.

R7: Erroneous WG document status information shall be corrected via an exception handling process (e.g. trouble ticket raised with the tools team) rather than by deleting status information in real-time.
R8: The Datatracker shall provide a convenient way for WG Chairs or their delegates to update the status of WG documents, for instance through the use of a multiple-choice selection box in a web interface.

R9: WG authors and editors shall be able to change of the state of their own “I-D Exists” documents to the next state which is “WG Adoption Requested”.

R10: The Datatracker shall provide a convenient way for WG Chairs to see the current status of all documents in their WGs, and a summary of all status updates made to WG documents by their delegates.
R11: A separate tagging or annotation field shall be added to the Datatracker to capture a number of specific “substate” conditions for a draft, where the conditions can exist in parallel. These conditions do not change the WG state of the document but they are useful to indicate what action is needed next for the document.

R12: The tracker should provide a means to set one or more of these annotation tags for each working group document, for instance by use of a multiple-choice selection box in a web interface.
R13: As part of the WG document status handling, a field should be available to indicate the next planned state of a draft, and the planned date for that state. The Next WG Document State field shall have the same possible values as the WG Document State field (R1).
R14: A field should be available to indicate the intended status of each WG document, with the possible values being:

- “Informational”
- “Experimental”
- “Best Current Practice”
- “Proposed Standard”
- “Draft Standard”
- “Full Standard”
- “Historic”
Discussion

- Is anything BIG missing?
- Do we want specific requirements for the GUI into the Datatracker for:
  - Status update data entry?
  - Queries?
Agenda

- Administrivia (5 min):
- BoF scope and goals (10 min)
- Definition of WG document states (45 min)
- Requirements to extend the IETF Datatracker for I-D authors and WG chairs (45 min)

- Next steps & any other business (15 min)
Next Steps & AOB

1. “WG document states” I-D will be revised next week to incorporate comments from today.

2. Initial Requirements I-D will be ready next week too.

3. Please review and comment on both:
   - e-mail anytime to edj.etc@gmail.com
Thank You