

# Notes from the Applications Area Chairs lunch meeting at IETF 87

## Openness of IESG process

### Putting the IESG Evaluation on the WG mailing lists

We are experimenting with adding the WG mailing list to the "send notices to" field of selected documents, with agreement from the chairs. This will cause all IESG DISCUSS and COMMENT messages, along with subsequent discussion, to be CCed to the WG mailing list as well as to the IESG.

- **ACTION:** When we do this, please alert your WGs. Tell them they may respond when appropriate, but should mostly let the editors and shepherd lead the discussion.
- This is not just App Area; other ADs will soon start trying it
- Comment: There's likely to be an uneven experience with this, from WG to WG
- Discussion about how to expose this, and whether there should be some filtering
- Alternative: perhaps the shepherd could summarize the discussion to the WG, rather than having all the messages going to both the WG and the IESG

### Try using non-chair shepherds

Barry thinks chairs should consider using non-chair document shepherds much of the time. Pete disagrees, and thinks it's better to do this sparingly -- it's mostly a chair job.

- Can offload work from the chairs
- Can help train participants in document process
- Consider Barry's extended shepherding draft: [draft-leiba-extended-doc-shepherd](#)
- Comment: Need more guidance on what shepherding tasks are
  - This is in the extended shepherding draft
  - Perhaps put that into a wiki so it can be adjusted easily

### Inviting document shepherds to IESG telechats

The IESG is experimenting with inviting document shepherds to IESG telechats, at times when that shepherd's document will be discussed and significant discussion is expected. It's been done twice so far, with good feedback. The shepherd is welcome to stay for the whole telechat, to see other discussion and be exposed to the process.

## Reducing conflict lists

Meeting scheduling is extremely difficult with the large and involved conflict lists.

- **ACTION:** Chairs, please reduce conflict lists for scheduling. Please look closely at

your conflict lists, sort and reduce them.

- A single participant, even a doc author, does not create a first-level conflict
- Consider:
  - First level: You can't have an effective meeting if these two group conflict
  - Second level: You can get by, but the meeting will lose something significant
  - Third level: Anything else, but can work this out with agenda coordination
- Please make use of agenda coordination with chairs of other WGs
- People might have to move between two WGs sometimes
- Comment: Push work into one WG more, rather than creating multiple, related, conflicting WGs
- Comment: Can we have separate conflict lists for multiple sessions of the same WG?

## **Appsawg and AppArea session scheduling**

Do we need to have appsawg/apparea on Monday morning? We have been using the meeting for planning the week, but except for the BoF and new WG overviews, there's little reason to tie into Monday. Some discussions started in this session can be discussed in the halls later in the week, so Monday is good. On the other hand, hallway discussions can create topics for the meeting if it's later in the week. Will probably unbind this session from the Monday morning slot.