



IETF Structure and Internet Standards Process

Scott Bradner

*92nd IETF
Dallas, Texas, USA*





Agenda

IETF history & overview

IETF Purpose

how work gets done

IETF role & scope

IETF structure & associated groups

IETF management & selection

IETF process & procedure

a working group session

intellectual property rights (IPR)



The IETF

Internet Engineering Task Force
formed in 1986

expansion of US ARPANET-related government activities

Internet Configuration Control Board (ICCB) (1979) and Internet
Activities Board (1983)

was not considered important for a long time - good!!

not “government approved” (US or other) - great!!

although funding support from U.S. Government until 1997

people not companies

*“We reject kings, presidents and voting. We believe in
rough consensus and running code”*

Dave Clark (1992)





IETF Overview

Internet Standards R Us

most Internet-related standards were developed by, or are maintained by, the IETF

not including physical network or page display standards

does not exist (in a legal sense), no members, no voting


The IETF is “*an organized activity of the Internet Society*”

1K to 1.5K people at 3/year meetings

many, many more on mail lists



IETF Meeting Attendance





IETF Purpose

develop and maintain standards for technologies used to provide Internet service or to provide services over the Internet

ensure that the technology can perform needed functions

ensure that the technology will support the proper scale of deployment and usage

ensure that the technology itself is secure and can be operated securely

ensure that the technology is manageable

IETF produces standards and other documents





IETF “Standards”

IETF standards: not ‘because we say so’ standards
they are standards only if people use them

formal SDOs can create legally mandated standards

IETF standards are published in “RFCs”

no formal recognition for IETF standards

by governments or “approved” standards organization

but some government standards refer to IETF standards

lack of formal government input “a problem”

at least to some governments

no submitting to “traditional” standards bodies





IETF Work Team

128ish “active” Working Groups

Working Group Chairs: manage working group

Document Editors: edit individual documents

8 Areas, each with Area Directors (ADs)

APS, GEN, INT, O&M, RAI, RTG, SEC, TSV

APS & RAI may be merged into an ART area

IETF Chair: AD for General Area, chief spokesperson

Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG): technical review, process management (ADs + IETF Chair)

Internet Architecture Board (IAB): architectural



guidance & liaisons

Area Directors

Areas have 1, 2 or 3 ADs
responsible for setting direction in Area
responsible for managing process in Area
approve BOFs & propose working groups
ensure working groups follow proper process
have authority to change working group management
generally with IESG consultation
review working group documents prior to IESG review



IESG

Internet Engineering Steering Group

ADs + IETF Chair

multi-disciplinary technical review group

provides cross-area pre-publication technical review of
IETF RFCs

approves publication of IETF documents

reviews and comments on non-IETF RFC submissions

manages IETF process

approves WG creation (with IAB & community advice)

part of appeal chain





How the IETF Work Gets Done

generally, IETF technology development is done in
Working Groups

but can be an individual effort

proposals are published as working documents

“Internet Draft”


working document revised & republished based on
discussion

working document submitted to AD for IESG review

AD performs technical and process review of
document

returns document with comments if AD finds issues






How the IETF Work Gets Done, contd.

when AD satisfied, the IESG issues IETF-wide “Last Call” for comments

IESG performs interdisciplinary technical review of proposal & reviews Last-Call comments

returns document to WG with comments if IESG finds issues

when IESG satisfied, the document sent to RFC Editor for publication as RFC





Birds of a Feather Sessions (BOF)

often precedes the formation of a Working Group
group of people interested in a topic convince an AD
that they have a good idea - one worth exploring &
that there are enough interested people to do the
work

need description and agenda before a BOF can be
scheduled

and sometimes a draft charter for a working group

BOFs generally only meet once

can lead to a WG or can be a one-time thing

Working Groups

this is where the IETF primarily get its work done

most discussions on a WG mailing list

face-to-face meetings focused on key issues (ideally)

note: face-to-face meetings generally quite short

“bottoms up”

i.e., generally proposed by IETF participants, not ADs,
IESG or IETF Chair

makes it hard for the IETF leadership to commit the IETF
to do something


often preceded by a BOF



Working Groups, contd.

Working Groups are focused by charters agreed
between WG chair(s) and area director
restrictive charters with milestones
charter approved by IESG with IAB advice
after public announcement for comments
announcement goes to other SDOs to check for overlaps
IESG has final say on charter
working groups are closed when their work is done
at least in theory

Working Group Creation





A Working Group Session

WGs only meet for a few hours at an IETF meeting
most working group work is done on the WG mailing list
often only specific unresolved issues are discussed at meetings
so read the IDs and mailing list before the session
advice: listen (and read) before speaking

sessions are being streamed & recorded

so speak directly into the mike (don't look at the questioner)
say your name - *every* time you get to the mike
for the people in audio-land & for the scribe(s)


sign the “blue sheets”

record of who is in the room - required for openness



I E T F®

scanned & posted - original not retained





This Week

127 sessions

112 unique sessions

7 BOFs

9 IRTF sessions

Technical Plenary – M 1710-1910

ITU Plenipotentiary High Level Summary

IP Stack Evolution, Privacy and Security

Operations and Administration Plenary – W 1640-1910

Bits-n-Bites – Th 1900-2100

Technology on display - lubricated by nibbles & drinks



Rough Consensus

no defined IETF membership - just “participants”

“***Rough consensus and running code...***”

does **not** require unanimity

chairs should ensure that everyone has their say

no formal voting (can not define the constituency)

can do show of hands or hum - but no count

disputes resolved by discussion

on mailing list and in face-to-face meetings

final decisions must be verified on mailing list

to ensure those not present at face-to-face are included

but taking into account face-to-face discussion





IETF Documents

all IETF documents are open

i.e., anyone can download and make copies (in full)

Internet Draft

IETF working documents

some I-Ds are working group documents

RFC

archival publications (never changed once published)

update or correction gets new RFC number



IETF Document Format

English is the official language of the IETF

but blanket permission is given to translate any IETF document
(in total) into any language for any reason

ASCII is the mailing list and general document format

Moving to a XML-based authoritative format for documents
will produce pure-text & pdf versions

note that the current format is still readable after 44 years
(see RFC 20 for an example)

how many other SDOs can claim that?





Internet-Draft

IETF working documents

random or non-random thoughts

input to the process

no admissions control other than boilerplate (see IPR)

removed from the main IETF Internet Drafts directory
after 6 months or upon replacement

all RFCs must pre-exist as IDs

to deal with IPR handoff, etc.

(other than some IANA or RFC Editor created ones)





Internet Draft (ID) Naming

ID filename used to classify Internet Drafts

all ID filenames start with “draft-”

individual IDs continue with the last name of the lead author/editor and, often, the name of the working group the ID is targeted at

Working Group IDs continue with “ietf-WGNAME”

filename continues with subject

filename continues with version number

initial version “00”

filename ends with “.txt” extension



Internet Draft (ID) Naming, contd.

examples:

`draft-ietf-idr-bgp4-26.txt`

26th revision of the BGPv4 specification

a product of the Interdomain Routing Working Group

`draft-bradner-rfc3979bis-06.txt`

6th revision of my proposed update to RFC 3979

not a working group document

`draft-iab-rfcformatreq-03.txt`

3rd revision of an IAB document on requirements for the formats of RFCs



What is a RFC?

IETF document publication series

RFC used to stand for “Request for Comments”

now just a (brand) name

now tend to be more formal documents than early RFCs

RFC 1 *Host Software* - Apr 7 1969

now over 7000 RFCs

not all RFCs are standards!

see RFC 1796

though some vendors sometimes imply otherwise

many types of RFCs



RFC Repository Contains:

standards track

OSPF, IPv6, IPsec ...

obsolete Standards

RIPv1

requirements

Host Requirements

policies

Classless InterDomain

Routing

April Fool's Day jokes

IP on Avian Carriers

... updated for QoS

poetry

'Twas the night before startup

white papers

On packet switches with
infinite storage

corporate documentation

Ascend multilink protocol

experimental history

Netblt

process documents

IETF Standards Process



I E T F®



Standards Track RFCs:

Best Current Practices (**BCP**)

policies and procedures (best way we know how)

3-stage standard track (not all the way followed)

Proposed Standard (**PS**)

good idea, no known problems

Draft Standard (**DS**)

PS + stable

multiple independent implementations improve document clarity

not **interoperability** not conformance

Internet Standard (**STD**)

DS + wide use

T F



Standards Track RFCs:

Best Current Practices (**BCP**)

policies or procedures (best way we know how)

2-stage standards track (changed 2011 - RFC 6410)

Proposed Standard (**PS**)

good idea, no known problems

Internet Standard (**STD**)

PS + stable + “benefit to Internet community”

multiple interoperable implementations to prove document clarity

note: interoperability, not conformance



Other RFC Types

Informational

Experimental

Historical

always check the current status of an RFC before relying on it. A new RFC may have obsoleted or updated the one you are looking at, or it may have been reclassified as Historical

you can find out by looking at the RFC index

remember that RFCs are not changed after publication - so no status change notice put in RFC

RFC Editor

IETF publication arm

was one person, then one small team

now multiple parts

- oversight (RFC Series Editor - RSE)

- editing (RFC Production) - done by AMS

- publishing (RFC Publisher) - done by AMS

- independent submissions (Independent Submissions Editor - ISE)

- RSE & ISE selected & appointed by IAB



RFC Production & Publishing

receives requests to publish IDs from multiple streams

- IETF (via IESG)

- IRTF (via IRSG)

- IAB

- Independent Submissions (via ISE)

edits IDs for publication

- verify edits with authors

publishes RFCs





Independent Submissions Editor

ISE gets requests to publish IDs

can only publish informational or experimental RFCs


asks IESG for advice

but can exercise own discretion to publish or not

presumption is to publish technically competent and
useful IDs


which sometimes is a conflict with IESG

IETF Submissions



Non-IETF Submissions

(The IAB & IRTF have their own procedures)





The Role & Scope of the IETF

‘above the wire and below the application’

IP, TCP, email, routing, IPsec, HTTP, FTP, ssh, LDAP,
SIP, mobile IP, ppp, RADIUS, Kerberos, secure email,
streaming video & audio, ...

but wires are getting fuzzy

MPLS, GMPLS, pwe3, VPN, ...

generally hard to clearly define IETF scope

IETF is constantly exploring the edges

e.g. (IP) telephony



Scope of Other SDOs

the Internet (& the Internet protocols) are very interesting to other standards development organizations (SDO)

Internet is becoming the underpinnings of the entire world telecommunications business

other SDOs trying “fix” or “extend” IETF protocols

they may be trying to solve a different problem

or are making different assumptions


problem: what happens when these extensions break underlying protocol assumptions or make non-interoperable versions?

SDO (including IETF) assumption: each SDO modifies its own protocols



but, see dispute with ITU-T over MPLS for transport

Top Level View of IETF Organization



The Internet Society (ISOC)

non-profit, non-governmental, independent, international organization

more than 133 organizational members, more than 71,000 individual members & 108 chapters in 92 countries

formed 1992 to:

provide legal umbrella over IETF

continue Landweber developing country workshops

mission:

“To promote the open development, evolution, and use of the Internet for the benefit of all people throughout the world.”

join at www.isoc.org



ISOC, contd.

IETF agreed to come under ISOC legal umbrella in 1996
after a (long) open working-group-based discussion

ISOC is now the organizational and administrative home
for IETF (as of 2005)

legal umbrella, insurance, IASA home, IAD employer, etc.

ISOC Board of Trustees part of appeal chain

ISOC President appoints chair of nomcom


IAB chartered by ISOC

ISOC President is on the IAB list & calls

IETF (through IAB) appoints 4 ISOC trustees

Internet Research Task Force (IRTF)

focused on **long term** problems in Internet
Crypto Forum Research Group (CFRG)*



Delay-Tolerant Networking Research Group (DTNRG)

Global Access to the Internet for All Research Group (GAIA)

Internet Congestion Control Research Group (ICCRG)*

Information Centric Networking Research Group (ICNRG)*

Network Function Virtualization Research Group (NFVRG)*

Network Management Research Group (NMRG)

Network Coding Research Group (NWCRCG)

Software-Defined Network Research Group (SDNRG)*

proposed Human Rights Protocol Considerations RG*



*Meeting this week

Internet Architecture Board (**IAB**)

provides overall architectural advice & oversight
to IESG, IETF, IRTF & ISOC

deals with IETF external liaisons

appoints IRTF chair

selects & oversees IETF-IANA

appoints & oversees RFC Editor

chartered by & advises the ISOC Board

approves IESG slate from nomcom

step in appeals chain



IAB, contd.

provide input to IESG on WG formation & charters

sponsor & organize IRTF

convene topic-specific workshops

mostly invitation only

write IDs/RFCs stating IAB opinion

with community & IESG review

participate in WG discussions

IAB activities organized in 9 “programs”

IAB members plus others to ensure continuity

<http://www.iab.org/activities/programs/>



IANA

Internet Assigned Number Authority

need to record parameters in IETF protocols

assigns numbers and keeps them from colliding

assigns protocol numbers (ports, MIME types, etc)

IP addresses

assigns address blocks to 5 regional IP Address registries

which assign addresses to ISPs and end sites

domain names

defines top level domains (TLDs) - e.g., .com, .ca, .us, ...

maintains root server database of TLD server addresses

the IANA predates the IETF

currently preformed by ICANN under a MoU



IANA, contd.

Internet Drafts need to include a “IANA Considerations” section

section tells the IANA what assignment actions are needed if ID is to be published as a RFC

can say “no IANA actions required”

see RFC 5226 for details

IANA reviews IDs during IESG consideration phase to see if any IANA actions required prior to publication

IETF Management

IETF management are all volunteers

AD job: half to 3/4 time

IAB job: 1/3 time

IETF Chair job: full time

IETF does not pay ADs, IAB members, IAOC members, WG chairs or IETF Chair a salary or expenses

people are company- or self- supported

secretariat, RFC publication support & IAD are paid



IETF Secretariat

Association Management Solutions, LLC - Fremont, CA,
USA

managed by IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)
runs

plenary meetings, mailing lists,

Internet-Draft & directory, IESG teleconferences, REF
editing & publication

coordinates

day to day work of IESG



IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)

provides the administrative structure required to support the IETF standards process: see RFCs 4071 & 4371

has no authority over the standards process

housed within the Internet Society



creates budget for IETF

money from meeting fees, meeting-related sponsors & from ISOC

responsible for IETF finances

contracts for IETF support functions

Secretariat functions, RFC evaluation and publication & IETF-IANA

deals with IETF IPR



IASA, contd.

includes:

IETF Administrative Director (**IAD**) - Ray Pelletier

ISOC employee

day to day operations oversight



IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (**IAOC**)

8-member body

IAB & IETF chairs

ISOC President

members selected by nomcom (2), IAB (1), IESG (1) & ISOC (1)

IETF Trust

created in Dec 2005 to hold IETF-related IPR

- copyrights (on RFCs etc)

- domain names (e.g., ietf.org, rfc-editor.org)

- trademarks

- software paid for by IETF

- databases

- etc

IPR created under the secretariat contract goes to Trust

The IETF Trust is not a patent pool

Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents

<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info/IETF-TLP-4.htm>





Selecting IETF Management

picked by a nominations committee (nomcom)

nomcom chair appointed by ISOC president

process described in RFC 3777

members selected randomly from list of **volunteers**

requirement: present at 3 of last 5 IETF meetings

very random process to select from volunteers: RFC 3797

gets list of jobs to fill

can include IETF Chair, IESG, IAB & IAOC members

nominate one person for each job

IAOC selections approved by IESG, IESG & IETF Chair

selections approved by IAB, IAB selections approved by

ISOC BoT



Dots

 IAB member (red)

 IRSG member

 IESG member (yellow)

 Working Group chair (blue)

 nomcom (orange)

 Local host (green)

 IAOC member (purple)



IETFer specifically happy to help



Appeals Process

IETF decisions can be appealed

start level above decision being appealed

1st to the WG chair(s)

only then to the Area Director

only then to the IESG

only then to the IAB

if claim is that **the process** itself is broken, (not that the process was not followed)

then an appeal can be made to the ISOC Board (after the above is complete)

it is OK to appeal decisions – people do (& succeed)

but appeals are not quick



starting “low” is the right thing to do

I E T F®



Intellectual Property Rights

IPR is a very big issue in standards bodies
two areas:

- copyright in documents

- patents covering standards technology



IPR (Copyright)

ID author(s) need to give non-exclusive publication rights to IETF Trust if to be published at all
also (normally) the right to make derivative works
this right required for standards track documents
author(s) **retain** all other rights

Rules described in RFC 5378

IETF Trust released a FAQ on IETF copyright
see <http://trustee.ietf.org/faqs.html>

IPR (Patents)

IETF IPR (patent) rules (in RFC 3979)

require timely **disclosure** of your own IPR in your own submissions & submissions of others

disclosures published on IETF web site

“**reasonably and personally**” known to the WG participant - i.e., no patent search required

WG may take IPR into account when choosing solution

RFC 3669 gives background and guidance

push from open source people for RF-only process

consensus to not change to mandatory RF-only

but many WGs **tend** to want RF or IPR-free

(or at least assumed to be IPR-free)

update in the works

Note Well

The “Note Well” statement shows up a lot at the IETF.

Mailing lists, registration, meeting openings, etc.

defines “contribution” and requires obeying IETF rules

In effect, a **“contribution” is anything you say or write with the intent to effect the IETF standards process**

if you make a contribution that includes or relates to your IPR you must disclose that fact

Note Well note is undergoing revision – big discussion on IETF discussion mailing list





IETF Mentoring Program

match experienced IETF participants with newcomers
to aid newcomer integration into the IETF community
through advice, help, and collected wisdom

for more information or to request a mentor see:

<http://www.ietf.org/resources/mentoring-program.html>





Other IETF Training/Tutorials

1300 – 1450 Newcomer's Orientation ← you are here

1300 – 1450 Working Group Leadership

1400 – 1700 YANG Advice and Editing Session

1500 – 1650 Transport Area Overview

1500 – 1650 Writing RFCs and I-Ds in markdown and a bit of YAML

1600 – 1700 Newcomer's Meet and Greet

newcomers, WG chairs & ADs

1700 – 1900 Welcome Reception

(talking to IETF people is often quite an education!)





Newcomer's Dinner

informal dinner for newcomer's to chat about their experience

meet at the IETF registration desk at 7:30 PM Monday

walk to nearby reasonably priced restaurant

please email Maddy Conner (mconner@amsl.com) if you would like to attend or for more information



What next?

join mailing lists

this is where the work happens

but read (and understand) before writing

read the drafts & contribute

don't be shy (but do not come on too strong)

talk with (not just to) people

treat everyone with respect, even if you disagree

look for common ground

don't settle for second-rate discussion or technology



Questions?