Working Group Re-charter
Discussion of Draft Charter Proposal and Expected Follow-through

David Noveck

IETF99 at Prague

July 20, 2017

Summary

- My premises:
  - Working group needs to continue doing the sorts of things it has been doing
  - All of these things are outside the current charter which needs to change.
- Need to come up with a proposed charter
  - That says we will continue our current path.
  - That the working group can live with.
  - And that is acceptable to AD and IESG
- Be nice to have some milestones
  - But we also need to make provision for adding them later.
- Need an action plan to go forward with
  - Target dates would be nice

Getting to a Charter Proposal
Current Drafts

- I've been circulating a charter draft (Now at iteration Four)
- Also a milestones draft
  - Only one milestone now but we could add some.
- Current Issues (that I know of) to resolve:
  - Chuck's issue with the virtualization-management text
  - How to address flex-files work.
  - Worries about security area (see Security Issues Slides)
  - Very limited set of milestones (see Milestones)
- I may be missing some issues

Getting to a Charter Proposal
Next Steps

- Need general agreement on broad outlines.
- So speak up ASAP if:
  - You think we need a more restrictive, strictly-maintenance-focused Charter
  - You know of an extension area we are missing
  - There is an important new initiative we should be considering.
  - You think the IESG's security concerns should be addressed in a different way.
  - You think my draft is significantly wrong in any other way.
- Those not here should also have an opportunity to comment.
- Citing nits is OK, but need to focus on agreement on basic message.

Upward Acceptability

- Have to face the fact that some people have veto power ⊣
  - But so far nobody has been brandishing a veto pen ⋏
  - We have to make a proposal and see what happens.
- Looking at sections of current proposal:
  - Maintenance section keyed to a lot of the stuff we have been doing, including RFC 7931 and the RDMA bis documents.
  - Extension section should be OK in general given publication of RFC 8178.
  - As far as specific extension areas, including security, we'll just have to see.

Security Issues
SECDIR Feedback

- Bad feeling of SECDIR about NFS security.

  - Could be an issue when charter is considered by IESG.

- Description of *Security Considerations* in RFC7530:

  - "Not a security plan."

  - "Woefully inadequate"

  - "A collection of random thoughts jotted down in a haphazard manner"

- It isn't a well-thought out plan for NFSv4 security. However,

  - The IESG at the time approved RFC7530 as a Proposed Standard

  - Very similar to *Security Considerations* in RFCs 3530 and 5661.

Security Issues
Addressing SECDIR Feedback

- Will evolve over time
  - First step is for the charter to *allow* us to address these issues (see [Next Slide](#))
- May need to provide specific security improvements to address existing weaknesses
  - Need more specificity from SECDIR about their concerns.
  - Need general working group agreement on addressing these issues.
  - There are a large number of possible approaches
    - Some possible directions laid out in Possible Security Directions
    - Need to get something acceptable to the working group and SECDIR.

Security Issues
Charter Proposal Responses

- Limited so far:
  - In maintenance section, added a reference to addressing IESG expectations in this area.
    - Not yet sure how to address these expectations
  - Extension section refers to "more effective responses to security challenges"
    - Will need to understand IESG/SECDIR expectations for those extensions.
- Maybe proposing to deal with security challenges (in the abstract) is not OK right now.
  - It would be nice to have at least one concrete proposal for a security-related extension, either from someone in WG or SECDIR.

Possible Security Directions

Slide One of Two

- Explain better where we are and why
  - Respond to the one specific SECDIR criticism.
  - Might not be enough but would help anyway.
- Try to address usage of NFSv4 in non-LAN environments
  - This sounds like it would appeal to SECDIR.
  - We would need SECDIR input regarding current weaknesses.
  - But there might not be sufficient working group or implementer interest.

Possible Security Directions

Slide Two of Two

- Focus on acceptable performance when encryption is needed
  - Would address MITM attacks without a VPN
  - Would address the problem of NFSv4 being used without privacy, almost universally
  - Since our competition is with disk access protocols, an implementation like that for ISCSI might make sense.
  - Would not help performance until adopted by NIC/RNIC vendors
    - Software implementations would serve as prototypes.
    - Would be a very long-term effort

Milestones

- We need to have some to make clear to the IESG where we are going in the near-term.

- Right now only one ⌐⌐

- Possible milestone sources:
  - Work arising out of migration-issues-xx.
  - Work for flex-files-xx.
  - RDMA-related milestones?
  - Something security-related?

- We do have the option to add them later.

Arriving at an Action Plan

- Plan needs to address:
  - Who is responsible for what
  - And needs target dates for completion of individual steps
- Needs target dates for:
  - Agreement on broad outlines
  - Agreement on initial set of milestones
  - A proposed draft with any necessary fine-tuning
  - Completion of the process