RFC Editor Future Development Program

Brian Rosen

Eliot Lear

(chairs)

Interim Meeting

17/18 Dec. 2020

Note Well (Break out the reading glasses)

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.
As a reminder:
By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement
As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam. (
https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/) if you have questions or concerns about this.
Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:
BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
BCP 78 (Copyright)
BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)
https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/ (Privacy Policy)

Agenda

1. Note Well

2. Bash

3. Review Issues (12, 24, 13)
   – don't expect to get through them all

4. AOB

Issues 12, 24: Is the expert an advisor (RSA) vs an executive editor (RSE)

Things on which we have rough consensus:

- The person can raise issues
- The person does not make strategic decisions but that those are decided by the strategic body.
- The person does not direct the RPC/REP.

Things on which we think we have rough consensus (we'll check):

- The RSE does **not** chair the strategic body.
- The RSE can provide the RPC advice on how to address questions relating to the existing process.

Where we left things:

- What is the expected working relationship between this person and the RPC, and the RPC and the strategic body?
- Given a corner case, who makes the final decision on a document?
  - What happens if someone wants to step out of the style guide?
  - Who owns the style guide?

Brian's Text (slightly modified)

\# Role of the RFC Series **Editor**

This person will be a senior professional with deep knowledge of technical publishing.

The RS**E** will operate by providing expert advice to the RSAWG, and if requested, to the RPC, on any relevant matters. The RS**E** is expected to be active in proposing improvements to the RFC Series, and in developing vision and policy documents. For example, the RSE might be consulted about proposed changes to the style guide, RFC formatting in general, web presence, copyright matters, or archiving policy, or might of their own initiative suggest such changes to the RSAWG.

The RS**E** is expected to actively participate in all RSAWG meetings, **and to have an ongoing working relationship with the RPC and tooling team.**

Issue 13: WG or Board model?

Things on which we have consensus:

- There is **some** strategic body

We think we are likely to have consensus on the following (we'll check):

- The RSE, stream managers, and a representative of the RPC are expected to participated in all meetings and in online discussions.

We need a bit more clarity on this point (restated):

- All strategic body meetings are open to the public, all discussions of issues take place on open mailing lists.
- Strategic decisions get documented in RFCs
  - but we're not sure if this has been sufficiently discussed and may need its own issue

We do not yet have consensus on this point:

- Who has decision-making power: is it the board or an open WG?

Discussion: Who has decision-making power: is it the board or an open WG?

- WG model
  - Rough consensus can deadlock
    - Is this a bug or a feature or both?
    - Would any process help to resolve a concern about this?
  - Diffused accountability
    - Who do we point the finger at if things go wrong?
    - Could we move from this mode to a board model if we really did deadlock?
  - Weak RS[EA] could be problematic.
    - How to measure series health?
- Board model
  - Not community driven
    - Require some community expression of support/allow for objections for any board decision?
      - Who gauges that support?
    - Creates its own gravity – board members have to show success
      - Only ex-officio participation?
    - Ex-officio participation can make accountability difficult.

Issue 13 (ctd)

- What sort of decisions do we expect the group to make?
  - Style guide / format evolution?
    - Direct doc editing?
    - Approval?
  - Direction to the RPC on publication standards?
    - Use of PDF-A?
    - HTML rendering?
    - Tooling guidance?
    - Additional improvements on representation/input format?

Next Meeting

- Doodling now
- Next proposed meeting date: w/o 11 Jan 2021

AOB

Feel free to edit this…

?

Tooling Team

Authors/
Stream Managers
Day to day

LLC

Strategic Body

Occasional
Operational
Guidance

RSE

Strategic Advice

Situational
Awareness

SLA results, exceptions, common issues