

SIDROPS Interim - 10/01/20

Nathalie/Keyur/Chris

Note Well

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

Chair's administrivia

- o Agenda bashing and Chair's slides - [5 min]
- o Discussion about Discussion - [10 mins]
- o 6486-BIS Wording Finalization, finally? - [45 mins - or less!]
- o Done

Discussion - How to have it, how to not have it

Understand and believe that all parties involved here have been working for the security of the Internet.

Discussion should center around the efficacy of the technical topic, only.

Devolution into, or discussion about, personalities or intents distracts from the topic.

Frustrations with speed/scope will happen. Disagreements on direction will happen.

We should not believe our fellow working-group-mates are here to sabotage the process or the Internet, nor advantage themselves over the security of the Internet.

If we learn from operating this system we need to feed those lessons back.

Finalizing the final wording - 6486-bis

Editors edited, there was more discussion.

We adopted the draft 8/11/2020.

There was a bunch more chat about it

Martin - Issues raised: failed why? How? && Unknown(new) object(s)

Various parties - Discuss Martin's mail... we derail here.

Some diversions on:

‘What about new objects?’

‘What about older RP software?’

... continued

Do we agree (the WG) that simplicity in the repository collection is a goal

- o This means the WG is accepting that publication points may 'break'
- o This means that more exactness needs to be the norm the pub point

How far is the current draft from success?

Does the editor role need to transition?

Or is there time/gas for 2 more loops through?

Finish!