

RFC Editor Future Development Program

Brian Rosen

Eliot Lear

(chairs)

Interim Meeting

18 Feb. 2021

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. Agenda
 - Issue 13 – Resolved (Who can participate)
Expect modest text tweaks as we go forward
3. Adrian's Proposal (Issues 15, 16)
4. Does the RSE serve on the strategic body (if there's time)
5. Next Meeting
6. AOB

Adrian's proposal (A)

A. Development Cycle

The WG is expected to show its work to the approval group and attempt to be aware of issues that the approval group might be concerned about. The members of the approval group are expected to pay attention to the work of the WG and speak up when they have concerns. The intention is early discovery of issues and avoidance of late surprises.

What about document adoption?

B. WG last call

The WG last calls its work following the model of an IETF WG. It is assumed that all members of the approval group will participate the WG last call, in an attempt to expose any of their concerns that still remain, and to reach agreement.

How long does a last call last?

C. Community last call / public comment

It is unclear whether this step (corresponding to IETF last call) exists and how it would be operated. The working group will then consider public comments received. When they are satisfied, they request approval.

To Do: figure out where to send it. Can evolve over time.
May be further down.

D. Participation by members of the approval group

As noted in steps A and B, participation in WG work by members of the approval group is expected. It is understood that, from time to time, a member of the approval group may find it impossible to participate in a particular discussion: in this case, they are encouraged to send delegates.

Mike: "Encouraged to ask their body to send an alternate"

E. Discussion by the approval group

The approval group shall discuss the output of the WG. Such discussion is to take place normally within 2-4 weeks of the WG making a request. The 2-4 week period may be stretched by holidays or IETF meetings, but the WG must be notified if this is the case. All comments and concerns shall be documented to the WG which may take them into consideration.

Merge text with C. Time tables stay the same.

2-4 weeks everywhere

F. Approval by the approval group

The voting members of the approval group shall formally ballot by the end of the discussion period in E.

Each voting member may ballot one of:

- Yes: Means "I support this work." A Yes ballot may be accompanied by comments indicating thoughts and issues that should be looked at, but are non-blocking.
- Discuss: Means "I have a serious concern that I would like to Discuss before this work can proceed." Those who hold this position must document their reasons. Voting members are expected to actively engage in resolving their Discuss positions.
- No Position: Only used in exceptional cases such as illness or long vacation. Voting members are expected to try to present a different ballot position.
- Abstain: Means "I have a serious concern, but recognise that it will not be resolved." An Abstain ballot is a way for a voting member to get out of the way of progress even though it worries them. The existence of an Abstain ballot does not imply the work is flawed, but indicates a genuinely irreconcilable difference of opinion.
- Recuse: Means "It would be improper for me to have a position." For example, if the proposal was to remunerate the voting member.

G. Reasons for a Discuss

The approval group shall maintain a list of reasons for a Discuss ballot. A Discuss that does not conform to one of these reasons shall not be valid, and must be re-balloted.

An initial draft of this list is as follows:

- The proposal would cause significant harm to one of the streams
- The proposal would cause significant harm to the series
- The proposal would cause inconvenience to a group of consumers, the benefit of the change does not outweigh the cost of the inconvenience, and that inconvenience could be overcome by using a different approach

G. Work proceeds if...

At the end of the discussion period (point E) or at any later time, there is at least one "Yes" and no "Discuss" ballot. That is, work fails to proceed unless it has approval.

Do we need quorum rules, or are there alternates?

H. Resolution of Discusses

A voting member who ballots Discuss shall explain their concerns to the WG and shall engage in discussions attempting to resolve the concerns and arrive at a compromise or other agreement. When such agreement is reached, the voting member should transition their ballot to a "Yes". A voting member may transition their ballot to an "Abstain" at any time, although all parties are encouraged to attempt to reach agreement.

I. Single Discuss resolution

In the event of there being exactly one Discuss ballot, and there being no timely progress to agreement between the WG and the member of the approval group who issued the ballot, the WG may request that the approval group exercise an exception resolution process as follows:

- The approval group will discuss the concern giving rise to the ballot and any proposed resolution from the WG
- The approval group shall attempt to reach consensus on whether to sustain the Discuss or to release the work, but failing that shall vote with a simple majority determining the outcome
- If the Discuss is sustained, return to step H
- If the work is released, the Discuss ballot shall be changed to an Abstain and the work shall progress

J. Appeals (Issue 16)

In the event that more than one Discuss cannot be resolved or that a single Discuss is sustained by the approval group, there is a right of appeal. The details of this need to be worked out per Adam and Mark.

(or here)

Does the RSE sit on the approval body?

Next Meeting

- IETF 110!

AOB