RFC Editor Future Development Program

Brian & Eliot

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 Bashing
3. Getting to done- the approval flow
4. Issues
5. Next meeting
6. AOB

Our circuitous path

Mar 2020 Group formation

April 2020 Organizational Discussions

June – August Initial concepts introduced in 4 drafts

September/ October Issue formation

November – Now: Set them up And knock them down

Next steps: Going through approval process

We are here

So how far are we?

Total Opened Issues	37
Total Closed Issues	38
Tracking issues	12
Issues that likely have overlapping solutions	8

Next steps

- Get through remaining issues
- Editorial (ahem) review… make sure it reads correctly
- Check leveling and detail?
- Approval – two possible paths
  - Combined IAB/IESG approval to handle updates from different streams
  - Separate document for RFC 2850 update

Discuss?

Open Issues

Issue #	Heading	Status	Anticipated next step
41	How to select RSWG chairs?	Looks like consensus	Open consensus call
45, 67, 69	When do WG chairs call for consensus / What counts as "community"?	In discussion	Proposed text needed
71	Who chairs the RSAB	In discussion	Discuss
47	What is success	In discussion	Discuss
49	RSEA response to feedback	Text in draft	Open consensus call
51	RFC 8728 review	Deferred	Volunteer?
50	Can RSAB do anything other than review RSWG proposals?	Text in draft	Propose to close
55	Suggestions for ongoing RSEA evaluation	Text in draft	Propose to close
56, 58, 79	Process for RPC work not requiring consensus (including style guide)	Text in draft	Propose to close
57, 61, 62	How are RPC priorities set/ Work Programme	Text in draft	Discuss, then open consensus call
80	Name of RSWG	New from Lars review	Discuss
63	What happens if the process breaks down?	In discussion	Proposed text needed
18	Name of the role	Discussion	Discuss, then (re)open consensus call?

Issue 45, 67, 69: When do the WG chairs call rough consensus, adopt text, etc?

The proposed principles (combining Joel/Brian):

- Chairs call consensus

- Chairs do their best to judge the actual rough consensus of the WG

- Chairs are also entitled to participate as individuals in the work of the WG

- Chairs are expected to consider their own input as individuals along with all other input in judging rough consensus, paying attention to their possible conflict of interest.

Mind Your Hat

Issue 71: who chairs the RSAB

- Points to address:
  - Decided by the RSAB itself?
  - Annually decided?
  - Rotated among the organizations?
  - Can RSCE/RSEA be chair?
    - If so, must be within scope of SOW (could even be within scope if not)

- Arguments we've heard
  - All other boards choose as a matter of their internal procedures
  - Fairness and "job for life" suggest rotation

Work programme text (Issues 56,57,61,62)

What's currently in the working copy of the draft:

The RPC shall report regularly to the RSAB, RSWG, and broader community regarding the contents and progress of its work program and any key risks or issues affecting it.

Work Programme continued: What Jay first proposed

Role of the RPC

Publication of RFCs shall be continue to be handled by the RFC Production Center (RPC) function in accordance with high-level policies currently in force or yet to be defined following the processes specified in the foregoing sections of this document.

RPC work program

The RPC follows a work program based on requirements it has gathered from a variety of sources, including policies that have been through the RSWG/RSAB process, and from direct discussions with the RSEA, stream managers, IETF LLC, authors and other IETF participants. In developing this work program, the RPC makes some key decisions which impact the IETF community:

1.   For each requirement that is gathered, can it be directly incorporated into the work program or must it first be subject to community consultation.

2.   Setting the relative priorities for the various requirements within the work program.

3.   Determining if all the important requirements have been gathered.

It is likely that the RPC will require advice during the drafting of its work program, which it should seek from at least the RSAB and if required, the chairs of the RSWG.

In order to ensure community oversight of the RPC work program:

* The RPC must present a draft work program for community feedback at least annually and then publish a final work program incorporating any agreed feedback.

First alternative

Roles and Processes

RFC Production Center (RPC)

Publication of RFCs shall continue to be handled by the RFC Production Center (RPC) function under direction from the IETF LLC, in accordance with high-level policies that have been specified through the RSWG/RSAB process, and subject to the IETF LLC providing the necessary resources. They shall provide reports regularly to and consult with the RSAB, RSWG, and broader community regarding status of work undertaken and plans for work to be done, including timeline for implementation as well as any key risks they identify. In doing so, the RPC will observe the principle of transparency. The RPC shall consult with the RSAB for advice on how to resolve any conflicts that arise from community input.

All matters of budget, timetable and impact on its performance targets, are between the RPC and IETF LLC.

Relationship between the RPC and the IETF LLC

This document does not specify the exact relationship between the IETF LLC and the RPC function; [[for example, the RPC function could be provided by a separate corporate entity under contract to the IETF LLC, it could be performed by employees of the IETF LLC, or the IETF LLC could work with independent contractors for some or all aspects of the RPC function.]] The exact relationship is a matter for the IETF LLC and the IETF Executive Director to determine.

The IETF LLC has authority over negotiating performance targets for the RPC and also has responsibility for ensuring that those targets are adhered to.

If individuals or groups within the community have concerns about the performance of the RPC, they can request that the IETF LLC look into the matter. Even if the IETF LLC opts to delegate this activity, concerns should be raised with the IETF LLC. The IETF LLC is ultimately responsible to the community via the mechanisms outlined in its charter.

Second alternate

RFC Production Center (RPC)

Publication of RFCs shall continue to be handled by the RFC Production Center (RPC) function in accordance with policies described in the Editorial series of RFCs, and consistent with the engagement agreement(s) between the RPC and the LLC.

- The LLC is requested to negotiate a deliverable with the RPC that results in regular updates to the community regarding status of work undertaken, planned work, implementation timelines, and any identified risks to those timelines.

- The LLC is requested to negotiate a task with the RPC that permits and requires the RPC to collaborate in at least an advisory capacity in the content creation of the Editorial series RFCs as they affect the RPC and that collaboration is expected to be the main path for community input into the RPC processes.

The RPC shall consult with the RSAB generally and the RSCE specifically for advice on how to resolve any conflicts that arise between the RSWG proposed documents, the Editorial series, the RPC's existing engagement agreement's scope, and any technical or cost limitations for implementing the Editorial series policies, and if necessary, shall refer any issues unresolved after such consultation to the LLC or the IED for final resolution.

Relationship between the RPC and the RSAB or RSWG

Neither the RSAB nor the RSWG has any oversight, monitoring, or directive relationship with respect to the RPC. The RSAB and RSCE have an advisory relationship with the RPC as described above.

Issue 51: RFC 8728 Review

- Opened as part of Brian Carpenter review
- Did we cover everything that we need to cover?
  - For each item:
    - It's in there
    - It's not in there and needs to be
    - It's not in there and that's intentional
- Volunteer?

Working off the issue tracker

Next meeting

- This meeting was at 8:00pm CEST
- Next meeting will NOT be at this time.
- Doodle now open.

Any other business

Acknowledgments

- Rear view mirror by Pratheep P S, www.pratheep.com CC BY-SA 3.0, https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?curid=16035503

- Top hat by Nikodem Nijaki - Own work, CC BY-SA 3.0, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=16920930