What is a Working Group ID (and when to adopt one)

Adrian Farrel

adrian.farrel@huawei.com

Maastricht, July 2010

Apple Pie

- Hopefully none of this is a surprise

- The bottom line is "carry on doing what you are doing"

- Some chairs have had recent crises of confidence

- Intention is to reinforce and allow discussion

What is a Working Group Draft?

- An I-D under the care of a working group
  - "Ownership" is reflected in the file name
    - draft-ietf-wgname-foo
  - Editors are appointed by the WG chairs
  - Content is controlled by WG consensus

Questions

- How do I decide?
  - Polling the WG
  - Making the decision
- What are the process steps to become a WG I-D?
- Special cases
  - Creating a document as a WG I-D
  - Competing drafts
  - Can an Individual I-D be under the care of a WG?

Polling the Working Group

- Recall: we do not vote

  We reject kings, presidents and voting. We believe in rough consensus and running code

  - David Clark quoted in RFC 4677
  - No membership and no identity checks
    - How could we vote?

- What is a "poll for adoption"?
  - It is a consensus poll
    - Just like a hum or show of hands in a meeting
    - Helps the WG chairs judge **rough** consensus
    - Different people carry different weights
  - May need to be explicit and careful in your question
    - "Do you think this I-D should become a WG draft?"
      - Can easily turn into a vote
    - Ask for reasons to be given to accompany a "no" opinion
    - Ask for expressions of willingness to work on or review the draft
  - Avoid votes!
    - This has popped up in a couple of places and looks ugly
    - See my slides in MPLS on Monday in the meeting materials

Criteria for Adoption

- Very little is documented
  - RFC 4677 (Tao) (draft-hoffman-tao4677bis)

    Working Group drafts are usually reviewed by the Working Group before being accepted as a WG item, although the chairs have the final say.
    - RFC 4677 is only Informational

- Some "obvious" criteria
  - I-D is in scope for the working group
    - Specific milestone or clearly within charter
    - If not, consider an easy charter-tweak
  - There is good support to work on the I-D
  - The level of technical (or other) objections is low
    - Technical objections (but note next slide)
    - Lack of clarity of intent
    - IPR
  - The WG chairs agree

Non-Criteria

- There is 100% support in the WG
- There are no errors of punctuation
- idnits passes (although, …)
- The I-D contains a perfectly formed solution
- The solution pleases everyone
  - Recall: once this is a WG I-D, the content is owned by the WG and can be completely changed

    The Chair must make sure that authors of WG documents incorporate changes as agreed to by the WG

    - RFC 2418 – Working Group Guidelines

Process Steps

- Notify your working group
- Tell the Secretariat that you are granting permission
  - https://datatracker.ietf.org/cgi-bin/wg/wg_init_rev_approval.cgi
- Tell the editors to submit the -00 version
- Go back to the day job

A Wrinkle – Who are the Editors?

- High expectation that it will be the editors of the source document
  - This is normally the case
  - It is not a requirement

    A working group generally designates a person or persons to serve as the Editor for a particular document.

    - RFC 2418

    - That means the WG appoints the editors

- If you intend to change the editors, discuss how and why with the original authors as early as possible!

Going Straight to WG I-D

- It is possible to have a -00 WG I-D without an original individual I-D
  - If it is clear that a WG I-D is needed
  - If a suitable set of initial authors can be found
  - If a Design Team is established
- Important to keep this open
- May be better to have the DT deliver an individual submission first

Competing Drafts

- Happens more often than comfortable
- Two solutions drafts as Individual I-Ds
  - Opposing solutions
  - Competing companies
    (Yes, people in the IETF do work for companies!)
- Can the author-teams merge their work?
  - In private
  - With help from the mailing list
  - Despite commercial and technical differences
- If "yes", ask them to do this before deciding to adopt
- If "no", you have a hard consensus choice to make
  - You may be able to get guidance from a previous document
    - E.g., a requirements RFC already published
  - You may need to drive a discussion on the mailing list
    - This may delay adoption until the discussion leads to consensus

Individual I-Ds Under WG Care

- Happens from time to time
- The I-D retains its individual name
  - draft-smith-wgname-foo
- WG does review and provides input
  - Includes WG last call
- Document editors retain control

- Personal opinion : I really don't like this!
  - Is it or is it not a WG I-D?
  - Where does control really lie?

Discussion Points

- What is not clear?
- What needs further formal documentation?
  - RFC?
  - IESG statement?
- Does documentation help?