draft-carpenter-gendispatch-draft-adoption


current authors:

Brian E. Carpenter Fernando Gont Michael Richardson


https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/gendispatch/fhU_Z7rrE_XxyLkoGzAFJLQ04hY/https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/ipv6/3T-SG-8ylxt_rrKCOrVGFcA_v3w/

background: https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc7221


draft-carpenter-gendispatch-draft-adoption Life of an Internet Draft



draft-carpenter-gendispatch-draft-adoption Pathologies observed



draft-carpenter-gendispatch-draft-adoption Worse pathologies observed



draft-carpenter-gendispatch-draft-adoption

"Adoption represents a commitment that the WG will spend time and effort on the draft, but it does not guarantee that the draft will reach WG consensus and be submitted to the IESG for publication as an RFC."

draft-carpenter-gendispatch-draft-adoption

"A WG Adoption Call of an I-D is not a required step of the IETF standards process. The WG chairs decide what documents belong in the WG, and can create new documents by fiat.

A simple situation would be if a WG decides that an existing document should be split into two pieces:

There is no reason to adopt each piece, that is needless bureaucracy.

draft-carpenter-gendispatch-draft-adoption why should this work be done

WGs should adopt drafts as soon as they can agree on the problem statement, so that the WG is fully in charge of the nature of the solution.

If we want to allow WG to have different styles, then the style should be explicitely stated, rather than leaving participants to guess.

draft-carpenter-gendispatch-draft-adoption where should this work be done?

Options seem to be:

- 1) AD sponsored.
- 2) Charter a new WG (there are no active process WGs)

https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/gendispatch/fhU_Z7rrE_XxyLkoGzAFJLQ04hY/https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/ipv6/3T-SG-8ylxt_rrKCOrVGFcA_v3w/

background: https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc7221