

Applications Area Meeting

IETF 78

Area Directors:
Alexey Melnikov
&
Peter Saint-Andre

Note Well

- Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:
 - The IETF plenary session
 - The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG
 - Any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices
 - Any IETF working group or portion thereof
 - The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB
 - The RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function
- All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).
- Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice.
- Please consult RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 for details.
- A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.
- A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.

NomCom

- NomCom will soon open a call about nominations for Application Area Director
- Please provide feedback to NomCom about desired AD qualities and details about particular AD candidates
- Please volunteer to serve as an Applications Area Director

Applications Area WG proposal

Alexey Melnikov & Peter Saint-Andre
IETF 78, Maastricht

Problem Statement

- There are lots of individual drafts in the Applications Area
- AD shepherding & review can be:
 - Slow and inefficient
 - Open to charges of subjectivity
- WG process is a Good Thing™
- However, sometimes a topic is too small to justify a dedicated WG

Proposed Solution: Area-Wide WG

- Precedent in other IETF areas
- Basic concept:
 - Area-wide WG chartered to accept items that would otherwise be individual drafts
 - However, individual drafts still welcome
 - Set reasonable guidelines regarding what is in or out of scope for the WG
 - Chairs are not necessarily the ADs
 - One tool in the toolbox, not a panacea

Proposed Scope

- Well-defined security solutions that apply to multiple Apps Area technologies (e.g., application server identity in TLS with certs)
- Small-scale additions to the protocol stack for an existing Apps Area technology (e.g., well-known URIs)
- Topics traditionally in scope for the Apps Area (e.g., date and time formats)

Proposed Acceptance Criteria

- WG consensus on suitability, importance, and projected quality
- Core team willing and able to do the work
- Enough other WG participants to review the work
- AD input and coordination

Discussion Topics

- What are the potential benefits?
- What are the potential costs?
- Are there process concerns?
- Does it increase transparency?
- On balance would it help or hurt?
- Is this just a way for those lazy ADs to offload more work onto other folks? 😊