Notes from the Applications Area Chairs and Applications Directorate lunch meeting at IETF 86

Look for chairs and appsdir members

- ACTION: All chairs who are not already appsdir members, please consider joining; see SM.
- ACTION: All chairs, please keep an eye out in your working groups for active, insightful participants who can join appsdir and/or who might be good as new chairs. See Barry/Pete.

Writing quality & reviews

Discussion of writing quality of documents, and how that affects reviews. Note that focusing on issues is better than spending time & effort on nits. At the same time, too many nits can make for a very hard-to-read document, so calling that out is important.

Document shepherds

Brief discussion of document shepherding.

- ACTION: When you're shepherding a document, the ADs expect you to have thoroughly reviewed the document. Please post your shepherd review to the mailing list, so it's on record.
- ACTION: Please have a look at draft-leiba-extended-doc-shepherd. Comments to Barry, and also consider following the advice described in it.

Using the datatracker

Brief discussion of ongoing enhancements to the datatracker. There's a new feature that's not quite finished, which allows submission of a document through a tracker state change (email is triggered automatically).

- ACTION: Chairs, please always set the shepherd field in the datatracker and post shepherd writeup to the datatracker.
- ACTION: Request publication by setting document state to "Sent to IESG for Publication", and *also* (for now), send email to the AD noting that you did that. No need to include the shepherd writeup if you have put the writeup into the tracker.

DISCUSS positions to WG lists?

Discussion of whether IESG DISCUSS positions, along with the ensuing discussion, should be copied to the WG mailing lists. Extended discussion -- mostly support on the grounds of openness and accountability, but some concern about "noise" on the mailing

lists, opening old wounds, that sort of thing.

- ACTION: App ADs will do this on an experimental basis; if you want to try it for your working group, please let your AD know.

Target audience, who understands the doc?

WGs often respond to cross-area questions by saying that anyone who works in this space would understand this. But is that really true? Where do we find the balance between saying too much (we can't explain *everything*) and not saying enough (and getting bad implementations because people *don't* really understand)?