

Notes, RSOC telcon, 11-Apr-2012

Attending:

Fred Baker - RSOC chair

Nevil Brownlee

Joel Halpern - IAB representative

Bob Hinden

Olaf Kolkman

John Klensin

Alexey Melnikov

Heather Flanagan - RSE & scribe

Russ Houseley - IETF Chair

Ray Pelletier - IAD

Sandy Ginoza - guest, RFC Production Center

Apologies:

Ole Jacobson

1. RSE Reports

a. RFC Publication

* Stats are looking very good; submissions low for the month, but the IETF has not met yet; more docs expected after their meeting

* two documents are held up in queue for policy-related reasons:

** (RFC 6574 <draft-iab-smart-object-workshop-10.txt>) RFC editor pushed back to the IAB with a concern about how the IAB document header does not match the 1:1:1 mapping required in RFC; this came up in the recent IAB meeting, but more explanation is required; HF to contact them to help clarify

**another document wants to take advantage of the Contributing Author option tried out earlier this year; HF is working with the AD to find a better option since Contributing Author is no longer available

** (Ray) has anyone considered Contributing Author to be someone who holds an intellectual property right to the doc? (Russ) This is not currently in the IPR policies for the currently recognize Contributing Authors

b. RSE Priorities & Projects

i. Format discussion -- BoF went well, rfc-interest VERY active

ii. Style Guide, parts 1 and 2 -- pursuing clarification on specific points, such as capitalization of names

iii. Authors, Editors & Contributors

iv. web/wiki space

2. RFC Publisher / Production Center split

(Joel) As a starting point, some sort of split has been agreed to, and we are not trying to discuss whether we should just give up on all of this and go back to the way it was. Keep in mind the question Sandy asked "why am I handing off my archive to the Publisher?" Created a 3 element split, and this is not about contracts, just looking at conceptual entities: 1 = Production Center, 2 = Publication Center (making available the actual approved RFC and errata and supporting information about that), 3 = both of those functions need IT support.

At least for discussion, where we had talked about 2 & 3 being the same, let's split conceptually for now; think of this as an API between Production Center and Publisher; if the Production Center signs the doc, then the Publisher can treat that signature as the verification they need (reducing number of signatures and authN steps). This would change something in 5620bis but that's ok for now; this means

subpoenas would just go to the Production Center

We can run with this modification as an experiment, let the community know that this will be an experiment, and the next time the RFC describing this comes up, we can adjust

(Sandy) conceptually, I understand this and it makes sense; only part trying to understand is the IT support; if the database, which is considered an IT function, what server would it be found on? The publisher database or the production center?

(Joel) the model just outlined conceptually has two databases, because the production center shouldn't be touching the data published to the public; whether that is on one machine or two, doesn't matter; this makes Sandy cringe because there would then be two different transactions with the Datatracker; RPC would hold state change data for pre-pub data

(Russ) as long as the IT department is giving the tools you want, why do there need to be two different databases?

(Joel) clean separation, but it should be invisible from anyone's perspective, including RPC;

(Sandy) so if the RPC or Publisher move, where does the database(s) go?

(Joel) the database stays with IT, the content and data goes with RPC or Publisher (depending on what data is in question and who moved). If the RPC and Publisher have clear API, then it doesn't matter what moves where, IT must provide the support to help make it work

(Sandy) question for John Klensin: why would it be better for subpoena go through Publisher instead of RPC?

(John) so far, all the subpoenas we've had (as far as I know) have requested the docs, but we haven't been in a situation where it's the IETF or the RFC Editor have been the objects of the suit; if it ever comes to that, then it will be challenging to describe how the entire process works and is validated;

(Joel) the production center should be the signer, which would resolve some of these concerns;

(Russ) this is a change to 2026; (John) in general, just wants Sandy to be comfortable with the process if it comes to a subpoena

Summary:

3. Security Incident

- * no data was compromised

- * Glen's email holds the detail of information

- * (Fred) primary motivation is likely that many people access the web server and so this might be used to distribute something

- * (Sandy) internal access was down for longer than the site itself as they went through a manual password change procedures; no hiccups or service interruptions since then

- * (Olaf) Most appropriate if Heather is the point person; community communications should go through the RSE