

**From:** shyam bandyopadhyay <shyamb66@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** [IAB] Procedures related to Independent Submission Stream need to be more transparent  
**Date:** January 31, 2019 at 6:06:42 AM PST  
**To:** iab@iab.org  
**Cc:** amitava.datta@uwa.edu.au, soumitro@iiserkol.ac.in, Dave Thaler <dthaler@microsoft.com>, Suresh Krishnan <suresh.krishnan@gmail.com>, iesg@ietf.org, Nevil Brownlee <rfc-ise@rfc-editor.org>, john-ietf@jck.com, Scott Bradner <sob@sobco.com>

To:  
The Chairperson, IAB

Sub: An appeal to make the procedure related to  
Independent Submission Stream more transparent

Dear Chairperson,

Long back I had submitted draft-shyam-site-multi and draft-shyam-real-ip-framework to the then Independent Submission Editor (ISE) Mr. Nevil Brownlee. Both the drafts were denied to be published by the reviewers.

Unfortunately contents of draft-shyam-site-multi appeared in a different manner in few drafts produced by Mr. Fred Baker, Mr. Brian Carpenter and others. I raised objection against those drafts and wrote it to the IETF Secretariat. IETF Secretariat revoked those drafts (it had happened twice). I did not try to follow up whether any other development was going on in the same line with the assumption that it won't happen any more, but same activities were continued and two drafts have already been published in this line RFC 8028 and RFC 8043. Mr. Brian Carpenter who was one of the reviewer of my drafts happened to be one of the authors of RFC 8028. RFC 8028 just elaborates the basic principle of draft-shyam-site-multi, i.e. "default routing based on the source domain of the source address of the outgoing traffic". RFC 8043 and draft-ietf-rtgwg-enterprise-pa-multihoming are based on the same principle and make a reference to RFC 8028. draft-ietf-rtgwg-enterprise-pa-multihoming is on the line for publication.

I proposed IETF to revoke all the above mentioned documents and approached IESG to resolve the conflict more than an year back. Mr. Suresh Krishnan and Alissa Cooper tried to follow up this case and what they tried to convey me are as follows.

Both Suresh Krishnan and Alissa Cooper said: "RFC 8028 is a consensus

publication of the IETF"

My point is if the decision makers analyzed the contents of RFC 8028 as a viable technical approach to be published, then draft-shyam-site-multi should have been published earlier and contents of RFC 8028 should have mentioned what it was trying to achieve on top of whatever was specified in draft-shyam-site-multi by making a reference to it.

Alissa Cooper had said further:

"As Suresh noted, the way to replace an existing RFC is to write a new draft that renders the previous RFC obsolete. Rendering RFC 8028 obsolete requires the consensus of the IETF community. It is not Suresh's decision to make, nor is it mine."

By making the status of RFC 8028 as obsolete does not solve the problem. By saying an RFC as obsolete means whatever used to be conveyed through the RFC is not necessary any more. If RFC 8028 is declared obsolete and another RFC comes up with the technical contents of RFC 8028, it must make a reference to RFC 8028.

For the sake of argument let us consider that IETF agrees to consider draft-shyam-site-multi to be published (with necessary changes) as a RFC and after that if I go for making a patent of it, it is going to be rejected saying that some work in this line e.g. RFC 8028 has been published earlier. Same thing will happen if I try to publish my work in any journal/conference etc. In fact even while trying to review within IETF same question should be asked (if the reviewer is not already aware of whatever had happened earlier).

I expect draft-shyam-site-multi and draft-shyam-real-ip-framework to be reviewed once again under the Independent Submission Stream, but entire effort will go waste until this conflict gets resolved.

So, I would request IETF to come up with an approach such that my documents can be published without any conflict. I feel that RFC 4846 needs to be updated such that work from the authors who will submit their drafts under the section of Independent Submission Stream can be protected.

I approached IESG more than an year back to resolve this conflict. Why shall I have to go through this pain? Not only that, why shall I have to involve many others like Suresh Krishnan and Alissa Cooper

and waste their time? I would request IETF to consider this kind of activity as serious offense.

Thanks and regards,  
Shyam Bandyopadhyay