How do we make sure the result is right?

Specific focus items:

● Cross-community review of ideas with large impact:
- Do we catch on in time that things are happening?
- Does anyone read Last Calls anyway?

● Architectural insight:
- Are we getting the right clues into the IETF process at the right time?
- Is the IAB helping do that? Can it do better?

Possible topics with large impact?

IPv6 (did we get this right? mixed opinions)

IDN (potential danger?)

Instant Messaging (potential danger?)

Middleboxes

QoS (we have router per-hop behaviors, but not end-to-end QoS)

Multicast (we have multicast in routers, but not end-to-end multicast)

AAA/Diameter (did we get this right?)

IPSEC/IKE (did we get this right?)

SIP (largely a success, with further simplification in progress?)

MPLS (we didn't get this right)

OPES (still in progress)

PPP, DHCP, MIME (we got *something* right here)

Routing (did we get this right?)

● How well has the IETF done on these topics?

- What about cross-community input?

- What about architectural input?

● The reason to ask the questions is ultimately to learn from what has and hasn't worked in the past.

- Have we totally blown anything?

- IDN and Instant messaging have been suggested as things that we might blow in the future.

- Things that we didn't do that we should have?

- The perception of the average IETFer on how well the IETF has done in terms of getting the result right?

What about the smaller topics? How well have we done?

- PANA.

- Transport: SCTP, CM (Congestion Manager).

- ...

How does one get cross-community review, and architectural input, on these kinds of topics? Is it needed?

The role of the IAB?

IPv6
IDN
Instant Messaging
Middleboxes
QoS
Multicast
AAA/Diameter
IPSEC/IKE
SIP
MPLS
OPES
PPP, DHCP, MIME
Routing

Possible mechanisms for cross-community review and for architectural input:

• BOFs and Interim Reviews?

• Problem statements and architectural statements?

• Roadmap Working Groups, for working on the larger picture?

• Panels of reviewers?

• Design reviews during plenary sessions?

• A better understanding, for each topic, of the impact (or lack of impact) on other areas and layers, or on other things within the area? (Some things need cross-community review, and some things just don't...)