

This presentation is full of tiny text. You're encouraged to download your own copy from <http://www.seastrom.com/nanog39mlcupdate.pdf> and follow along. Apologies for any inconvenience.

Mailing List Committee Status Update

NANOG 39, 4-Feb-2007
Toronto, Ontario (Balmy Canada)

Rob Seastrom, Chairman, NANOG MLC
rs@seastrom.com

Agenda

- Status update on list administration committee membership
- Process Flow Recap
- What's been happening
- What's not been happening
- Technical Stuff
- Pending AUP additions
- Questions

Who is the MLC?

Present committee membership:

- Sue Joiner - Merit
- David Barak - Callisma / AT&T
- Alex Pilosov - Pilosoft
- Brett Watson - Neustar
- Rob Seastrom - ServerVault (Chair)

What does the MLC do?

- List administrivia
- AUP enforcement
- New policy development

List Administrivia

People sometimes need help with getting onto, off of, sending mail to, or adjusting suscriptions to nanog@, nanog-post@, nanog-futures@, and the like. We're here to help.

AUP Enforcement

Occasionally threads get out of hand on tangents that have nothing to do with network operations. More commonly, individuals get a bit too... *enthusiastic* about their posting, to the detriment of the character of the list. Most commonly, folks forget to use their real, identifiable names when posting to the list. In all cases, we're here to help.

NANOG AUP

1. Discussion will focus on Internet operational and technical issues as described in the charter of NANOG
2. Postings of issues inconsistent with the charter are prohibited
3. Postings to multiple mailing lists are discouraged
4. Postings that include foul language, character assassination, and lack of respect for other participants are prohibited
5. Blatant product marketing is unacceptable
6. Postings of political, philosophical, and legal nature are discouraged
7. Postings to the list must be made using real, identifiable names and addresses, rather than aliases

How AUP violations are handled

- Subscriber sends an e-mail to the list
- An MLC volunteer judges e-mail to be a violation of the AUP (perhaps on own initiative, perhaps in response to a community complaint). AUP as previously discussed is at <http://www.nanog.org/aup.html>
- The Steering Committee is authorized to make changes per the Nanog Charter (7.1.1)
- For one-off violations, an MLC volunteer sends an off-list note to the offending subscriber, giving guidance about the list's AUP and explaining the MLC volunteer's concern.
- For repeated violations, the MLC discussion on the nanog-admin list may result in an official warning being sent to the user, outlining the specific violations the user has been responsible for, and specifying that further violations might result in revocation of posting privileges.
- For repeated violations following one or more official warnings, MLC discussion on the nanog-admin list may result in a decision to remove posting privileges for the subscriber for 3 to 6 months.
- For repeated violations following one or more official warnings and also following a temporary posting ban, MLC discussion on the nanog-admin list may result in a decision to permanently revoke posting privileges for the subscriber.

Typical email from the MLC

From: Robert E.Seastrom <rs@seastrom.com>
To: Joe Foobar <joe.foobar@gmail.com>
Cc: nanog-admin@nanog.org

Howdy,

Please take a moment to read the NANOG Mailing List's AUP at <http://www.nanog.org/aup.html> with particular attention to item 7 which requires use of real names, not aliases, on the mailing list.

We'd appreciate it if you'd honor our AUP by posting with your real name in the future.

Best regards,

---Rob (on behalf of nanog-admin,
the nanog@nanog.org list
administration team)

What's been happening?

It's been a quiet week in Lake Wobegon, my hometown...

Since last meeting, MLC action has included no warnings, no list removals, and three requests to use one's real name instead of a truncated or alias name.

We've had a thread or two that got pretty verbose, but weren't sufficiently far afield from network operations on the whole (despite individual messages or microthreads that went off on tangents) that anybody complained.

What's Not Been Happening?

A new policy proposal (vacation message ban) and a documentation of existing policy (removal process) have languished due to time constraints; ML chair should have delegated these to someone who has the time to get them into presentable form, onto the wiki, and referred to the -futures community for discussion.

Technical Stuff

How about that Blogger™ problem we were having?

Someone was gatewaying NANOG mailing list traffic to Blogger, which was having problems digesting some MIME-encapsulated (cryptographically signed) posts to the list, and was generating bounce mail... but we were having trouble figuring out exactly what was going on because the mail was not going directly to Blogger and the bounce message did not provide sufficient detail for us to be able to debug it.

Blogger (cont'd)

The MLC in consultation with the SC decided to take a two-pronged approach - an appeal to Google via various channels (thanks to Warren Kumari among others who pressed this issue inside Google), and a migration of nanog.org mailing list services to an independent machine (from trapdoor.merit.edu) where more advanced mailing list software, particularly software that could offer per-subscriber envelope-from could be run without impacting Merit services.

So what finally happened?

To be honest, we wish we knew. Google appears to have fixed the problem with Blogger, but there's been no formal communication to that effect.

... and the separate mail server??

The desire to be running on separate hardware (along with a request to open a dialog about the particulars) was raised with Merit staff before the holidays. In mid-January, an offhand comment was made in email by a Merit representative to the effect that a server donation had been offered and accepted, and that Merit staff would be installing them shortly. This came as a surprise to the stakeholders who originally raised the request. This situation turns out to be more of a communications problem than an execution problem, and there will be a detailed discussion before the end of this conference to hammer things out.

Pending Action Items

(for post on wiki, discussion on nanog-futures... and possibly eventual implementation?)

Refinement of warning and removal process

The warning and removal process documentation needs to be cleaned up, reconciled with a flowchart done by Bill Norton many moons ago, and posted on the wiki for community feedback.

Emergency Actions

Replace current 3.5 (Emergency Actions) with the following:

3.5. If Merit determines that a subscriber is behaving in such a way that the operation of the NANOG list (or other associated Merit systems) are threatened, then Merit may initiate emergency procedures to defer the threat. Within 12 hours of Merit's determination to suspend privileges, Merit will seek approval from any two people from either the List Administration team or Steering Committee. Sustained revocation will be determined by the List Admin. team given the AUP and NANOG list management procedures.

3.6. If a List Administrator identifies an AUP breach which appears to warrant immediate action, at a time when convening other List Administrators to follow the normal consensus process is not possible, that List Administrator may institute a temporary, 72-hour ban for the corresponding subscriber so long as support for the action has been obtained and documented from two other people who are either List Administrators or Steering Committee members.

Needs to go to wiki and nanog-futures for discussion.

Misconfigured “Vacation” software

Previously proposed “vacation” policy:

Subscribers with software (including but not limited to MTAs and MUAs) that is (mis)configured in such a fashion as to send vacation notices to either the mailing list or to individual list posters are subject to removal from the list without notice, and are welcome to resubscribe at such time as their software is fixed.

Plenty of local pockets of enthusiastic support for this, but no clear consensus. Needs to go to wiki and nanog-futures for discussion.

Questions?