

**Terms of Appointments for NomCom-selected IETF Leadership Positions**  
**draft-klensin-nomcom-term-01.txt**

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on December 26, 2006.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2006).

Abstract

A consensus is emerging in the IETF that very long tenure in leadership roles is not in the best interests of the community. While, in theory, that advice could simply be given to the NomCom, there is reason to believe that a different model for consideration of renewal or replacement for members of the leadership would be more efficient for the NomCom and would impose less hardship on incumbents and the community. This document outlines that alternate method.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	<a href="#">Mailing List . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">The Review and Clean Nomination Model . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.1.</a>	<a href="#">Phase 1: Review of Incumbents . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2.2.</a>	<a href="#">Phase 2: Nomination and Selection of New Candidates . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">2.3.</a>	<a href="#">Revised schedule . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">Previous Discussion Points . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	<a href="#">IESG-only, or all NomCom appointments? . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	<a href="#">"Doing an excellent job" as justification for third term? . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	<a href="#">Guidance, or hard limit on service length? . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Internationalization Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">Security considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">Acknowledgements . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	<a href="#">References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">8.1.</a>	<a href="#">Normative References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">8.2.</a>	<a href="#">Informative References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
	<a href="#">Authors' Addresses . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
	<a href="#">Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">10</a>



## **1. Introduction**

A consensus is emerging in the IETF that very long tenure in leadership roles is not in the best interests of the community. While, in theory, that advice could simply be given to the NomCom, there is reason to believe that a different model for consideration of renewal or replacement for members of the leadership would be more efficient for the NomCom and would impose less hardship on incumbents and the community. This document outlines that alternate method.

### **1.1. Mailing List**

This proposal should be discussed on the main ietf list at [ietf.org](http://ietf.org).

## **2. The Review and Clean Nomination Model**

The current nomination process pits incumbents, incumbent performance, and questions of stability in the IESG against potential other candidates. This is undesirable for a number of reasons. It creates the notion of incumbents being "fired" rather than honorably retired to the citizenry after a brief period of contributing to the community by assuming a leadership role. And, while there is significant value in treating stability as a goal, it can also create distortions about the degree of support various ideas have in the community.

This specification changes the current model by reintroducing some principles that the author believes are widely held in the community and optimizing the selection process to support those principles.

The principles include:

- o Service in the IETF's leadership bodies is a short-term contribution to the community, not a career. Indeed, assuming those positions may be considered a responsibility to the community.
- o It takes long enough to learn the job of being an effective AD that, in general, having someone retire after a single two-year term is uneconomic for the community.
- o Just as retirement of an AD after one term should be considered a major step because of the inefficiencies of the learning period, the six-month or more period in which an incumbent is uncertain about whether work should be planned that spans the "first meeting of the next year" introduces inefficiencies that should be minimized to the degree possible.
- o A demonstrated shortage of people willing to do work in the IETF should be taken as an indication that there is insufficient real community interest in the work to reach a meaningful consensus about high-quality results. While that position appears to be



reasonably well-understood with regard to the number of active IETF participants interested in putting a working group together, and in finding leadership for working groups, the same principle probably should be applied to ADs and areas: if there are only one or two people willing and qualified to do the AD job, that may be an indication that the IETF should review the appropriateness of that area's existence or definition.

To deal effectively with these problems, the NomCom consideration and evaluation process is divided into two phases.

### **2.1. Phase 1: Review of Incumbents**

Incumbent performance should be evaluated, not compared to potential other candidates or replacements. The incumbent will always have more experience. An AD who has done his or her job well, will have accumulated strong proponents and probably strong detractors. Other candidates are always risks, and direct comparison is inevitably difficult.

In Phase 1, the NomCom will evaluate the performance of incumbents, collecting information from the community as needed to do that. The NomCom is instructed that an incumbent should be returned once (i.e., permitted/encouraged to serve two terms) unless there is strong evidence of problems (e.g., incompetence, inability to work with WGs, inability to work with other ADs, non-feasance, or malfeasance). Conversely, the NomCom should assume that it is better to return an incumbent who has served two terms to the community and active WG work unless some special circumstances apply.

While this process allows flexibility, the NomCom is instructed that "special circumstances" should be a rare occurrence, based on what is best for the affected area, the IESG, and the IETF as a whole. Simply doing an outstanding job as an AD should not constitute "special circumstances" that would justify a third term.

The level of special circumstances required for a fourth, or subsequent, term should be required to be much higher than that for a third: the intent is to make more than three terms a rare and nearly impossible event without formally prohibiting that through a term limit: it is important that the NomCom retain flexibility and the opportunity to judge special circumstances.

Discussions between the NomCom and a candidate as to whether that candidate is willing to serve again should be covered by the NomCom's normal privacy rules except as mutually agreed. If the NomCom chooses to not return a candidate who is willing to serve, the expectation is that this will be indistinguishable to the community



from the candidate voluntarily stepping down. Under normal circumstances, the NomCom is expected to conduct informational evaluations of even those candidates who have chosen to step down (the evaluations may inform later choices), but such candidates may negotiate with the NomCom as appropriate, perhaps supplying in-depth analysis of the relevant Area and its status and issues as an alternative.

At the end of this phase, the NomCom submits the list of returning candidates to the IAB as usual. The IAB makes its decision and the choices are announced to the community. The list of (remaining) open slots is then announced to the community and nominations and recommendations sought. Any incumbent who is not returned in this phase is not eligible for the relevant position in the second phase.

## **2.2. Phase 2: Nomination and Selection of New Candidates**

This procedure works exactly as described in [[RFC3777](#)], with the understanding that no incumbent will ever be a candidate for the same position under this process. As a side-effect, the process makes it more difficult than it has traditionally been to shift people around within the IESG: it is considered an explicit corollary to the principles above that an incumbent AD in one area should normally have working experience within one or more WGs in a new area before being considered as a candidate for AD in that area.

## **2.3. Revised schedule**

[[to be supplied]]

The authors are aware of other proposals that would also affect the NomCom timeline. Rather than trying to develop a revised schedule on a per-proposal basis, we suggest that one NomCom schedule revision be considered, based on this and other proposals that would be accommodated.

## **3. Previous Discussion Points**

In informal discussions before the initial version of this draft was completed and posted, there was considerable discussion on three points:

- o Whether this proposal should apply only to IESG appointments, or to all NomCom appointments,
- o Whether "doing an outstanding job" is justification for third terms, and





- o Whether this proposal should contain a statement of guidance, or hard term limits.

Reasonable people spoke in support of both sides on each of these points, but the proposal authors had to make choices. The community will need to discuss, and decide upon, these issues.

### **3.1. IESG-only, or all NomCom appointments?**

This specification has been written to apply to the IESG only, since the IESG's operational role and observed rates of AD burnout make it most obviously important there.

It is possible that consideration should be given as to whether a similar or identical model should be applied to the IAB and/or other appointments made by the NomCom.

### **3.2. "Doing an excellent job" as justification for third term?**

This specification is written to allow NomCom to return ADs for third terms, and beyond, due to "special circumstances". One question we've been asked is whether "doing an outstanding job" should be included in "special circumstances".

While our intention is to provide guidance to NomCom, rather than rules, this specification proposes that this guidance be "no".

- o The community is better served by having former ADs returning to technical work. A consistent criticism of the current working group process is that specifications often lack sufficient cross-area review when they are forwarded for publication. ADs provide this type of review, but currently-serving ADs don't have time to provide reviews early in the development of a draft, where it is most useful and most likely to have a positive impact.
- o Allowing "doing an outstanding job" to constitute "special circumstances" removes deterministic benefits of this model. The intention is that ADs return to the community after two terms. It is desired that all ADs "do an outstanding job" - this proposal would remove ADs who aren't headed for "outstanding", after their first term - but Only in Lake Wobegon are all the children above average, and Lake Wobegon is a fictitious place.
- o We also note that former ADs are often asked to serve as working group chairs in difficult situations, to help with BOFs and WG charter discussions, and to carry out assignments that benefit from AD experience but do not require the assignee to be a serving AD. It is unlikely that an outstanding AD who wants to continue to serve the community will be overlooked after leaving the IESG.



### **3.3. Guidance, or hard limit on service length?**

There was considerable discussion about whether it was better to offer the NomCom the guidance above, discouraging terms beyond the second, or whether to flatly prohibit more than two terms. One group believed that giving the NomCom a little extra flexibility was a good idea; the other believed that any additional flexibility would likely lead to very long terms since there would always be a reason to make an exception.

The authors of this proposal prefer to offer NomCom guidance, rather than rules. To take one example - if the NomCom believes that returning a third-term AD is appropriate (due, perhaps, to the other serving co-area director stepping down before the end of a second term), we prefer to allow NomCom this flexibility, rather than restrict them to a course of action that seems ill-advised.

## **4. Internationalization Considerations**

This specification is about IETF Procedures. It has no impact on internationalization issues.

## **5. IANA Considerations**

This specification is about IETF Procedures. It has no impact on IANA issues and does not contemplate any IANA actions.

## **6. Security considerations**

This specification is about IETF Procedures for leadership selection. It has no impact on Internet security issues.

## **7. Acknowledgements**

[[ to be supplied ]]

## **8. References**

### **8.1. Normative References**

[RFC3777] Galvin, J., "IAB and IESG Selection, Confirmation, and Recall Process: Operation of the Nominating and Recall Committees", [BCP 10](#), [RFC 3777](#), June 2004.



## [8.2.](#) Informative References

Authors' Addresses

John C Klensin  
1770 Massachusetts Ave, #322  
Cambridge, MA 02140  
USA

Phone: +1 617 491 5735  
Email: john-ietf@jck.com

Spencer Dawkins  
Huawei Technologies (USA)  
1700 Alma Drive, Suite 100  
Plano, TX 75075  
US

Phone: +1 469 229 5397  
Fax: +1 972 509 0309  
Email: spencer@mcsr-labs.org





## Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at [ietf-ipr@ietf.org](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

## Disclaimer of Validity

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

## Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2006). This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

## Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.

