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Why are we here?

- Changes in IETF administrative tasks over the past 10 years
- Changes in the IETF community’s expectations for the administrative functions
- Changes in the world around us
- What administrative arrangement best supports the IETF going forward?
Problems

• **Lack of Clarity**
  1. Responsibility - Demarcation between IETF and ISOC not clear
  2. Representation - Who speaks for the IETF (ISOC, IETF Chair, IAOC, ...)
  3. Authority - Decision-making with and without ISOC approval
  4. Oversight - Reporting chains

• **Lack of Resources**
  1. Volunteers - Lack of qualified volunteers to staff IAOC
  2. Staff - IAD role overly complex and taxing

• **Lack of Transparency** - Perception that IAOC is not transparent enough

• **Funding/Operating Model Mismatch**
Goals

• **Protect IETF Culture** - Keep financial support independent of technical contributions

• **Improve Technical Environment** - Undertake changes to better enable technical contributors to make technical contributions

• **Clear Definition of IETF/ISOC Relationship**

• **Re-envisioned Funding Model** - Provide support needed to adapt the funding model to changes in the industry

• **Clarity in IETF/ISOC Financial Arrangements**
Goals

• **Clarity in Roles & Responsibilities** - Clearly document roles of staff, contractors, and volunteers

• **Define Support Staff Roles & Responsibilities**

• **Re-define Role of IETF Community vis-a-vis Administrative Activities** - As administrative responsibilities change for staff & volunteers, the role of the community will change must be better defined

• **Define Improved Transparency Requirements**

• **Define a Transition Plan** - How do we get from today’s structure to the new structure?
Transition Options

• Structure
  – **IASA++** - IETF administrative structure implemented as an activity within ISOC
  – **ISOC Subsidiary** - IETF administrative structure implemented as ISOC subsidiary with its own accounts, by-laws, charter, staff, etc.
  – **Independent Organization** - IETF administrative structure exists in a new non-profit organization with its own accounts, by-laws, charter, etc.

• All options still have funding dependencies on ISOC

• Need to define relationship between IETF administrative organization and ISOC

• Governance

• Increase or reorganization of staff resources
Reflections on feedback

• Very thankful for feedback already received!

• Feedback broken out by major topics:
  – Options (IASA++, Subsidiary, Independent)
  – ISOC relationship
  – Staff
  – IETF Trust
  – IETF vs IETFAdminOrg roles
  – Funding
  – Advisory Council
  – Volunteers
  – Comparisons
  – Missing items
IASA 2.0 Options Feedback

- Options are points along a trajectory/spectrum
  - IASA++ represents a range of options from do nothing onwards
  - Mark a point along the continuum so we agree on what we are discussing

- “Worth having a clear organizational boundary” vs. “subsidiary just adds bureaucracy and distance from funding source”

- Solving specific problematic issues vs. evolving basic organisational design to reduce issues
ISOC Relationship

- As long as the IETF is largely reliant on ISOC for funding, ISOC will have a degree of control regardless of formal independence.
- Important to retain close relationship with ISOC.
- To which extent should the subsidiary or independent options change the way IETF does budgeting or funding.
- Specifying how future evolution in the interface happens.
Staff

- The bigger role of staff or contractors, increased number of people working for the IETF
  - Some growth seems unavoidable
  - Need to ensure our oversight, control, roles are clear
Trust, Roles

- Keep IETF Trust out of this reorganisation
- What does emphasizing difference between IETFAdminOrg and IETF accomplish?
Missing Items

- Document should discuss the impact to IRTF and IAB, IETFAdminOrg serves more than IETF (and role of IAB for ISOC)
Way forward

- Fleshing out all three options is time-consuming
- Suggestion: Pick a direction and work out the details, including a draft transition plan
- Discuss...
## Inter-organizational challenges for IASA++

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IETF perspective</th>
<th>ISOC perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISOC employs IETF staff</td>
<td>The IAD is an ISOC employee.</td>
<td>Unclear whether to include IAD in all the reindeer games (e.g., staff retreats, etc) Where to put in Org chart?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel management and review</td>
<td>The IAD works with and for the IETF. IAOC is responsible for hiring/firing and personnel review for staff (IAD). IAOC does the annual performance review – but subject to HR framework that fits a 100 person org (ISOC)</td>
<td>ISOC can’t do the performance review of the IAD as the IAD doesn’t actually fit into the ISOC structure and flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel details</td>
<td>Needs to know compensation numbers to set successor IAD compensation correctly</td>
<td>Exposing personnel compensation to non-employees is not advised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inter-organizational challenges for IASA++ (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IETF perspective</th>
<th>ISOC perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>IETF negotiates terms aligned with its needs, expectations, and relationships</td>
<td>Is the signer of contracts for the IETF (e.g., hotels, etc). ISOC must be comfortable with terms in the contract for exposure and fiduciary responsibilities. (<em>Finding the line can be hard</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support software resources</td>
<td>Selecting its own software to support work (e.g., Salesforce)</td>
<td>Has a rationalized IT arrangements that don’t support the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational support ideology</td>
<td>The IETF has ideology about best practices, open source, eating our own dog food</td>
<td>“Why are my IT choices driven by the IETF’s ideology”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Representation</td>
<td>The IETF makes its own choices, and needs to represent to attract financial support</td>
<td>Why is ISOC calling me about the IETF? When is the IETF “us”, and when is it separate? Very difficult to make that clear to prospective supporters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>