

# IETF 105 Plenary Minutes

24 July 2019, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

## 1. Welcome

Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slides 1-4](#)

## 2. Host presentation

Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slides 5-7](#)

## 3. Updates

Note: Reports available in the [datatracker](#).

- IETF Chair report: [IETF Chair and IESG Report, IETF 105](#)
  - Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slides 8-19](#)
- IRTF Chair report: [IRTF Plenary Report](#)
  - Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slides 20-25](#)
- RFC Series Editor report: [RFC Series Editor Updates](#)
  - Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slides 26-35](#)
- IAB Chair report: [IAB Report to the Community, IETF 105](#)
  - Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slides 36-43](#)
- IETF LLC Executive Director report: [IETF LLC Executive Director](#)
  - Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slides 44-60](#)
- IETF LLC Board report: [IETF LLC Report](#)
  - Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slides 61-73](#)
- NomCom report:
  - [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slides 74-84](#)

## 4. IETF 106 welcome

Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slides 85-89](#)

## 5. IETF LLC Board open mic session

Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slide 90](#)

The LLC Board introduced themselves:

- Jason Livingood, Chair

- Alissa Cooper
- Sean Turner, Treasurer
- Maja Andjelkovic
- Peter Van Roste (via MeetEcho)

Jacob Hoffman-Andrews: I know there are a lot of important topics coming up that a lot of people really care deeply about and I wanted to recommend in the interest of time and audibility, that I'd like to ask to save clapping or cheering to the very end so we can hear everything everyone has to say. Thanks.

Jason Livingood: Thanks. All right.

Leslie Daigle: Jason, you mentioned in your remarks that among the things the very very busy LLC Board is doing is looking at planning how to simplify the contracts. I'd kind of like to hear that expressed in terms of what is the strategic-level objective the LLC board has and how is your new executive director going to implement it?

Jason Livingood: So like, why are we simplifying?

Leslie Daigle: Why is the LLC board worried about what the contracts look like? It seems to me that's dangerously close to getting into nitpicking stuff as opposed to the high level strategic stuff the LLC Board was designed to do. I may have missed the point and I'd like to hear how you have a strategic objective that you're going to get the new executive director to implement.

Jason Livingood: From a contract standpoint it's the more complicated you make a contract, the harder it is to understand, the harder it is to make sure everyone agrees and is aligned on what the responsibilities are and so on. That's the idea in breaking them apart, is making them a little bit simpler and more comprehensible.

Leslie Daigle: So what you're telling me if I'm hearing it correctly is that the LLC Board would like to ensure there is ease and clarity for all to understand the contracts and this is a high level priority in the establishment of this organization.

Jason Livingood: It's a high level objective, it's part of the normal legal aspect of the administration of this stuff, yeah.

Leslie: I'll probably see you on the next plenary mic. Thanks.

\* \* \*

Eliot Lear: As people may have seen on the IETF list I've put out a draft called draft-lear-we-gotta-stop-meeting-like-this and the purpose of that draft is really simply to engage the LLC and the ED perhaps to start thinking about new modalities of how we should be

meeting, with an eye towards not only effectiveness but also how we preserve the environment, costs, and a litany of other things. The purpose of the draft is not to specify answers, in fact I don't even know if I have the right questions in the draft, but rather to have somebody who can look at this in a long term way as you put up a list of meeting dates, we tend to get backed up in terms of thinking 3, 4, 5 years in advance. So any change we might want to consider at an experimental level can take a while. The purpose of me standing here is to say first of all, can people in the community please provide some comment on the draft, and perhaps can you take that forward as you see fit in consultations with the IESG.

Jason Livingood: Thanks, I'll say certainly we definitely noticed the draft. I thought it was interesting to read and we're watching all the community discussion. As community consensus develops, that will help provide direction. Timing wise, to the extent that we wanted to follow some recommendations, for example around a consultant to help do some assessment or something, given that we're beginning the budget process soon, the timing may be convenient between now and the end of year if something like that wanted to be budgeted. We'll certainly keep an eye on what the community discussion is and assess how to move forward.

Alissa Cooper: We have a meeting location policy which calls for a specific rotation on a specific time scale, so there is some intersection between your proposal and that. Since the policy is documented in what is now going to be a consensus RFC, that would be a matter for community consensus to be determined.

Eliot Lear: I totally understand, but the point is actually just to figure out where we might want to go. The draft basically calls for the LLC and the IESG to maybe bring some ideas back to the community, and then to take it forward from there. It's sort of step by step and if we need to make changes to documents later we can do that later.

\* \* \*

Bob Hinden: Nice report earlier. I'm glad we're on budget. I was looking at the budget and particularly I was comparing it against the previous year's budget. I noticed the previous year, the total expenses were a little over \$7 million; but the expenses for this year, the first LLC budget, was almost \$8.7 million. That's \$1.6m more to have the LLC. It seems like quite a lot to me. I have 2 questions relating to this: I'd like you to tell us why it's gone up so much and I'd also like to know why you didn't talk about this ever earlier. It's a pretty significant change. The difference is close to the cost of a meeting and a half of IETF meetings. This is a lot of money.

Jason Livingood: I'm going to defer to our treasurer in a second. I would say that the budget was developed by the interim board so it was established late last year. I think it's been discussed since that time. Sean, do you want to speak to some of the differences?

Sean Turner: I think some of the cost differences come down to trying to figure out who's doing what to whom with respect to ISOC and paying for things, and trying to lay out what the real costs were. That started before and we're going to continue to do that going forward.

Bob Hinden: That's a pretty general answer, I'd like to get a lot more specifics on that to understand. This is a significant increase in the overhead costs of the IETF. I'm not expecting you to do it this second, but I think some more responses of why these extra expenses are being incurred, and what we're getting for it, and why it's justified.

Sean Turner: I'll take a note, thanks.

Alissa Cooper: We can follow up in more detail, but just a few things. As you know, Bob, the IETF budget has increased every year. As long as I can remember, not by this much, but it's not as if the entire increase is attributable solely to the transition to the LLC because it increases every year. We did talk about this when we were forming the LLC and in the WG process and on the interim board. I think I'm the only person here who was on the interim board. There was a bunch of discussion about this at the time when we created the budget a year ago. Obviously a bunch of it is accountable to salaries that we budgeted for this year but aren't actually paying out because we haven't hired the people; we didn't know the timing of the hiring but we had to budget as if it was a whole year's worth of expenditure even though the people haven't been hired. Lastly, just to note, our revenue also increased significantly because we got a much larger contribution from ISOC this year than we have in any prior year. So it's not as if we're in danger of being underwater as a result of this.

Jason Livingood: Good questions, we'll take it as an action item and follow back up. Additional questions?

\* \* \*

Mike Bishop: I wanted to follow up on your comment that the endowment needs to grow further. The endowment webpage has not been accepting donations since around the end of last year, and now the endowment webpage as of sometime very recently gives you a cert error, and then a 404 if you proceed past that. I kind of think, if we want more money we might want to start accepting it.

Jason Livingood: That's an excellent point. We made a decision to, during the transition period for a short period of time, take that down because it would be unclear what bank account it could be accepted into and it was difficult from an accounting and paperwork standpoint to have a definite cut date for moving it over. I think we also felt we wanted to have a chance, and there will be community consultation of course, to articulate what the long term goals are, explain this, and put up a new page. So that's going to go out eventually to community comment. We're in an interim period. I agree, you can't accept money if you don't have a page to accept it. At the

same time, a lot of the places we're going to go aren't places that might donate on a webpage. It depends what our target audience is and that's part of that assessment we'll do.

Mike Bishop: Do you have a timeline for that?

Jason Livingood: Hiring and some RFPs are probably in the queue beforehand. The next few months, I think is our goal.

\* \* \*

Harald Alvestrand: In what way are two contracts that define two functions and the interface between them, simpler than one contract that defines two functions? I was a bit confused by this striving toward making more contracts because my experience is that more contracts creates more interfaces which creates more confusion which creates more trouble. The last thing you want is trouble. And it's micromanagement by the board. Care to comment?

Jason Livingood: I don't think it's micromanagement at all, I think it's us doing our job to reduce risk and make things more clear and simple. In particular it might be one perspective to say that two contracts is more complicated than one, but at the same time when you come in and you look at an agreement and you try to figure out, this service is this particular thing, which of these pages apply to that? It's very complicated when over time, you keep adding to an existing contract. At some point the underlying contract isn't fit for the purpose of some of the add on services. We're trying to bring clarity here, it's not about micromanagement and we're trying to make it more clear and easy to understand over the long term.

Harald Alvestrand: I'd be very happy to see you hire someone who knows how to run contracts and interfaces between them and give them the power to decide. So yes, do figure out what the functions are, but when it comes to the legal stuff, leave it to the professionals, please.

Jason Livingood: I hear you, we have legal counsel and that's a core part of our agreement. Thanks very much for your time, we're closed. Thank you.

## 6. IESG open mic session

Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slide 91](#)

Present on the stage:

- Ignas Bagdonas, Operations and Management Area
- Deborah Brungard, Routing Area
- Alissa Cooper, General Area
- Roman Danyliw, Security Area
- Ted Hardie, ex officio; IAB Chair

- Benjamin Kaduk, Security Area
- Mirja Kuehlewind, Transport Area
- Suresh Krishnan, Internet Area
- Warren “Ace” Kumari, Operations and Management Area
- Barry Leiba, Applications and Real Time Area
- Alexey Melnikov, Applications and Real Time Area
- Alvaro Retana, Routing Area
- Adam Roach, Applications and Real Time Area
- Martin Vigoureux, Routing Area
- Eric Vyncke, incoming Internet Area
- Magus Westerlund, Transport Area

[Introductions]

Leslie Daigle: Following up in something from your report, Alissa. I wanted to say thanks to the IESG for recognizing the issue of tone on the mailing list, and for taking on some responsibility for addressing that. I wanted to say we are you and you are us. It was interesting to hear you'd had some input from professional communications people. I'd be curious to know what they shared with you, and can you share with us? In large part because in March there will be a slightly different IESG. So educating all of us not only educates the current IESG but all future IESGs too.

Alissa Cooper: Yeah, we were super lucky this man, [Mike Hoy?], was able to drive over from his house and meet with a few of us. But we will continue to distill everything we learned and will learn so everyone can benefit from it.

\* \* \*

Martin Thomson: To further Leslie's point, I'd personally like to make a commitment here, and encourage others to do the same. I felt constrained in the recent discussions, I didn't feel like I could say anything. And I realized recently, partly in the conversations with Mike we had earlier this week, that standing by and letting this bad behavior occur is me being part of the problem. So in addition to me being respectful of others, and the diversity of opinions we have here and the great set of people that form this community, I plan to be less tolerant of bad behavior in others, and I encourage others to do so as well.

Alissa Cooper: Thank you, Martin.

\* \* \*

Dean Bogdanovitch: About the feedback from last year NomCom member. Recruiting candidates for AD positions is really hard, as you probably already know. I really want the whole community to hear that because lately it was an interesting comment that I heard when trying to

find to get some people to nominate for AD and asking if they would be interested, and hear "oh, that is a career death sentence. I still want to do development work." And we have to think about how we can solve that. The other part was the AD were saying there is one thing in the job description and the other part what is the actual work that you have to do. There is a specific way to lead a volunteer organization. We have to think about that, learn how to do that, and based on that grow and groom potential leaders. But I don't think it is enough to be discussed in the NomCom or within the IESG. This has to be a wider problem of the whole community. Because at one point the people who are rotating through their leadership positions retire. And then what?

Alissa Copper: I think we agree with you. Hopefully, no one up here feels like this is a death sentence, but to the extent that people feel that way, that's a major issue. It's been an ongoing discussion in the IESG and we would welcome discussion with the community about it as well. Okay, I'm going to cut the mic line since we're supposed to stick to ten minutes. Kirsty you're next.

\* \* \*

Kirsty Paine: So I wanted to echo some of the comments on conduct, its really great to see it taken seriously at this IETF and on the mailing list as well. I had a suggestion, you did mention before on ways to prevent or you know tackle bad behavior and your idea here, so I just wanted to pitch my idea which was to create an Everyday Sexism Style, but Everyday at IETF. So for those who are not aware of the Everyday Sexism Project I recommend looking it up on twitter. Its just where people can submit their experiences where they relate to sexism and harassment they experience so I'm proposing just as an idea, and Everyday IETF, not limited to the sexism and harassment you might experience, but poor conduct and various difficult behaviors you might encounter. So I would just put that forward as an idea following the Everyday Sexism format. Thank you.

Alissa Cooper: Thank you very much.

\* \* \*

Daniel Kahn Gillmor: So I am very happy to hear that this community is starting to take our internal conduct more seriously. We do a lot of work in the public and we are an extremely unrepresentative sample of people who depend on our work and there are a lot of people who might be interested in being here who are turned off by all kinds of stuff that happens here. Partly just the technical jargon, but the aggressiveness we sometimes treat each other even when we know each other well is really off-putting. Especially to some newcomers. So I think we would do well to take that seriously and think about the way that the conduct not only has an effect on those of us who are here, and I'm sure we've all been burned by some of this conduct, but I hope that we're thinking about the conduct in respect to the people who aren't here and whether we want more people to join us.

Alissa Cooper: Thank you.

\* \* \*

Jana Iyengar: Martin and DKG have basically said everything I wanted to say, but I'm going to say it again because it's worth repeating. I've been with this community for nineteen years, and I don't really pay attention or listen to the IETF mailing list. I'm not saying this because I'm proud of it, I'm saying this because I can't keep up with what I see on the mailing list oftentimes. Separately, I want to applaud but I won't. What I saw on the slides was very encouraging. To me, the leadership taking some action on figuring out how to deal with conduct but what I saw on the slides was more of a safeguard against unprofessional behavior actually making this place positive and encouraging for others to contribute in is something that the community, each one of us, has to do. And to that extent, the minimum I can do is to make sure if I see somebody being abrasive or continuously abrasive I will call it out. I'll at least talk to them and try to make sure that its considered.

Alissa Cooper: Thank you.

\* \* \*

Mark Nottingham: I have a suggestion. I don't know if its a good one, but I think it's worth thinking about. Jana referred earlier to the IETF mailing list. It's a free-for-all. I appreciate the focus on behavior that we're seeing. This is really good. But I can't help but wonder if it's really representative of the community anymore. Anecdotally, I hear of a lot of people who don't subscribe to it because the find it too gladiatorial, toxic, whatever word you want to use. As a result, I wonder if we're getting good technical input there. Especially regarding IETF Last Calls, that's one of the purposes of the list. It's supposed to be the community's review of the technical work that's happening here. So to me, it seems like we should have a list that's dedicated to that purpose and more heavily moderated than the IETF main list. So the participants who can't put up with that level of whatever it is can still go and have a voice in Last Call discussions. I know there's some downsides to that, but I think it's something we should take seriously and consider.

[Applause]

Barry Leiba: I'll take the applause and lack of boos to support for what Mark said. I support it also. I think that the discussions that happen on the IETF list are important discussions and while they may veer off into the weeds and particular discussions might be annoying, on the whole we need it. But I agree completely that we should make the Last Call comments and the threads that come out of that have their own home. So I would like to support that. I'd like the IESG to do that.

Alissa Cooper: We'll seek some more feedback on that suggestion, thank you. And that brings us to the end of our ten minutes, so thank you IESG. Next we have the IAB.

[Applause]

## 7. IAB open mic session

Slides: [All Slides: IETF 105 Administrative/Operations Plenary Slides 92-98](#)

Present on the stage:

- Jari Arkko, IAB
- Alissa Cooper, IETF Chair
- Stephen Farrel, IAB
- Heather Flanagan, RFC Series Editor
- Wes Hardaker, IAB
- Ted Hardie, IAB Chair
- Christian Huitema, IAB
- Zhenbin Li, IAB
- Mark Nottingham, IAB
- Colin Perkins, IRTF Chair
- Melinda Shore, IAB
- Robert Sparks, IAB
- Jeff Tantsura, IAB
- Martin Thomson, IAB
- Brian Trammell, IAB

Not present:

- Erik Nordmark, IAB

Ted Hardie: As I said earlier in my email, the IAB is here primarily to listen, so if you have advice for us at this point, please go to the mic lines.

Lucy Lynch: I thank Olaf for this. There are some places in the model where I might argue with him a bit. I actually think the RFC Editor is a role, not just a function. I actually think the series in itself is a box along with the IAB and the IESG. It predates the IETF, so for me stewardship of the RFC Series and protection of the independence of the RFC Editor as a role are extremely important. So I have a couple of questions for you, Ted, speaking for the IAB. What do you think the role of the Series is, what do you think the role of the RFC Editor is, and what is the responsibility of the IAB as stewards of that asset?

Ted Hardie: I think one of the things that changed in the RFC Editor Model version 2 is that some of the things that had historically been associated with a single role were moved into multiple roles, and one of the protective functions of the RFC Editor has historically been to provide a mechanism to allow people who are not a part of the IETF standards process or one of the other common ways of producing documents of interest to the Internet technical community to publish. And I think we took that aspect of the RFC Editor historic function, and it became the Independent Series Editor, which has its own editorial board, and became the input stream. So I think to some degree, I certainly agree with you; the RFC is itself a role, but it is also a role that has been shared among multiple other roles in this current model. Now, you asked me what I feel the role of the RFC Editor is, and the way I look at it from a metaphor perspective is sort of like a town planner. If you think about what we do, we're the construction workers. We build the houses. What the RFC Production Center does is, they come through and make sure that everything in the houses is up to code, and if necessary they help us bring it up to code if it isn't. The role the RSE plays is more like a town planner. She doesn't get into the details of whether any particular document is up to code; she makes sure that the codes are modern, and she helps make sure that the outputs from the city are well-connected to the rest of the world. That the roads coming in and out of the city, in this case the publication venues in which the RFC Editor, sorry, the RFC publications are understood. That all of those work well. So, from our perspective, it's a very, very important role, and it's at a level that most of us don't operate at on a day-to-day basis. We are mostly the construction workers. We're writing the drafts. We're mostly building the houses and interacting on a day-to-day basis with the code inspectors. So, as stewards of that function, and as Brian Carpenter has put, the kind of stewardship that's involved in that has gone through multiple steps, the main thing that we have to do as stewards is to make sure that it keeps going. We're not experts in town planning, and we're not experts in publication. Our job is to make sure that with the community, and with the RSOC, that the function keeps going, so that the individually-built houses--each draft--remains part of a functioning whole: the city, or the Series. Does that make sense?

Lucy Lunch: It does make sense. It also explains to me why you may have a little more limited view of the editorial capability that provides that integrity, independence, whatever, that is needed, speaking for the big-I Internet community, not just the inside-the-box community.

Ted Hardie: Okay, and I appreciate that. I will say that it is never a good idea to let the people who are building the houses to write the code. There is always a risk there. You do want independence, and I recognize that.

\* \* \*

John Klensin: Ted, I want to start with a brief observation about Olaf's presentation, which is that when the RSOC started, and I was very much a part of it at the beginning, it saw its role as assisting and aiding the RSE to perform well and make sure the overall function worked. And at some stage that seems to have shifted into what's now seen as an oversight, in the management sense role, and I don't know what started that shift or how we got there, but I

notice that the IAB has over the last several years completely repopulated the RSOC, and I'd like to better understand why that was done, and how the mandate and your expectations of the RSOC and the RSE changed in the process.

Ted Hardie: Thank you. So, RFC 6635 doesn't actually tell the IAB on what schedule to repopulate it or how to do it. And so, the IAB has done it on a periodic basis, essentially in the past 4-5 years, every two years, and looked for new volunteers, or looked to refresh the program. The last time through, we did a standard program refresh, which means that we called for volunteers for the whole program, got many volunteers who had already been on the RSOC for some time, and some new ones, and then asked for community commentary and then went through the process of selecting some and populating the new RSOC. As you have noticed, we have definitely heard from the community that that might have been the wrong thing to do. And we've proposed to the community that we switch that--if there are not more major changes--to a rotating membership for 3-year fixed terms with renewal that make sure that we never refresh all of the RSOC at any one time again. And I think that that is sort of a structural change that will help make sure that the lessons we learn from this aren't as easy to lose, because I do think you're right. One of the things that happened here was the standard meaning of "oversight," more and more came into play in the understanding of what the RSOC was meant to be doing. I think in particular it occurs when you're around these moments of contract and contract renewal. And it's because in those cases it causes people who have standard business arrangements to say, "Hey, I understand what oversight means when I'm making a contract." Or, "I understand what oversight means when I'm hiring a person." We lost some of the nuance that what "oversight" was meant to mean was something different here. And I think what we are looking to figure out--I mean, obviously, this whole process has been a forceful reminder that the community has a different expectation here--how we make sure that this becomes reflected in the documents in a way that is part of the structures, because it is pretty obvious, and we had people with 5, 3, 2 years of experience on the RSOC, but the lore didn't get carried forward in the program in a way that was enough; I think it has to be in the documents themselves. And I think we've referred to that as one of the structural things that happened here, where they way the document was written, and what it talked about as oversight had very basic kind of hiring and firing oversight in it, and other things that described the role in different ways, and the tension between them has now been manifested in this tension, and we need to fix that.

John Klensin: In addition to that--I will make this very brief--there was a shift from expecting there to be serious publication strategy expertise on the RSOC that got lost somewhere in the process, and that also may be a matter of having not written things down enough, it may be a matter of not enough institutional memory on the IAB, but to the extent to which one wants that historical "oversight" role, there has to be expertise there, which is above and beyond very sincere members of the community wanting to help with this.

Ted Hardie: Thanks for the feedback; I appreciate it.

\* \* \*

Kathleen Moriarty: Okay, so my question is for a Ted and Alissa, and I'm gonna ask this multi-part question retrospectively, but it's more with an eye towards how do we bake this into the process going forward and make sure that it's considered, because I think it will make a difference. So, was risk management considered in the decision process? And by that I mean, were the potential outcomes enumerated with the possible outcomes, and I'm sorry, possible outcomes and potential business impact and remediation options, as to inform a business decision? And I ask this as I've been CSO multiple times, right, so I've had to go through this type of process every time some some sort of large security decision was made. And another part of that is, was the LLC consulted, since they own the contract? Or the Trust, which I am on, so I know we weren't, but we own the published RFC's.

Ted Hardie: Thank you for the comment. I think I might need to follow up with you a little bit more offline about exactly how you're modeling risk management, because I think what you mean by it might not be quite what I understand it be, but given the mic lines, if you don't mind, I'd like to take the further details--

Kathleen Moriarty: And that's fine. I've done quite a bit of work in this space, so it's really just making sure it goes up to people in the business. It looks like Alissa wants to respond as well.

Alissa Cooper: I mean, I'm happy to have more follow-up on this, but the one thing I would say, at least my understanding of RFC 6635 is, like, a very strong presumption of delegation to the RSOC for all of these matters, and I think that was by design. Like, why would you have two committees overseeing, you know, having any oversight role over a single individual if they weren't supposed to have functionally different roles? So I think that's part of what gets to your question, is that there was a strong level of independence and delegation between the IAB and RSOC, at least as I've understood it from the lawyers and the RFC.

Kathleen Moriarty: Thank you, and I think it goes to some of the role definition and assumptions and they seem to be a little bit different through the room.

\* \* \*

Sue Hares: This question is for Alissa. As you go forward, you've asked us to think about going forward and I'd like to see what your arc is ingoing forward. Alissa, we had a--and I know you're in a unique position since you sit both on the IESG and IAB and I'm sure Ted, I'd love to hear this from you--but we had an RFC++ BOF to work on our main output, which is RFCs. What was your conclusion from that BOF, and how did you come to it? Just, if you'd share the reasoning, it would help maybe tell us what you're thinking about.

Alissa Cooper: Sure. I mean, I think it was a bit more of an IAB initiative than anything else, but I think, I think it was very clear feedback from the BOF that the topics that were raised were squarely in the province of the RFC Series Editor, and she agreed to take them on and work on

them, and I think that was, I mean in the realm of, you know, clarity of result from a BOF, it's one of the clearest results I've seen, so that was a good outcome. I think you know the BOF itself was extremely divisive, and that's why I've talked about it as having been a mistake because I think it created, you know, a lot of strife that was unnecessary, but in terms of like further follow up, it's entirely in the RFC Series Editor's court.

Sue Hares: So, as we're transitioning that, did you feel the directions that Heather outlined were the appropriate directions? She outlined several things she thought next or even this time, like AUTH48. Does that seem to be the same sort of thing you foresee for the future?

Alissa Cooper: I don't think the AUTH48 topic was really related to the BOF.

Sue Hares: No, it wasn't; I was just giving it as an example that you might elucidate what things you felt in the BOF would be good going forward, what positive things.

Alissa Cooper: Yeah, so I don't think the AUTH48 topic was related to the BOF, but I will say that as far back as a year and a half ago, Heather and I were talking about the the RPC performance evaluation, and this was the main topic that that came up, that it would be great to get going on revisions to AUTH48, and you know, I knew that it was sort of as the next project after the the format transition, so from my personal, individual perspective, I think that's that seems like a fantastic next project. But it's not really--I mean, my opinion isn't really the one that matters. It kind of depends on the community, and you know, what the population of people who are working in the IETF stream want, so I'll be interested to see if it does generate interest to other people.

Sue Hares: Those sound a bit tactical. I was hoping for a strategic comment, but thank you. I'm sure maybe you give us some strategic forward how we make the stream more effective, more than just the processing through.

Alissa Cooper: Sure. Yeah, so, the strategy for the RFC series is not my responsibility.

\* \* \*

Leif Johansson: So earlier today, Sarah sent out an email to the IETF list with an apology from the RSOC, and I just want to say to you that I think that was a stand-up thing to do, and thank you for it; I think it sets a very good example. There was a couple of things in that email that caught my eye, and one of them was talk about how the current situation came to be as a result of wanting to test out an RFP process, because there was some uncertainty around, sort of, the earlier application of it. As somebody who does this for a living, managing RFPs as a large part of my day job, you know, there is no such thing as "to test an RFP process." You either run it or you don't, and in the kind of contracts that the various parts of the organization manages, none of them as far as I can see are for a square meter of something, a standard service; it's all special-purpose, it's all, you know, one-offs in various forms and shapes and you have to be

very much more careful when you manage and buy those kinds of services. So what I'm here to ask is, is there anything else on the table, so you know, that we should be worried about? You know, are we gonna be here in Singapore or in Vancouver looking at other breakages? Because there are other people in the community who are affected by contracts: the NOC people, Tools Team--not all of them are reimbursed directly or contracted, but a lot of them are affected by contracts that the current IETF leadership is negotiating in various sort of constellations. I also want to make sure that we learn from this, not only in the future RSE process or the future hiring of this particular function, but in other parts of the organization, so we don't break anything else?

Ted Hardie: Thank you for your comment, and I think the good news is that none of the other contracts are held in quite this way where there's this recommendation, appointment, and then referral to the LLC. I think they are mostly a good bit simpler than this, but I'm sure that the LLC board members here who are listening are listening to the point you've made, and will try and avoid making this kind of error--

Leif Johansson: Right, because there were a couple of--Sarah actually had a couple of points in her email. One of them was, you know, we're looking at an RFC where we don't understand what's going on, we need to test it and--oh, RFP, that's a Freudian slip. We're looking at an RFP we don't know why it didn't go as to expected that last time, so we're gonna test it; I think that's your number one mistake, right? The number two mistake, of course, is not communicating properly, right, and I'm not actually directing this at Sarah, of course, I'm directing it at the entire I\* leadership.

Sean Turner: So, with my IETF LLC hat on, the lesson I learned was to call your contractors and thank them, and make sure they submit a bit.

Leif Johansson: Yeah, that's that's part of it. I mean, I might--

Sean Turner: So I did do that.

Leif Johansson: And my final point is, I've done the same thing with vendors that I manage, you know, not to extend their contract when I had the option. But I've never done that when I was happy with the vendor. Never ever.

Ted Hardie: We hear you, and I think you've seen from Sarah and from the RSOC that that wasn't the intent, and we apologize.

\* \* \*

Mike St Johns: I've been trying to get an idea of the timeline here, and we've been working our way back through all this stuff. Could the IAB members of the RSOC identify themselves, please?

[Christian Huitema and Mark Nottingham raise their hands.]

Mike St Johns: Okay, cool. So, I went back and to look at the RSOC minutes, and there were only two discussions on this particular topic. One of them was that because the ISOC HR person back in 2005 [sic] had said you may not evaluate the contractor, you would come up with a, you must develop, you're going to evaluate the contract. But someplace in the middle of this, you basically went off and decided that the evaluation of the contract was also to do a rebid. So, who in this process was the prime mover for the rebid, and what discussions were done besides, it looks like the last meeting and maybe two meetings prior, and that topic was just the evaluation criteria as near as I can tell, just because it was listed as an executive session.

Ted Hardie: So let me let me caution you about something related to the executive session. In addition of course to the executive session, there is an executive equivalent mailing list, so you're probably not seeing the full record, because some of it may have been, since if is a personnel or a contract matter on this, so please understand that because we have to treat these as confidential even when the intent is to be laudatory toward the person, some of this is not in the public record and can't be put there. Now, going back to the timeline question, Christian, you want to take that?

Christian Huitema: The timeline is what you said; it was discussed in the last three months, about, no more.

Mike St Johns: And it was discussed at one meeting, and you came up with the decision to do the rebid in one meeting?

Christian Huitema: We had the discussion before, and we were really concerned that the RFP had only produced one bid--

Mike St Johns: That was a year and a half prior. When did that discussion happen?

Christian Huitema: No, those discussions happened in May.

Ted Hardie: Okay, so, could I ask you to clarify why you think that timeline is particularly the primary issue here?

Mike St Johns: I'm trying to figure out how much thought went into this process of deciding to do this, and I'm trying to make sure we don't end up with a "oh let's just do the RFP" without, you know, just somebody randomly deciding to do this. So, I need to understand, was there any discussion of this and the impact of the rebid, and I'm not seeing that in there in the record.

Ted Hardie: I think what you normally see in this case is the output, and I think I've talked to you about this on mailing list but I'll repeat it here because this is something where it relates to a contract, or in similar cases with personnel matters, you normally judge these by the output, not by rehashing the discussion in public, and in this case the output was a recommendation for renewal; now--

Mike St John: This was a consensus recommendation from the entire RSOC?

Ted Hardie: I'm going to go on. In addition to that recommendation for renewal, they brought back up an issue that had occurred, including in discussions from Heather, that the last time that they had sought candidates, they'd received only one, and at the same time decided to make a concerted effort over the following two years to figure out what had happened and see if they could issue another RFP. Now, as we've noted in the previous things here, that was certainly a mistake in communication. In communicating those at the same time, because it was completely misunderstood that as something that was reflective of Heather's performance, despite it having caveats about that in it. That's a mistake, and it was--I think Sarah has been very clear about that. It was also something where I think, in response to Leif, we certainly agree that that's not how this should have gone; that instead, we understand that what we should have done here--and this is a broad "we"--is make sure that everybody was on board with that process, including Heather, before making the decision to do--

Mike St Johns: And perhaps including the community.

Ted Hardie: And including the community as well, but at that point in the process, the only part that had happened was the RSOC recommendation and then the RSE's resignation, so some bits of this that might have corrected this--and it would be kind of fanciful to assume that we actually got this right--didn't happen, and that's where it went wrong.

Mike St Johns: And did the IAB at that time reach out to Heather to request her to reconsider while this was still private?

Ted Hardie: So, the information came to the IAB, I mean, pretty much at exactly the same time that she told the LLC board. Sarah did reach out to her right away. I sent her an email personally, but off-list saying thank you for your service. I intended to reach out to her after I got back from the DEDR workshop to discuss it further, but because it was a, you know, I was literally in Helsinki getting on a plane, I couldn't get more than that. But, you know, it is definitely the case that we have heard that this did not go right, and we will see what we can do to make sure that it is structurally prevented from failing in this way again.

\* \* \*

Ron Bonica: I have three comments. First, thanks to Olaf for his slides; they make a very complicated process look really easy, and it looks like a process that should run. The second is, I don't think we're quite ready to put out an RFP yet, and the reason why is this process looks like it should run well, and it didn't. It failed in a spectacular way. The people standing around the microphone are trying to debug the process now. What happened, what went wrong. Probably the people who can debug the process best are the ones who executed it. They should probably do a post-mortem. Figure out what went wrong, who made the mistakes, and be honest about it. We learn from our mistakes. The next thing is, and we undo the damage? Is it possible? If not, can we at least admit to the mistakes and not repeat them. Once we understand where the process went wrong, we can make sure we don't do it again, but we shouldn't leap into the process again until we understand why the router crashed.

Ted Hardie: Thank you for the feedback.

\* \* \*

Patrick McManus: I'm going to try and be responsive to the question of where do we go from here, all right, and provide some input into that. I think the core issue of what we have to deal with right now is a result of asking the RSE to simultaneously deal with these issues of strategy and administration. And it's not surprising when you think about what the core work product of the IETF is, and how leadership is responsible for greasing the wheels to make that happen that the RSE is the nexus of a lot of discussions about not only the strategic evolution of the series, but also, you know, the SLAs that may be behind, the format that everyone wants yesterday, yada-yada-yada. And if I\* was not responsive to that, I would be at the mic saying, "hey, what about the SLAs?" Right, because that's what I need as output from my work when I come here. So that creates this inherent tension, and we should deal with that, rather than putting a new person immediately in a place where the same tension exists. And I think the strategic--I'm sorry, I think the more operational parts of RSE have, you know, in many ways been moved out to the production center and the publisher as up here in the slides--forgive my hesitations; talking here, the feedback here is amazing at this microphone. Does the operational course that have largely been moved out, and I think, you know, the RFCs will continue to flow should this position be vacant for, you know, a period, a short period of time, while we deal with the harder strategic questions. And then once you, if you manage to separate those roles, you can ask the question and I've heard wildly divergent opinions on how you structure someone that is only dealing with strategic questions there, right. Have we now created a leadership position that looks a lot like the other leadership positions we have, and so this shouldn't be, you know, a hired or a contracted position? This should be more of an appointed position, you know, and then you would have more of a peer kind of relationship. And as soon as you create that other model, you necessarily bring management into that, and is that attention that's not survivable? Can you carve off enough of that so that leadership's more consistent with the model we already do? I'm not asking you to solve that tonight but, I'm saying, like, those are the questions I would like to see solved before we jump in with a new, you know, long-term relationship.

Ted Hardie: Thank you for the feedback.

\* \* \*

Bob Hinden: So, regrettably, I was standing at the mic the last time we were here in this hotel talking about what happened at the at the RFC++ BOF, and it's only gotten worse. I mean, this is, you're the management of this oversight and this has been a giant failure. You know, Olaf's presentation was quite good, and you know, he said something very important. He said the RSOC was supposed to be the people with the long-term history in this so things didn't change very quickly. I mean that's what was the intent in setting this up and when you, when the IAB decided to cycle a whole bunch of people in the RSOC, you lost all of that, and that's, I think, what led to the events that caused us to lose a really good person who, you know, to lose Heather. It was a series of errors that, you know, come back to a bunch of things the IAB did. So where I'm going with this is, I have no confidence that the current RSOC and the current IAB are going to bring us, run the process to get us the next RFC Editor in the way we want. I think there's gonna have to be some significant changes in this to get the right set of people involved in this, so we get a good outcome.

Ted Hardie: Thanks for your comments. A couple of clarifying comments from me, and then just to move on to the next person. The way the IAB program structures are worked, not just for RSOC, which is one of the oldest and best-described, but all of them, isn't to try and keep the history in the people in the program, but to keep the history in the structure of the program. The idea is that by creating the structured program that lasts longer than any IAB two-year term, that there are always enough people in it who have been in it long enough that the structures of the program keep things going. In this case, the IAB did do a refresh that called for new people, but it actually kept three people with a total of eleven years of experience in the RSOC. So, I think it's important to note that they weren't either going and using this in a way where we were not going and using this in a way that's different from the other IAB structures, or that the people who stayed in the RSOC hadn't been there some significant period of time. What I do think is a very important strategic question, and I certainly agree with you that we should deal with, is whether this is still the right structure. It may very well be that having an RSOC that is directly appointed by the NomCom, or from some other mechanism that's tied to the stream managers or some other thing may be a better solution now. I think the most important thing that we can do from this point, though, is to figure out how we get to that strategy and if it is not "run the RFP process and hire somebody to help us," then we have to understand it will take some time for the community to come to consensus on what the new strategy ought to be.

\* \* \*

Eric Rescorla: I have a few notes. So, um, I was interested to hear the discussion of what people's conceptions of 6635's intention for the RSOC were. I went back and reviewed the material, as I assume that the documents actually, document what they're supposed to document. So, I mean, this seems like a pretty classic oversight function to me. It has, like, due

diligence, annual reviews, candidate selection; all those things. It's like if someone gave me, like, the definition of oversight, that's what I'd expect, and it's, and so, it's what I expect the IAB to do for the RFC function, and it's what I expect that given they've chosen to delegate that to RSOC, or, the community's chosen to delegate that to RSOC and with IAB overseeing them, that's what I expect RSOC to do. So, and I certainly think the IAB is responsible to the community for their ultimate decisions, but I certainly would not be happy if what that, you know, the output of this was that the RSOC and the IAB, every time they made a decision, had to, like, go out to the community for validation of every individual decision. That seems non-functional. The structure we have in this community is we trust the leadership to do things and then, when they don't do them, we have structures for removing them in various ways. We don't assume that they're double checking everything with the community, so--

Ted Hardie: Can you speak a little bit slower?

Eric Rescorla: Oh, I'm sorry, yes; I thought we were running out of time.

Ted Hardie: We are running tight on time, but we are also trying to listen.

Eric Rescorla: I'm sorry, sure, should I start from the beginning? Okay, the second thing I want to say is I want to just, sort of, thank you for you to say that earlier about the sort of structures that we use for continuity. It's really not a viable system to assume that continuity has to reside in, like, a few individuals who then carry on forever. That, like, doesn't work. And I'm--we make this mistake in the IETF over and over again; we like, think that if we put exactly the right person in, and like, the way one builds, like, a viable long-term system is by having structures, not by having the great man or great woman theory of history. This has been my experience in the companies I've worked in. That's not really survivable if all those people leave. Finally, um, I think it is clear from this interaction that the structure and the sort of grand strategy of what the RFC system and those boxes on the screen perhaps, may need some rethinking. I was heartened to hear Patrick say that, you know, that if we don't solve this problem right away, the RFCs will continue to flow and I agree with that. I mean, that's what we're here for, so as long the RFCs must flow, so yeah, I thought you'd like that, so I think, certainly that gives us some time. It's not, like, an emergency. So I think, you know, we have a broad scale; we have sort of two options. One, I think the one that Ron just indicated, which is, take a pause and don't appoint anybody new for a little while and sort of try to sort out in the community with the RSE what the structure ought to be. And the second is, you know, to appoint somebody for a shorter term, perhaps, who can help us sort out what that ought to be when the RSE processes indicated 6635 is to pick that person, but with the expectation that we're gonna sort things out rather than, like, that they're fitting into some long-term final structure. I think either those would be viable, but I think clearly whatever it is, like, we do, you know, ask the question, is this the right strategy and structure going forward? Thank you.

Ted Hardie: Thank you. I understand Heather would like to say something.

Heather Flanagan: So with regards to RFCs flowing, absolutely a priority. There will--so, yes, I have a very tactical role and the RSE also is a very strategic role. The tactical role is an immediate need that you need to consider. We've been talking about the format change. There's going to be day-to-day questions about how do we handle different things that will need to be answered ongoing, and fairly quickly. We've already added a new state in the database so that we can track, you know, as we track EDIT time, we track RFC-EDITOR time, we track AUTH48 time, and now we're gonna track tools time, where if something is stuck in a state where the tools aren't quite right that they need to change. Regardless of the long-term direction that the organization takes, and I do suspect you need to spend some quality time with that, someone needs to be able to help the RFC production center with those day-to-day, "what about this field?" So, please keep that in mind.

Ted Hardie: So, can I ask you this question in a slightly more direct fashion, then? Is it your advice to the community that we do not pause the RFP, but we do seek to hire it even if it's only a temporary successor RSE at this time?

Heather Flanagan: No. I think having trying to find--telling the Tools team, perhaps to take this part and run it, I think trying to find an interim person is going to be wildly difficult for anyone you bring in. For them to be able to do that job--we run an XML vocabulary that's like nothing else in the world, so I don't see you'll be able to find the expertise to do this role. I think you'll need to get it from within the community, and then spend some time with the bigger picture, what do you actually want to hire for going forward.

Ted Hardie: I see; thank you for the clarification.

\* \* \*

Richard Barnes: I'd like to sound a bit of a note of positivity and thank the IAB and the RSOC for the oversight they've been doing. To me, oversight is about back, you know, when you're in oversight of a role, it's about backstopping that role and paying attention to when there might be question marks or signs that things might need attention, and I think that's what I've seen out of the IAB and RSOC is fulfilling that role. But thinking back, the last few times I've been at this plenary mic, including, perhaps, like, right on this spot, have been expressing concerns about, you know, ways the RFC Series needs to evolve, whether that's in terms of SLA violations or speed of processing or in terms of reaching out to stakeholder communities, the consumers of RFCs. So, like, I think there have been question marks that come through and I think it's the duty of the oversight bodies to be looking into those and taking a look and so I'd like to thank the RSOC and the IAB for doing that, and invite them to continue fulfilling the role that they've been charted within the relevant RFCs. And so in that regard, I kind of disagree with this idea there's been a deep structural failure. I think we've had a disagreement and there's been unfortunate consequences of that disagreement, and we'll need to come together as a community and think about how to move forward and come to a better consensus on how we should operate in the future and avoid these sorts of disagreements in the future. But I don't think there's a kind of

deep structural failing that some other speakers have mentioned, and so in that framing, I'm a bit more optimistic than other folks about our ability to carry on here, and kind of stay the course. I think I broadly agree with the two alternatives that were raised. We could have kind of a brief appoggiatura and take some time, breathing room, and have a vacancy while we use a community to discuss this. But I also think that I'm slightly more persuaded by the case that we should go ahead and try and find an interim person; as Heather points out, there's some operational issues that need attending to. I think it would also be useful to have someone in that role to kind of guide the community discussion and be kind of a focus point for this conversation as we discuss the evolution going forward. So yeah, I think I again, I'd like to thank the IAB in the RSOC, and I think, you know, either of these two options is acceptable, but I have a slight preference for going ahead and putting a candidate in the spot.

Ted Hardie: Okay, thanks for expressing your preference.

\* \* \*

Aaron Falk: So, I completely disagree with Richard. I think there's been a failure here. First, let me apologize to you publicly, Ted, if you felt that I was harassing you on the IETF list. I got some feedback that maybe I wasn't clear with what I was trying to get to, and I was trying really hard to not put words in your mouth, but I did. I was asking, you know, did the IAB think anything went wrong? Was there anything that could have been done differently? And I think that there were things that the IAB did wrong and could have done differently, but first the response was there was nothing wrong; the IAB was regretful, and then you said that you thought the mistake was that you hadn't realized that Heather was unhappy. This evening, in this discussion, you said, well maybe the IAB made a mistake because they made the change to the RSOC's constitution or membership. I think those were in fact mistakes, and I was, but you know, I don't think you're or the IAB is arguing in bad faith about the sense of the stewardship role for the RFC series. I've been on the IAB in an ex-officio capacity in the past, and I've always had that sense that the IAB felt like the RFC Series was part of the things that it was responsible for. However, I don't really sense, I don't see that the IAB's really acted like it was responsible for the RFC series, right? An interruption in the RFC series or a major disruption in the RFC series, you're responsible for that, right, you're responsible for the RFC series, and now it's being disrupted. It's being disrupted because the RSE has told us that she had the impression that her customer wasn't happy with her. She sent that, and maybe you can confirm this, but I believe that she sent that to you before it went to the larger community. So why didn't you find out why? Why didn't, if you think that she misunderstood how the community felt about her performance, why didn't you try to rectify that? Maybe, you know, if you were happy with it, if you thought there were no issues, why didn't you convince her of that before her resignation went public? If I had a valued contractor, one that was critical to the operation of my company, and they said they were leaving, I would try to turn them around. And so I see that as a real failure of stewardship on the IAB's part. So, let me, I have two suggestions--positive suggestions--to move forward. I think that the RSOC members that were removed from the RSOC should be added back in. They bring expertise, history for searching for an RSE. They've

done this before. And I think that the RSAG and the ISEB bring a lot of continuity and expertise in the RFC editors, specifically going back to when Bob Braden was RFC Editor, and I think you should take advantage of them even if they aren't on your picture. Thank you.

\* \* \*

Hannes Tschofenig: I was in the IAB when version two of this model was created, and Olaf presented it fairly nicely, although still incomplete, but it showed the complexity of all of this. And when it was written, I had the impression it was overly complicated for what we are doing in the IETF. We are publishing technical specifications, and this to me looks like wily, as a sort of publisher, and I would encourage the IAB to look into simplifying that model, because I think part of the problem is that so many parties are involved for something that is not just not big enough. We just over engineered this process.

\* \* \*

Suresh Krishnan: So first of all, I'd like to put positive stuff first. Like, yeah, thank you, Heather, for your service, and thanks, Sarah, for the apology. I think it really changed the tone of the conversation. And one thing I want to say is, like, if we want to change what 6635 does, we need to change it, I think it's like, pretty tight to talk about right now. I like to say, like, okay, we're going to revisit this. I think it's gonna be a, like, difficult call to make. Specifically, like, it relates to what Aaron said about the disruption of the RFC series, pretty much. So, I think we should at least for this, like, cycle continue with the RSOC, like, doing the selection and the IAB, like, approving it; pretty much what it said in 6635. And one thing I want to say is, like, with the RFC++ BOF, I think one of the learnings is, like, you know, we need to come and connect to the community that we have that's like consuming this stuff, and a lot of the communities here, okay, like the IETF is here, the IRTF is here, like, IAB is here, obviously, but there's also, like, other people outside, like, who are not here, and I think some of the stuff that came up was, like, you know, we're not listening to them. I think we should make an effort to reach out to the other people who are implementing our stuff and using our stuff to also find out their needs. I think, like, some of the stuff that Heather mentioned right, like, you that kind of thing, like, those are like, really something that we need and I think taking all these things into account, I think it's, like, a really good idea going forward.

\* \* \*

Jeffrey Yasskin: On the topic of leaving the series editor position empty for a period, we're getting the new RFC format soon. It sounds like it's still going to be being debugged when we lose Heather at the end of the year, and leaving leaving nobody in charge while that new format is still being debugged, it makes me nervous. Now, Heather and the other editors know best how to deal with that, but I wanted to raise that as a worry.

Ted Hardie: Thank you.

\* \* \*

Cullen Jennings: So, when I first heard about this and started digging into it, my first reaction is, "Well, wow, something must have gone wrong here; I want to figure out what it was." And I went back trying to read all of the ietf@ietf list, and that made me realize that we actually had a much larger problem than this. Reading that list--and there was a reason I didn't read it--but after I worked on for a while, I think that we've heard this from multiple people, what we do going forward is by far more important here. And, I worry sometimes we have a very frustrating experience and then we make reactionary adjustments to it. You know, I caution us to proceed in a rational way that thinks about this stuff and sets up something that wasn't a reaction to a mistake or something that happened but instead is a better way of doing this. I heard suggestions like the three-year rotating term to keep continuity and those types of things, and that type sounds like a very logical type of thing. I also think that we should think that it's very normal for any one of our groups that is responsible for contracts that are one of our most expensive budget items in this organization of producing the RFCs, that that we would, even if we thought that the contractor was doing a wonderful job, but we still would ask about other prices for it periodically. That would be a normal oversight I would expect from any business group spending large chunks of money, that would occasionally check that it was, you're getting the right thing, the best things you could, so I think that that's pretty normal. I had a very hard time seeing a very specific problem with the structure; it seems like our structure is in many ways similar to any other structure we'd invent. But I do think we have to give more guidance on what we want out of it, and sort of, step back as a community think about what are the things we can do to improve that, and then and then make those happen over time. Thanks.

\* \* \*

Ted Hardie: I think the mic lines have not drained. I'm not going to try and cut anybody off, but at some point we may need to move everybody to the front of the room so that they can start resetting the back. So if folks who are in the back, if you could consider moving front to allow them to do that, that'd be good.

\* \* \*

Henrik Levkowitz: So yes, I think something went wrong. I think we need to look again at the setup of the RSOC and the process, but I have one particular question for Ted. I may be wrong, but I seem to recall that in the RFC++ BOF, the two new IAB members on the RSOC were quite vocal in proposing quite dramatic changes. Did you consider that putting them on the RSOC might be a contributing action to conflict within the RSOC and something that would spill over and make Heather unhappy?

Ted Hardie: So, I think that we sent a message a year ago, pretty much exactly, about the output of the RFC++ BOF and acknowledged that there were not just one, but I think I count

seven mistakes in it, among them some of the early consultation issues, and it's clear that there was an eighth mistake, and that was at the end of that, we were very clear that the community wanted Heather to take the lead in the further evolution discussions, and not us, and you know, we thought that that was done. Apparently, it continued to be a source of frustration for her enough that when a later of frustration--this last straw on the camel's back--it was one of the things she cited in her message to the community as one of the issues that that had caused her to decide it was better for her to go away, that we were no longer aligned. We didn't think that it was any more a question of alignment, we thought we had aligned with the community on that, and it's clearly a mistake that that was not sufficiently communicated to either her or the community, that that was no longer something we were either advocating for or expecting. Does that answer your question?

Henrik Levkowitz: Not really. My question is about the potential for a built-in conflict or built-in tension in the RSOC as a result of putting two people who had been vocal in advocating quite big changes in there.

Ted Hardie: So, neither of the people who were put on the RSOC were proponents for the BOF and one of them wasn't even on the IAB at the time.

Henrik Levkowitz: No, I quite clearly recall Mark being very vocal in the RFC++. Am I wrong? Am I mistaken?

Mark Nottingham: I'd love to talk to you more about that because it's not my recollection.

Henrik Levkowitz: Okay.

Mark Nottingham: My recollection is that I--we should talk because that's really not my recollection, and I'd like to understand where you got that.

Henrik Levkowitz: So there are some different perceptions there. I'll talk to you more offline, okay.

\* \* \*

Leslie Daigle: So, I have a question for you, either you, Ted, or you representing the IAB or whatever, and I want to give my answer and then answer your question about filling the slot. So, the question is on a continuum from the RFC++ BOF to now, I think we can agree we've encountered some uncomfortable situations with the RFC Editor and the RFC Series. What do you think good looks like?

Ted Hardie: I'm sorry, I don't really understand how I can answer that retrospectively.

Leslie Daigle: I'm not asking you to answer it retrospectively. I'm offering the past year and the discomfort as the problem that has to be solved. So, given that, what do you think good looks like?

Ted Hardie: So, I don't think we can get back to the status quo ante, given what's happened so far, so I think what good looks like starts by having the community come to an agreement about whether they want to bring in a new RSE to help the future discussion now, or as close to now as we can make it, and with the acknowledgement that John had brought up earlier of needing to stretch beyond the increasingly small number of people that's in this room, and after that, to finish the community discussion of what changes need to happen here. And I think given some of the issues that Bob Hinden raised, those changes might in fact mean that it's no longer the IAB which appoints the RSOC at all, that its role changes quite significantly as a result of this. I actually think that the right thing to happen is to make sure that the community believes and has the structures in place to make sure that the function goes forward in the future. Whether the IAB remains involved in that or not is not nearly as important as making sure that the community has confidence in those structures.

Leslie Daigle: Okay, thank you because I think that was definitely responsive to my question. And my answer to the question aligns with much of it, if not all. My answer is that a year from now, I would like the IETF and the Internet technical community as a whole, which are impacted by this situation, to have confidence that we are all on the same page about what the RSE is what the RFC series is, and that the people who are making the decisions not only agree with what that is, but are also empowered to make it happen. I think that from my perspective the, RFC++ BOF in some ways broke my confidence that the IAB actually have the same view of what the RFC series is, and that confidence is not yet restored. I'm not sure that it's going to be addressed by structural issues, but by way of getting to confidence as the target. Again, I want to reiterate that the fact that we have lost the contractor for this role at a time not of our choosing is actually a problem not just for the IETF, but for the broader Internet technical community that this series is meant to serve. And I'd really like to feel more confident that the IAB remembers that as we go forward.

And then, finally, to your question of whether or not to repopulate, or attempt to repopulate the RSE position at this time, the only thing I would say is if you elect not to do that, please put a hard time limit before you will, because if we just say "when we have consensus," it might be a while.

Ted Hardie: That's a very important point, thank you.

\* \* \*

Rich Salz: Yeah, an observation with no value assessed to it in terms of judgment. You're the only one who's spoken. Thank you.

Ted Hardie: So Rich, that was largely to make sure that we were not all trying to speak and therefore taking more time with us talking than listening, that's why.

\* \* \*

Brian Dickson: Longtime listener, first-time caller. So, looking at this with a kind of shock on my face, I want to apologize, but I definitely want to extend my thanks as just an ordinary participant. The way I would look at the RFC Series Editor position would be potentially more akin to like a C-series suite type role. And the RSOC role, I would say, better would align with, like, a board of directors. And, a board of directors for a corporation has the best value when it has a lot of stability. And, I don't know what the rules are for how the constituency of the RSOC is maintained, where they're drawn from, etc. etc., but I think having a better dialogue with the RFC Series Editor on the constituency and the long-term direction and having much less change occur and having it be not duration-driven, but more responsibility or vision-driven, like it would be in any kind of bigger board type of thing. There's no reason not that I could see. And I would say that along with that, as much as the RFC Series Editor is a paid role, I do not think it should be viewed the same as a contractor. It should be viewed as a semi-limited role with the expectation of, as long as it's being done well, then it's up to the decision of the RSOC to replace or not. But it shouldn't be driven by a particular scheduling or duration of contracts. I think restructuring it along those lines may have better results, in terms of the people you attract and possibly even who you can retain.

Ted Hardie: So, do you mean an employee relationship, is that what you mean?

Brian Dickson: Yes, I mean look at it exactly the same as an employee relationship for a CEO. A CEO reports to the board at the will of the board, but is expected to retain that role unless there's some mutual disagreement or reason to leave or, you know, contractual just, disagreement.

Stephen Farrell: Very quickly, I think that we've had some discussion on the IASA2 list, and during the discussion I expressed opposition to the idea of the RSE as an employee for various reasons that are on that list, so I think--the rest of your comments I totally agree with, but that part's a no for me.

\* \* \*

Erik Nygren: Meta comment/concern. I think I see, there's kind of, watching some of this dialogue and watching some of the conversations in the IETF list and looking at it as an observer, I see some of it--I think EKR alluded to this in one of his comments--of the community trying to do an incident review by plenary, or micromanaging people we put it in a leadership role by plenary, or trying to do design by plenary, and it's unclear how constructive that is. I think at some point there, we have a set of people that we put in a leadership role, and having been in those types of roles before, trying to have the whole community micromanage, kind of

second-guessing decisions that were made that were presumably made in good faith is not really a healthy way to run the community. And, at some point we have to assume that the people we put in the IAB and the RSOC are acting in a good faith leadership role and are listening to the inputs and comments that we're giving to them. But trying to go and have the entire community micromanaging and trying to second-guess every single decision they are [making], has a risk of creating an unhealthy environment, in an environment where NomCom was asking earlier, like, "Hey, we're having trouble getting people into leadership roles." We should be asking ourselves if people who are in those leadership roles are feeling like if they make a mistake and then say sorry, we made a mistake, and start trying in good faith to look at what they did to make that kind of mistake and try to figure out how do they improve that going forward; if people feel like even if they do that, the entire community is gonna be constantly second-guessing them, it's gonna be hard to get people who are gonna be interested in going into leadership roles going forwards.

Ted Hardie: So just to quickly respond to that, well, I certainly hope that everybody believes we're acting in good faith. Being in front of the plenary and answering questions from the community and listening to the community is one of the primary accountability mechanisms that has been built into the IETF, and I think that probably the worst possible result of all of this would be losing it, so I think as much as this is a difficult way of getting things done, we need to listen, and we need to listen in public.

\* \* \*

Adrian Farrel: I'm the Independent Submissions Editor. Some quick thanks; thanks for you staying up there facilitating this and risking your blood sugar levels; thanks to Olaf for what turns out to be really helpful slide set. Along the way, Olaf mentioned the four streams that feed the RFC series, and I think Ted, you introduced a term that hadn't come up from Olaf, which was the stream managers, so that's the people "responsible," in some inverted commas, for the streams. I wondered along the way, lots of decisions have been made by people on the platform at the moment and elsewhere, and in the future lots of decisions eventually need to be made as well. What efforts were made, and will be made, to consult the stream managers about those decisions?

Ted Hardie: So, I think that this is one of the structural changes we may have to make, that the way that the system is currently set up, the RSOC and the stream managers don't actually have a good interface other than just talking to each other, and that it may be necessary to institute a much more structural relationship if that's what we want to see.

Adrian Farrel: Yes, I think maybe that's what we need, because just talking to each other should work just fine.

\* \* \*

Bret Jordan: Some of the comments tonight have referred to Heather in the abstract. She's a person, and I think we need to realize that we are losing Heather, and I think that we should, like, thank her for her sacrifice and her service and more care and feeding of your employees would be really good on your part.

Ted Hardie: Well, if we'd like to do another standing ovation, I'm certainly willing.

[Ovation]

Heather Flanagan: You all have the capability of being very kind.

\* \* \*

Alia Atlas: But the point [Bret Jordan] made is something that I would also like to touch on. In Heather's note and in the discussion here, it's clear that there was not enough open communication and checking in on her and on the concerns that had been raised, and I would like to know what your plans are for checking in on all of the other incredibly critical contractors and volunteers and making sure that they are not in similar states.

Ted Hardie: So, that that's a really good question. We do have some methods of working with most of those folks in less than formal structures, and I think those are avenues where we might potentially learn of that, but it's probably something that we need to work with the LLC board on, since the IAB actually doesn't have formal relationships with many of those other contractors. But thanks for raising the issue.

Alia Atlas: Not just contractors, the volunteers and also, they're people. We talk to each other and built a team. I mean, it's the formal and the informal, and that's what I'm hearing was missing. Thank you very much.

\* \* \*

Ted Hardie: Okay, Richard I know you've been up at the thing before, so please make it short, because we've got a short amount of time left.

Richard Barnes: I'm seeing Alexa showing up looking threatening; I'm happy to yield to John because I think he was up before me.

John Klensin: I've also been here before. This will be very brief but I've heard something a couple of times tonight and a couple of times on the list, which needs clarification. If I decided to go down to the local hardware store and buy a kilogram of tenpenny Canadian standard nails, because they are Canadian standard, there is a Canadian standard for tenpenny nails. At a Canadian standard for kilogram, I know what I'm getting, and if I decide to go to the next

hardware store and do price comparisons, I can do that in a reliable way. If we start talking about bidding these contracts on a competitive price basis, we are in deep deep trouble, because we are insulting the people whom we would most want to do the jobs, and we are going to get ourselves exactly what we deserve. So let's be very, very careful about a vocabulary which starts talking about re-competing these things periodically to get a better price.

Ted Hardie: Thank you. I think that the point was made on the list that in the past these have never been actually evaluated on price, and I think it's unlikely that we would ever go to that point.

\* \* \*

Richard Barnes: I just like to briefly revisit some points that were made earlier about the composition of the RSOC and say, perhaps unsurprisingly, I have a little bit more positive view than has been expressed here. I think the current RSOC has a good blend of experience and new-thinking folks, representing different aspects of the community. So I'm actually quite pleased with the current RSOC, and I feel like they've been, as I said earlier, doing a pretty good job of oversight. I'm also deeply uncomfortable with another notion that was raised here, of consulting the broader Internet community. As Christian pointed out on the lists, like, it's really hard to get to the whole Internet; the Internet's really big, and, you know, as we're seeing here, if you look around the room we're having trouble getting the committed IETF community to show up for these discussions.

Leslie Daigle: It still represents the entire technical community. Whether or not you can consult it, it's a part of the RFC Series. We actually don't get to redefine that.

Richard Barnes: But I mean at some point, we need to represent people; a concrete group of people and the needs of the concrete folks who are showing up in the room and doing work and producing these things and the people who are using--

Several people off-mic: No!

Richard Barnes: --Who are using this and and the community of the people who are--

[Clamor]

Richard Barnes: --Using them to get the work done.

Ted Hardie: Folks, we're listening. At this point, he stated his opinion, and we can move on.

\* \* \*

Ted Hardie: Henrik, I think we have to go ahead and say we're done taking new people in line because we're now seriously over time, like over an hour over time. So, I'm gonna drain the queue on this side since it was already occupied.

\* \* \*

Eliot Lear: Thank you, Ted; thank you, IAB, for staying late and I'd like to also thank colleagues here. I think generally that we've had a pretty positive discussion here, and I think we should all recognize that. I can see that there's still a lot of passion that people have, and there are ideas that they haven't had the opportunity to express. One of the things, I think, the most important question I have is, where do we go from here in terms of, how do you want to structure the conversation going forward, Ted?

Ted Hardie: Okay, I think that the short answer is we're probably going to make a very quick decision about whether this needs a new mailing list or whether we'll reuse rfc-interest. After that decision, we'll write up a short reflection on this meeting and post it to the IETF, rfc-interest, and if there is a new list to that list, and put out the rest of the discussion from that point. I have a strong belief at this point that one of the key risks that Heather articulated was that if the ball gets dropped during this period of transition in the format, there may be a set of issues that makes it even more difficult to bring somebody in afterwards. As a result of that, I think the most likely result here, even though there were very clear articulations for why we might want to wait until further community discussion occurred, that we will probably say that having the ability to overlap with Heather is probably an overriding concern. But that's the reflection that will go to the lists for further discussion.

\* \* \*

Eric Rescorla: I will be incredibly quick. Two points. Yes, generally in our technical designs we try to avoid single points of failure. I would encourage people to think about that as we go forward, in terms of structure. Second, the primary purpose is what Hannes said: of this organization is to publish technical specifications, and whatever structure we choose has to serve that, ultimately. Thank you.

Ted Hardie: Thank you. And let me add at the final moment to say thank you to all of you who came to this part of the plenary and gave your thoughts to each other and the IAB and the RSOC on this set of points. I realize it's been a very emotional couple of weeks for many, and I also appreciate the collegial and professional manner you all participated in. Thank you very much.