

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Experimental
Expires: 11 July 2021

B.E. Carpenter
Univ. of Auckland
S. Farrell
Trinity College Dublin
7 January 2021

Additional Criteria for Nominating Committee Eligibility
draft-carpenter-eligibility-expand-10

Abstract

This document defines a process experiment under RFC 3933 that temporarily updates the criteria for qualifying volunteers to participate in the IETF Nominating Committee. It therefore also updates the criteria for qualifying signatories to a community recall petition. The purpose is to make the criteria more flexible in view of increasing remote participation in the IETF and a reduction in face-to-face meetings. The experiment is of fixed duration and will apply to one, or at most two, consecutive Nominating Committee cycles, starting in 2021. This document temporarily varies the rules in RFC 8713.

Discussion Venues

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

Discussion of this document takes place on the ad hoc mailing list (eligibility-discuss@ietf.org), which is archived at <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/browse/eligibility-discuss/> (<https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/browse/eligibility-discuss/>).

Source for this draft can be found at <https://github.com/sftcd/elig> (<https://github.com/sftcd/elig>).

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

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."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 11 July 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction 3
- 2. Term and Evaluation of the Experiment 3
- 3. Goals 4
- 4. Criteria 4
 - 4.1. Clarifying Detail 5
- 5. Omitted Criteria 6
- 6. IANA Considerations 6
- 7. Security Considerations 6
- 8. Acknowledgements 6
- 9. Normative References 6
- Appendix A. Available data 7
- Appendix B. Change Log 11
 - B.1. Draft-09 to -10 11
 - B.2. Draft-08 to -09 11
 - B.3. Draft-07 to -08 11
 - B.4. Draft-06 to -07 11
 - B.5. Draft-05 to -06 12
 - B.6. Draft-04 to -05 12
 - B.7. Draft-03 to -04 12
 - B.8. Draft-02 to -03 12
 - B.9. Draft-01 to -02 12
 - B.10. Draft-00 to -01 13
- Authors' Addresses 13

1. Introduction

According to [RFC8713], the IETF Nominating Committee (NomCom) is populated from a pool of volunteers with a specified record of attendance at IETF plenary meetings, which were assumed to be face-to-face meetings when that document was approved. In view of the cancellation of the IETF 107, 108, 109 and 110 face-to-face meetings, the risk of future cancellations, the probability of less frequent face-to-face meetings in future in support of sustainability, and a general increase in remote participation, this document defines a process experiment [RFC3933] of fixed duration (described in Section 2) to use modified and additional criteria to qualify volunteers.

During this experiment, the eligibility criteria for signing recall petitions - which [RFC8713] defines to be the same as those for NomCom eligibility - are consequently also modified as described in this document. This experiment has no other effect on the recall process.

2. Term and Evaluation of the Experiment

The cancellation of the in-person IETF 107 through 110 meetings means that the current criteria are in any case seriously perturbed for at least two years. The experiment therefore needs to start as soon as possible. However, the experiment did not apply to the selection of the 2020-2021 Nominating Committee, which was performed according to [RFC8788].

The experiment will initially cover the IETF Nominating Committee cycle that begins in 2021. As soon as the entire 2021-2022 Nominating Committee is seated, the IESG must consult the 2021-2022 Nominating Committee chair and the 2020-2021 Nominating Committee chair (who will maintain NomCom confidentiality) and publish a report on the results of the experiment. Points to be considered are whether the experiment has produced a sufficiently large and diverse pool of individuals, whether enough of those individuals have volunteered to produce a representative Nominating Committee with good knowledge of the IETF, and whether all the goals in Section 3 have been met. If possible, a comparison with results from the previous procedure (i.e., RFC 8713) should be made.

The IESG must then also begin a community discussion of whether to:

1. Amend [RFC8713] in time for the 2022-2023 Nominating Committee cycle; or

2. Prolong the current experiment for a second and final year with additional clarifications specific to the 2022-2023 cycle; or
3. Run a different experiment for the next nominating cycle; or
4. Revert to [RFC8713].

The IESG will announce the results of the consensus determination of this discussion in good time for the 2022-2023 Nominating Committee cycle to commence.

In the event of prolongation of this experiment for a second year, the IESG will repeat the consultation, report and community discussion process accordingly, but this document lapses at the end of the 2022-2023 Nominating Committee cycle.

3. Goals

The goals of the modified and additional criteria are as follows:

- * Mitigate the issue of active remote (or rarely in-person) participants being disenfranchised in the NomCom and recall processes.
- * Enable the selection of a 2021-2022 NomCom, and possibly a 2022-2023 NomCom, when it is impossible for anyone to have attended three out of the last five IETF meetings in person.
- * Prepare for an era in which face-to-face plenary meetings are less frequent (thus extending the issue to many, perhaps a majority, of participants).
- * Ensure that those eligible have enough current understanding of IETF practices and people to make informed decisions.
- * Provide algorithmic criteria, so that the Secretariat can check them mechanically against available data.

4. Criteria

This experiment specifies several alternative paths to qualification, replacing the single criterion in section 4.14 of [RFC8713]. Any one of the paths is sufficient, unless the person is otherwise disqualified under section 4.15 of [RFC8713]:

- * Path 1: The person has registered for and attended 3 out of the last 5 IETF meetings. For meetings held entirely online, online registration and attendance counts as attendance. For the

2021-2022 Nominating Committee, the meetings concerned will be IETF 106, 107, 108, 109, and 110. Attendance is as determined by the record keeping of the secretariat for in-person meetings, and based on being a registered person who logged in for at least one session of an online IETF meeting.

- * Path 2: Has been a Working Group Chair or Secretary within the 3 years prior to the day the call for NomCom volunteers is sent to the community.
- * Path 3: Has been a listed author or editor (on the front page) of at least 2 IETF stream RFCs within the last 5 years prior to the day the call for NomCom volunteers is sent to the community. An Internet-Draft that has been approved by the IESG and is in the RFC Editor queue counts the same as a published RFC, with the relevant date being the date the draft was added to the RFC Editor queue. For avoidance of doubt, the 5 year timer extends back to the date 5 years before the date when the call for NomCom volunteers is sent to the community.

Notes:

- * Path 1 corresponds approximately to [RFC8713], modified as per [RFC8788].
- * Path 3 includes approved drafts, since some documents spend a long time in the RFC Editor's queue.
- * Path 3 extends to 5 years because it commonly takes 3 or 4 years for new documents to be approved in the IETF stream, so 3 years would be too short a sampling period.
- * All the required data are available to the IETF Secretariat from meeting attendance records or the IETF data tracker.

4.1. Clarifying Detail

Path 1 does not qualify people who register and attend face-to-face meetings remotely. That is, it does not qualify remote attendees at IETF 106, because that meeting took place prior to any question of cancelling meetings.

If the IESG prolongs this experiment for a second year, as allowed by Section 2, the IESG must also clarify how Path 1 applies to IETF 111, 112 and 113.

5. Omitted Criteria

During community discussions of this document, certain criteria were rejected as not truly indicating effective IETF participation, or as being unlikely to significantly expand the volunteer pool. These included authorship of individual or Working-Group-adopted Internet-Drafts, sending email to IETF lists, reviewing drafts, acting as a BOF Chair, and acting in an external role for the IETF (liaisons etc.).

One path, service in the IESG or IAB within the last 5 years, was found to have no benefit since historical data show that such people always appear to be qualified by another path.

Since the criteria must be measurable by the Secretariat, no qualitative evaluation of an individual's contributions is considered.

6. IANA Considerations

This document makes no request of IANA.

7. Security Considerations

This document should not affect the security of the Internet.

8. Acknowledgements

Useful comments were received from Abdussalam Baryun, Alissa Cooper, Lars Eggert, Adrian Farrel, Bron Gondwana, Russ Housley, Chrsitian Huitema, Ben Kaduk, John Klensin, Victor Kuarsingh, Warren Kumari, Barry Leiba, Eric Rescorla, Michael Richardson, Rich Salz, Ines Robles, Martin Thomson and Magnus Westerlund.

The data analysis was mainly done by Robert Sparks. Carsten Bormann showed how to represent Venn diagrams in ASCII art.

9. Normative References

- [RFC3933] Klensin, J. and S. Dawkins, "A Model for IETF Process Experiments", BCP 93, RFC 3933, DOI 10.17487/RFC3933, November 2004, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3933>>.

- [RFC8713] Kucherawy, M., Ed., Hinden, R., Ed., and J. Livingood, Ed., "IAB, IESG, IETF Trust, and IETF LLC Selection, Confirmation, and Recall Process: Operation of the IETF Nominating and Recall Committees", BCP 10, RFC 8713, DOI 10.17487/RFC8713, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8713>>.
- [RFC8788] Leiba, B., "Eligibility for the 2020-2021 Nominating Committee", BCP 10, RFC 8788, DOI 10.17487/RFC8788, May 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8788>>.

Appendix A. Available data

An analysis of how some of the above criteria would affect the number of NomCom-qualified participants if applied in August 2020 has been performed. The results are presented below in Venn diagrams as Figure 1 to Figure 4. Note that the numbers shown differ slightly from manual counts due to database mismatches, and the results were not derived at the normal time of the year for NomCom formation. The remote attendee lists for IETF 107 and 108 were used, although not yet available on the IETF web site.

A specific difficulty is that the databases involved inevitably contain a few inconsistencies such as duplicate entries, differing versions of a person's name, and impersonal authors. (For example, "IAB" qualifies under Path 3, and one actual volunteer artificially appears not to qualify.) This underlines that automatically generated lists of eligible and qualified people will always require manual checking.

The first two diagrams illustrate how the new paths (2 and 3) affect eligibility numbers compared to the meeting participation path (1). Figure 1 gives the raw numbers, and Figure 2 removes those disqualified according to RFC 8713. The actual 2020 volunteer pool is shown too.




Figure 1: All paths, before disqualification




Figure 2: All paths, after disqualification

Figure 3 and Figure 4 illustrate how the new paths (2 and 3) interact with each other, also before and after disqualifications. The discarded path via IESG and IAB service (Section 5) is also shown, as path "I". The data clearly show that path "I" has no practical value.




Figure 3: New paths, before disqualification




Figure 4: New paths, after disqualification

Appendix B. Change Log

This section is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

B.1. Draft-09 to -10

- * IESG comments

B.2. Draft-08 to -09

- * IETF Last Call comments

B.3. Draft-07 to -08

- * AD review comments

B.4. Draft-06 to -07

- * Clarifications following reviews by Lars Eggert, Victor Kuarsingh and Barry Leiba

- * Added ASCII art versions of Venn diagrams
- B.5. Draft-05 to -06
- * Allowed for IETF 110 decision
 - * Resolved open issue
 - * Removed "future work" section
 - * Editorial improvements
- B.6. Draft-04 to -05
- * Adjusted criteria according to comments received
 - * Removed previous path 3
 - * Renumbered paths
 - * Updated diagrams
 - * Editorial improvements
- B.7. Draft-03 to -04
- * Adjusted criteria according to comments received
 - * Shortened period to one year (initially)
 - * Renumbered paths
 - * Updated diagrams
 - * Editorial improvements
- B.8. Draft-02 to -03
- * Adjusted criteria according to comments received
 - * Added data
- B.9. Draft-01 to -02
- * Made this an RFC 3933 process experiment

- * Eliminated path based on directorate reviews, used to be: "Has submitted at least 6 reviews as a member of an official IETF review team within the last 3 years."
- * Other comments from IETF107 virtual gendispatch meeting handled

B.10. Draft-00 to -01

- * Added author

Authors' Addresses

Brian E. Carpenter
The University of Auckland
School of Computer Science
PB 92019
Auckland 1142
New Zealand

Email: brian.e.carpenter@gmail.com

Stephen Farrell
Trinity College Dublin
College Green
Dublin
Ireland

Email: stephen.farrell@cs.tcd.ie