

# Are the Criteria Too Lax?

(Donald Eastlake's review)

Martin Duke  
ELEGY  
IETF 115

Thread:

<https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/eligibility-discuss/Ya3QgGS7oOAbrOPOrLlex5J5rl0/>

# Principles

> The idea that the world is divided into "the IETF community" and "not  
> the IETF community" by a line seems wrong to me. There is really a  
> spectrum from people with deep, full-time, long-term participation, to  
> people who have just read a few messages on one IETF mailing list or  
> stopped by one meeting of one WG.

>  
> It seems to me that fundamental principles for nomcom pool eligibility  
> would be things like

>  
> + A pool generally biased towards those more familiar with the  
> spirit, processes, and leaders of the IETF.

>  
> + A large enough pool membership that each pool member has < 10%  
> chance of being chosen so they do not feel entitled to a vote.

>  
> + A sufficiently dynamic pool, implemented through a sufficiently  
> short time horizon, that you get a reasonable number of new pool  
> members each year.

>  
eligible? And the current zeitgeist is the if you are eligible,  
people are going to push, Push, PUSH for you to volunteer because they  
seem to think a bigger and bigger and bigger volunteer pool is always  
better even if the result is more people not that enthusiastic about  
putting in the work required and more people declining if they are  
randomly selected, etc.

## Path 1 Critique (Registered for 3 out of 5)

Someone who logs in for only one session for a meeting seems like the sort of ultra-narrow participant that we DO NOT want on the nomcom.

Furthermore, a reference to the "last 5 IETF meetings" is affected by the number of meetings per year. Better to say something like "3 IETF meetings during the last 2 years". Remote attendance is OK and was obviously necessary in the era of COVID but this "one session" criterion is absurdly lax.

With automated blue sheets and hybrid meetings, even though in-person attendance is more securely determined than on-line, I'm not sure how much sense it makes to distinguish them. How about something more like

"The person has attended at least 3 IETF meetings over the previous 2 years. Attendance is defined as their attendance being recorded (either on-line or in-person) for at least two sessions on each of at least 3 days of the meeting."

## Path 2 (WG Chair or Secretary)

I understand that very few people qualified under this path that didn't qualify under Path 1. Especially if that's true, then I see no reason for the path -- there is plenty of representation of the WG Chair viewpoint among others qualifying under Path 1. Each path adds complexity and increases the attack surface. It also doesn't look that good where the ADs/IESG select WG Chairs and the WG Chairs, even if they haven't qualified in any other way, are eligible to be involved in the selection of the ADs/IESG.

I didn't realize that WG Secretaries were included. This seems pretty flakey to me. Some WG Secretaries do a fair amount of work, and some do very little. They can just be appointed/removed by the Chairs. I have a lot more confidence in the ADs/IESG than I do in, say, the worst of the WG Chairs. Can a WG Chair appoint a new Secretary of their WG each day for a month? I see no reason why not. And as far as I know, neither the WG nor the AD is directly informed when a Secretary is appointed.

Why should someone new to the IETF just appointed a Chair (presumably paired with an experienced co-Chair) or Secretary and perhaps having only served for a few weeks or even days be nomcom eligible if they don't qualify in any other way?

I would just drop this path. (If it were to be kept, I would change it to require time in office. So "... Chair [or Secretary] for at least a year within the 2 years prior ...".)

## Path 3 (RFC Author/Editor)

primarily as a reward for people who have contributed. You do learn/see some things in putting a document through but mostly if you are the primary author.

And 5 years is too long. I think 2 or 3 years would be long enough. Consider that documents can get stuck in misref for years. Here, for example, is a document that has been stuck in

## His proposal: replace it all with...

The person has attended at least 3 IETF meetings over the previous 2 years. Attendance is defined as recording your attendance (either on-line or in-person) at at least two sessions on each of at least 3 days of the meeting. Being a front-page author of an IETF Stream RFC (or approved draft in the RFC Editor's queue) in the previous three years may be substituted for up to two of these attendance instances.