

# Working Group Surveys

Jay Daley, IETF Executive Director

IETF 121 Dublin - WG Chairs Forum

# Background

IESG wants better information about WGs. Good overall information from annual community survey but not at WG level. Now considering two new surveys:

- A per-WG survey to get WG participants' views on the performance of each WG and how they engage with each WG.
  - The results for each WG should be comparable so that outliers can be identified.
- A survey of WG chairs to understand their level of knowledge/expertise in various aspects of chairing, the personal impact of being a chair and their attitudes toward chairing.
  - This survey is intended to get answers from the WG Chairs as a cohort, not to get an individual WG Chair's view on their WG.

Per-WG survey

# Aims and Distribution

The questions aim to get WG participant views on two things

- the performance of the WG
- their personal engagement with the WG.

No direct questions about the performance of WG Chairs, either collectively or individually.

Many people active in many WGs so survey needs to be short, efficient (not asking respondents to repeat the same answers for each WG) and allow for prioritization as people will not necessarily wish to respond for every WG they participate in.

Distribution will therefore be a unique link generated for each WG and sent directly to that WG list.

# Approach to questions (only 3 in total)

1. No demographics as a) some demographic slices will be too small (e.g. some age ranges, some genders) and therefore risk de-anonymisation; and b) we don't want to ask people to repeat per WG.
2. Include standard "type of participant" question where people self-select between 'regular', 'occasional', 'reader', 'monitor', 'new', 'ex-' and 'non-'.
3. Use the two WG questions from the Community Survey, but this time specifically for each WG, as this allows for baseline comparisons.
4. Anything that needs to be added?
  - a. Attributes of chairs? desire for people to step up? level of opportunity in the WG? recognition of contributions?

# Question - Type of participant

How would you best describe your participation in the XXXX WG mailing list? (this question cannot be skipped) *[Single choice]*

- I regularly post ("regular")
- I occasionally post ("occasional")
- I regularly read messages but never post ("reader")
- I monitor message subjects and occasionally read but never post ("monitor")
- I have recently subscribed and I am still deciding how I fit in ("new participant")
- I no longer read or post but I used to ("ex-participant")
- I have never read or posted ("non-participant")

**Commentary:** While the slices may be small, this allows us to separate out, for the analysis, those who are actively involved from those that are not.

# Question - Statements about the WG

How true are the following statements about the XXXX Working Group (WG)? *[Matrix choice: Almost always ... Almost never]*

- This WG has goals that are appropriate and realistic
- This WG meets its goals
- This WG addresses all reasonable technical concerns raised
- This WG makes decisions based on rough consensus
- Decisions in this WG take a reasonable amount of time
- Discussions in this WG welcome contributions from all participants
- Disagreements in this WG are resolved in a fair manner
- Meetings of this WG are well organised and managed
- The behaviour of participants in this WG is managed well
- Participants in this WG contribute as individuals and not as representatives of their employer or clients

**Commentary:** This question is about perceptions of the overall “performance” of the WG. It corresponds to a question asked in the community survey, with each choice directly corresponding but slightly different wording to apply to this specific working group and not all working groups.

# Question - Statements about participation in the WG

How true are the following statements about your participation in the XXXX Working Group (WG)? *[Matrix choice: Almost always ... Almost never]*

- This WG is a good use of my time
- I am able to share my views in this WG
- My contributions to this WG are valued
- I support the consensus of this WG
- I am happy with the behaviour of other participants in this WG
- I learn a lot from participating in this WG

**Commentary:** This question is about perceptions of personal engagement with the WG. It corresponds to a question asked in the community survey, with each choice directly corresponding but slightly different wording to apply to this specific working group and not all working groups.



WG Chairs survey

# Aims and Distribution

Survey for WG Chairs to understand their level of knowledge/expertise in various aspects of chairing, the personal impact of being a chair and their attitudes toward chairing.

Intended to get answers from the WG Chairs as a cohort, not to get an individual WG Chair's view on their WG.

Given that each chair only does this once and this is important to them, this can be a medium length survey (i.e. up to 10 minutes to complete).

Distributed by direct email to each WG Chair, just once for each chair with security in place to ensure each link can only be used once. The survey is run in anonymous mode.

# Demographic questions

All of the following will be optional:

- Region
- Age
- Gender
- Employment status

Same questions as asked in the community survey - gives both an understanding of the WG chairs as a whole and “representation” of the community.

# Role questions

As we run this survey anonymously, we can't extract this from Datatracker and assign it to the respondent (and Datatracker has limited information beyond 12 years)

- How many WGs are you currently a chair of?
- How many WGs in total have you been a chair of, including those you are currently a chair of?
- In what year did you become a WG Chair for the very first time?

If the survey needs to be shorter these can be dropped as using them for cross-tabulation with the answer is potentially not that important.

# Onsite participation questions

Which of the following best describes your onsite participation at IETF meetings? *[Single choice]*

- I aim to participate onsite at every IETF meeting
- I only participate onsite at some IETF meetings
  - Please explain why [FREE TEXT]
- I rarely/never participate onsite at IETF meetings
  - Please explain why [Free text]

**Commentary:** Aims to provide a baseline of onsite participation that can be used in other contexts

When you participate onsite at IETF meetings, what is your current primary source of funding? *[Single choice]*

- My employer
- One or more clients
- My own business
- A grant or bursary (including fee waivers)
- My personal funds
- Not applicable / Prefer not to answer

**Commentary:** This is almost the same as a standard question asked in post-meeting surveys.

# Self-assessment question

How do you rate your performance in the following areas of chairing of WGs? [*Matrix choice: Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, Very poor, No opinion*]

- Keeping WGs discussions focused
- Ensuring that milestones are met
- Ensuring that document authors/editors accurately incorporate WG decisions
- Ensuring that contributions are recognised
- Calling consensus
- Organizing WG sessions
- Chairing WG sessions
- Keeping the WG informed of your activity as a chair
- Resolving disputes within the WG
- Dealing with problematic behavior
- Overall

**Commentary:** This question intentionally asks about output (performance) not input (skills) as the former is more important.

# Personal impact and support questions

How do you rate the following personal aspects of being a WG Chair? *[Matrix choice: Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, Very poor, No opinion]*

- Your total workload as a WG Chair
- Your personal satisfaction from being a WG Chair
- Your commitment to continuing as a WG Chair

How do you rate the support you get from the following sources/people? *[Matrix choice: Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, Very poor, No opinion]*

- The Area Directors for your Working Group(s)
- Other Working Group chairs
- Secretariat
- IETF LLC
- Tools Team

# Knowledge and training questions (part 1)

How do you rate your knowledge of the following subjects documented in the listed BCPs/RFCs and websites? *[Matrix choice: Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, Very poor, No opinion]*

- IETF Working Group Guidelines and Procedures as documented in BCP 25 (RFC 2418 and RFC 3934)
- The Internet Standards Process as documented in BCP 9 (RFC 2026 et al)
- IETF Anti-Harassment Procedures as documented in BCP 25 (RFC 7776)
- IETF Guidelines for Conduct as documented in BCP 54 (RFC 7154)
- Rights Contributors Provide to the IETF Trust as documented in BCP 78 (RFC 5378)
- Intellectual Property Rights in IETF Technology as documented in BCP 79 (RFC 8179)
- I-D authoring guidelines, tools and processes as documented at [authors.ietf.org](http://authors.ietf.org)
- RFC publication process (particularly AUTH48) as documented at [rfc-editor.org](http://rfc-editor.org)
- Resources for WG Chairs as documented at [chairs.ietf.org](http://chairs.ietf.org)

**Commentary:** This is a new question. The set of documents chosen may be missing some important areas. The two questions on anti-harassment and code of conduct could be combined.



# Knowledge and training questions (part 2)

How do you rate your knowledge of the following tools used for the chairing of WGs? *[Matrix choice: Excellent, Good, Average, Poor, Very poor, No opinion]*

- Using mailman3 to manage your WG mailing list(s)
- Using Datatracker to process WG documents
- Using Meetecho to chair WG sessions

How would you prioritize the following proposed subjects for chairs' training? *[Matrix choice: Very High ... Very Low, No opinion]*

- Using IETF tools (e.g. Datatracker) as a WG Chair
- Implementing general WG practices and processes (e.g. the practicalities of managing documents, organizing meetings)
- Dealing with group dynamics (e.g. how to manage different personalities in WG discussions)
- Accessing templates/examples of standards WG chair documents/ actions (e.g. WG Last Call messages)
- Working across the IETF (e.g. how and when to engage other ADs and other WGs, rechartering)

What other subjects should be considered for chairs' training? *[Free text]*

Questions?