

Process issues in general

Brian Carpenter

General Area Open Meeting

IETF 65, Dallas, March 2006

P, P and P

- *Principles* - not my topic today. Belong in generic documents such as the Tao and the Mission Statement.
- *Process* - essentially, our equivalent of legislation.
- *Procedures* - not my topic today. Must conform to process. Belong to individual bodies (IESG, IAB, IASA...).
- *Slogan*: IETF efficiency depends on all three Ps, but don't confuse them.

Finding your way

`draft-carpenter-procdoc-roadmap-04.txt`

- Modifying the process
- General description of workflow
- Definition of standards track and related document types
- Intellectual Property
- Review and approval process
- Appeal process
- Bodies involved in the process
- Conduct of participants
- Publication process
- Registration process
- Administration

Comments wanted; RFC or living web document?

Practical problems

`draft-carpenter-rfc2026-critique-00.txt`

- A *personal* critique of RFC 2026
- Too detailed to summarize on one slide
- Comments welcome
- Need something similar for RFC 2418

Comments wanted

My list of early targets for process update and new BCPs

- The standards track itself (2026bis)
 - The appeals process (ex 2026)
 - Implementation reports (ex 2026)
- WG process (2418bis)
 - Mailing list management (ex 3683, ex 3934)
- IESG charter (from 3710)

Already under control

- IANA Considerations (2434bis)
- IPR (dedicated WG)
- RFC Editor issues (IAB responsibility)
 - charter (new)
 - publication requirements (techspec BOF)
 - Independent submission channel (new)
 - IRTF publication channel (new)

Not early targets (*IMHO*)

- NomCom
- IAB Charter
- IASA

Floating an idea

- The IAOC owns administrative issues
- The IAB owns
 - process oversight
 - liaisons
 - architectural overview
- The IESG manages ongoing work
- No body owns "corporate" issues
 - organizational policy (how everything fits together)
 - external communications
- Do we need an Executive Committee?

Interesting question (for me at least)

- Should we or shouldn't we split the IETF Chair role from the IESG Chair role from the General AD role?
 - IETF Chair: externally visible role
 - IESG Chair: making the IESG work
 - General AD: managing the General Area

IETF Chair

- Act as visible head of the "organisation"
 - external relations beyond liaisons (like it or not, peer with heads of other SDOs)
 - public relations and media contacts
 - report to our funding agency
- Initiate and moderate IETF discussions, ascertain IETF opinions, assess IETF consensus (on non-AD matters)
- Be an active IAB member
 - we don't have an Internet Architect these days
- Be an active IAOC member and IETF Trustee
- Be a lightning rod; catch hot potatoes
 - Help desk of last resort

Not the IETF Chair

- Be a lawyer
 - we have counsel for that
- Be an administrator
 - we have the IAD for that
 - "The IETF Chair has primary responsibility for supervising the work of the IETF Secretariat, with the advice and consent of the IESG, the IAB Chair and the ISOC president." (RFC 3710)
Wrong since BCP101!

IESG Chair

- Moderate IESG discussions
 - call consensus for decisions not decided by ballot process
 - call votes to break deadlock
- Progress chasing in the IESG
 - now done by IESG Whips
- Catch and assign general incoming items
 - appeals, random drafts...
- Represent IESG needs to IASA
- Represent IESG views to the IETF

General AD

- Act as AD for process related topics and (in theory) for anything else that doesn't fit in another Area
 - note potential for conflict for an IETF and IESG Chair who is naturally engaged in the core of process debates