

Internet Engineering Task Force
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: September 1, 2017

J. Arkko
Ericsson
February 28, 2017

Thoughts on IETF Finance Arrangements
draft-arkko-ietf-finance-thoughts-00.txt

Abstract

This short memo outlines the author's thoughts of current status and future development questions around IETF's financing mechanisms.

This memo is also input for discussion that the IETF community should have. The memo is the first part of the author's goal to document the status and various challenges and opportunities associated with the IETF Administrative Activity (IASA), in the context of the so called "IASA 2.0" project.

The memo has no particular official standing, nor does it claim to represent more than the authors' thinking at the time of writing.

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 <http://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 September 1, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 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 (<http://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	2
2. Discussion	3
3. Acknowledgements	5
4. Informative References	5
Author's Address	6

1. Introduction

The purpose of the IETF is to "... produce high quality, relevant technical and engineering documents that influence the way people design, use, and manage the Internet ..." [RFC3935]. This is of course only possible when the organisation offers a platform: process, and basic services that allow IETF participants to work Internet technology in an effective way. One part of this platform is sufficient funding to run those services, maintain archives, have web presence, have staff that can do the final publication editing, etc.

The IETF's funding situation is generally in good shape: The IETF has multiple sources of funds, from corporate supporters to participants to Internet Society and to donors interested ensuring in the long-term sustainability of the efforts.

But there are issues as well, such as a rising cost trend in a setting where the basis of our funding from attendees and sponsors is staying largely the same.

And, it is always good to evaluate our arrangements, and the ongoing "IASA 2.0" effort to assess the IETF Administrative Activity (IASA) organisation is a good moment to do this analysis [RFC4071] [IASA20]. For the finance aspects as well as other organisational matters.

This short memo outlines the author's view of the current status and future development questions around IETF's financing mechanisms. The memo is the first part of the author's goal to document the status and various challenges and opportunities associated with IASA.

This memo is also input for discussion that the IETF community should have.

The memo has no particular official standing, nor does it claim to represent more than the author's thinking at the time of writing.

2. Discussion

Some of the trends affecting our financing arrangements include:

Community size is stable

The size of the IETF community both in participants and participating companies has been relatively stable for over ten years. This is by itself neither good or bad, and it reflects IETF's role in the world. While the Internet technology business keeps growing tremendously, standards for core Internet technology are only one part of the overall picture. That is a very important part, and one where there has been a lot of activity. But one should not necessarily expect a tremendous growth.

Continuously rising costs

On the other hand, costs for running the operation have increased, and are predicted to increase. This is partially due to external cost pressures, for instance the of cost hotel services such as meeting space continue to increase. But the trend is also affected by the need to provide more services, for instance related to remote attendance or tools migrating to the secretariat.

Over-the-net participation

The ability to work together without being in the same place continues to improve; global communities can be built based on - at least to large extent - over-the-net collaboration. As engineers working on real-time communication among other things, this trend should be apparent to IETF participants. This is not to say that in-person meetings will cease to be useful.

This will affect one leg of the IETF's funding structure: participant fees. Even where remote participation might be an activity that can have a fee associated with it, such fees are likely smaller than those in physical meetings.

While the IETF financing models have recently started evolving, they are still based primarily on meeting fees and meeting-based sponsorship. It would be useful to build also sponsorship models that allow supporting the IETF's work, not just a given meeting for instance.

Professionally run services

IETF services are increasingly run on a professional, commercial model, as overall number of services continues to grow, volunteer tools are left to be run by the secretariat as the volunteers move on to develop more tools, etc.

Different types of sponsors

There are many willing supporters of the IETF's work. But it is important to recognise how they -- due to their background or in some cases even legal or accounting reasons -- have different sets of expectations.

It is useful to cater for different classes of donors, for instance both large corporations capable of, for instance, hosting a meeting, as well as smaller corporations still interested in supporting the IETF but unable to take a hosting commitment.

Similarly, most corporate sponsorships are typically to support the current activities. Meeting sponsorships are an example of this. On the other hand, IETF Endowment donations are an example of a more long-term support for the long-term. Both models are necessary, and useful.

Finally, the IETF is backed by Internet Society, and the support of the IETF is one of core missions that the organisation was founded for.

The sponsor experience

While there has been a lot of support for, e.g., meeting hosting, getting support for the full sponsorship program is not easy.

The value to sponsors is not always obvious, the IETF community is sometimes critical or unappreciative, and the same sponsors get tapped again and again for many related but different opportunities.

Also, and this may sound obvious, but the IETF should be open for getting sponsorship from the different sources. There is one area that we are not as open as we should be: Traditionally, meeting sponsorship has been sought from the location that a meeting is at. However, this may not be the best strategy when a significant fraction of these sponsorships come from global multinational companies.

A corollary to the desire for supporting multiple different sponsorship models is that the IETF is clear on what the options give, clear how they benefit the IETF. As the number of options have grown, we have not always been clear enough, or provided answers that were aligned with the desires of the sponsors. For instance, the IETF Endowment was re-specified in 2015-2016 to make it about support of the IETF rather than general-purpose support for Internet openness and technology development. But work remains in ensuring that all sponsorship options are crystal clear.

Finally, the basis for any financial involvement of the sponsors needs to be viewed in terms of the value that the IETF provides for the participants and the supporters. Articulating that is important, and this needs work from the IETF. Although again, the value is probably slightly different for different sponsors. Ultimately, value is the one that ensures we continue to draw the participants, and attracts sponsors in a thoughtful and long-term fashion, and helps tune IETF activities to meet the needs of the community.

Expectations on the IETF

Some factors in our environment are changing, and the role of the IETF is also evolving in some ways. For instance, the IETF Trust took a role in managing IANA-related IPR in 2016.

3. Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Kathy Brown, Andrew Sullivan, Ray Pelletier, Leslie Daigle, Alissa Cooper, Gonzalo Camarillo, Greg Kapfer, and Sean Turner for interesting discussions in this space.

4. Informative References

- [IASA20] Arkko, J., "Proposed Project: IETF Administrative Support 2.0", November 2016 (<https://www.ietf.org/blog/2016/11/proposed-project-ietf-administrative-support-2-0/>).
- [RFC3935] Alvestrand, H., "A Mission Statement for the IETF", BCP 95, RFC 3935, DOI 10.17487/RFC3935, October 2004, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3935>>.
- [RFC4071] Austein, R., Ed. and B. Wijnen, Ed., "Structure of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)", BCP 101, RFC 4071, DOI 10.17487/RFC4071, April 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4071>>.

Author's Address

Jari Arkko
Ericsson
Kauniainen 02700
Finland

Email: jari.arkko@piuha.net

Internet Engineering Task Force
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: September 27, 2017

J. Arkko
Ericsson
March 26, 2017

Thoughts on IETF Administrative Support Activities (IASA)
draft-arkko-ietf-iasa-thoughts-00.txt

Abstract

This short memo outlines the author's thoughts about the challenges and opportunities with the IETF's administrative support activities, currently organised as part of the IETF Administrative Support Activities (IASA), IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC), and IETF Trust.

This memo is just input for discussion that the IETF community should have. The memo is a part of the author's goal to document the status and various challenges and opportunities in the context of the so called "IASA 2.0" project.

The memo has no particular official standing, nor does it claim to represent more than the authors' thinking at the time of writing.

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 <http://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 September 14, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 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 (<http://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	2
2. Changes, Challenges, and Opportunities	3
3. Acknowledgements	6
4. Informative References	6
Author's Address	7

1. Introduction

The arrangements relating to administrative support for the IETF (IASA, RFC 4071 [RFC4071]) were created more than ten years ago, when the IETF initially took charge of its own administration. The arrangements have served the IETF well, but there's been considerable change in the necessary tasks, in the world around us, and our own expectations since the creation of the IASA. Looking forward, this is a good time to ask what administrative arrangements best support the IETF in the next ten years.

Background for this analysis are the various challenges and frustrations we have experienced along the way, for instance around meeting arrangements. But we also need to ask the bigger questions about how the organisations are structured. What kind of support we need in the coming years, from the point of view of the community, IESG, IAB, IAOC, Trust, and our partners such as ISOC, meeting hosts or contractors? Areas to look at include structure, financing and sponsorship arrangements, organisation, and ways of working. This is the context of the so called "IASA 2.0" project [IASA20].

This document gives the author's view on structure and ways of working in the current IASA arrangements. This memo is just input for discussion that the IETF community should have. The memo is a part of the author's goal to document the status and various challenges and opportunities in IASA.

The memo has no particular official standing, nor does it claim to represent more than the author's thinking at the time of writing.

The authors's views on financing aspects have been discussed in [I-D.arkko-ietf-finance-thoughts]. A collection of early views from a community process on IASA issues has been published in [I-D.hall-iasa20-workshops-report].

2. Changes, Challenges, and Opportunities

It is useful to understand the evolution of the IASA arrangements over time. Leslie Daigle's memo discusses the changes from the initial IASA arrangements to today [I-D.daigle-iasa-retrospective].

But it is also necessary to understand how far along we have come from even the early 2000s. As Leslie's draft notes:

A first priority was to establish meeting dates, locations and contracts more than a year in advance, to improve contract negotiating positions, costs, and provide clarity for attendee planning. (Historical data point: the early 2004 Seoul IETF meeting did not have a hotel contract booked in December of 2003).

So, while there are a number of challenges, overall the system has served the IETF well.

Section 5 of Leslie's draft covers some of issues:

- o Do current arrangements match the tasks and organisation that have grown larger?
- o Today's IETF is international and diverse, which poses challenges to meeting site selection.
- o Too many sponsorship and other aspects of the organisation are focused around the meetings.
- o The line between IETF and ISOC organisation has not been clear-cut, which has lead to issues around transparency, budgeting, and, perhaps more importantly, clarity of control.
- o The role of ISOC in representing IETF towards sponsors and donors is sometimes unclear.
- o Staffing that in practice extends beyond one employee, with structure and control that was designed for one.
- o IAOC membership is structurally challenged, with a significant fraction of members having full-time IETF responsibilities elsewhere.

- o The IAOC also has a limited ability to pick chairpersons, given that some of the members are not eligible for being a chair.
- o Community participation centers on meeting arrangements, with only a small number of volunteers willing to be a part of the board.

In addition, there have been issues around transparency, particularly relating to the meeting location selection process. A change in spring 2016 led to the early release of cities under consideration, to help spot potential issues early. However, other issues remain in discussion, for instance relating to publishing future hotel contracts.

There are also many issues that are not visible externally. For instance, the IAOC is a board for oversight, but the lines between oversight and execution are blurred. Particularly when staff is overloaded. Almost anything that the board does needs staff assistance, so any effort in helping move topics forward adds to the overload situation. This situation is particularly exacerbated when something unexpected happens, such as was the case with the Zika-virus concerns.

But many of the specific issues are by-products of the way that we have structured the activities at IETF. Specifically, the author believes that the following issues are root causes of many of the difficulties:

Internal organisational structure

There is obviously a need for a central entity to keep the full picture of budget and activities, but the current organisation was designed at a time when we expected to have a board and one administrative director. While the organisation has grown, and for instance IAOC committees taking on more responsibility, we still operate largely on this simple model but having to deal with many more vendors and topics than before. The author's opinion is that the IETF would benefit from looking at evolving the structure and practices, for instance, relating to division and delegation of responsibilities, and making the model less dependent on a single director.

Bundling the IAOC with IETF Trust

While the IETF Trust has a budget and regularly deals with IETF lawyer and the legal team, the schedule and nature of the work in the Trust and the rest of the IASA is quite different. The bundling of these organisations with the same members and same meeting slots has hurt our ability to deal with both as effectively as we should. And it certainly adds to the workload

and volunteer problems. The Trust is a stable, long-term entity that deals mostly with legal questions, and typically has low workload. Trust decisions have a very long-lasting effect on IETF, however. The IAOC deals with a large financial responsibility, and is a more high-activity entity.

Expertise and willingness to work on administration

IETF participants are naturally more interested in technology evolution than details of administration or meeting arrangements, unless those arrangements lead to problems. While there are many highly capable persons in the IETF, with a lot of experience of managing budgets and contracts, it generally has not been easy to find volunteers for IASA-related tasks.

This would point to a need to re-evaluate division of work between volunteer boards and contracted, professional services.

Meeting planning processes

Another area where some re-thinking would be useful are the meeting planning processes. Involving community earlier in the location choices and writing a community-specified mandatory requirements for meeting sites seem like obviously useful things, but have started only recently, and have not yet found their perfect forms.

Re-thinking what we as community do and how much we contract out would also be useful here, of course as long as the community has full visibility and ability to affect the decisions.

On a more practical level, a big fraction of the effort within the IASA is spent on meeting arrangements. Community input indicates that while some new locations are necessary, repeat visits are desirable. Indeed, 5 out of 6 future meetings are to locations that the IETF has been to recently (and that one new location was the subject of much controversy).

Given the repetitive schedule, one would assume that this helps meeting planning. While some groundwork (such as site visits) are not unnecessarily repeated, and while contracts often have to renegotiated, much of the rest of the process is run through as if we were making completely independent decisions. This seems like a missed opportunity for rationalisation, or further delegation to vendors specialising in meeting organisation. Further use of repeats with multi-meeting agreements would also seem to be sensible.

Note: no organisation can rely on a very small number of possible meeting sites, due to the danger of becoming unable to attain competitive pricing. So the pool of possible meeting sites has to be still large enough, and be occasionally refreshed.

Further clarity of roles between the IETF and ISOC

The interface between the IETF and ISOC has evolved in natural ways over the years. For instance, improvements in properly accounting for in-kind contributions have made budgeting clearer. And ISOC's support activities such as sponsorship acquisition are obviously very important and useful for the IETF. Budgeting clarity is only one part of an interface, however, and further work is needed, for instance, in the area of how the different support activities are managed. It might even be useful to refactor the responsibilities between IETF and ISOC. As an example, there's a very clear relationship between the IAOC and the IAD, but it is less clear how ISOC and IETF co-operate in managing a particular support activity.

3. Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Kathy Brown, Andrew Sullivan, Ray Pelletier, Leslie Daigle, Alissa Cooper, Ted Hardie, Tobias Gondrom, and Gonzalo Camarillo for interesting discussions in this space.

4. Informative References

[I-D.arkko-ietf-finance-thoughts]

Arkko, J., "Thoughts on IETF Finance Arrangements", draft-arkko-ietf-finance-thoughts-00 (work in progress), February 2017.

[I-D.daigle-iasa-retrospective]

Daigle, L., "After the first decade: IASA Retrospective", draft-daigle-iasa-retrospective-00 (work in progress), October 2016.

[I-D.hall-iasa20-workshops-report]

Hall, J. and J. Mahoney, "Report from the IASA 2.0 Virtual Workshops", draft-hall-iasa20-workshops-report-00 (work in progress), March 2017.

[IASA20]

Arkko, J., "Proposed Project: IETF Administrative Support 2.0", November 2016 (<https://www.ietf.org/blog/2016/11/proposed-project-ietf-administrative-support-2-0/>).

[RFC3935] Alvestrand, H., "A Mission Statement for the IETF",
BCP 95, RFC 3935, DOI 10.17487/RFC3935, October 2004,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3935>>.

[RFC4071] Austein, R., Ed. and B. Wijnen, Ed., "Structure of the
IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)", BCP 101,
RFC 4071, DOI 10.17487/RFC4071, April 2005,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4071>>.

Author's Address

Jari Arkko
Ericsson
Kauniainen 02700
Finland

Email: jari.arkko@piuha.net

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: December 7, 2017

L. Daigle
Thinking Cat Enterprises LLC
June 5, 2017

After the first decade: IASA Retrospective
draft-daigle-iasa-retrospective-01

Abstract

The IETF Administrative Support Activity was formally established and undertaken as a project of the Internet Society in 2005. In the following 10+ years, the IETF has grown and changed, as have the responsibilities that fall to the IASA.

This document reflects on some of those changes and the implications within the IASA structure, providing some areas for further discussion to consider evolving the IASA and the IETF/ISOC relationship.

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 <http://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 December 7, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 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 (<http://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	2
2. Forming the IASA	3
3. Evolution of IASA breadth	4
3.1. IASA coverage in 2005	4
3.2. IASA coverage in 2017	5
4. Evolution of Internet Society Partnership	8
5. Issues and Potential Next Steps for the IASA structure	9
6. Closing remarks	12
7. Acknowledgements	12
8. References	12
8.1. Normative References	12
8.2. Informative References	12
Author's Address	13

1. Introduction

In April 2005, BCP 101 ([RFC4071]) was published, formally creating the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA). At the end of an intense community discussion, the IASA was formed as an activity housed within the Internet Society (ISOC), and BCP 101 defined the roles of the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC), and the IETF Administrative Director (IAD). Together, these roles have defined responsibilities for IETF's fiscal and administrative support.

With the newly established IASA, the IETF was in a position to formalize several activities that had been undertaken by other organizations, on behalf of the IETF. This allowed the IETF take responsibility of those operations. Through the 10+ years since the inception of IASA, the operations and responsibilities have, however, grown and requirements have evolved. Nor has the world stood still -- at the same time, the Internet Society has grown and taken on a broader role in Internet governance discussions and global activities.

This document reflects on some of those changes and the implications within the IASA structure, providing some areas for further discussion to consider evolving the IASA and the IETF/ISOC relationship.

2. Forming the IASA

In 2003, the IETF and IAB Chairs formed an IAB Advisory Committee (AdvComm) to "review the existing IETF administration relationships (RFC Editor, IETF Secretariat, etc.) and propose IETF management process or structural changes that would improve the overall functioning of the IETF" ([RFC3716]). The AdvComm identified several stressors to the efficient and effective operation of the IETF related to financial support, informality of relationships, and opaqueness of decision making in administrative matters.

To address the identified stressors, the AdvComm developed a set of requirements for any eventual solution:

- o Resource Management
 - * Uniform Budgetary Responsibility (autonomy)
 - * Revenue Source Equivalence (ability to consider all sources of income and apply them as appropriate across all functions, which was not possible when the Internet Society was funding the RFC Editor function and CNRI/Foretec was supporting the Secretariat function)
 - * Clarity in Relationship with Supporting Organizations (clear contractual relationships between the IETF and each supporting organization)
 - * Flexibility in Service Provisioning (ability to make choices)
 - * Administrative Efficiency (avoiding duplicate overhead across multiple organizations)
- o Stewardship (looking after the future as well as the present)
 - * Accountability for Change (i.e., accountability to the IETF community)
 - * Persistence and Accessibility of Records
- o Working Environment
 - * Service Automation (for administrative tasks and IETF information flow management)
 - * Tools (development of more tools for IETF support)

The IETF followed up the AdvComm recommendations with discussions of possible administrative structures to support the IETF and ensure its continued ability to focus on its mission of making the Internet work better. The eventual result was the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA), defined in BCP101 ([RFC4071]) and formed in 2005.

The selected form of the IASA (as "an activity of the Internet Society") meant that the IETF could focus on building out the pieces of administration necessary to carry out its standards activities, without having to instantly build general corporate overhead. That is, the Internet Society was specifically tasked with providing any additional needed clerical or financial support, and was identified as solely responsible for obtaining sponsors for the IETF. The latter also was intended to provide arms-length distance between corporate donors and direction of the IETF's activities: the IETF could not be "bought".

3. Evolution of IASA breadth

3.1. IASA coverage in 2005

In order to understand the evolution of the IASA, it is important to describe the baseline -- what the IASA was when it was first formed.

- o Secretariat -- the IETF Secretariat function was carried out by an organization that had been a subsidiary of CNRI (which had collected meeting fees and provided Secretariat services until the creation of the IASA). In 2005, key personnel migrated to Neustar to carry out the Secretariat function under contract with the Internet Society (for IASA). This gave the IETF full control and responsibility for picking meeting locations, as well as setting and collecting meeting fees.
- o Meeting planning -- A first priority was to establish meeting dates, locations and contracts more than a year in advance, to improve contract negotiating positions, costs, and provide clarity for attendee planning. (Historical data point: the early 2004 Seoul IETF meeting did not have a hotel contract booked in December of 2003).
- o RFC Editor -- The RFC Editor function had been handled at USC/ISI for many years (since Jon Postel moved to USC/ISI from UCLA in 1978). In the years leading up to the formation of the IASA, The Internet Society had provided funding to ISI in the form of a contract to carry out the work. With the creation of the IASA, this contract was folded into the ISOC/IASA support. See [RFC5540] for more details.

- o IANA -- by the time the IASA was created in 2005, ICANN was well-established and had been carrying out the Internet Assigned Names Activity since 1998. The IETF had agreed on a Memorandum of Understanding with ICANN on the handling of protocol parameters for IETF standards ([RFC2860]), but it did not specify levels of service or practical terms of agreement. (See more IANA detail at <http://www.internetsociety.org/ianatimeline>).
- o Tools -- the Secretariat had developers on staff who had built tools to support the workflow of the IETF (e.g., liaison manager). The software was proprietary, and IETF community programmers had no access or insight. At the same time, the IETF community being what it is, there were community-driven tools that were built up in an open source fashion. These were completely separate and separately maintained.
- o Meeting network support -- in 2005, standard meeting hosting agreements included providing network connectivity to the meeting hotel. This might have extended to include a terminal room for attendees.
- o Staff -- the IASA established that the IETF would have one full-time employee (officially an employee of ISOC, as part of the administrative arrangements). That one employee was the IETF Administrative Director.
- o The IAOC -- established as an administrative oversight body, the IAOC was established with 3 voting and one non-voting ex officio members (IETF Chair, IAB Chair, ISOC CEO and IAD, respectively), one member appointed by the ISOC Board, and 4 appointees from the community (2 from NomCom, 1 each appointed by the IESG and IAB).

3.2. IASA coverage in 2017

A little more than a decade later, things have changed substantially in terms of the coverage of the responsibilities of the IASA.

- o Secretariat -- the IASA put the Secretariat contract out for competitive bid in 2007, establishing a contract with professional association management company (Association Management Services) in 2008, with key personnel moving to AMS.
- o Meeting planning -- IETF meeting locations are now mostly contracted two to three years in advance. At the same time, IETF leadership and participants' expectations of meeting locations and venues have evolved. The IETF now aims to meet regularly in Asia, as well as Europe and North America. Meeting layout requirements have evolved. The topic is sufficiently complex that the MTGVENUE

working group was created in 2016 to develop an IETF consensus document on meeting venue requirements.

- o RFC Editor -- the IAB split the RFC Editor function into separate functions and these have been contracted out -- RFC Series Editor; RFC Production, Independent Series Editor. These are collectively overseen by an IAB-based, community-populated advisory board (RSOC). The RFC Series continues to grow in terms of number of documents published, and new features (e.g., ISSNs) and other formats supported for the documents. (N.B.: The IASA is not responsible for defining or driving any of that growth -- the IASA role is limited to writing and managing the contracts for the work defined by the IAB and RSOC).
- o IETF Trust -- the IETF Trust was formed to hold IETF-related IPR (marks, copyright, domain name registrations) after the IASA was established. It was created in late 2005, by agreement between the Corporation for National Research Initiatives (CNRI) and the Internet Society (ISOC) as the Settlers, the IETF and the initial trustees (IAOC members at the time). One provision of the Trust Agreement was that, prior to July 1, 2010, the Trust could be amended only by unanimous written consent of both the Settlers and two-thirds of the Trustees. The Trust Agreement includes a list of the initial assets contributed to the Trust, and they generally included the IETF and IETF SECRETARIAT marks, relevant domain names, and the content of the databases used to do the IETF's work (including then-current Internet-Drafts). RFC 4371 ([RFC4371]) updated RFC 4071 (BCP 101) to reflect the fact that there would be an IETF Trust to hold the rights to IETF-relevant intellectual property. Additionally, RFC 4748 updated RFC 3798 (the first organization of IETF rights in contributions), and that RFC was updated by RFC 5378 ([RFC5378]) to unify the IETF rights definitions and Trust structure.
- o IANA -- the IETF Trust holds the IANA IPR (IANA trademark and iana.org and related domain name registrations). We now formally contract with ICANN to do the work (which is an update over the SLA that was established in the intervening decade)
- o Tools -- the IETF's software tools are still a mix of things developed spontaneously by community members and specific work put out for hire. The latter is now handled through RFPs, and care is made to ensure that tools upon which the community is dependent can be maintained and supported for as long as needed.
- o Meeting network support -- network support for IETF meetings has grown in scope and expectation of uniformity of services in meetings across the globe. This now encompasses a large scale

combination of NOC volunteers, hired support, in-kind donations of equipment and specialized support for remote participation. The following list of current meeting network support expectations highlights not only the complexity of the support, but also the increased issues in funding, contract management, and implications for hotel contracts that land on the IASA plate:

- * Support for pre/post events (ISOC BOT, Hackathon, etc.)
 - * Ubiquitous wireless with multiple SSIDS
 - * Hotel wireless with IETF SSIDs -- sometimes multiple venues
 - * V6 enabled throughout
 - * Increasing remote participation support
 - * Support for experiments
 - * Bits and Bites
 - * Core network management (ASN/ip addresses/DNS/monitoring/etc.)
 - * Storage, management and shipping of IETF-owned equipment (in-kind donations)
- o Comms -- Beyond simply having a reliable website, the IETF's use of "communications" has extended in recent years. This ranges from updates in the website itself, to work with social and industry media and messaging to position the IETF in relevant global discussions. Of late, the IETF has used the services of ISOC's professional communications staff, helping deal with some of the publicly visible issues such as the impacts of surveillance revelations or the IANA transition. Starting from 2017, this support is for the first time part of the IETF budget, whereas previously the activity and its funding not visible at that level
 - o Sponsorship and funding -- even as the IETF retains its basic operational structure, the industry around it changes. The last decade has seen increased costs of meetings and productions, and a greater reliance on corporate funding. Where once the IETF relied on individual community members convincing their companies to step up for the next meeting, the IETF now plans its meetings several years in advance and needs to align funding expectations accordingly. It takes expertise to update funding models, build and implement programs for securing industry sponsorship. BCP 101 formally identifies that the IETF is not to fundraise on its own; indeed, the IASA is not responsible for the sponsorship

development (just managing its impact on the IASA budget). The IETF sponsorship models have evolved, and in 2017 they consist of ISOC memberships, the Global Host program, meeting hosts and other meeting sponsors, the Hackathon and Bits-n-Bites sponsorships, and the IETF Endowment. The team helping with sponsors involves a primary sponsorship person at ISOC, the IAD, the Secretariat, as well as frequent help from the IETF leadership and their connections.

- o Staff -- the IASA still has exactly one permanent employee -- the IETF Administrative Director.
- o IAOC -- the structure of the IAOC remains unchanged since the IASA's inception.
- o IAOC Committees -- recognizing the need for more eyes and specialized attention for different branches of work requiring IAOC oversight, the IAOC expanded its support by creating committees. Committees are dynamic -- formed and closed as needed to focus on key areas of the moment, and often include members from outside the IAOC. The committees do the heavy lifting on background work for IAOC decisions. The IAOC is nonetheless responsible for its decisions based on committee output and recommendations. Example committees include:
 - * Finance Committee: reviews financial reports prepared by the IAD (with support from ISOC Accounting staff), discusses budget proposals before going to the whole IAOC.
 - * Meetings Committee: reviews candidate IETF meeting venues and proposes selections for approval by the IAOC.

Further details about IAOC Committees, including the current list of committees and membership, is available from <https://iaoc.ietf.org/committees.html> .

4. Evolution of Internet Society Partnership

When the IASA was formally created, the Internet Society had only recently established a substantial and steady financial basis (through its Public Interest Registry project). "Internet Governance" was a relatively new global policy discussion topic, and the Internet Society provided a much needed voice from the Internet technical community. It had a very small staff (10 staff listed in the 2004 annual report), a broad footprint of Chapters around the globe, and a few, focused projects undertaken by staff.

Since 2005, the Internet Society has expanded significantly, organizationally (reaching 90+ staff) and in its presence on the world stage of Internet policy, development and technology. While it remains committed to its role of support of the IETF, it becomes increasingly challenging to maintain (and explain) the reality that the Internet Society and the IETF are two separate organizations, with independent roles and perspectives, while everything from the hotel contracts to the MoU with ICANN (for IANA services) is signed by the Internet Society (as the legal entity for the IETF).

5. Issues and Potential Next Steps for the IASA structure

Here are some issues that could use addressing in updates to the IASA structure:

- o The most general question: the effort involved in IASA-related tasks has considerably risen during its existence, and the current organisational arrangements may no longer be the perfect match for the task. Are changes needed in the organisation?
- o The 2017 IETF is more diverse and more international than it was previously. Arranging meetings is a particular area that today demands more work. In addition, the IETF community periodically raises new requirements that must be met by venues. Local conditions, invitation and visa processes, and hotel and network facilities demand effort. While the IAOC has made some changes regarding site selection, and ongoing IETF working group efforts will help specify requirements more clearly, this remains a sensitive and critical area.
- o Sponsorship and hosting issues in particular are increasingly difficult for meetings. While some operational changes are being made to the sponsorship opportunities for the IETF, the IETF would probably be served well by moving more towards a funding model that is independent of the meetings.
- o In the last couple of years, the IAOC and ISOC have worked to ensure that contributions such as staff time and other support are properly accounted for in the IETF budget. This increases transparency and awareness. However, even with this progress, the actual work is still organised within two separate organisations, which makes it hard to have one decision point regarding where and how to spend resources.
- o Clarity of IETF representative communications: who is responsible for determining the structure and message of the IETF's place on the world stage, to potential sponsors, etc. The IASA role is to ensure there are appropriate resources (expertise, materials), but

it is not currently clear to whom those should be provided, and therefore, what the specification of the task is.

- o Representation for sponsorship: The Internet Society is formally responsible for IETF fund raising (per BCP101). The IASA is responsible for aligning promised sponsor benefits with meeting realities, and tracking the overall budget. Currently, the IASA relies on the IETF Chair to take responsibility for managing discussions required to vet any possible changes in representation, but perhaps there are other models that would scale more effectively.
- o Clarity of role in the IETF Endowment: related to the question of determining the shape of representative communications materials, potential IETF Endowment contributors ask for a perspective of where the IETF is going in the next decade, and how Endowment money might be used. The future of the IETF is not for the IASA to decide, but the IAOC's role in building and managing the IETF budget make it a natural place to look for some of these answers. This highlights three problems:
 - * It is ISOC that is pitching the IETF Endowment (because ISOC is a legal organization; because the IETF is not supposed to do fundraising, per BCP 101) and potential funders can be confused why the IETF is not speaking directly.
 - * The obvious question, "Why doesn't ISOC just pay for it?" -- which stems from a lack of perception of the different world roles of the two organizations.
 - * In preparing the pitch for the IETF Endowment, ISOC naturally turns to the "money manager" of the IETF to get answers to questions, and it is confusing when the IAOC can neither provide answers or identify the suitably responsible part of the organization.

A better plan would be to have clarity about who the IETF thinks is responsible for such discussions, and messaging that more clearly to the rest of the world.

- o Clarifying, and as necessary, updating the relationship between the IETF and the Internet Society: in establishing the IASA in 2005, the IETF and the Internet Society determined the best relationship was to have the IASA homed as an Internet Society project. Is that still the best arrangement for all concerned?
- o Staffing: The IASA was created with one full-time IETF staff person -- the IETF Administrative Director. Some questioned

whether it would even be a full-time job. It always has been at least a full-time job, and over the years the shortfall of resources has been at least partially addressed by contributions of Internet Society staff resources that are available (e.g., see notes above about the IETF Communications plans, etc). The problems are mismatch of talent, (lack of) resources for the IETF, and unplanned impact on resources for the Internet Society that has its own projects to pursue. It would be better that the IETF should just manage its own staffing needs

- o IAOC membership: The IAOC has 4 ex officio members (IETF Chair, IAB Chair, ISOC CEO, IETF Administrative Director (non-voting)), and 5 appointed members. One of 5 members is appointed by the ISOC Board of Trustees, and is traditionally expected not to stand for IAOC Chair. That leaves a small pool from which to select the IAOC Chair (and the IETF Trust Chair, usually a different person), and very few (2, by the time you've appointed Chairs) "worker bees" for the IAOC. This is a functional model for handling those review issues that can be put to the IAOC by the IAD and the Committees and addressed in the IAOC monthly teleconference. There is zero bandwidth for deep review or engagement on any topic. While the IAOC was intended only ever to be oversight, and the IAD does not need a huge flock of "bosses", the fact that this shallowness has become a friction point suggests that something structural needs to change, either within the IAOC or the IASA staffing.
- o IETF Trust Trustees: Since its inception, the Trustees of the IETF Trust have been defined as the current sitting IAOC members. While the Trust was being established, there was value in keeping the process of identifying Trustees simple, especially if the Trust did not persist beyond its minimum lifespan (July 1, 2010). The Trust has become an integral part of the IETF support system and seems to be here to stay. It could be useful to appoint Trustees through some process independent of appointing IAOC members, to reduce the level of role and committee overload described elsewhere, and also to make the separation between the Trust and the IETF clearer and better formalized.
- o IETF participant engagement in IASA: Most participants in the IETF demonstrate little interest in the work done by IASA, including how things are administered and paid for, unless something goes "wrong". (Consider the consistent lack of interest and short volunteer lists for open IAOC positions, contrasted against the e-mail evaluations of meeting venues at each and every IETF meeting. Hmmm. Perhaps the latter dissuades potential volunteers?!). This makes it difficult for the IAOC to identify, pursue, or suggest changes that might ultimately be in the

organizations long term (or, sometimes, even short term) interest. More consistent engagement might help.

6. Closing remarks

The creation of the IETF was a step in formalizing discussions among engineers who were interested in the development of the specifications of the technology to drive the Internet. Creating the IASA was a logical step in bringing together the various administrative functions that had been first offered by different organizations involved in the work. As the world continues to evolve around the IETF and the Internet, perhaps it is time for another review of where we are and whether our administrative formalizations fit the needs of the work at hand.

7. Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Harald Alvestrand, Brian Carpenter, Dave Crocker, Lucy Lynch and Greg Wood for review and comments on an earlier version of the document.

8. References

8.1. Normative References

- [RFC2860] Carpenter, B., Baker, F., and M. Roberts, "Memorandum of Understanding Concerning the Technical Work of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority", RFC 2860, DOI 10.17487/RFC2860, June 2000, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2860>>.
- [RFC4071] Austein, R., Ed. and B. Wijnen, Ed., "Structure of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)", BCP 101, RFC 4071, DOI 10.17487/RFC4071, April 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4071>>.
- [RFC5378] Bradner, S., Ed. and J. Contreras, Ed., "Rights Contributors Provide to the IETF Trust", BCP 78, RFC 5378, DOI 10.17487/RFC5378, November 2008, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5378>>.

8.2. Informative References

- [RFC3716] IAB Advisory Committee, "The IETF in the Large: Administration and Execution", RFC 3716, DOI 10.17487/RFC3716, March 2004, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3716>>.

[RFC4371] Carpenter, B., Ed. and L. Lynch, Ed., "BCP 101 Update for IPR Trust", BCP 101, RFC 4371, DOI 10.17487/RFC4371, January 2006, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4371>>.

[RFC5540] Editor, RFC., "40 Years of RFCs", RFC 5540, DOI 10.17487/RFC5540, April 2009, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5540>>.

Author's Address

Leslie Daigle
Thinking Cat Enterprises LLC
Email: ldaigle@thinkingcat.com

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: September 14, 2017

J. Hall
CDT
A. Mahoney
March 13, 2017

Report from the IASA 2.0 Virtual Workshops
draft-hall-iasa20-workshops-report-00

Abstract

This is the Workshop Report for the IETF Administrative Support Activity 2.0 (IASA 2.0) Virtual Workshops, held on 28 February 2017 at 1100 UT and 1600 UT. The original IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA) was created ten years ago, and since has been subject to some reflection. In the intervening years, there has been considerable change in the necessary tasks of IETF administration and in the world around the IETF, and in how the IETF raises funds and finances its work. The IASA 2.0 process seeks to address which administrative arrangements will best support the IETF going forward.

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 <http://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 September 14, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 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 (<http://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	2
2. Terminology and Organizational Structure	3
2.1. Terminology	3
2.2. Organizational Structure	3
3. Issues Raised	4
3.1. Structural and Organizational Issues	4
3.2. Funding Issues	6
3.3. Transparency and Communication Issues	9
3.4. Staff and Volunteer Resource Issues	10
3.5. Internal IAOC Organizational Issues	11
4. Security Considerations	13
5. IANA Considerations	13
6. Acknowledgments	13
7. Informative References	14
Appendix A. Participants	15
A.1. Participants in the 1100 UTC virtual workshop	15
A.2. Participants in the 1600 UTC virtual workshop	15
Authors' Addresses	17

1. Introduction

The IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA) arrangements were created more than ten years ago, when the IETF initially took charge of its own administration [RFC4071]. In the intervening years, there has been considerable change in the tasks of IETF administration and in the world around the IETF [I-D.daigle-iasa-retrospective] and in how the IETF raises funds and finances its work [I-D.arkko-ietf-finance-thoughts].

In 2016, IETF leadership began a discussion to review and possibly rework administrative arrangements at the IETF, dubbed the IETF Administrative Support Activity 2.0 project [Arkko-2016]. The IASA 2.0 process seeks to address what administrative arrangements that will best support the IETF going forward.

To make changes, the IETF community first needs to understand the challenges and/or missed opportunities within the current system. A number of areas face challenges: structural and organizational issues regarding the roles and interfaces between the IETF, the IAOC, ISOC, the IESG, and contractors; the IETF funding model; transparency and communication issues among the many IASA moving pieces; availability

of staff, contractor, and volunteer resources compared to the administrative workload; and internal IAOC organizational issues.

To get input from the community to identify challenges and opportunities in these and other areas, the IETF leadership set up two virtual workshops open to everyone in the IETF community and to people who are or have worked in IETF-administrative roles. These virtual workshops were held on 28 February 2017 at 11:00 UTC and 16:00 UTC. The agenda, slides, and minutes from the two meetings are available at the workshop proceedings [IASA20-proceedings]. Recordings of the two workshops are also available [IASA20-1100UT-rec] [IASA20-1600UT-rec].

At these workshops, the participants provided their experiences and suggestions. Proposed changes and solutions will be discussed and dealt with in a later phase of the IASA 2.0 project.

2. Terminology and Organizational Structure

2.1. Terminology

The following acronyms will be heavily used in the discussion below:

- o IASA - IETF Administrative Support Activity - An organized activity that provides administrative support for the IETF, the IAB and the IESG.
- o IAOC - IETF Administrative Oversight Committee - A largely IETF-selected committee that oversees and directs IASA. Accountable to the IETF community.
- o ISOC - The Internet Society - An organization that assists the IETF with legal, administrative, and funding tasks.
- o IAD - IETF Administrative Director - The sole staff member responsible for carrying out the work of the IASA. An ISOC employee.
- o IETF Trust - Acquires, maintains, and licenses intellectual and other property used in connection with the administration of the IETF. Same composition as IAOC.

2.2. Organizational Structure

In terms of organizational arrangements, the workshop chairs provided a diagram that captured many of the organizational relationships among various entities [IASA-Org-Chart]. The IAOC relies on a number of committees to get its work done - Finance, Legal Management,

Meetings, Technology Management, and RFP Committee in addition to any ad hoc committees. Participants noted that the connections between these committees and the IAD are not reflected in the diagram.

Some workshop participants felt that the diagram generally reflected reality and that it illustrated the large number of moving pieces involved. A workshop participant said that there are a lot of moving parts compared to 11 years ago when the IASA was formed, as IASA now encompasses certain functions that it did not at that time, such as the Secretariat and the RFC Production Center.

3. Issues Raised

The IASA 2.0 Virtual Workshops focused on the areas below.

3.1. Structural and Organizational Issues

Slide 10 of the slide deck [IASA2-Workshop-Slides] discussed the following structural issues between the IETF, the IAOC, ISOC, the IESG, and contractors:

- o The line between the IETF and ISOC is not organizationally clear-cut, which has led to issues around transparency, allocation of staff time and priorities, budgeting, and clarity of who is responsible for what.
- o The respective roles of ISOC, the IETF chair, the IAOC, and the secretariat in representing the IETF to sponsors and donors and communicating with them are not clear.
- o Having ISOC represent the IETF to sponsors and donors -
 - * creates confusion about why the IETF does not represent itself,
 - * yields questions about why ISOC does not instead increase its IETF support and how donations can be guaranteed to be dedicated to the IETF, and
 - * can result in those soliciting sponsorships and donations having a lack of familiarity with IETF work.

Workshop participants discussed organizational issues between ISOC and IETF. For example, participants noted some items are branded IETF, like the IETF Journal, are ISOC driven and funded, and are not directed by the IETF community. One participant said it is often not clear who is doing what on behalf of whom; a comment was made that IASA 2.0 discussions should focus on what the _IETF_ is doing. Other ISOC-funded activities include participation in the Ombudsteam -

which was requested by IETF and should show up in an accounting of IETF resources - and ISOC Fellows and Policy Fellows - which are ISOC-funded and controlled programs that should not show up in an IETF budget. (The ISOC Fellows and Policy Fellows programs encourage, respectively, technologists from emerging and developing economies and policy experts from around the world to interact with the IETF community.) A commentor mentioned that this sounded like a branding issue at times: while the IETF Trust holds IETF trademarks, is the IETF brand and the contours of what it encompasses clear? The commentor further asked: who defines the contents of ISOC activities that are visible to the outside world? Who decides how to drive those things? Should those be included in the budget?

A related but distinct issue arose around control and policy authority among the various IASA components. One workshop participant said that the IETF community is confused about who has policy authority. They continued: for example, if the IETF community wants to change the structure of relationships with sponsors, who has the authority to make that decision? IESG? IAOC? Community consensus? This participant felt that this is unclear. A participant said that there is a gap in terms of the IAOC being the body that carries this out. How does the IAOC get its policy instructions from the IETF community? The IAOC only goes to the community for specific policy questions - e.g., the privacy policy or changes to the trust legal provisions - but does not get general "please do this" feedback from the community. A commentor stated: In many cases the "policy from the IETF community" comes through the IESG as voiced by the IETF chair. Another workshop participant felt that there was a lack of clarity around even where some questions should be asked (e.g. "how many logos do we want on our badges?" or "who drives/has responsibility for some specific functions?"). That commentor felt that an important question is whether or not the IETF community wants a "thin" IAOC that has mostly oversight of the IAD or a "thick" IAOC that has administrative responsibilities - i.e. "who is driving the bus?"

In terms of accounting structure, the discussion at the virtual workshop concluded that there have been improvements to accounting that have helped increase accuracy, and the IETF budget has been adjusted over the last 5 or 6 years to recognize ISOC staff contributions, but appropriate accounting between ISOC and IETF needs more work. One commentor said that it was not clear to them who is in the driver's seat. One participant stated it as: "If we don't like a function, can we delete it? Or does that require IETF participation?" Some things are very clearly IETF topics, and then there are some that fall in between IETF and ISOC, and then there are some that are purely ISOC. A participant felt that control needs to be aligned with accounting.

On the marketing side, workshop participants discussed how the IETF is represented to the outside world - donors, media, other organizations and communities - and some felt that it needs to be clearer, even if this is currently an ISOC activity. One participant said that people don't understand the difference between ISOC and IETF and that we need to understand this before we can correctly communicate it.

Some felt that the lack of rigid formality in the organization and structure was not necessarily a bad thing. One commentor felt that the structure of IETF, which is not well-defined and flexible, provides a benefit to the Internet. Another commentor stated that given the proclivities of engineers towards structure and formality, working to improve IASA could make the IETF more structured and thus less appealing to some kinds of contributors. Further, they stated that we need clarity that institutionalizes this level accessibility to all participants, which will be tricky. In contrast, another participant felt that we do ourselves a disservice by this long-standing confusion about whether IETF is an organization; they felt that people within the community know what is meant by the IETF and that more formality is not necessary. The point was made that any changes to the organization of the IETF will have practical implications, such as impacting legal transactions, which generally go through ISOC.

3.2. Funding Issues

Slide 12 of the slide deck [IASA2-Workshop-Slides] discussed the following issues related to the IETF funding model:

- o Meeting fees are currently an important source of revenue, but remote participation and other factors may be responsible for declining in-person meeting attendance going forward. Even if fees were charged for remote participation, charging the same for remote and in-person attendance is unlikely to be a viable way to make up the difference.
- o While there has been a lot of sponsor support for, e.g., meeting hosting, getting support for the full sponsorship program is not easy. The value to sponsors is not always obvious, the IETF community is sometimes critical or unappreciative, and the same sponsors get tapped again and again for many related but different opportunities.
- o Relying heavily on meeting-based revenue is somewhat at odds with the fact that much of the IETF's work takes place outside of in-person meetings.

- o The IETF is increasingly relying on professional services to support its activities, causing expenses to grow.

Workshop participants discussed funding issues faced by the IETF, including: increasing costs due to more tools, higher hotel fees, etc.; relatively flat growth in funding; meeting fees that do not cover operating expenses so that there is increased pressure on sponsorship and increased ISOC contributions. These funding issues are covered in [I-D.arkko-ietf-finance-thoughts].

Some workshop participants commented on how the willingness of sponsors to fund IETF is a useful measure of the IETF's relevance. That is, they said, looking for sponsors is a good way to measure support in the community. The commentor went on to say if sponsorship starts to dry up, it may be a symptom of larger problems, that the IETF is no longer relevant or at least becoming less relevant. This participant felt that the IETF needs to ensure its ongoing relevance and that the IETF needs to understand what it's offering. One commentor stated that while it's valuable to stay in touch with the engineers who understand how the Internet works, that may not justify their attendance at three meetings a year. It was felt that individual sponsors' goals and the goals of the IETF community will never line up perfectly, but that fact doesn't take away the need for clarity.

In terms of funding sources, participants commented that it is generally good for the IETF to have multiple sources of funding on which to stand. This participant further stated that diversity in funding sources allows IETF to shift gears: IETF endowment can provide longer-term stability; Long-term sponsorship, such as the Global Host program (\$100k per year for 10 years, also stated as the best way to support the IETF as an organization); meetings can be funded through fees (although registration fees are prohibitive for many) and sponsorships. However, explaining the need for diversity of funding is more complicated than it needs to be. One participant felt that we probably need to find a simpler story.

Specifically, participants discussed a potential mismatch between the IETF's activities and its funding model, which is mainly constituted from meeting fees. Questions raised included: What is the right proportion for meeting-based revenue? What are the alternative methods to fund the non-meeting-based activities? Sponsorships? Do we hire staff or contract to provide assistance?

While ISOC currently makes up any current budget shortfalls for IETF (after meeting fee and sponsorship income), a participant commented that the assumption that ISOC's primary purpose is to fund the IETF is more strongly held in some corners than others. At the same time,

this commentor said that another school of thought believes that the .org contract that funds ISOC requires ISOC to ensure the support of the IETF, so is a core goal of ISOC. Another commentor said that after consulting some of the people involved when the .org contract was given to ISOC, the IETF was clearly only a part of the public interest the .org contract mission sought to fulfill. Further, another commentor noted, those in local ISOC chapters don't think that IETF is a purpose of ISOC, let alone the main purpose.

In terms of the relative amounts of funding from sources, a commentor mentioned that the level of funding that the IETF receives through Global Hosts is much smaller compared to the sponsorship funding of many large-scale open-source projects (e.g., \$500K/year per sponsor), and the IETF could be getting a lot more money through this source.

Further, in terms of sponsorship funding, a participant state that it's not often a cut-and-dry proposition, requiring a larger, more diffuse commitment than a sponsor may originally expect. For example, this participant noted that meeting sponsors are also responsible for extra work like printing T-shirts and staging social events, and there is a lot of risk to a meeting sponsor if they get anything wrong (presumably in terms of backlash from the community). This aspect of logistics and event programming is an area of expertise that few IETF participants have, so sponsors often have to get their marketing departments involved, for example. A commentor said, if sponsors could focus on just securing the money, where someone else would worry about the logistics problems, that would help.

There were also issues discussed with communication to potential sponsors and funders what they are agreeing to. A workshop participant felt that the IETF needs to be able to clearly state what it is asking for, and what the relevance is for the potential sponsor. One participant stated that it's unclear now who is responsible for communicating these messages to funding sources, Further this participant said that it's unclear how this outreach is done and if it is done well, especially for large sponsors. One commentor states that it seems like there are two types of organizations the IETF is looking for - those involved in the Internet ecosystem, and those interested in standards. This person felt that honing outreach to both of those types of organizations would be helpful. Another commentor stated that the same sponsors are asked for support over and over again. This person further asked about how new companies are sought out and developed for potential support. One commentor noted that outreach appears to be split between the various IASA parties. A commentor stated that when ISOC is raising funds on behalf of the IETF, its relationship to the IETF needs to be clearly communicated.

Participants offered up some perspective as current and past IETF sponsors through their own organization. One participant noted that they consider it unusual to fund the IETF through a third party (ISOC). This can raise approval and audit questions inside the sponsor company, and the sponsor is left guessing as to when the IETF might receive the money they contribute. Finally, this participant wondered if this indirect structure makes sense in the future or if it can be made direct. The structure also makes it difficult to contribute to the IETF endowment for the same issues and because there is no independent organization managing and reporting on the IETF endowment. Thus, perhaps a different level of financial and administrative separation from ISOC would be helpful for fundraising in the future, both for supporting the IETF generally and for the endowment.

Some commentors talked about what kinds of support were easier to secure from their organizations. An IETF participant may be more inclined to seek, and find it easier to gain, sponsorship for easily communicated and defined activities, for example, the Systems Lunch. For activities like these, commentors noted that IETF participants may do a better job than staffers hired to solicit funding, and we should distribute the solicitation work as best as we can.

3.3. Transparency and Communication Issues

Slide 9 of the slide deck [IASA2-Workshop-Slides] discussed the following issues involving transparency and communication:

- o IAOC has typically been perceived to operate less transparently than what is the norm for IETF processes and other IETF leadership bodies.
- o Lack of transparency has some roots in concerns about confidentiality of contract terms and business relationships, and fear of community reaction to administrative decisions.
- o Requirements from the community about IAOC transparency expectations are not clear.

Some said that the IAOC and IASA could better communicate with the IETF community. IASA has lagged progress of groups like the IESG, who have made agendas and meetings open. Participants felt that the IETF community should document the transparency requirement clearly, e.g., set the default to be open, such as open meetings and materials, and publish an exception list for confidential or sensitive matters. Hotel contracts aren't shown due to confidentiality agreements, and there have been some arguments about that reducing transparency of meeting deals. One workshop

participant identified fear as a significant cause of lack of transparency. A commentor offered two potential sources of fear: making a decision that the IAOC knows the community won't like, and having a situation where there is a Last Call and all of the previous conversations the IAOC has had are rehashed.

With regards to IAOC communication to IETF, some said that we could use a better understanding of what needs to improve and where it can improve. A commentor felt that the IAOC could do better in telling the community what it does and how it makes decisions. However, another commentor noted, now that plenary time has been shortened, the community doesn't get to see the IAOC, and this reduces the opportunities for the community to understand what they do. This commentor noted that participants have said that they don't want exposure to the boring details at the plenaries - "which are boring until they're not, and then everyone is surprised." Another participant asked, how we encourage the IETF community to understand the IAOC and role of the IASA to best reduce these poor outcomes? One suggestion was for the IAOC to hold information sessions or office hours at meetings, to allow people to raise concerns and ask for guidance. This could help the community get to know the IAOC and have people volunteer. Some felt that the IAOC needs to provide insight into what the IAOC is going to do, as opposed to what it has just done. This commentor felt that telegraphing for a few years may improve the level of education. It could help with transparency without running afoul of the confidentiality of contracts. Some felt that a Last Call for some IAOC things is worthwhile, but other, more mundane tasks don't need it. A participant mentioned that the IAOC should document the basis for a decision, rather than the mere fact of it.

3.4. Staff and Volunteer Resource Issues

Slide 8 of the slide deck [IASA2-Workshop-Slides] discussed the following issues involving staff and volunteer resources:

- o IAD workload is (much) more than a full-time job, but we have one staff person allocated to it.
- o IASA tasks touch on a wider variety of topics and require more different kinds of expertise than 10 years ago (visa issues, local social/political/health issues, new modes of fundraising, etc.), but the job descriptions and skill sets of staff and volunteers do not always match these needs.
- o Very few community members have the time, support, and interest to stand for the IAOC (or even participate in administrative

discussions, unless something goes astray), and many who do are self-funding their work.

Much of the discussion at the workshops regarding staff and volunteer issues focused on the IAOC committees. Committees allow the IAOC to draw in expertise in a particular area, without burdening committee members with the overall task of IAOC responsibility. One participant observed that the function of the committees seems to go pretty well, but sometimes scope and authority in relation to the IAOC are unclear. They asked, who's really in charge of the committee? Who is leading the discussions and making decisions? What kind of decision is being made? Who is supporting those decisions? Another participant noted that a committee can make a recommendation that is subject to easy reversal by the IAOC, which can provide an undercurrent of doubt when discussions take place.

A participant said that, although IAOC committees are listed on the IAOC website (<https://iaoc.ietf.org/committees.html>), there is a lack of documentation about how the committee participants are chosen. Elaborating the expertise and skills needed can be a challenge. For some teams it is necessary to have paid staff or contractors. Examples of paid contractors include the IETF lawyer, and some of the site visit and meeting contract negotiation staff. Last year the IAOC asked for volunteers from the community and added participants to several committees.

A Workshop participant noted that, in order to understand how the committees work, one needs to understand the requirements and dependencies on contractors and other support structures, which is complicated and not generally well understood. The commentor further asked, what are the contractors doing? What effort is required to serve as a volunteer? A participant felt that the committee composition of volunteers plus paid staff may cause confusion about participants' roles, and also cause control and accountability issues. Another person said that the lack of encouragement for participation in committees might be a disincentive for IAOC participation. However, one workshop participant was surprised at the number of participants involved in IAOC committees as well as the varied mix of roles - volunteers, contractors, staff - which can make it hard to assess if a committee member was serving as a paid hand, policy maker, or somewhere in between.

3.5. Internal IAOC Organizational Issues

Slide 11 of the slide deck [IASA2-Workshop-Slides] discussed the following issues specific to internal IAOC organizational matters:

- o The IAOC has 4 ex officio members (IETF Chair, IAB Chair, ISOC CEO, IAD (non-voting)), and 5 appointed members. One of 5 members is appointed by the ISOC Board of Trustees, and is traditionally expected not to stand for IAOC Chair. This yields -
 - * A small pool from which to select the IAOC Chair
 - * A small pool from which to select the IETF Trust Chair
 - * Very few (2, by the time you've appointed IAOC and Trust Chairs) "worker bees" for the IAOC
- o Requiring that the IAOC and the IETF Trust be constituted by the same group of people overloads the job responsibilities of both roles, narrows the pool of individuals willing and able to serve on the IAOC, and creates the potential for conflicts in cases where the creation of Trust policies requires IAOC oversight.
- o Requiring that the IAB chair serve on the IAOC overloads the IAB Chair's job responsibilities and narrows the pool of people willing and able to serve as IAB Chair. The same may be true for the IETF Chair.

Some workshop participants wondered if better communication, for instance, knowing about IAOC activities early enough to affect them, would translate into more people wanting to participate in the IAOC. Information about the IAOC can be made available in email and on the website, but that may not inspire people who don't care about administrative issues to volunteer. A workshop participant stated that having people spend time just on the technical work would be a success, but relying on volunteers for the IAOC's large volume of work may be unreasonable.

It was pointed out that populating the IAOC is difficult because there are so many leadership positions, and only those appointees from the IESG, IAB, and the two appointed by NomCom can be Chair. One of those four people will always be the Chair, and another of those four will chair the IETF Trust. Another participant said that there is a tradition of the ISOC Board of Trustees appointee not standing for chair, but that is not a requirement, and the IAOC could move away from it. It's important that the appointers choose people who have interest in chairing, otherwise the pool gets smaller. A workshop participant said that they had heard stories that NomComs did not know what to look for when appointing someone to the IAOC. One participant followed up to say that in their experience, NomComs have looked for someone to clearly represent the IETF community, to act as a balance against the institutional appointees. This

participant noted that This goal is probably in contrast to finding a good chair.

Participants noted that the ex officios bring much knowledge to the IAOC and they need to be participants, but they don't have the time. One way to solve that would be to increase the regular membership of the IAOC. There needs to be a way for the community to pick additional people.

The question was asked: to what extent is the IAOC an oversight body? A participant felt that if the community wants the IAOC to be able to do more than provide the thinnest layer of oversight, then it needs to revisit how to populate the IAOC. Another commentor felt that in order to make any changes to the IAOC, the community needs to understand the current roles and responsibilities of its members.

A commentor said that the IETF Trust requires talent separate from the rest of the IAOC tasks. This commentor said that maybe it is no longer convenient that the IAOC and Trust are together, given the IANA stewardship transition and the need for IAOC feedback to the Trust concerning the IANA IPR. However, this commentor felt that this is a secondary issue compared to other issues raised during the workshops. When asked if the Trust could be smaller, workshop participants responded that size was not an issue aside from getting quorum occasionally (this has only happened once or twice). Another commentor felt that the size and composition of the IETF Trust should be determined by its role, which needs to be discussed. Currently, the IETF Trust has a light workload.

4. Security Considerations

This document describes the challenges and opportunities of the IETF's administrative support activity. It introduces no security considerations for the Internet.

5. IANA Considerations

This document has no actions for IANA.

6. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the participants of the IASA 2.0 workshops for their thoughtful insights.

7. Informative References

[Arkko-2016]

Arkko, J., "Proposed Project: IETF Administrative Support 2.0", 2016, <<https://www.ietf.org/blog/2016/11/proposed-project-ietf-administrative-support-2-0/>>.

[I-D.arkko-ietf-finance-thoughts]

Arkko, J., "Thoughts on IETF Finance Arrangements", draft-arkko-ietf-finance-thoughts-00 (work in progress), February 2017.

[I-D.daigle-iasa-retrospective]

Daigle, L., "After the first decade: IASA Retrospective", draft-daigle-iasa-retrospective-00 (work in progress), October 2016.

[IASA-Org-Chart]

IETF, "IASA 2.0 Workshop #2 Slide Deck; Slide 5: IASA Organizational Chart", 2017, <<https://www.ietf.org/proceedings/interim-2017-iasa20-01/slides/slides-interim-2017-iasa20-01-sessa-iasa-20-workshop-2-02.pdf#page=5>>.

[IASA2-Workshop-Slides]

IETF, "IASA 2.0 Workshop #2 Slide Deck", 2017, <<https://www.ietf.org/proceedings/interim-2017-iasa20-01/slides/slides-interim-2017-iasa20-01-sessa-iasa-20-workshop-2-02.pdf>>.

[IASA20-1100UT-rec]

IETF, "Recording: IASA 2.0 Virtual Workshop, 28 February 2017 (1100 UT)", 2017, <<https://ietf.webex.com/ietf/ldr.php?RCID=ef0761bb5806958ce37a631b20fa2910>>.

[IASA20-1600UT-rec]

IETF, "Recording: IASA 2.0 Virtual Workshop, 28 February 2017 (1600 UT)", 2017, <<https://ietf.webex.com/ietf/ldr.php?RCID=ee9f475275e8758dc55d73b11c851d00>>.

[IASA20-proceedings]

IETF, "IASA 2.0 Virtual Workshop Proceedings", 2017, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/interim-2017-iasa20-01/session/iasa20>>.

[RFC4071] Austein, R., Ed. and B. Wijnen, Ed., "Structure of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)", BCP 101, RFC 4071, DOI 10.17487/RFC4071, April 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4071>>.

Appendix A. Participants

We list here participants in each virtual workshop (as listed in the WebEx recording "Participants" list).

A.1. Participants in the 1100 UTC virtual workshop

- o Alissa Cooper
- o Eric Rescorla
- o Gonzalo Camarillo
- o Greg Wood
- o Hans Peter Dittler
- o Jari Arkko
- o Joseph Lorenzo Hall
- o Lars Eggert
- o Leslie Daigle
- o Lou Berger
- o Randy Bush
- o Scott Bradner
- o Sean Turner
- o Stephen Farrell
- o Suzanne Woolf

A.2. Participants in the 1600 UTC virtual workshop

- o Alexa Morris
- o Alia Atlas

- o Alissa Cooper
- o Ben Campbell
- o Avri Doria
- o Ben Campbell
- o Bob Hinden
- o Cindy Morgan
- o Dave Crocker
- o Desiree Miloshevic
- o Gonzalo Camarillo
- o Greg Wood
- o Hans Peter Dittler
- o Henrik Levkowitz
- o Jari Arkko
- o Jason Livingood
- o Jean Mahoney
- o Joel Halpern
- o Joseph Lorenzo Hall
- o Kathleen Moriarty
- o Laura Nugent
- o Leslie Daigle
- o Mat Ford
- o Peter Yee
- o Ray Pelletier
- o Richard Barnes

- o Robert Sparks
- o Russ Housley
- o Scott Bradner
- o Spencer Dawkins
- o Suresh Krishnan
- o Suzanne Woolf

Authors' Addresses

Joseph Lorenzo Hall
CDT

Email: joe@cdt.org

A. Jean Mahoney

Email: mahoney@nostrum.com