Individual Submission   B. Haberman, Ed.
Internet-Draft   Johns Hopkins University
Intended status: Informational   J. Arkko
Expires: January 8, 2018   Ericsson Research
                                                                L. Daigle
                                              Thinking Cat Enterprises LLC
                                                             J. Livingood
                                                                  Comcast
                                                                  J. Hall
                                                                      CDT
                                                              E. Rescorla
                                                               RTFM, Inc.
                                                             July 7, 2017

                     IASA 2.0 Design Team Recommendations
                       draft-haberman-iasa20dt-recs-00

Abstract

   The arrangements relating to administrative support for the IETF were
   created more than ten years ago. Since then, there has been
   considerable change in the tasks and in our own expectations. The
   IETF community has discussed these changes and the problems they
   cause. The community has some sense of the properties they expect
   from future arrangements, including structural and organizational
   changes, changes to volunteer and staff personnel resources, and
   transparency changes.

   This document is a product of a design team, focused on providing
   additional information to the community about solution options, as
   well as supporting analysis of the implications of those options. To
   be clear, the community is responsible for adopting any
   recommendations or making any final decisions.

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 January 8, 2018.

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

   The arrangements relating to administrative support for the IETF
   (referred to as the "IETF Administrative Support Activity" (IASA)
   [RFC4071]) were created more than ten years ago, when the IETF
   initially took charge of its own administration. The arrangements
   have served the IETF reasonably 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. What administrative
   arrangements best support the IETF in the next ten years?

   The system has experienced various challenges and frustrations along
   the way, for instance around meeting arrangements. There are also
   some bigger questions about how the organisations are structured, for
   instance about the division of responsibilities between IETF and
   ISOC.

   The IETF community has discussed and continues to discuss these
   topics, most recently on the "IASA20" mailing list and BOF at IETF98.
   Alissa Cooper, the Chair of the IETF, convened a small design team to
   start evaluating potential options going forward. The purpose of the
   design team is to provide material that informs the community
   discussion, both in terms of providing a bit more worked through
   solution ideas, as well as supporting analysis of the implications of
   those options. This information, along with all other input provided
   in the discussion, hopefully helps the community and IETF leadership
   decide what next steps to take.

   To be clear, the community is in charge of adopting any
   recommendations or making any decisions. This draft, the output of
   the design team's considerations, has no particular official
   standing.

   Once an initial version of this draft is published, the authors would
   like to ask feedback particularly on two aspects:

   o If the set of options outlined in the draft covers the options
      that should be looked at.

   o If the analysis of the implications of the options is correct.

   Once this discussion completes, it becomes feasible to discuss what
   the conclusions or recommendations ought to be, and which
   recommendations the community should adopt. It should also be noted
   that IETF administrative matters have been organised jointly with

ISOC, and it is important that ISOC be involved in the process of looking at the reorganisation.

As a base for this work there was a good articulation of the set of problems we are facing in [I-D.hall-iasa20-workshops-report] and [I-D.daigle-iasa-retrospective]. The community discussion seems have indicated also some of the outcome properties that are expected. The scope of the solutions explored included:

o Structural and organizational changes, both externally (with ISOC and contractors) and internally (within the IAOC and subcommittees)

o Changes to personnel resources, both volunteer and paid

o Transparency changes

Changes to the funding model are out of scope to the extent they fall outside the categories above.

The rest of the document is organised as follows. The next two sections (Section 2 and Section 3) describe the background and summarise the challenges noted in the community discussion. The two sections after that (Section 4 and Section 5) explain what categories of changes were considered, and describe the primary options for structural changes. The following two sections (Section 6 and Section 7) focus on analysis of the different options along with conclusions and recommendations.

2. Background

The administrative support structure is intended to be responsive to the administrative needs of the IETF technical community.

RFC 4071 [RFC4071] defines the current IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA). It is an activity housed within the Internet Society (ISOC), as is the rest of the IETF. RFC 4071 defines the roles and responsibilities of the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC), the IETF Administrative Director (IAD), and ISOC in the fiscal and administrative support of the IETF standards process. It also defines the membership and selection rules for the IAOC.

As RFC 4071 notes, IASA is distinct from IETF-related technical functions, such as the RFC Editor, the IANA, and the IETF standards process itself. The IASA has no influence on the technical decisions of the IETF or on the technical contents of IETF work.

Today, IASA's activities support a number of functions within the IETF system:

o Meeting planning

o Budget and financial management

o Contracting with and overseeing the secretariat

o Contracting with and overseeing the RFC Editor (together with the IAB)

o Contracting with and overseeing IANA (together with the IAB)

o Legal ownership of IETF materials, domain names and copyright

o Ownership of IANA-related domain names and copyright

o General legal support (including topics beyond domains and IPR)

o IETF website

o IETF IT services

o Tooling support, maintenance, and development (together with volunteers)

o Meeting network support

o Remote attendance support

o Communications assistance for the IETF

o Sponsorship and funding (together with ISOC)

2.1. Terminology

The following acronyms are used in this document:

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 in the current IASA system - A largely IETF-selected committee that oversees and directs IASA. Accountable to the IETF community.

o IAOC committees - Recognizing the need for specialized attention
   for different branches of work requiring IAOC oversight, the IAOC
   expanded its support by creating committees. Currently, the
   committees do the heavy lifting on specific tasks, while the IAOC
   is the one responsible for final decisions.

o ISOC - The Internet Society - The organizational home of the IETF,
   and one that in the current IASA system assists the IETF with
   legal, administrative, and funding tasks.

o IAD - IETF Administrative Director - In the current system, the
   sole staff member responsible for carrying out the work of the
   IASA. An ISOC employee.

o IETF Trust - In the current system the IETF Trust acquires,
   maintains, and licenses intellectual and other property used in
   connection with the administration of the IETF. Same composition
   as IAOC.

3. Challenges

   Discussion leading to this document has been framed by the issues
   discussed on IETF mailing lists and documented elsewhere
   [I-D.daigle-iasa-retrospective], [I-D.hall-iasa20-workshops-report],
   [I-D.arkko-ietf-iasa-thoughts]. The reader is referred to those
   documents and ongoing discussion on the IASA20@ietf.org mailing list
   for fuller details on the range of challenges facing the IETF in its
   handling of administrative matters.

   In summary, the key areas of challenge that have shaped this work
   are:

o The range of IETF administrative tasks have grown considerably; we
   must ensure that we have the right structure, community
   involvement and level of staffing to address them effectively and
   efficiently.

o The relationship and division of responsibilities between the IETF
   and ISOC have changed, as both organizations have grown
   considerably in the last decade.

   The joint organisation that supports the IETF has grown rather
   organically, and would benefit from re-assessment and possible
   reorganisation.

o Community expectations of transparency of administrative actions
   and execution from the administration could be better aligned.

o Lack of predictably of funding levels combined with regular
   shortfalls.

   We face continued challenges related to funding IETF activities on
   a background of increasing costs. We must properly manage
   expectations about locations of meetings (broadening of IETF
   engagement, sponsor preferences) while balancing against
   operational practicalities. And we must ensure that we continue
   to not be influenced by funding entities on the technical work of
   the IETF.

Of the items above, the first two are largely to be addressed by
structural updates, while the last two groups are more about
discussing tradeoffs and updating documented expectations.

4. Considering a Change

   Given that a change seems necessary, what might that change include?
   There seem to be three broad categories of IETF organisation that
   will be affected:

   1. overall structure

   2. oversight

   3. interfaces and expectations to rest of the IETF

   The overall structure also includes questions such as whether IETF is
   an organisation and its relationship to ISOC.

   There are some interconnections between different aspects of
   reorganisation. For instance, how IETF defines its relationship to
   ISOC will have some implications on what kind of oversight structure
   is needed; a more independent, free-standing organisational model for
   IETF would imply new functions for the IASA.

   There are a number of choices to make within the reorganisation
   effort. In particular, IETF's relationship to ISOC could be arranged
   in a fundamentally similar manner than it is today, but improved,
   e.g., to make clear who is expected to control a particular part of
   the operation. But the relationship could also be arranged in a
   different way, for instance, as a subsidiary of ISOC or as a more
   free-standing, independent organisational unit.

4.1. Goals

   The IASA redesign effort needs to address the main challenges listed
   above. More specifically, a new organisational structure needs to do
   at least the following:

   o Define the roles of IETF and ISOC in a way that helps the above
      structure be as clear as possible, in terms of who does what, how
      are things accounted for, and who is in charge of adjustments and
      control (e.g., staff resources). A redesign needs to propose a
      starting point for the financial arrangements between IETF and
      ISOC, either as they are now or changed in some fashion. It must
      also be clear to people outside the IETF and ISOC organisation
      (e.g., sponsors) what the arrangements are and what their
      contributions affect and do not affect.

   o Define the roles of the oversight entities and staff/contractors
      to match the grown size of the tasks. Ensure that we have a
      structure that can adapt to future growth and other changes.

   o Accommodate strategic, operational, and execution tasks within the
      administrative efforts, and take into account the limited
      availability of IETF volunteers for performing administrative
      tasks. The new design needs to ensure that overload in such
      things as operational decisions does not affect the ability to
      drive strategic changes.

   o Set expectations and limits of those expectations on the different
      parts of the system. This includes but is not limited to
      community expectations of transparency.

   o Ensure that future IASA organizational structure and processes
      preserves and protects the IETF's unique culture of individual
      contribution, clear separation of financial support from technical
      work, as well as rough consensus and running code.

5. Reorganisation Options

5.1. Overall Structure

   The design team believes that there are three general approaches to
   evolving the IASA function. The options generally focus on the
   relationship between the IETF and ISOC. Changes to this relationship
   directly affect how the IASA function gets carried out.

   It should be noted that all three options require more administrative
   budget per year than what is currently allocated for IASA functions.
   In addition, they will most likely require a more predictable level

of ISOC funding, rather than the current model of a base funding
level combined with periodic infusions to cover shortfalls.

The following subsections describe each option. Section 6 highlights
their pros and cons and effectiveness in comparison to the goals
stated earlier.

5.1.1. IASA++

In the IASA++ option, the IETF and ISOC maintain the current
structural relationship. This means that the IETF remains an
organized activity of ISOC, ISOC maintains funds and contracting
authority on behalf of the IETF, and all IASA staff are ISOC
employees.

While the relationship remains the same, the IETF and ISOC will make
improvements to the relationship in order to enhance the
functionality of the IETF. The following are some potential
improvements that could be made under this approach:

o Provide clarity and transparency about authority, responsibility,
   budgeting, and allocation of staff time for all IETF-related work
   and activities.

o Add IASA staff to better reflect the increased workload on what is
   now a single staff member.

o Provide clarity about authority of the IAOC in reviewing
   performance of IASA staff.

o Re-structure the internal IETF organization and appointment
   processes for the IAOC and the IETF Trust to address current
   challenges.

o Establish IETF community consensus about who has policy authority
   for administrative decisions where there is currently a lack of
   clarity.

Some specific changes to make these improvements are discussed in
Section 5.2 regarding board and staff work divisions. While in this
option there is no need for a formal board, there is still a need to
redefine the role of the IAOC. The necessary staff changes are
discussed in Section 5.3.

It would also be necessary to improve IAOC transparency. In the
IASA++ option, in addition to the general improvement needs in this
area, there is an added need to continue the improvements relating to
accurate accounting of resources and actions on the ISOC side.

5.1.2. ISOC Subsidiary

   In this option, an ISOC subsidiary would be created as the new legal
   home of the IETF. A subsidiary can have its own bank account, by-
   laws, charter, board of directors/trustees, staff, and corporate
   identity. As a subsidiary of ISOC, the IETF and ISOC can share
   overhead and resources. The IETF would likely rely heavily on
   contractors for most administrative tasks.

   As a subsidiary of ISOC, the IETF could eliminate the IAOC and
   replace it with a board of directors/trustees (see Section 5.2).
   Administrative decision-making authority would rest primarily with
   the administrative staff, with oversight provided by the board (see
   Section 5.3. Exception cases could be developed where board approval
   would be required to authorize strategic decisions.

   Other likely changes could include:

   o Transfer existing IETF-related contracts between ISOC and
      contractors to be between the subsidiary and contractors.

   o Multiple options to structure community involvement in
      administrative decision-making (e.g., committees organized by
      subsidiary staff).

   There are also other possible changes that would need further
   discussion:

   o Eliminate the IETF Trust and have the IETF subsidiary assume
      responsibility for the IETF's intellectual property rights (IPR).
      This would simplify the overall structure, but would also bundle
      the IPR with the rest of the IETF operations. Note that the IETF
      Trust currently holds IPR also on behalf of the users of IANA.

   o Transfer existing ISOC funds earmarked for the IETF to the
      subsidiary's bank account, and have future IETF income held in
      that subsidiary's bank account.

5.1.3. Independent Organization

   In this option, a new non-profit organization (e.g., IETForg) is
   created independent from ISOC as the new legal home of the IETF.
   IETForg would have its own bank account, by-laws, charter, board of
   directors/trustees, staff, and corporate identity. The
   administrative staff for IETForg could be kept lean and would likely
   rely on contractors for the bulk of administrative tasks. Minimally,
   the IETForg staff would be responsible for administration,
   development/fundraising, communications, and personnel management.

As an independent organization, the IETF could eliminate the IAOC and replace it with a board of directors/trustees. Administrative (day-to-day) decision-making authority would rest primarily with IETForg staff and contractors, with oversight provided by the board. Exception cases could be developed where board approval would be required to authorize strategic decisions. Again, further detais regarding the board and staff changes are in Section 5.2 and Section 5.3.

Other likely changes could include:

o Transfer existing ISOC funds earmarked for the IETF to IETForg, and have future IETF income held by IETForg. ISOC would still be largest IETForg sponsor, if funding is maintained at current projections.

o Transfer existing IETF-related contracts between ISOC and contractors to be between IETForg and contractors.

o Multiple options to structure community involvement in administrative decision-making (e.g., committees organized by subsidiary staff).

Other possible changes that may need more discussion would include possible change in the role of IETF Trust, as discussed in Section 5.1.2.

5.2. Oversight

Oversight is obviously affected by what we decide to do with the relationship to ISOC. A bigger, more independent role for the IETF would require an IASA board to be designed for that. Nevertheless, some change in the role of an oversight body and the work division between it and staff is necessary in any case.

Also, the design team believes the role of the community members serving in the IASA needs to be kept at a level appropriate for volunteer service (see community role in Section 3 and limits in Section 4.1).

Beyond this, there are a number of choices in division of responsibilities and the structure of the organisation. The key decision points are:

o Whether the community representative or board control of the IASA is at the level of individual administrative decisions (as it is today) or at a more traditional board level of control, i.e., strategic direction, budgets, and key personnel choices.

o Whether the interface to the community is via staff or a community
   representative or board function.

5.2.1. Strategic Board

In this option, the current IAOC is disbanded and replaced by a
traditional oversight board, common in most non-profit organisations.
This board, the IASA Board (IB), acts to set strategic direction for
IETF administrative matters, sets budgets, provides fiscal oversight,
provides high-level oversight about major new projects, and so on.
The board is also responsible for hiring and assessing the
performance of the Executive Director (the highest-level staff
director, see Section 5.3).

This option is potentially valid for all overall structure choices
outlined in Section 5. However, for the ISOC Subsidiary and
Independent Organisation options, the board would have to be a formal
board, typical of other non-profit organisations.

The board works with staff who is empowered to carry out the
operations as directed by the board. The staff is responsible for
operating within the limits set by the board, and are accountable to
the board. Including being hired and fired as needed. The staff's
responsibilities include:

o preparing for and making decisions on their agreed and budgeted
   areas (for example, meeting venue decisions)

o operational execution of these decisions, including contracting
   with vendors

o communicating with the community

o development of the IETF's administrative operation, in
   consultation with the community

The primary difference between this option and the current IAOC
arrangements is that board acts at a higher decision level, and is
not involved either in detailed decisions. These are tasks reserved
for the staff, and the board's role is to oversee that staff performs
appropriately in their role.

The composition of the board needs careful attention. It is
important to have regular IETF participants in the board, but at
least some of the board members need to have skills and experience
less common among IETF participants, namely non-profit management,
budget experience, and ability to help make connections to raise

money or provide advice about fundraising (all of which are typical
for a non-profit board).

One potential model for populating the board is a Nomcom-selection
for 2/3 of the board members and some other type of selection for 1/3
of the board members with a view for more independent, well-networked
members. However, the responsibility of the board and the manner in
which board members are selected are separable design matters.

5.2.2. Strategic Board and an Advisory Council

In this option, there is a board and staff just like in
Section 5.2.1, but in addition, an Advisory Council (AC) provides an
interface to the community on matters that require assessing
community opinion. For instance, the current polling of community
feedback relating to potential future meeting locations could be one
such matter.

An advisory council canvassing and pulling for this information might
be a better approach than either free-form mailing list discussion,
or the relatively opaque process that is currently used. Advisory
board results could be documented in the same fashion as IESG
documents last call results. Some IAOC site decisions have been done
in this way, summarising feedback received, others with less
information.

The advisory council would be comprised of IETF community members and
selected by Nomcom, and would benefit from having either the IETF
Chair or another IESG member as a liaison. The advisory council
would not make decisions about how the IETF should run, but it would
be available for the staff to consult whenever they needed a view
from the community, and it would also be available to run community
discussion processes or to get input from the community to funnel
back to the staff. The advisory council would have a well-defined
interface to the IESG as well.

The separation of the board and the advisory council, with some
overlap between them, allows the allocation of people to tasks
according to their skills. We can have experienced managers involved
in hiring, firing, and reviewing the Executive Director and
overseeing the budget, while we have experienced community people
giving the perspective of the community.

5.3. Staff Structure

The design team believes that staff resources need to increase and/or
be reorganised in order to move from one director to a few more
specialised roles (see growth in Section 3). And In addition, the

team believes that future organisation for IASA may benefit from
organising all resources under the more clear and direct control of
the IETF (see division of responsibilities in Section 3 and roles in
Section 4.1).

The current arrangement involves one officially designated IASA
employee, but there are also many supporting employees. They are
less clearly assigned for the IETF, working as contractors or at
ISOC.

This document suggests a structure that involves the following roles:

o Executive Director. The person in this role is in charge of the
   overall IASA effort, but can rely on other staff members below as
   well as contractors. The Executive Director is accountable to the
   Board.

o Director of Operations. This person is responsible for meeting
   arrangements, IT, tools, managing contracts (including RFC Editor
   and IANA), and day-to-day budget management.

o Director of Fundraising. This person is responsible for working
   with IETF's sponsors and other partners, and his or her primary
   responsibility is fundraising for the IETF.

o Director of Communications. This person is responsible for
   working with IETF leadership (including the IETF Chair, IESG, and
   IAB) on communications matters (primarily but not exclusively
   external communications), assisting them in efficient
   communication and dealing with ongoing communications matters.

Note: The Executive Director likely needs to be a full-time employee,
as is likely the case for the other Director-level positions.

These persons also need to rely on a number of contractors and
outside specialists. For instance, a Legal Counsel, to assist the
IASA on legal matters as well as contracting.

6. Analysis

This section provides a basic analysis of the effects of the
different options.

6.1. Criteria

We use the following criteria based on the goals stated earlier
(Section 4.1):

o The arrangements match the scale of the task (SCALE)

o The arrangements are designed to evolve as situations evolve
   (EVOLVE)

o Accommodates strategic tasks (STRAT TSK)

o Accommodates operational and execution tasks (OPS TSK)

o Avoids overload in one class of tasks preventing progress in other
   (OVERLOAD SEP)

o Clarifies the relationship between IETF and ISOC (CLEAR ISOC REL)

o Allows direct IETF control of resources (e.g., staff) working on a
   task (DIR CONTROL)

o Preserves IETF culture and mode of operation (CULTURE)

o Separates IETF technical work and administrative tasks and funding
   (WORK SEP)

o Sets expectations on what can or can not be expected from IASA
   (IASA EXP)

6.2. Overall Structure

6.2.1. Pros and Cons

   Table 1 highlights the pros and cons of the IASA++ option.

+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+
| Pros | Cons |
+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+
Maintains familiar structures	Does not provide the IETF with
and relationships	true independence of funding or
	staff from ISOC
+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+
Start-up costs limited to	Creates risk that challenges
those associated with hiring	present in the current IASA will
additional staff	not actually be solved or will
	re-emerge over time
+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+
Does not require legal and	Potentially requires ISOC to
administrative work to	cede more authority to the IETF
incorporate a new entity	community or increase
	transparency beyond ISOC's
	comfort zone
+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+
Allows IETF to continue to	Continuing confusion about
rely on ISOC to somewhat	alignment between ISOC and IETF
frictionlessly compensate for	on policy and standards matters.
budget shortfalls if necessary	
+--------------------------------+--------------------------------+

Table 1: IASA++ Pros and Cons

Table 2 highlights the pros and cons of the ISOC subsidiary option.

Pros	Cons
Forces some delineation of responsibility, staff, and funds between the IETF and ISOC	Leaves open some potential for continued lack of clarity about authority and funding between the IETF and ISOC
Provides the IETF community with greater authority over IETF administration	Potentially requires ISOC to cede more authority to the IETF community or increase transparency beyond ISOC's comfort zone
Can leverage existing ISOC legal structures and personnel to keep administrative work required to incorporate subsidiary to a minimum	Requires legal and administrative work to incorporate subsidiary
Requires less IETF community volunteer time commitment to administrative matters than current IASA	Vests more decision-making authority in paid staff than under current IASA
Allows IETF to continue to rely on ISOC to somewhat frictionlessly compensate for budget shortfalls if necessary	Start-up costs include costs of incorporating the subsidiary and re-organizing/hiring additional staff
Allows IETF to continue to leverage expertise of ISOC administrative personnel	Continuing confusion about alignment between ISOC and IETF on policy and standards matters.

Table 2: ISOC Subsidiary Pros and Cons

Table 3 highlights the pros and cons of the independent organization
option.

Pros	Cons
Eliminates all ambiguity about IETF having authority independent from ISOC over staff, funds, and decisions	Start-up costs include legal and administrative costs to incorporate a new entity, hire new staff, transfer contracts and funds
Provides the IETF community with potentially complete authority over IETF administration and funding	ISOC's financial support for the IETF may be viewed as more tenuous if the IETF is a legally separate entity from ISOC
Requires less IETF community volunteer time commitment to administrative matters than current IASA	Ability for the IETF to rely on ISOC in the event of budget shortfalls may be more limited
Allows for direct investment in small number of professional staff specifically tailored to the IETF's needs and culture, while continuing to rely heavily on contractors	Vests more decision-making authority in paid staff than under current IASA
Provides opportunity to structure board in such a way to overcome current challenges with IAOC structure	Requires more from board members than what is currently required of IAOC insofar as hiring and evaluating staff
Removes need for alignment between ISOC and IETF on policy and standards matters.	Requires IETF to assume legal risk currently assumed by ISOC

Table 3: Independent Organization Pros and Cons

6.2.2. Comparison to Criteria

   For the overall structure, the implications of the current situation
   and the three options are summarized in Table 4.

```
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
| Criteria | Current    | IASA++   | ISOC      | Independent    |
|          | situation  |          | Subsidiary| Organization   |
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
| SCALE    | NO         | NO       | YES       | YES            |
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
| EVOLVE   | NO         | NO (Note | MAYBE     | YES (Note 1)   |
|          |            | 1)       | (Note 1)  |                |
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
| STRAT TSK| NO         | NO (Note | YES       | YES            |
|          |            | 1)       |           |                |
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
| OPS TSK  | YES        | YES      | YES       | YES            |
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
| OVERLOAD | YES        | YES      | YES       | YES            |
| SEP      |            |          |           |                |
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
| CLEAR    | NO         | NO       | YES       | YES            |
| ISOC REL |            |          |           |                |
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
| DIR      | NO         | NO       | YES       | YES            |
| CONTROL  |            |          |           |                |
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
| CULTURE  | YES        | YES      | YES       | YES            |
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
| WORK SEP | YES        | YES      | YES       | YES            |
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
| IASA EXP | NO         | MAYBE    | MAYBE     | MAYBE (Note 2) |
|          |            | (Note 2) | (Note 2)  |                |
+----------+------------+----------+-----------+----------------+
```

Table 4: IETF-ISOC Relationship Implications

Note 1: Evolution in the current system is more difficult than if
IETF was either clearly a subsidiary or its own organisation. This
is because changes need agreement from two organisations, and, in the
current model, the control of IETF-dedicated resource is not as clear
as it could be. A subsidiary or independent model would also ease
driving any strategy that the IETF wants to drive, as decisions would
be more on the IETF side than something that today would require
negotiation with ISOC.

Note 2: Setting expectations is difficult merely based on an
organisational model. Certainly a clear separation between roles of
the board and staff helps. However, expectations are also a matter
of documentation, which would have be created and communicated.
Finally, expectations are a cultural matter, current IAOC
arrangements and community views have ended up in a situation where

there is a lack of trust and unclear models for what can or cannot be
expected.

6.3. Oversight

   For the internal organisation, the implications of the current
   situation vs. a strategic board model is summarised in Table 5.

```
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
| Criteria       | Current Situation | Strategic Board |
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
| SCALE          | NO               | YES              |
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
| EVOLVE         | MAYBE (Note 1)   | YES (Note 1)     |
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
| STRAT TSK      | NO               | YES (Note 2)     |
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
| OPS TSK        | YES              | YES (Note 2)     |
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
| OVERLOAD SEP   | NO               | YES (Note 2)     |
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
| CLEAR ISOC REL | n.a.             | n.a.             |
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
| DIR CONTROL    | n.a.             | n.a.             |
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
| CULTURE        | YES              | YES              |
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
| WORK SEP       | YES              | YES              |
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
| IASA EXP       | NO               | MAYBE (Note 3)   |
+----------------+------------------+------------------+
```

                Table 5: Internal Organization Implications

   Note 1: Given that the IASA is being reorganised, we acknowledge that
   the current structure is capable of evolving. However, the
   operational focus and overload in the current arrangements are making
   this harder than is necessary. Change requires action from outside
   of the IASA, rather than being a normal task within the IASA to
   evolve their own model. A strategic board that is not deeply
   involved in the operations should be able to look at evolution more
   easily. Similarly, a dedicated advisory council can help determine
   community concerns, and might be able to do this even better than a
   board. However, lines of authority between a strategic board and
   advisory council would need to be clearly delineated.

   Note 2: There may be a difference between the strategic board with
   and without an advisory council, in how overload situations and the

separation of different tasks goes. The existence of an advisory
council alleviates some workload on board or staff, particularly in
dealing with community opinion determination, freeing the board to do
its strategic work and staff to concentrate on operations and
execution.

Note 3: Setting expectations is difficult merely based on an
oganisational model, see Note 2 under Section 6.2.2.

6.4. Financial Impacts

There are two different classes of financially-relevant changes.
First, both the ISOC interface change and staff changes will imply
changes in what is being accounted for in budgets and reports, even
in cases where the actual work or the number of people stays the
same. That is, depending on the chosen overall organisation model,
some items that are currently in ISOC budget may move to become IETF
budget items, but the total amount of expenditure stays the same.
Note that the IETF already accounts for the expenses related to key
IETF support staff (e.g., IAD, communications, etc).

Secondly,there are some actual increases in required financial
resources. We expect all the alternatives to lead to somewhat higher
funding needs, and in fact shifting more work to staff from
volunteers is one of the goals. For the staff changes, the primary
position actually being added is having both Executive Director and
Operations Director, instead of one IAD. We've already had a Legal
Counsel and roles similar to the Director of Fundraising and
Communications Director. These chances coincide with other personnel
changes in IASA, as the experienced, long-term IAD is retiring. Even
from a learning curve point of view more people will be needed, but
in this case it also makes sense to have the organisation be less
dependent on one central person.

Given the learning curve effect, and a new organisation, it is
expected that the role of the Legal Counsel will also increase, e.g.,
in terms of reviewing contracts.

It is important to ensure that IETF funding is arranged in a manner
that is satisfactory to the IETF and ISOC communities. Further
comments and observations are welcome.

6.5. Other Impacts

Depending on the chosen option, volunteers are needed for either
different roles than today (the board) or for both different roles
and more volunteers (the board and the advisory council).

It is for further study whether current IETF leadership (e.g., IAB Chair) should continue to be part of these boards or councils.

7. Conclusions and recommendations

While there are some initial conclusions in the analysis in the previous sections, clearly more work is needed. In particular, we request and welcome thoughts and contributions from the IETF community, particularly regarding any potential missed options or the implications of options being considered here.

8. Acknowledgments

This text is the work of the design team, but greatly influenced by discussions in the IETF community. The team would in particular like to thank Alissa Cooper, Andrew Sullivan, Ray Pelletier, Ted Hardie, Gonzalo Camarillo, Brian Carpenter, Lucy Lynch, Stephen Farrell, Dave Crocker, Jon Peterson, Alexa Morris, Michael Richardson, Olaf Kolkman, Kathy Brown, and Melinda Shore for interesting discussions in this problem space.

9. Informative References

[I-D.arkko-ietf-iasa-thoughts]
          Arkko, J., "Thoughts on IETF Administrative Support
          Activities (IASA)", draft-arkko-ietf-iasa-thoughts-00
          (work in progress), March 2017.

[I-D.daigle-iasa-retrospective]
          Daigle, L., "After the first decade: IASA Retrospective",
          draft-daigle-iasa-retrospective-01 (work in progress),
          June 2017.

[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.

[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>.

Authors' Addresses

   Brian Haberman (editor)
   Johns Hopkins University

   Email: brian@innovationslab.net

   Jari Arkko
   Ericsson Research

   Email: jari.arkko@piuha.net

   Leslie Daigle
   Thinking Cat Enterprises LLC

   Email: ldaigle@thinkingcat.com

   Jason Livingood
   Comcast

   Email: Jason_Livingood@comcast.com

   Joseph Lorenzo Hall
   CDT

   Email: joe@cdt.org

   Eric Rescorla
   RTFM, Inc.

   Email: ekr@rtfm.com