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- Status and what feedback we're looking for
- High-level description of IASA 2.0 options
- Overview of feedback received so far
Status and desired feedback

- We do not yet have fully specified options for you
- And we have only started the analysis of the differences between options
- But we think we have an understanding of what options there are
- Looking for feedback on:
  - Whether we are missing top-level options or other aspects
  - What factors should be considered when comparing the options
  - Missing options or comparison factors would be most useful at this point, but all feedback is welcome!
  - (This meeting probably shouldn’t be about "let choose option D")
- Very thankful for feedback already received! (More on that later)
Areas of Possible Reorganisation

- Organisational structure
- Oversight
- Staffing
- Relationship to ISOC
IASA 2.0 Structural Options

- IASA++
- ISOC Subsidiary
- Independent Organization
IASA++

- IETF and ISOC maintain current structural relationship
- ISOC maintains funds and contracting authority on behalf of the IETF
- All IASA staff are ISOC employees
- IETF and ISOC will make improvements to the relationship to enhance functionality of the IETF
ISOC Subsidiary

• Create new ISOC subsidiary as new legal home of the IETF
• Subsidiary maintains its own:
  – By-laws
  – Bank account
  – Charter
  – Board
  – Staff
  – ...
• Potentially heavy reliance on contractors for administrative tasks
• Could eliminate IAOC and replace it with Board of Directors
• Administrative staff holds administrative decision-making authority (with oversight)
Independent Organization

• Create a new non-profit (e.g., IETForg) as new legal home of the IETF

• IETForg maintains its own:
  – By-laws
  – Bank account
  – Charter
  – Board
  – Staff
  – ...

• Potentially heavy reliance on contractors for administrative tasks

• Administrative staff notionally responsible for administration, fundraising, communications, and personnel
Other Reorganization Options

• **Oversight**
  - Related to relationship with ISOC
  - Role of oversight body WRT tactical vs strategic decisions
  - IETF community interface

• **Staffing**
  - DT view that staff size needs to increase
  - Administrative staff as ISOC employees or contractors

• **Relationship to ISOC**
  - Maintain similar relationship to what it is today
  - Increased autonomy
  - Implications on other vectors of reorganization
Open questions with the options

- Transfer of intellectual property
- Transfer of contracts
- Administrative oversight model
- Transfer of funds
- Structure of community involvement
Overview of feedback so far

- General document feedback
- Feedback on options
- IAOC strategic vs. operational
- Other feedback (transparency, IAOC selection, fundraising, etc.)
General document feedback

- Stephen: DT has only focused mostly on legal separation issue
- Stephen: Did not find Section 6 clear or convincing
- Stephen: Should write down what is working now that we need to be careful not to break (AMS staff, lack of membership)
- Brian C.: Problem statement in Section 3 is insufficient; need a consensus version of problem analysis
- Brian C.: add a goal to define how volunteer contributions to the tasks interface to staff and contractors, how volunteer effort is directed and managed
- Brian C.: need to understand the conditions and the dynamics that led to the IAOC becoming effectively an executive committee
• Brian C.: a couple of embedded perception issues in the document that are difficult to understand:
  
  – Perception of a lack of clarity about budget and money flow (which are perfectly clear to Brian C. from the published data, except for hidden staff costs)

  – Perception of confusion about alignment between ISOC and IETF on policy and standards matters (which has been clear to Brian C. since 1992 and has never changed)
Feeback on options

- Stephen: it may be impossible to come to consensus on whether or not IETF should become an incorporated entity
- Ted: clarity on incorporation won’t help us solve oversight miscalibration
- (offlist anon): do not to mess with the org-pir-isoc-ietf pipe
- Bob Hinden: should discuss financial implications of each option
- Bob Hinden: IETF Trust should be kept out of all of this; it is working and changing it risks effects like ICANN reconsidering having moved IANA trademarks and domain there
IAOC strategic vs. operational

- Ted: Oversight exercised by IAOC may not be appropriate (operational vs. strategic); an independent design axis
  - skeptical that the IAOC could not suddenly revert to a more strategic approach now; many processes and committees are built around the current way of working

- (offlist anon): skeptical of our ability to put in place a strategic management component as we havent done well in the past.

- Matt Ford: natural for us to get operational; will need to design mechanisms that disincentivize these tendencies

- Brian C.: missing bullet in 5.2: Whether the operational subcommittees (+volunteers) report to staff or oversight

- Brian C.: the “Directors of x” added by DT is arguably overdesign, should be ED that decides structure
Other feedback

• IASA Transparency:
  – Jordi: specify very clearly what is and is not open
  – Stephen: would prefer a default open rule with an amendable list of exclusions

• Selection of members of IASA committees
  – Jordi: unlike the Nomcom process, IASA committees have a bootstrapped membership; should be more formal
  – Bob Hinden: Unless we can understand how to fix the difficulty of NomCom finding qualified volunteers for the IAOC, how is it going to fill positions on a Board of Directors?

• IAOC responses to the community
– Jordi: IAOC should have a more formal flow for responding to community input with deadlines.

● Fundraising:
  – Bob Hinden: fund raising problem is not going to be fixed by adding a Director of Fundraising; the problems are more structural and caused by changes in the industry.

● Staff management:
  – Bob Hinden: IETF is not very good about is managing staff; If we are going to have more staff, then this needs to be dealt with (writing performance reviews, setting appropriate goals, fairly judging their performance, replacing them as needed)