

Problem WG IESG Status Update

IETF56

Plan

- Background
- Charter
- Milestones and Deliverables
- Administrative stuff
- Working process/editing team
- Current status of deliverables
 - Overview of first draft

Background

- During 2002 at IETF54 in Yokohama and IETF55 in Atlanta a significant number of thoughts about problems that exist with the way the IETF operates were discussed in the IESG Plenary
- Before trying to change the IETF procedures or establishing rules to deal with these problems the IETF should have a clear, agreed description of what problems we are trying to solve.

Charter

- This group is charged with
 - producing the document describing these problems. The analysis of the problem should seek out the root causes of the problems as well as the perceived derivative problems.
 - As a second work item, the group will also produce a proposal for a process to develop solutions to the problems identified by this working group.
 - It is not a part of this group's charter to propose solutions to the problems.

Goals and Milestones

Done	First I-D of problem statement issued
MAR 03	Problem statement reviewed at the IESG Plenary
MAR 03	First I-D of draft document describing the process by which the ietf will change its processes issued
MAY 03	Problem statement submitted for IESG review
JUL 03	Draft document describing the process by which the ietf will change its processes reviewed at the IESG Plenary
AUG 03	Draft document describing the process by which the ietf will change its processes submitted for IESG review
OCT 03	Re-charter or close working group

Administrative Stuff

- Active Working Group as of 6 March 2003
- Chairs:
 - Avri Doria [<avri@acm.org>](mailto:avri@acm.org)
 - Melinda Shore [<mshore@cisco.com>](mailto:mshore@cisco.com)
- General Area Director:
Harald Alvestrand [<harald@alvestrand.no>](mailto:harald@alvestrand.no)

Mailing Lists:
problem-statement@alvestrand.no

Archive:
<http://www.alvestrand.no/pipermail/problem-statement/>

Process

- Produce 1st draft in consultation with the editing team. Content drawn from discussions held on the list and elsewhere.
- Regular WG cycle of discussions and drafts + IESG plenary review
- Use of bug tracking for issues on the draft.

Editors and Editing Team

- Editors:
 - Problem Statement
Elwyn Davies <elwynd@nortelnetworks.com>
 - Process Recommendation
Margaret Wasserman <mrw@windriver.com>
- Editing Team
 - Rob Austein <sra@hactrn.net>
 - Dave Crocker <dcrocker@brandenburg.com>
 - Spencer Dawkins <spencer_dawkins@yahoo.com>
 - Avri Doria <avri@apocalypse.org>
 - Jeanette Hoffmann <jeanette@wz-berlin.de>
 - Melinda Shore <mshore@cisco.com>

Status

- 1st draft of Problem statement released and being reviewed on WG email list.

draft-ietf-problem-issue-statement-00

- Root Cause approach
 - Differentiate derivative from primary cause
 - Current organization of draft is provisional
- Initial thoughts
 - Problems are not new
 - Problems are not all IETF specific
 - Many are consequences of growth
- The Aim is Improvement,
not Finger-pointing

Initial list of root causes

- The IETF does not have a common understanding of its Mission
- The IETF does not use Effective Engineering Practices
- IETF contributors appear to be less engaged than in earlier days
- Authority and Influence in the IETF are concentrated in too few hands
- IETF Decision making processes are flawed
- IETF Participants and Leaders are inadequately trained

The IETF does not have a common understanding of its Mission

- The IETF is unsure what it is trying to achieve
- The IETF cannot determine what its 'scope' should be
- The IETF is unsure who its customers are
- Working Groups can potentially be hijacked by sectional interests
- The misty vision has restricted the associated architectural view to an outline top level view.
- The lack of precision regarding goals reflected in WG charters and requirements

The IETF does not use Effective Engineering Practices

- Lack of explicit quality auditing
- Lack of written guidelines or templates for the content of documents
- Poorly defined success criteria
- Lack of criteria for determining schedule slip or failure
- Tools to support the engineering process are minimal
- Do not develop test tools for verifying that protocols meet specifications
- Insufficient project entry, goal setting and tracking processes
- WG charters have insufficiently granular milestones
- even where the IETF does have Engineering Practices defined, there are frequently cases where they are ignored or distorted

IETF contributors appear to be less engaged than in earlier days

- Although there may be large attendances at many WG meetings, in many cases 5% or less of the participants have read the drafts which are under discussion or have a bearing on the decisions to be made
- Commitments to write, edit or review a document are not carried out in a timely fashion.
- Little or no response is seen when a request for 'last-call' review is issued either at WG or IETF level.

Authority and Influence in the IETF are concentrated in too few hands

- IESG/IAB and alumni appear to be a ruling class
- IESG/IAB insufficiently accountable
- Management and technical review processes currently in place insufficient for an organization this size
- Current IESG processes allow one (or two) IESG members to block or veto the work put together and approved by the many in a Working Group, possibly without good reason being given

IETF Decision making processes are flawed

- The IETF appears to be poor at making timely and reasonable decisions that can be guaranteed to be adhered to during the remainder of a process or until shown to be incorrect.
- Revisiting decisions stops the process moving forward, and in the worst cases can completely derail a working group.
- the decision making process must allow discussions to be re-opened if significant new information comes to light or additional experience is gained which appears to justify alternative conclusions for a closed issue.

IETF Participants and Leaders are inadequately trained

- No consistent training in the principles of the organization or means of carrying out the processes
 - voluntary and inconsistent processes
- First-time non-compliance with unwritten rules by newer participants is sometimes treated as an opportunity for abuse rather than by recognition of a training failure
- Lack of training compounded with concentration of influence in the 'ruling class' can lead to newcomers being ignored during discussions, consequently being ineffective either in their own eyes or their employers and so leaving the IETF.

Discussion

- Began here
 - Join us at the WG meeting
Friday AM
 - Participate on the mailing list.
-
- Above all, read the draft
 - Then read it again
 - And comment