Hello

Agenda

- Process
- There is only rough consensus about the
- What are we doing here, at this hour?
- Introduction

I. IETF structure
II. Formal process
III. The inner working group
IV. Conflict resolution
The need for working group chair training

- Chairs often unclear about limitations and authorities
- Keep working group focus
- Listen to all points of view
- Difficulty making progress and being fair
- No voting means (very) rough consensus
- Process increasingly formal
- IETF large, diverse
Handbook, Lynch & Rose, eds.

"Evolving the System" in Internet System

Working Group Guidelines (in progress)

The Internet Standards Process (RFC 1310)

Documents
The people who do the work

Managing a working group to a productive

Oversee for specific working groups

Area Director

IETF Oversight

Internet Engineering Steering Group

Staff Support

IETF IAB

Secretariat

Internet Society

Legal cover

Internet Society

WG chair

AD

IESG

IETF Structure

I. IETF Structure
Group with common vision, providing core effort

Design team is primary advocate as self-selecting consensus

Working group is jury, providing ideas, review

Document records-keeper and editor of
driver towards „right“ choice
evaluation of technical options and
focused, on time
process management, thinks fair

Chair oversees entire process, but:

Working group roles
Acceptance Criteria

Developmental Steps

Formal Labels For A Specification

Formal Process
use

community acceptance (and
field experience and clear

functionality

implementation

errors, might have
stable spec, no known

working document

no official standard, this

Formal Labels

Internet Standard:

Draff Standard:

Proposed Standard:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus: Rough but clear writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coherence: Clear writing providers &amp; users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherency: Technically sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IETF Acceptance Criteria**
II. Developmental steps

0. Bird's eye view (BOV)

Market research to determine interest and
ability to pursue topic

Optional, one-shot meeting

1. Charter

Role:

Scope:

Approach:

Product:

Checkpoints:

What is to be pursued
How it will be pursued
What will be delivered
Milestones and dates

Public announcement
II. Developmental steps

- Agreement about whole project or parts may permit eventual decision.
- Diversity of opinion about solution may be clear.
- Clearly dominant agreement.

3. WG Consensus

- Clarity of solution.
- Clarity of writing.
- Clarity of purpose.

II. Developmental steps

- Via Secretary & AD

5. Submission to IESC Question

- Independent review when results of wg in

- Process review

- Technical review

4. Area Director Approval
II. Developmental Steps

- May conduct independent review
  7. IESC Review (x Approval)

- Not intended as formal, full review

- Cracks

- Intended to detect major errors in process

- Request for final feedback from IETF

- Last Call
I. Developmental steps

II. RFC editor has publication criteria

8. RFC Publication

If formal challenge not resolved by IESG (7.5) IAB Conflict Resolution
III. The Inner Working Group

- Conflict Management
- Debate
- Venues
- Developmental Phases (Problem Solving 101)
- Group Roles
- Group Style
- The Lives of a Chair
Progress stalled

- Escalate to IETF management when necessary
- Maintain pressure for forward progress

Proactive management

- Group desires
  - Rehash only if constructive and working
- Maintain clear focus
- Adequate debate, but not more than that
- Agenda & schedule

The Lives of a Chair

- How to keep from being sat on
Jury & other contributors
wg consensus
complex; must work to keep
effort, when wg diverse, is topic
Primary advocates for the core
keeping track of things
movement towards choice
evaluation of choices and
alternatives
through airing of views and
ensuring fairness and a

Working group:

Design team:

Scribe:

Judge:

Facilitator:

WG management roles
Problem Solving 101

- Specification Refinement
- Solution Adoption
- Solution Exploration
- Problem Statement
Discussion & decision venues

Face-to-face meetings
- Can be run as “meetings”
- The real place for consensus
- Efficient, but extensive
- International participation

Email

Need for clear agenda and crisp limited time
- Inherently restricted attendance
- Well-advertised ahead of time
Ensure verification through email

Treat meetings as "strange indicators" prima facie basis for decisions

Meetings have limited attendance

Working group WGs results must show approval based on entire person's perspective

Email vs. meetings
Resolution or Impasse: Must be tolerated and even encouraged, until

Can tear the group apart

Can clarify purpose, implications, alternatives

Debate
IV. Conflict Resolution

- Preferable to solve within working group
- Conflict types
- Timing of objections
- Often can’t
- Chain of appeal

3.
I. Conflict Types

- Topic Mised:
  - Unreal Practice:
    - Process
    - Basic Philosophies:
      - Specific Detail:
        - Technical

- Chair
  - Usually claim against wg
  - Often unresolved

- Minor vs. Show-Stopper

- Oop's (showstopper?)
2. Timing of objections

- Issue compelling or new alternative intriguing.
- WG may allow topic to be re-opened if WG feels infraction fell.
- Unfair practice complaints allowed whenever.
- Making decisions about approach.
- Philosophical debate welcome only at time WG subject.
- Small details welcome only at time WG covers the technical showstoppers welcome anytime.
Make it happen!

Ask questions

move on

working group, respect the opinion, but

When minority view clearly will not sway

Not all differences can be settled

Temper often flare, but then settle down

Differences happen

Intentioned

Most IETF members are remarkably well-

---

When those around you...

If you can keep your head