Working Group Chairs Workshop for

D. Crocker

dcrocker@sgi.com / +1 415 390 1804 Silicon Graphics

Hello

- INTRODUCTION
- What are we doing here, at this hour?
- process There is only rough consensus about the
- AGENDA
- I. IETF structure
- II. Formal process
- III. The inner working group
- IV. Conflict resolution

The need for working group chair training

- IETF LARGE, DIVERSE
- Process increasingly formal
- No voting means (very) rough consensus
- DIFFICULTY MAKING PROGRESS AND BEING FAIR
- Listen to all points of view
- Keep working group focus
- CHAIRS OFTEN UNCLEAR ABOUT LIMITATIONS AND **AUTHORITIES**

Documents

- THE INTERNET STANDARDS PROCESS (RFC 1310)
- WORKING GROUP GUIDELINES (IN PROGRESS)
- HANDBOOK, LYNCH & ROSE, EDS.] ["EVOLVING THE SYSTEM" IN INTERNET SYSTEM

IETF Structure

Internet Society

ISOC

legal cover

liaisons Design cohesion, process appeals, IETF Internet Architecture Board

Staff support

IETF secretariat

Internet Engineering Steering Group IETF oversight

IESG

AD

Area director

Oversight for specific working groups

Manage a working group to a productive

WG chair

Working group The people who do the work

Working group roles

CHAIR OVERSEES ENTIRE PROCESS, BUT:

Facilitator Process management, things fair,

focused, on time

Judge

driver towards "right" choice Evaluation of technical options and

Record-keeper and editor of

Scribe documents

- WORKING GROUP IS JURY, PROVIDING IDEAS, REVIEW, CONSENSUS
- GROUP WITH COMMON VISION, PROVIDING CORE EFFORT DESIGN TEAM IS PRIMARY ADVOCATE AS SELF-SELECTING

Formal Process

- FORMAL LABELS FOR A SPECIFICATION
- DEVELOPMENTAL STEPS
- ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

Formal labels

Internet draft:

no official standing, fluid working document

Proposed Standard:

 stable spec, no known errors, might have implementation

Draft Standard:

multiple, interoperable implementations testing all functionality

Internet Standard:

field experience and clear community acceptance (and use)

IETF acceptance criteria

Competence:

technically sound

Constituency:

providers & users

Coherence:

clear writing

Consensus:

rough but clear

- BIRDS OF A FEATHER (BOF)
- ability to pursue topic "Market research" to determine interest and
- Optional, one-shot meeting
- 1. CHARTER

Role: Public announcement &

Checkpoints: project management plan What is to be pursued What will be delivered How it will be pursued Milestones and dates

Scope:

Product

Approach:

- 2. DOCUMENT SPECIFICATION

- Clarity of purpose Clarity of writing Clarity of solution
- 3. WG CONSENSUS
- Clearly dominant agreement
- decision resolved by agreement to make some Diversity of opinion about solution may be
- agreement about whole Agreement about parts may permit eventual

- 4. Area director approval
- Technical review
- Process review
- Independent review when results of wg in question
- 5. Submission to IESG
- Via secretariat & AD

- 6. LAST CALL
- Request for final feedback from IETF
- cracks or content that might have slipped through Intended to detect major errors in process
- Not intended as formal, full review
- 7. IESG REVIEW (& APPROVAL)
- May conduct independent review

- (7.5) IAB CONFLICT RESOLUTION
- If formal challenge not resolved by IESG
- 8. RFC PUBLICATION
- RFC editor has publication criteria

III. The inner working group

- THE LIVES OF A CHAIR
- GROUP STYLE
- GROUP ROLES
- DEVELOPMENTAL PHASES (PROBLEM SOLVING 101)
- VENUES
- DEBATE
- CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

The lives of a chair

- HOW TO KEEP FROM BEING SAT ON
- Agenda & schedule
- Adequate debate, but not more than that
- Maintain clear focus
- group desires Rehash only if constructive and working
- PROACTIVE MANAGEMENT
- Maintain pressure for forward progress
- progress stalled Escalate to IETF management when

Working group style

- FREE-FLOWING
- Cohesive group
- Clear purpose
- TIGHTLY-MANAGED
- Complex topic
- Group diversity
- Major differences in philosophy

WG management roles

Facilitator:

thorough airing of views and ensuring fairness and a

alternatives

Judge :

evaluation of choices and movement towards choice

Scribe:

keeping track of things

Design team:

effort, when wg diverse & topic complex; must work to keep wg consensus Primary advocates for the core

Working group:

Jury & other contributors

Problem solving 101

- PROBLEM STATEMENT
- SOLUTION EXPLORATION
- SOLUTION ADOPTION
- SPECIFICATION REFINEMENT

Discussion & decision venues

- EMAIL
- International participation
- Inefficient, but extensive
- The real place for consensus
- Can be run as "meetings"
- FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS
- Well-advertised ahead of time
- Inherently restricted attendance
- Limited time
- Need for clear agenda and crisp management

Email vs. Meetings (One person's perspective)

- **WORKING GROUP** WG RESULTS MUST SHOW APPROVAL BASED ON ENTIRE
- MEETINGS HAVE LIMITED ATTENDANCE
- TREAT MEETINGS AS "STRONG INDICATOR" PRIMA FACIE **BASIS FOR DECISIONS**
- **ENSURE VERIFICATION THROUGH EMAIL**

Debate

- CAN CLARIFY PURPOSE, IMPLICATIONS, ALTERNATIVES
- CAN TEAR THE GROUP APART
- MUST BE TOLERATED AND EVEN ENCOURAGED, UNTIL RESOLUTION OR IMPASSE

IV. Conflict Resolution

- PREFERABLE TO SOLVE WITHIN WORKING GROUP
- 1. Conflict types
- 2. Timing of objections
- OFTEN CAN'T
- 3. Chain of appeal

1. Conflict types

TECHNICAL

Specific detail: minor vs. show-stopper

Basic philosophies: rarely resolved

PROCESS

Unfair practice:

usually claim against wg chair

Topic missed:

oops. (showstopper?)

2. Timing of objections

- TECHNICAL SHOWSTOPPERS WELCOME ANYTIME
- SMALL DETAILS WELCOME ONLY AT TIME WG COVERS THE SUBJECT
- PHILOSOPHICAL DEBATE WELCOME ONLY AT TIME WG MAKING DECISIONS ABOUT APPROACH
- UNFAIR PRACTICE COMPLAINTS ALLOWED WHENEVER INFRACTION FELT
- WG MAY ALLOW TOPIC TO BE RE-OPENED IF WG FEELS ISSUE COMPELLING OR NEW ALTERNATIVE INTRIGUING.

3. Chain of appeal

- WG CHAIR
- AREA DIRECTOR
- AREA DIRECTOR FOR STANDARDS MANAGEMENT
- IETF CHAIR
- IESG
- IAB

If you can keep your head when those around you...

- intentioned Most IETF members are remarkably well-
- Differences happen
- Tempers often flare, but then settle down
- Not all differences can be settled
- working group, respect the opinion, but When minority view clearly will not sway move on
- Ask questions
- Make it happen!