

problem working group update

agenda

- Background
- Charter
- Milestones and deliverables
- Administrivia
- Process
- Documents overview
 - Problem description (draft-ietf-problem-issue-statement-02.txt)
 - Process document (draft-ietf-problem-process-01.txt)

background

- There's a broad effort underway to improve IETF processes and results
- We need a problem analysis and clear description before changing IETF procedures or establishing new rules
- This working group was chartered in March 2003 to develop a description of existing problems and to propose processes for resolving those problems. **This working group is not chartered to propose solutions to the problems we identify**

charter

- This group is charged with:
 - producing a document describing the problems. This includes an analysis of root causes as well as derivative problems
 - a proposal for a process (or processes) to develop solutions to the problems identified by the working group

goals and milestones

- Done First I-D of problem statement issued
- Done Problem statement reviewed at the IESG Plenary
- Done 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

administrivia

- Chairs
 - Avri Doria <avri@apocalypse.org>
 - Melinda Shore <mshore@cisco.com>
- General Area Director
 - Harald Alvestrand <harald@alvestrand.no>
- Home page:
<http://www.ietf.org/html.charters/problem-charter.html>
- Mail archive:
<http://www.alvestrand.no/pipermail/problem-statement/>
- Issue tracker: <https://rt.psg.com>
(login ietf/ietf, queues are problem-statement, problem-process, and problem-other)

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 Hoffman <jeanette@wz-berlin.de>
 - Melinda Shore <mshore@cisco.com>

working process

- Editors produce initial drafts in consultation with editing team, content drawn from mailing list and elsewhere
- Normal IETF WG process, cycling drafts through discussion + IESG review
- Use of issue tracking system

problem description document

- Currently on -02 revision of document
- There's basic agreement on structure and contents
- There is still some dissent on specifics and newly-identified issues are still cropping up, but less often
- Should be able to put next iteration of document into WG last call

process document

- Currently on -01 draft
- Starting to work on nailing down consensus for proposals
- Organizes problems identified in problem statement into areas for improvement
- Categorizes areas into near-term and longer-term
- Proposes processes to address each area

problem areas

- Participants in the IETF do not share a common understanding of its mission
- The IETF does not consistently use effective engineering practices
- The IETF has difficulty handling large and/or complex problems
- Three stage standards hierarchy not properly utilized
- The IETF's workload exceeds the number of fully engaged participants
- The IETF management structure is not matched to the current size and complexity of the IETF
- Working group practices can make issue closure difficult
- IETF participants and leaders are inadequately prepared for their roles

criteria for near-term improvements

- We should address our most urgent, important problems
- The areas chosen should be cleanly separable, to allow multiple improvements to be carried out in parallel with minimal interference
- We should maximize the benefit vs. the cost of making the improvements (i.e. look for low hanging fruit)
- As much as possible, we should focus on improvements that are less likely to be completely invalidated by a longer-term reorganization of our management structure. This might be accomplished by focusing on improvements at the WG and participant levels, rather than at the IESG/IAB level

high-priority near-term proposals

- Improve WG quality processes and the effectiveness of document reviews at all levels
- Increase the availability and use of issue tracking and document sharing/revision control software in the IETF
- Improve training and resources for IETF leaders and participants at all levels
- Improved communication between WG chairs to identify and resolve inter-WG and inter-area problems
- Consider IETF processes or structures to better maintain IETF standards

other proposals

(This includes longer-term areas or issues which require structural changes.)

- Modify IESG-internal processes to make it impossible for one or two IESG members to indefinitely delay a document
- Modify IESG processes to delegate more responsibility to WG chairs, to directorates, to the IAB or to people in other formal or informal leadership positions.
- Modify the WG chair selection processes to widen the group of people considered, and consider ways to develop more leaders for the IETF.
- Initiate regular AD review of WG milestones and progress.

charter proposal, 'improve' working group

- Two focus areas:
 - Improving organizational scalability
 - Improving performance of standards track document process
- Two phases
 - Phase 1: document core values, mission, scope and goals of the IETF, try to define success metrics
 - Phase 1 deliverables include
 - A document describing the core values of the IETF that should not be compromised as a result of any reorganization or process changes.
 - A document describing the mission, scope and goals of the IETF.
 - A document describing how the IETF can recognize and measure our own success.
 - A set of performance baselines that characterize the recent performance of the IETF in achieving our mission and meeting and our goals.

charter proposal, 'improve' working group (cont.)

— Phase 2: Address structural issues

- Determine how the WG will identify, plan and execute any necessary improvements
- Solicit possible improvements from the community, and scour the problem-statement and solutions mailing lists for proposed improvements.
- Evaluate, scope and prioritize a set of improvements designed to increase the effectiveness of the IETF's organizational structure and standards track processes
- Implement the improvements (most likely by publishing BCP RFCs) After a suitable time, reapply the metrics developed in Phase One to determine if the improvements have been successful