

IETF 88 Administrative Plenary
Minutes: Amy Vezza, IETF Secretariat

1. Welcome

2. Host presentation - Yi Zhao, Huawei
<http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/88/slides/slides-88-iesg-opsplenary-4.pdf>

3. Reporting

- IETF Chair - Jari Arkko

<http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/88/slides/slides-88-iesg-opsplenary-2.pdf>

- IAOC Chair and IAD - Chris Griffiths and Ray Pelletier

<http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/88/slides/slides-88-iesg-opsplenary-5.pdf>

- IETF Trust Chair - Ole Jacobsen

<http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/88/slides/slides-88-iesg-opsplenary-3.pdf>

- NomCom Chair - Allison Mankin

<http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/88/slides/slides-88-iesg-opsplenary-6.pdf>

4. IAOC Open Mic

Introductions of IAOC

Stuart Cheshire - Makes a statement about the Hyatt sponsorship of the Sunday night Welcome reception and it seemed to him like a nice gesture.

Bob Hinden makes a statement about having had a hallway conversation with the hotel IT manager and how there is a good working relationship between the IETF and the Hyatt Regency Vancouver.

Wes George asks if the IAOC general's goal was to have venues contracted three years out why there was no announcements yet for 2016.

Ray Pelletier discusses the procedure of choosing areas that the IAOC has tried to set the 2016 meetings for Europe, the Americas, and Asia. At the beginning of the year, it was requested that South America be looked into as a possibility. Ray points out that with the inclusion of a possible South America meeting, the better time period for South America would be the March/April (Spring) meeting. This necessitated a change of the area lineup so they are slightly delayed announcing the cities for 2016 for the spring and summer meetings, but they should be announced by the end of 2013. They are on target to have the fall 2016 meeting signed and announced in Q1 of 2014 as is the expected timeframe.

Lee Howard thanks the IAOC for listening to the request to make the Admin Plenary content more useful.

5. IESG Open Mic

Introductions of the IESG members

Jari Arkko invites the attendees to the mic lines to ask questions or sing.

John Levine opens with a question about the new harassment policy. John encourages the IESG to not let the policy drop. He points out that while the ombudspersons will be trained, they will be amateurs and that he expects there will need to be a structure in place to support those people. He warns do not attempt to define harassment because then you run into the issue of people pushing the edges of the box to see how far they can go. But it is important to understand what the authority and levels of appeal are.

Jari Arkko pointed out that the policy was written with a lot of input from the community and that it is difficult to define harassment in any way. Human behavior isn't an engineering specification or protocol spec, and they will be going forward with that in mind and carefully with the selections of the ombudspersons. It may be existing appeals process will work, but it may need to be adjusted over time.

Dan Romascanu mentions he has been a liaison manager between the IETF and the IEEE and he has had a hard time explaining to the IEEE colleagues and anyone else from other standards organizations are about the dates of the milestones in our working group charters. He believes the situation is worse because he has seen charters out for review to other organizations without milestones or list of deliverables. Use the charter as contract between the IESG and the working group.

Benoit Claise agrees with Dan Romascanu.

Barry Leiba mentions that he believes that the text of the charter is the contract and if the text is not clear with regard to deliverables he wants the community to tell the ADs. The milestones may be useful to review if the schedule is reasonable, but as they are fungible he doesn't want give external organizations the image that the deliverable is done by X date when it may happen two years later. The text of the charter makes clear what the deliverables are and the milestones, if included, are extra information.

Sean Turner agrees with Barry. The text of the charter is more important than the milestones.

Stewart Bryant mentions a cultural difference between the IETF and other standards organizations is that the milestones and timelines are our best effort and we will make sure the quality is right where other standards bodies will ship on the date regardless of the error or completion state.

Pete Resnick notes that procedurally the milestones are changeable - the dates are changeable by the chairs themselves, the milestones add/subtract are changeable with the permission of the AD. The way we've been dealing with them is those are bookkeeping between the AD, the chairs, and the working group. The text of the charter is for solid information, not for possible document intended status (which is changeable), because that can't be changed without IESG approval.

Sean Turner mentioned that the IESG has overruled a working group in regards to the intended status of a document in the past.

Jari Arkko agrees that the state of the IETF Working Group milestones is bad. Out of date, sometimes new charters go out for review with no milestones, or old milestones that are out of date on new text. He asks Dan Romascanu if he agrees that the reasonable if the charter text is largely more important

Dan Romascanu states that he agrees that the text of the charter is more important. Thinking as an engineer, he takes timelines very seriously. He believes the IETF is out of balance - the IETF shouldn't neglect the list of deliverables or the timelines.

Joel Jaeggli wanted to see if he could get the milestones of some of his long lived working groups to reflect what the working group was working on. He's working at it and is hoping it is getting better, because he sees it as a problem as well. The milestones should reflect current work.

Gonzalo Camarillo notes as the liaison for 3GPP, if they want to know the status of a group sometimes it is impossible as it has been stated sometimes the milestones were off by years. He mentioned that his first year as an AD he had tried to solve that by requesting the milestones be updated reflect reality to but he got pushback from the community. So he tried suggesting if the milestones were not useful or up to date that they be removed from the charter, because they were confusing. He states people claimed even out of date milestones were useful to see the order of work items. He would like to see this fixed.

Ted Lemon generally agrees that the charter text is what is important. He wants to know if the current procedure of handling milestones is correct - between the AD and the working group chairs.

Dan mentions it is an implementation detail.

Ted Lemon agrees it is, but he would like clarification whether Dan thinks what we are currently treating as milestones should be in the text of the charter as part of the IETF consensus process.

Dan states he has a slight preference for making the milestones discussion part of the open process. It is a style he likes to have the open discussion of setting realistic milestones for other projects. But that it is delegated to the working group chairs or interaction between chairs and ADs is workable.

Ted states that what he understands is that Dan would like the Area Directors to do a better job with the milestones.

Dan agrees. He would like to see realistic dates and quicker updated revisions.

Pete mentions that the IESG has discussed this issue throughout the week.

Alan DeKok wanted to talk about the harassment policy. He thinks it is a good idea, but he can see where there can be problems at either extreme. One where the complaints are non-actionable "I feel harassed, but am not comfortable saying who" is a non-actionable. And one where people are well-intentioned, but it has gone past the point of harassment into illegal behavior, and that is where the policy should not apply, and the authorities should be involved as soon as possible.

Jari Arkko agrees in the domain of the police forces regarding illegal activities. Hopefully that is not something that will happen here.

Barry Leiba does not see the first example as a problem. In that case someone comes to the ombudsperson and needs to talk, and in so doing that talking helps the situation. It makes the person comfortable discussing the issue with the ombudsperson, and if the harassment should escalate to something they want to be more specific about, the person can feel comfortable enough to come to the ombudsperson again.

Alan DeKok agrees. He mentions how harassment is dealt with in other conferences in other areas, that you get rumors - "someone somewhere did that harassment thing" and the rumors end up causing all kinds of political issues, and should be squashed.

Jari reiterates that the conversations with the ombudsperson will be in complete confidence, and the ombudsperson will not be the source of any rumors.

Ted adds that the presence of the ombudsperson may prevent someone from going the rumor route.

Spencer Dawkins mentions not knowing what the right thing to do is, and the we will get smarter at this as we go. It may be similar to appeals, in that there will be a list of what needs to happen, and what should be provided. But we don't know enough to be able to come up with the procedure right now, but it will develop over time. Maybe some kind of expectation of what would be helpful to an ombudsperson would be a good thing.

Alan mentions that the issue of harassment gets into personal feelings. Policies and procedures can only go so far when dealing with personal feelings. Perhaps the best that the ombudsperson can do is validate and hear the person in the situation the procedure does not cover.

Jari hopes talking helps, but if there is something that is a real concern, appropriate action will be taken.

Alan remarks that if the situation is non actionable, have to listen, but in a situation it is actionable action should be taken.

Pat Thaler states the recent discussion of milestone discussion is the second or third discussion she heard this week comments that the IETF does it this way because we produce good standards and the other guys produce schlock. And she is a bit offended at that. In the document on the status of drafts and what "proposed standards" means there is a comment that states our standards are better standards.

Pete Resnick and Barry Leiba state that they heard those comments and the latest version does not have that text.

Pat notes that standards committees working under the same process can produce good standards as well as bad standards because the process has a lot to do with leadership. Leadership is partly about project management, and you can produce good things relatively on time. She states that if one of her groups slips by a few months it is okay because one sometimes needs to set milestones relatively aggressively to get the work done, but she has also seen milestones that were never going to be achieved because there was no reality in them. She would like to see a little tighter project management here and be able to count on the milestones more.

Jari Arkko agrees the IETF needs tighter project management.

Pat notes it doesn't mean sacrificing quality. Sometimes it helps quality.

Larry Masinter, with regard to milestones, this is an engineering task force. Larry notes he knows of no engineering organization and few research organizations that don't have at least estimates of their milestones, and some process by which if you don't make your milestone you explain why and what else needs to be done. You can change the date, but to make it explicit as to your best guess as to when you're going to get done with various parts and if the date has to change you have some reason, and a new, credible date. The fact that they can change is no reason to not give good faith estimates, and it is a standard process in any serious engineering effort.

Jari Arkko agrees with the assessment.

Sam Hartman has comments on milestones, and not the harassment but something related. He states Larry's experience is not his. He has been part of many engineering projects (open source and others) where long-term project planning wasn't part of the project because it didn't have value, or didn't have significant value enough to justify the cost. He mentions he has been a part of working groups whose milestones have been complete fiction because no one cares enough to do the work to come up with realistic estimates. It doesn't mean that the working group isn't doing valuable work, or people don't care about the work results. It means that people are more concerned with other things than project management on that sort of long-term scale. Sam states that if someone had come forward and said "I need to make some plans around this" I think people would have been responsive to that. I think there are some working groups that having an ordered list of milestones without dates would be much more valuable than what we have today, and it sounds like in other parts of the IETF having dates that are managed really well would be valuable to people. He says we have different groups doing different things with different requirements, and it would be good for our process to support that.

Sam Hartman also addressed the second issue related to the harassment policy - the larger diversity issue and discussions of discrimination that were made. What else is going on, where is the rest of that discussion?

Jari Arkko states that the IETF has been reaching further to the world in many ways, going to new places. There are programs by ISOC, we have mentoring, and newcomer training efforts, and the efforts ongoing in the diversity design team. Jari state he is not actually part of the team, and is unable to report what exactly

their most recent status is. There are a number of activities going on, and it is not one-IETF cycle worth of efforts and queries if Sam something specific related to diversity in the IETF.

Sam would like to see a report on the activities at the next IETF so it doesn't get lost. He states for an example of discrimination, not harassment, if someone decided they did not want to have any Asian chairs in their area. He mentioned he thought that would be bad, and would like a statement about that sort of thing.

Jari reiterates Sam would like an anti-discrimination policy put in place.

Sam agrees, and would like to see what the goals are, as many people have said they'd like to see goals, but the IETF as a whole hasn't gotten to a consensus position on that, nor has the IESG. He hasn't seen any statement from the IESG that they are seeking more diversity in their chairs, or that they are committed to that, and Sam believes that would all be valuable.

Brian Haberman responded to Sam's comments by stating a number of the ADs have taken some of the diversity issue to heart and have worked to get a wider diversity of people into the working group chair position. Brian doesn't think there is a need for an explicit statement for that, and he would rather be judged by the action taken to widen that diversity.

Sam states he has seen things he feels are not right, but hasn't felt empowered to do anything about it because the IESG hasn't specifically stated, in fact are pushing back on stating that this is something the IESG cares about. If the IESG has said this is something they would commit to then part of the implicit understanding would be if someone sees something happening that isn't right they could go to talk the IESG about it.

Jari responds to by stating that he thinks the IESG has been pretty clear that they value diversity quite a bit in all layers of the organization. The IESG has not made a formal statement, or had an IETF-wide discussion about a formal statement that gives all of our opinion not just the IESG opinion. Jari could entertain the idea that the IETF should do that.

Sam queries that one thing missing is if someone thinks something is wrong, where does that person take it? He states he can come up with answers for himself, but it is something the IESG could say, and he thinks it would be valuable to say.

Jari Arkko says that they could start with him. If anyone felt they had concerns of this nature they could start by talking to him.

Spencer Dawkins adds that something to remember that this was a very short IETF cycle, and that the IESG met with the diversity team in Berlin, and the IESG are still figuring stuff out. This was really quick for a lot of things including this. Two things - Spencer understands the value of the statements Sam is talking about, but if we say we value diversity and if someone comes in and says there are no left-handed working group chairs in the entire IETF, that matters more than the statement. What would be helpful is that people know who to talk to about things that just don't seem right.

Spencer continued by saying one of the ways to improve diversity is to have first or second time attendees not just bounce off and go home. The new attendees reception at this IETF was the best one he has been to in regards to the way it was laid out and the efforts everyone was making to engage everyone who walked in the room and get them to the right people. When I was on the IAB he quit going they were so crowded, and so confused and so loud he couldn't hear so he was just occupying space. He thinks it has been done well, and it will help diversity.

Michael [Richardson? audio recording is a bit garbled] has three comments about milestones. There is a bunch of proposed, or not yet committed to changes and fixes to the milestone stuff in the tool tracker that will make it a little easier. As a working group chair he'd like to write the sub-milestones in without necessarily needing to go to the AD. Second, he noticed a lot of milestones have not "publish as an RFC" but "submit document to the IESG." That is really craftily written whether by chairs or by the IESG, but it says the working group is done, there may be two years left of discusses, but the WG part is done. Third, as the chair, he is dealing with volunteers as authors and there are times some of them just disappear for a while and by the time the chair thinks to replace them they pop up again, so the chair has no idea what is going on. The IETF has a lot of data in the datatracker. Years ago in the XP space they described a velocity which was the number of ideal days to actual real days you could figure out. So you could map an estimate of effort divided by the duration it actually took to do things. It was rare to have a velocity of better than point five (0.5). In other words, it was rare to do better than half a day of useful work per day. That's like superhero good. For the IETF our velocity is like one day of useful work per three months. Probably a high velocity. It would be useful to do to figure out what those numbers are and maybe it would be useful to the IESG to look at the velocity of the working groups for red flags.

Sean Turner mentions that when he first started with the IESG he went and looked at the history of the documents to find out how often they've been revved [revised]. Sometimes its quick, but sometimes it is not. He had one document that hadn't been revised in 250 days and he went to the chairs and asked why they weren't done [with it] yet. That lit a fire and they got done. He's used that as a metric to figure out if anyone needs the work.

Michael mentions that is valuable.

Adrian Farrel asks if Michael would like WG chairs to use the milestones as tools to manage the working groups, or would he like the ADs to use the milestones as tools to manage the working group chairs.

Michael's reply is "Yes." He would like to have AD milestones for working groups that ADs control and working group chair milestones for working groups that the working groups control.

Jari suggested this being worked on at the IETF 89 code sprint.

Adrian requests time with Michael to review the milestones for his working group.

Michael agrees as all the milestones have 2012 as the predicted completion year.

Randy Bush states he is a recovering manager. He also states there are different management styles, different managers, and different projects. There is also micromanagement and he believes we are indulging in the latter.

Pete Resnick responds to Randy by stating that we are all engineers and tend to fall down into the weeds of the details worrying about the buttons are of the milestones but he thinks we've heard things that are actionable and useful about people need to manage and tools that we can work on.

Suresh Krishnan responds to Sam's comments about the diversity design team, they don't have a formal report because they haven't made a lot of ground breaking progress, but they have a working wiki that is full of a lot of items the community feels strong about. It is not about diversity, its about including people from diverse backgrounds. He can share a link with the discussion list after the plenary. Lots of positive things, cataloguing the needs of the community. They haven't had time to sit down as a team and prioritize the things to do - but people are taking items out of it and running with them. A lot of stuff has happened already. People are writing drafts, etc. There has been progress, but it's

not enough to come and present at the plenary. We hope to have a prioritized list to present to the community for feedback.

Kathleen Moriarty adds to what Suresh to add all the work ISOC is doing with the video and working with us. That was a big step. Program improvements are typically what makes the biggest difference for any diversity efforts as we learned from large companies who have gone down this path. ISOC had a booth at the Grace Hopper celebration which is young women in computer science from universities, and they asked me to go and represent the women of the IETF. That is where the code batch idea came out of, where she was able to talk to young women of computer science for three days. Hopefully other folks will do the same when exposed to an area where we want to bring other people into the IETF. She thinks its going to take time.

Jari Arkko notes we are doing many grassroots and practical things and not so much reporting in the plenary, and not so much grand statements, but all of believe it is very important work, so thank you and everyone else involved.

Dave Crocker notes that long ago when he moved from LA to Delaware to go to grad school he discovered he'd been living in a very sheltered environment. In Delaware he found a lot of the people were very casual about indulging in quite strong ethnic humor. He'd never been around it before and he found it shocking. He had a friend who worked on the line at Chrysler who was very funny and a source of a great deal of this humor. So Dave asked him about it and said that this was very racist, saying all these terrible things. And his friend replied it wasn't, because they said that about everybody, and you're only a racist if you focus on one group. Dave went on to say we have the view that we are all of us not biased. We are fair, we worry about diversity, we would never harass anybody. The reality is we don't actually understand the behaviors of these issues very well. Some of us do, some of us don't. As a group, we don't. Twice tonight someone up on the dais has said we don't really need to get very precise about this because I'm a good guy, and I know we need to worry about this topic. Worrying about it isn't enough. We need, as a community guidance that helps people understand in the harassment case what is acceptable and what is not, in the diversity case how to be more inclusive. Good intentions aren't enough.

Lee Howard states it is his shameful secret that he has an active project management certification. He is not interested in milestones. The definition of quality according to project management institute is good, fast, and cheap. Define how good, how fast, and how cheap you want it and if you meet your target then that is quality. He is much more interested in the definition in a charter how we will recognize whether the work has been done

well than proscribing when it will be done. Not just what should be done or what is in scope for discussion, but how do we know when it is done well. That is work I'd like to see in a charter.

Spencer Dawkins made some last comments about having a monitor on the stage helped immensely with allowing the people on the dais hear the questions from the audience and would like that to continue.

Jari Arkko ended the IETF 88 administrative plenary.

Other resources:

NOC Report

<http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/88/slides/slides-88-iesg-opsplenary-7.pptx>

IANA Report

<http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/88/slides/slides-88-iesg-opsplenary-0.pdf>

RFC Editor Report

<http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/88/slides/slides-88-iesg-opsplenary-1.pdf>