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Advisory Committee Report

• Analysis of our existing administrative organization and requirements for change
• In RFC-Ed pub queue
  – draft-iab-advcomm-01.txt
IETF Mission Statement

• Intended to capture the purpose for which we all meet and contribute our work
• To be discussed in more detail, later
• draft-alvestrand-ietf-mission-00.txt
Administrative Restructuring

Motivation

- draft-alvestrand-adminrest-motivation-00.txt
- “To put it succinctly, the IETF is in need of making some significant operational choices in order to evolve and continue to be able to fulfill its mission. Under today's operational model, these decisions have to be made by each organization supporting or funding an IETF function -- ISOC may seek more organizational support; IANA, Secretariat or the RFC-Editor may decide to scale back services to save money; the Secretariat may have to vary the meeting fees to meet their own costs. We believe there needs to be a single focus of the IETF's administrative management to allow these choices to be made and implemented in a way that is will allow the entire IETF effort to remain viable and relevant. A proposal for structuring that single focus is outlined in [3].”
Proposal for Administrative Restructuring

• draft-daigle-adminrest-00.txt
  – architecture/requirements
  – “specification” to follow

• Proposes a new piece of the IETF effort:
  – Responsible for administrative interface with Secretariat, RFC-Ed, IANA
  – Handles the financials
  – Responsible to the community through its board

• Will require full time management skills
  – Expect it will hire someone
Practical Overview

• Putting together the administrative pieces to tackle projects such as
  – better tools for WG support (issue tracking)
  – better tools to coordinate tracking work between I-D’s, RFC-Editor, IANA

• where “administrative pieces”, above are:
  – coordination of necessary funds
  – oversight of contracted work
  – clear accountability/responsibility to IETF community
  – not done directly by the IAB and IESG
Status

• Daigle & Alvestrand documents are Internet-Drafts
  – comments on documents, to authors
  – comments on proposal to IAB & IESG
Intended next steps

• Refining the proposal documents, based on input
• Specific implementation proposal
• Working with ISOC to establish a project to start taking on some of that coordination and development work now
• Continued monthly status reports on ietf@ietf.org
Questions for clarification?