

[Note that this file is a concatenation of more than one RFC.]

Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)
Request for Comments: 7437
BCP: 10
Obsoletes: 3777, 5078, 5633, 5680, 6859
Category: Best Current Practice
ISSN: 2070-1721

M. Kucherawy, Ed.
January 2015

IAB, IESG, and IAOC Selection, Confirmation, and Recall Process:
Operation of the Nominating and Recall Committees

Abstract

The process by which the members of the IAB and IESG, and some members of the IAOC, are selected, confirmed, and recalled is specified in this document. This document is a self-consistent, organized compilation of the process as it was known at the time of publication of RFC 3777, with various updates since that version was published.

Status of This Memo

This memo documents an Internet Best Current Practice.

This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has received public review and has been approved for publication by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Further information on BCPs is available in Section 2 of RFC 5741.

Information about the current status of this document, any errata, and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7437>.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2015 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Definitions	4
3. General	5
3.1. Completion Due	5
3.2. Nominating Committee Principal Functions	5
3.3. Positions To Be Reviewed	6
3.4. Term Lengths	6
3.5. Mid-term Vacancies	7
3.6. Confidentiality	8
3.7. Advice and Consent Model	9
3.8. Sitting Members	11
3.9. Announcements	12
4. Nominating Committee Selection	12
4.1. Timeline	12
4.2. Term	12
4.3. Structure	13
4.4. Chair Duties	14
4.5. Chair Selection	14
4.6. Temporary Chair	14
4.7. Liaisons	15
4.8. Liaison Appointment	16
4.9. Advisors	16
4.10. Past Chair	16
4.11. Voting Volunteers	16
4.12. Milestones	17
4.13. Open Positions	17
4.14. Volunteer Qualification	18
4.15. Not Qualified	18
4.16. Selection Process	18
4.17. Announcement of Selection Results	19
4.18. Committee Organization	20
5. Nominating Committee Operation	20
5.1. Discretion	21
5.2. Selection Timeline	21
5.3. Confirmation Timeline	21
5.4. Milestones	21
5.5. Voting Mechanism	22
5.6. Voting Quorum	22
5.7. Voting Member Recall	22
5.8. Chair Recall	23
5.9. Deliberations	23
5.10. Call for Nominees	24
5.11. Nominations	24
5.12. Candidate Selection	24
5.13. Consent to Nomination	25
5.14. Notifying Confirming Bodies	26

5.15. Confirming Candidates	26
5.16. Archives	26
6. Dispute Resolution Process	27
7. Member Recall	28
7.1. Petition	28
7.2. Recall Committee Chair	29
7.3. Recall Committee Creation	29
7.4. Recall Committee Rules	29
7.5. Recall Committee Operation	29
7.6. 3/4 Majority	29
7.7. Position To Be Filled	29
8. Security Considerations	30
9. References	30
9.1. Normative References	30
9.2. Informative References	30
Appendix A. Changes Since RFC 3777	31
Appendix B. Oral Tradition	31
Appendix C. Nominating Committee Timeline	32
Acknowledgments	35
Author's Address	35

1. Introduction

This document is a revision of and supercedes BCP 10. It is in essence a republishing of [RFC3777] and the other RFCs that updated that document into a single specification. The result is a complete specification of the process by which members of the IAB and IESG, and some members of the IAOC, are selected, confirmed, and recalled as of the date of its approval.

Section 4 of [RFC4071] provides further details about the IAOC positions that are filled by the nominating committee.

The following two assumptions continue to be true of this specification:

1. The Internet Research Task Force (IRTF) and Internet Research Steering Group (IRSG) are not a part of the process described here.
2. The organization (and reorganization) of the IESG is not a part of the process described here.

The time frames specified here use IETF meetings as a frame of reference. The time frames assume that the IETF meets three times per calendar year with approximately equal amounts of time between them. The meetings are referred to as the First IETF, Second IETF, or Third IETF as needed.

The next section lists the words and phrases commonly used throughout this document with their intended meaning.

The majority of this document is divided into four major topics as follows:

General: This is a set of rules and constraints that apply to the selection and confirmation process as a whole.

Nominating Committee Selection: This is the process by which the volunteers who will serve on the committee are selected.

Nominating Committee Operation: This is the set of principles, rules, and constraints that guide the activities of the nominating committee, including the confirmation process.

Member Recall: This is the process by which the behavior of a sitting member of the IAOC, IESG, or IAB may be questioned, perhaps resulting in the removal of the sitting member.

A final section describes how this document differs from its predecessor [RFC3777].

An appendix of useful facts and practices collected from previous nominating committees is also included.

2. Definitions

The following words and phrases are commonly used throughout this document. They are listed here with their intended meaning for the convenience of the reader.

candidate: A nominee who has been selected to be considered for confirmation by a confirming body.

confirmed candidate: A candidate that has been reviewed and approved by a confirming body.

nominating committee term: The term begins when its members are officially announced, which is expected to be prior to the Third IETF to ensure it is fully operational at the Third IETF. The term ends at the Third IETF (not three meetings) after the next nominating committee's term begins.

IETF Executive Director: The person charged with operation of the IETF Secretariat function. (See Section 2 of [RFC3710]).

nominee: A person who is being or has been considered for one or more open positions of the IESG, IAB, or IAOC.

sitting member: A person who is currently serving a term of membership in the IESG, IAB, or ISOC Board of Trustees.

3. General

The following set of rules apply to the process as a whole. If necessary, a paragraph discussing the interpretation of each rule is included.

3.1. Completion Due

The completion of the annual process is due within seven months.

The completion of the annual process is due one month prior to the Friday of the week before the First IETF. It is expected to begin at least eight months prior to the Friday of the week before the First IETF.

The process officially begins with the announcement of the Chair of the committee. The process officially ends when all confirmed candidates have been announced.

The annual process is comprised of three major components as follows:

1. The selection and organization of the nominating committee members.
2. The selection of candidates by the nominating committee.
3. The confirmation of the candidates.

There is an additional month set aside between when the annual process is expected to end and the term of the new candidates is to begin. This time may be used during unusual circumstances to extend the time allocated for any of the components listed above.

3.2. Nominating Committee Principal Functions

The principal functions of the nominating committee are to review each open IESG, IAB, and IAOC position and to nominate either its incumbent or a superior candidate.

Although there is no term limit for serving in any IESG, IAB, or IAOC position, the nominating committee may use length of service as one of its criteria for evaluating an incumbent.

The nominating committee does not select the open positions to be reviewed; it is instructed as to which positions to review.

The nominating committee will be given the titles of the positions to be reviewed and a brief summary of the desired expertise of the candidate that is nominated to fill each position.

Incumbents must notify the nominating committee if they wish to be nominated.

The nominating committee does not confirm its candidates; it presents its candidates to the appropriate confirming body as indicated below.

A superior candidate is one who the nominating committee believes would contribute in such a way as to improve or enhance the body to which he or she is nominated.

3.3. Positions To Be Reviewed

Approximately one-half of each of the then current IESG and IAB positions, and one IAOC position, is selected to be reviewed each year.

The intent of this rule is to ensure the review of approximately one-half of each of the IESG and IAB sitting members, and one of the two nominated IAOC positions, each year. It is recognized that circumstances may exist that will require the nominating committee to review more or less than the usual number of positions, e.g., if the IESG, IAB, or IAOC have reorganized prior to this process and created new positions, if there are an odd number of current positions, or if a member unexpectedly resigns.

3.4. Term Lengths

Confirmed candidates are expected to serve at least a two-year term.

The intent of this rule is to ensure that members of the IESG, IAB, and IAOC serve the number of years that best facilitates the review of one-half of the members each year.

The term of a confirmed candidate selected according to the mid-term vacancy rules may be less than two years, as stated elsewhere in this document.

It is consistent with this rule for the nominating committee to choose one or more of the currently open positions to which it may assign a term of not more than three years in order to ensure the ideal application of this rule in the future.

It is consistent with this rule for the nominating committee to choose one or more of the currently open positions that share responsibilities with other positions (both those being reviewed and those sitting) to which it may assign a term of not more than three years to ensure that all such members will not be reviewed at the same time.

All sitting member terms end during the First IETF meeting corresponding to the end of the term for which they were confirmed. All confirmed candidate terms begin during the First IETF meeting corresponding to the beginning of the term for which they were confirmed.

For confirmed candidates of the IESG, the terms begin no later than when the currently sitting members' terms end on the last day of the meeting. A term may begin or end no sooner than the first day of the meeting and no later than the last day of the meeting as determined by the mutual agreement of the currently sitting member and the confirmed candidate. A confirmed candidate's term may overlap the sitting member's term during the meeting as determined by their mutual agreement.

For confirmed candidates of the IAB and IAOC, the terms overlap with the terms of the sitting members for the entire week of the meeting.

For candidates confirmed under the mid-term vacancy rules, the term begins as soon as possible after the confirmation.

3.5. Mid-term Vacancies

Mid-term vacancies are filled by the same rules as documented here with four qualifications, namely:

1. When there is only one official nominating committee, the body with the mid-term vacancy relegates the responsibility to fill the vacancy to it. If the mid-term vacancy occurs during the period of time that the term of the prior year's nominating committee overlaps with the term of the current year's nominating committee, the body with the mid-term vacancy must relegate the responsibility to fill the vacancy to the prior year's nominating committee.
2. If it is the case that the nominating committee is reconvening to fill the mid-term vacancy, then the completion of the candidate selection and confirmation process is due within six weeks, with all other time periods otherwise unspecified prorated accordingly.

3. The confirming body has two weeks from the day it is notified of a candidate to reject the candidate, otherwise the candidate is assumed to have been confirmed.
4. The term of the confirmed candidate will be either:
 - A. the remainder of the term of the open position if that remainder is not less than one year or
 - B. the remainder of the term of the open position plus the next two-year term if that remainder is less than one year.

In both cases, a year is the period of time from a First IETF meeting to the next First IETF meeting.

3.6. Confidentiality

All deliberations and supporting information that relates to specific nominees, candidates, and confirmed candidates are confidential.

The nominating committee and confirming body members will be exposed to confidential information as a result of their deliberations, their interactions with those they consult, and from those who provide requested supporting information. All members and all other participants are expected to handle this information in a manner consistent with its sensitivity.

It is consistent with this rule for current nominating committee members who have served on prior nominating committees to advise the current committee on deliberations and results of the prior committee, as necessary and appropriate.

The list of nominees willing to be considered for positions under review in the current nominating committee cycle is not confidential. The nominating committee may disclose a list of names of nominees who are willing to be considered for positions under review to the community, in order to obtain feedback from the community on these nominees.

The list of nominees disclosed for a specific position should contain only the names of nominees who are willing to be considered for the position under review.

The nominating committee may choose not to include some names in the disclosed list, at their discretion.

The nominating committee may disclose an updated list, at its discretion. For example, the nominating committee might disclose an

updated list if it identifies errors/omissions in a previously disclosed version of the disclosed list, or if the nominating committee finds it necessary to call for additional nominees, and these nominees indicate a willingness to be considered before the nominating committee has completed its deliberations.

Nominees may choose to ask people to provide feedback to the nominating committee but should not encourage any public statements of support. Nominating committees should consider nominee-encouraged lobbying and campaigning to be unacceptable behavior.

IETF community members are encouraged to provide feedback on nominees to the nominating committee but should not post statements of support/non-support for nominees in any public forum.

3.7. Advice and Consent Model

Unless otherwise specified, the advice and consent model is used throughout the process. This model is characterized as follows.

3.7.1. Positions To Be Reviewed

The IETF Executive Director informs the nominating committee of the IESG, IAB, and IAOC positions to be reviewed.

The IESG, IAB, and IAOC are responsible for providing a summary of the expertise desired of the candidates selected for their respective open positions to the Executive Director. The summaries are provided to the nominating committee for its consideration.

3.7.2. Candidate Selection

The nominating committee selects candidates based on its understanding of the IETF community's consensus of the qualifications required and advises each confirming body of its respective candidates.

3.7.3. Candidate Review

The confirming bodies review their respective candidates, they may at their discretion communicate with the nominating committee, and then consent to some, all, or none of the candidates.

The sitting IAB members review the IESG candidates.

The Internet Society Board of Trustees reviews the IAB candidates.

The IAOC candidate is reviewed as specified in [RFC4071].

The confirming bodies conduct their review using all information and any means acceptable to them, including but not limited to the supporting information provided by the nominating committee, information known personally to members of the confirming bodies and shared within the confirming body, the results of interactions within the confirming bodies, and the confirming bodies' interpretation of what is in the best interests of the IETF community.

If all of the candidates are confirmed, the job of the nominating committee with respect to those open positions is complete.

If some or none of the candidates submitted to a confirming body are confirmed, the confirming body should communicate with the nominating committee both to explain the reason why all the candidates were not confirmed and to understand the nominating committee's rationale for its candidates.

The confirming body may reject individual candidates, in which case the nominating committee must select alternate candidates for the rejected candidates.

Any additional time required by the nominating committee should not exceed its maximum time allotment.

3.7.4. Confirmation

A confirming body decides whether it confirms each candidate using a confirmation decision rule chosen by the confirming body.

If a confirming body has no specific confirmation decision rule, then confirming a given candidate should require at least one-half of the confirming body's sitting members to agree to that confirmation.

The decision may be made by conducting a formal vote, by asserting consensus based on informal exchanges (e.g., email), or by any other mechanism that is used to conduct the normal business of the confirming body.

Regardless of which decision rule the confirming body uses, any candidate that is not confirmed under that rule is considered to be rejected.

The confirming body must make its decision within a reasonable time frame. The results from the confirming body must be reported promptly to the nominating committee.

3.8. Sitting Members

The following rules apply to nominees and candidates who are currently sitting members of the IESG, IAB, or IAOC and who are not sitting in an open position being filled by the nominating committee.

The confirmation of a candidate to an open position does not automatically create a vacancy in the IESG, IAB, or IAOC position currently occupied by the candidate. The mid-term vacancy can not exist until, first, the candidate formally resigns from the current position and, second, the body with the vacancy formally decides for itself that it wants the nominating committee to fill the mid-term vacancy according to the rules for a mid-term vacancy documented elsewhere in this document.

The resignation should be effective as of when the term of the new position begins. The resignation may remain confidential to the IAB, IAOC, IESG, and nominating committee until the confirmed candidate is announced for the new position. The process, according to rules set out elsewhere in this document, of filling the seat vacated by the confirmed candidate may begin as soon as the vacancy is publicly announced.

Filling a mid-term vacancy is a separate and independent action from the customary action of filling open positions. In particular, a nominating committee must complete its job with respect to filling the open positions and then separately proceed with the task of filling the mid-term vacancy according to the rules for a mid-term vacancy documented elsewhere in this document.

However, the following exception is permitted in the case where the candidate for an open position is currently a sitting member of the IAB. It is consistent with these rules for the announcements of a resignation of a sitting member of the IAB and of the confirmed candidate for the mid-term vacancy created by that sitting member on the IAB to all occur at the same time as long as the actual sequence of events that occurred did so in the following order:

1. The nominating committee completes the advice and consent process for the open position being filled by the candidate currently sitting on the IAB.
2. The newly confirmed candidate resigns from their current position on the IAB.
3. The IAB with the new mid-term vacancy requests that the nominating committee fill the position.

4. The Executive Director of the IETF informs the nominating committee of the mid-term vacancy.
5. The nominating committee acts on the request to fill the mid-term vacancy.

3.9. Announcements

All announcements must be made using at least the mechanism used by the IETF Secretariat for its announcements, including a notice on the IETF web site.

As of the publication of this document, the current mechanism is an email message to both the "ietf" and the "ietf-announce" mailing lists.

4. Nominating Committee Selection

The following set of rules apply to the creation of the nominating committee and the selection of its members.

4.1. Timeline

The completion of the process of selecting and organizing the members of the nominating committee is due within three months.

The completion of the selection and organization process is due at least one month prior to the Third IETF. This ensures the nominating committee is fully operational and available for interviews and consultation during the Third IETF.

4.2. Term

The term of a nominating committee is expected to be 15 months.

It is the intent of this rule that the end of a nominating committee's term overlap by approximately three months the beginning of the term of the next nominating committee.

The term of a nominating committee begins when its members are officially announced. The term ends at the Third IETF (not three meetings), i.e., the IETF meeting after the next nominating committee's term begins.

A term is expected to begin at least two months prior to the Third IETF to ensure the nominating committee has at least one month to get organized before preparing for the Third IETF.

A nominating committee is expected to complete any work in progress before it is dissolved at the end of its term.

During the period of time when the terms of the nominating committees overlap, all mid-term vacancies are to be relegated to the prior year's nominating committee. The prior year's nominating committee has no other responsibilities during the overlap period. At all times other than the overlap period, there is exactly one official nominating committee and it is responsible for all mid-term vacancies.

When the prior year's nominating committee is filling a mid-term vacancy during the period of time that the terms overlap, the nominating committees operate independently. However, some coordination is needed between them. Since the prior year's Chair is a non-voting advisor to the current nominating committee, the coordination is expected to be straightforward.

4.3. Structure

The nominating committee comprises at least a Chair, 10 voting volunteers, two liaisons, and an advisor.

Any committee member may propose the addition of an advisor to participate in some or all of the deliberations of the committee. The addition must be approved by the committee according to its established voting mechanism. Advisors participate as individuals.

Any committee member may propose the addition of a liaison from other unrepresented organizations to participate in some or all of the deliberations of the committee. The addition must be approved by the committee according to its established voting mechanism. Liaisons participate as representatives of their respective organizations.

The Chair is selected according to rules stated elsewhere in this document.

The 10 voting volunteers are selected according to rules stated elsewhere in this document.

The IESG and IAB liaisons are selected according to rules stated elsewhere in this document.

The Internet Society Board of Trustees may appoint a liaison to the nominating committee at its own discretion.

The Chair of last year's nominating committee serves as an advisor according to rules stated elsewhere in this document.

The Chair, liaisons, and advisors do not vote on the selection of candidates. They do vote on all other issues before the committee unless otherwise specified in this document.

4.4. Chair Duties

The Chair of the nominating committee is responsible for ensuring the nominating committee completes its assigned duties in a timely fashion and performs in the best interests of the IETF community.

The Chair must be thoroughly familiar with the rules and guidance indicated throughout this document. The Chair must ensure the nominating committee completes its assigned duties in a manner that is consistent with this document.

The Chair must attest by proclamation at a plenary session of the First IETF that the results of the committee represent its best effort and the best interests of the IETF community.

The Chair does not vote on the selection of candidates.

4.5. Chair Selection

The Internet Society President appoints the Chair, who must meet the same requirements for membership in the nominating committee as a voting volunteer.

The nominating committee Chair must agree to invest the time necessary to ensure that the nominating committee completes its assigned duties and to perform in the best interests of the IETF community in that role.

The appointment is due no later than the Second IETF meeting to ensure it can be announced during a plenary session at that meeting. The completion of the appointment is necessary to ensure the annual process can complete at the time specified elsewhere in this document.

4.6. Temporary Chair

A Chair, in consultation with the Internet Society President, may appoint a temporary substitute for the Chair position.

There are a variety of ordinary circumstances that may arise from time to time that could result in a Chair being unavailable to oversee the activities of the committee. The Chair, in consultation with the Internet Society President, may appoint a substitute from a

pool comprised of the liaisons currently serving on the committee and the prior year's Chair or designee.

Any such appointment must be temporary and does not absolve the Chair of any or all responsibility for ensuring the nominating committee completes its assigned duties in a timely fashion.

4.7. Liaisons

Liaisons are responsible for ensuring the nominating committee in general and the Chair in particular execute their assigned duties in the best interests of the IETF community.

Liaisons are expected to represent the views of their respective organizations during the deliberations of the committee. They should provide information as requested or when they believe it would be helpful to the committee.

Liaisons from the IESG and IAB are expected to provide information to the nominating committee regarding the operation, responsibility, and composition of their respective bodies.

Liaisons are expected to convey questions from the committee to their respective organizations and responses to those questions to the committee, as requested by the committee.

Liaisons from the IESG, IAB, and Internet Society Board of Trustees (if one was appointed) are expected to review the operation and executing process of the nominating committee and to report any concerns or issues to the Chair of the nominating committee immediately. If they can not resolve the issue between themselves, liaisons must report it according to the dispute resolution process stated elsewhere in this document.

Liaisons from confirming bodies are expected to assist the committee in preparing the testimony it is required to provide with its candidates.

Liaisons may have other nominating committee responsibilities as required by their respective organizations or requested by the nominating committee, except that such responsibilities may not conflict with any other provisions of this document.

Liaisons do not vote on the selection of candidates.

4.8. Liaison Appointment

The sitting IAB and IESG members each appoint a liaison from their current membership, someone who is not sitting in an open position, to serve on the nominating committee.

4.9. Advisors

An advisor is responsible for such duties as specified by the invitation that resulted in the appointment.

Advisors do not vote on the selection of candidates.

4.10. Past Chair

The Chair of the prior year's nominating committee serves as an advisor to the current committee.

The prior year's Chair is expected to review the actions and activities of the current Chair and to report any concerns or issues to the nominating committee Chair immediately. If they can not resolve the issue between themselves, the prior year's Chair must report it according to the dispute resolution process stated elsewhere in this document.

The prior year's Chair may select a designee from a pool composed of the voting volunteers of the prior year's committee and all prior Chairs if the Chair is unavailable. If the prior year's Chair is unavailable or is unable or unwilling to make such a designation in a timely fashion, the Chair of the current year's committee may select a designee in consultation with the Internet Society President.

Selecting a prior year's committee member as the designee permits the experience of the prior year's deliberations to be readily available to the current committee. Selecting an earlier prior year Chair as the designee permits the experience of being a Chair as well as that Chair's committee deliberations to be readily available to the current committee.

All references to "prior year's Chair" in this document refer to the person serving in that role, whether it is the actual prior year's Chair or a designee.

4.11. Voting Volunteers

Voting volunteers are responsible for completing the tasks of the nominating committee in a timely fashion.

Each voting volunteer is expected to participate in all activities of the nominating committee with a level of effort approximately equal to all other voting volunteers. Specific tasks to be completed are established and managed by the Chair according to rules stated elsewhere in this document.

4.12. Milestones

The Chair must establish and announce milestones for the selection of the nominating committee members.

There is a defined time period during which the selection process is due to be completed. The Chair must establish a set of milestones which, if met in a timely fashion, will result in the completion of the process on time.

4.13. Open Positions

The Chair (or the IETF Executive Director, if no Chair has been named four weeks after the First IETF meeting of the year) obtains the list of positions to be reviewed and announces it along with a solicitation for names of volunteers from the IETF community willing to serve on the nominating committee.

If the IETF Executive Director issues the solicitation for volunteers, the IETF Executive Director must also collect responses to the solicitation and provide the names of volunteers to the incoming nominating committee Chair when the incoming nominating committee Chair is named.

At the Chair's request, the IETF Secretariat may perform other clerical support tasks, as long as the task being performed does not require nominating committee Chair judgment, in the nominating committee Chair's opinion, and as long as the community is appropriately notified that this request is being made. This request may come from the incoming nominating committee Chair (if one has been selected for this nominating committee cycle) or the previous nominating committee Chair (if the search for an incoming nominating committee Chair is still underway).

The solicitation must permit the community at least 30 days during which they may choose to volunteer to be selected for the nominating committee.

The list of open positions is published with the solicitation to facilitate community members choosing between volunteering for an open position and volunteering for the nominating committee.

4.14. Volunteer Qualification

Members of the IETF community must have attended at least three of the last five IETF meetings in order to volunteer.

The five meetings are the five most recent meetings that ended prior to the date on which the solicitation for nominating committee volunteers was submitted for distribution to the IETF community.

The IETF Secretariat is responsible for confirming that volunteers have met the attendance requirement.

Volunteers must provide their full name, email address, and primary company or organization affiliation (if any) when volunteering.

Volunteers are expected to be familiar with the IETF processes and procedures, which are readily learned by active participation in a working group and especially by serving as a document editor or working group chair.

4.15. Not Qualified

Any person who serves on any of the Internet Society Board of Trustees, the IAB, the IESG, or the IAOC, including those who serve on these bodies in ex officio positions, may not volunteer to serve as voting members of the nominating committee. Liaisons to these bodies from other bodies or organizations are not excluded by this rule.

4.16. Selection Process

The Chair announces both the list of the pool of volunteers from which the 10 voting volunteers will be randomly selected and the method with which the selection will be completed.

The announcement should be made at least one week prior to the date on which the random selection will occur.

The pool of volunteers must be enumerated or otherwise indicated according to the needs of the selection method to be used.

The announcement must specify the data that will be used as input to the selection method. The method must depend on random data whose value is not known or available until the date on which the random selection will occur.

It must be possible to independently verify that the selection method used is both fair and unbiased. A method is fair if each eligible

volunteer is equally likely to be selected. A method is unbiased if no one can influence its outcome in favor of a specific outcome.

It must be possible to repeat the selection method, either through iteration or by restarting in such a way as to remain fair and unbiased. This is necessary to replace selected volunteers should they become unavailable after selection.

The selection method must produce an ordered list of volunteers.

One possible selection method is described in [RFC3797].

4.17. Announcement of Selection Results

The Chair randomly selects the 10 voting volunteers from the pool of names of volunteers and announces the members of the nominating committee.

No more than two volunteers with the same primary affiliation may be selected for the nominating committee. The Chair reviews the primary affiliation of each volunteer selected by the method in turn. If the primary affiliation for a volunteer is the same as two previously selected volunteers, that volunteer is removed from consideration and the method is repeated to identify the next eligible volunteer.

There must be at least two announcements of all members of the nominating committee.

The first announcement should occur as soon after the random selection as is reasonable for the Chair. The community must have at least one week during which any member may challenge the results of the random selection.

The challenge must be made in writing (email is acceptable) to the Chair. The Chair has 48 hours to review the challenge and offer a resolution to the member. If the resolution is not accepted by the member, that member may report the challenge according to the dispute resolution process stated elsewhere in this document.

If a selected volunteer, upon reading the announcement with the list of selected volunteers, finds that two or more other volunteers have the same affiliation, then the volunteer should notify the Chair who will determine the appropriate action.

During at least the one week challenge period, the Chair must contact each of the members and confirm their willingness and availability to serve. The Chair should make every reasonable effort to contact each member.

- o If the Chair is unable to contact a liaison, the problem is referred to the respective organization to resolve. The Chair should allow a reasonable amount of time for the organization to resolve the problem and then may proceed without the liaison.
- o If the Chair is unable to contact an advisor, the Chair may elect to proceed without the advisor, except for the prior year's Chair for whom the Chair must consult with the Internet Society President as stated elsewhere in this document.
- o If the Chair is unable to contact a voting volunteer, the Chair must repeat the random selection process in order to replace the unavailable volunteer. There should be at least one day between the announcement of the iteration and the selection process.

After at least one week and confirming that 10 voting volunteers are ready to serve, the Chair makes the second announcement of the members of the nominating committee, which officially begins the term of the nominating committee.

4.18. Committee Organization

The Chair works with the members of the committee to organize itself in preparation for completing its assigned duties.

The committee has approximately one month during which it can self-organize. Its responsibilities during this time include but are not limited to the following:

- o Setting up a regular teleconference schedule.
- o Setting up an internal web site.
- o Setting up a mailing list for internal discussions.
- o Setting up an email address for receiving community input.
- o Establishing operational procedures.
- o Establishing milestones in order to monitor the progress of the selection process.

5. Nominating Committee Operation

The following rules apply to the operation of the nominating committee. If necessary, a paragraph discussing the interpretation of each rule is included.

The rules are organized approximately in the order in which they would be invoked.

5.1. Discretion

All rules and special circumstances not otherwise specified are at the discretion of the committee.

Exceptional circumstances will occasionally arise during the normal operation of the nominating committee. This rule is intended to foster the continued forward progress of the committee.

Any member of the committee may propose a rule for adoption by the committee. The rule must be approved by the committee according to its established voting mechanism.

All members of the committee should consider whether the exception is worthy of mention in the next revision of this document and follow-up accordingly.

5.2. Selection Timeline

The completion of the process of selecting candidates to be confirmed by their respective confirming body is due within three months.

The completion of the selection process is due at least two months prior to the First IETF. This ensures the nominating committee has sufficient time to complete the confirmation process.

5.3. Confirmation Timeline

The completion of the process of confirming the candidates is due within one month.

The completion of the confirmation process is due at least one month prior to the First IETF.

5.4. Milestones

The Chair must establish a set of nominating committee milestones for the candidate selection and confirmation process.

There is a defined time period during which the candidate selection and confirmation process must be completed. The Chair must establish a set of milestones that, if met in a timely fashion, will result in the completion of the process on time. The Chair should allow time for iterating the activities of the committee if one or more candidates are not confirmed.

The Chair should ensure that all committee members are aware of the milestones.

5.5. Voting Mechanism

The Chair must establish a voting mechanism.

The committee must be able to objectively determine when a decision has been made during its deliberations. The criteria for determining closure must be established and known to all members of the nominating committee.

5.6. Voting Quorum

At least a quorum of committee members must participate in a vote.

Only voting volunteers vote on a candidate selection. For a candidate selection vote, a quorum is comprised of at least seven of the voting volunteers.

At all other times, a quorum is present if at least 75% of the nominating committee members are participating.

5.7. Voting Member Recall

Any member of the nominating committee may propose to the committee that any other member except the Chair be recalled. The process for recalling the Chair is defined elsewhere in this document.

There are a variety of ordinary circumstances that may arise that could result in one or more members of the committee being unavailable to complete their assigned duties, for example, health concerns, family issues, or a change of priorities at work. A committee member may choose to resign for unspecified personal reasons. In addition, the committee may not function well as a group because a member may be disruptive or otherwise uncooperative.

Regardless of the circumstances, if individual committee members can not work out their differences between themselves, the entire committee may be called upon to discuss and review the circumstances. If a resolution is not forthcoming, a vote may be conducted. A member may be recalled if at least a quorum of all committee members agree, including the vote of the member being recalled.

If a liaison member is recalled, the committee must notify the affected organization and must allow a reasonable amount of time for a replacement to be identified by the organization before proceeding.

If an advisor member other than the prior year's Chair is recalled, the committee may choose to proceed without the advisor. In the case of the prior year's Chair, the Internet Society President must be notified and the current Chair must be allowed a reasonable amount of time to consult with the Internet Society President to identify a replacement before proceeding.

If a single voting volunteer position on the nominating committee is vacated, regardless of the circumstances, the committee may choose to proceed with only nine voting volunteers at its own discretion. In all other cases, a new voting member must be selected, and the Chair must repeat the random selection process including an announcement of the iteration prior to the actual selection as stated elsewhere in this document.

A change in the primary affiliation of a voting volunteer during the term of the nominating committee is not a cause to request the recall of that volunteer, even if the change would result in more than two voting volunteers with the same affiliation.

5.8. Chair Recall

Only the prior year's Chair may request the recall of the current Chair.

It is the responsibility of the prior year's Chair to ensure the current Chair completes the assigned tasks in a manner consistent with this document and in the best interests of the IETF community.

Any member of the committee who has an issue or concern regarding the Chair should report it to the prior year's Chair immediately. The prior year's Chair is expected to report it to the Chair immediately. If they can not resolve the issue between themselves, the prior year's Chair must report it according to the dispute resolution process stated elsewhere in this document.

5.9. Deliberations

All members of the nominating committee may participate in all deliberations.

The emphasis of this rule is that no member can be explicitly excluded from any deliberation. However, a member may individually choose not to participate in a deliberation.

5.10. Call for Nominees

The Chair announces the open positions to be reviewed, the desired expertise provided by the IETF Executive Director, and the call for nominees.

The call for nominees must include a request for comments regarding the past performance of incumbents, which will be considered during the deliberations of the nominating committee.

The call must request that a nomination include a valid, working email address, a telephone number, or both for the nominee. The nomination must include the set of skills or expertise the nominator believes the nominee has that would be desirable.

5.11. Nominations

Any member of the IETF community may nominate any member of the IETF community for any open position, whose eligibility to serve will be confirmed by the nominating committee.

A self-nomination is permitted.

Nominating committee members are not eligible to be considered for filling any open position by the nominating committee on which they serve. They become ineligible as soon as the term of the nominating committee on which they serve officially begins. They remain ineligible for the duration of that nominating committee's term.

Although each nominating committee's term overlaps with the following nominating committee's term, nominating committee members are eligible for nomination by the following committee if not otherwise disqualified.

Members of the IETF community who were recalled from any IESG, IAB, or IAOC position during the previous two years are not eligible to be considered for filling any open position.

5.12. Candidate Selection

The nominating committee selects candidates based on its understanding of the IETF community's consensus of the qualifications required to fill the open positions.

The intent of this rule is to ensure that the nominating committee consults with a broad base of the IETF community for input to its deliberations. In particular, the nominating committee must

determine if the desired expertise for the open positions matches its understanding of the qualifications desired by the IETF community.

The consultations are permitted to include names of nominees, if all parties to the consultation agree to observe the same confidentiality rules as the nominating committee itself, or the names are public as discussed in Section 3.6. Feedback on individual nominees should always be confidential.

A broad base of the community should include the existing members of the IAB, IAOC, and IESG, especially sitting members who share responsibilities with open positions, e.g., co-Area Directors, and working group chairs, especially those in the areas with open positions.

Only voting volunteer members vote to select candidates.

5.13. Consent to Nomination

Nominees should be advised that they are being considered and must consent to their nomination prior to being chosen as candidates.

Although the nominating committee will make every reasonable effort to contact and to remain in contact with nominees, any nominee whose contact information changes during the process and who wishes to still be considered should inform the nominating committee of the changes.

A nominee's consent must be written (email is acceptable) and must include a commitment to provide the resources necessary to fill the open position and an assurance that the nominee will perform the duties of the position for which they are being considered in the best interests of the IETF community.

Consenting to a nomination must occur prior to a nominee being a candidate and may occur as soon after the nomination as needed by the nominating committee.

Consenting to a nomination must not imply the nominee will be a candidate.

The nominating committee should help nominees provide justification to their employers.

5.14. Notifying Confirming Bodies

The nominating committee advises the confirming bodies of their candidates, specifying a single candidate for each open position and testifying as to how each candidate meets the qualifications of an open position.

For each candidate, the testimony must include a brief statement of the qualifications for the position that is being filled, which may be exactly the expertise that was requested. If the qualifications differ from the expertise originally requested, a brief statement explaining the difference must be included.

The testimony may include a brief resume of the candidate and/or a brief summary of the deliberations of the nominating committee.

5.15. Confirming Candidates

Confirmed candidates must consent to their confirmation, and rejected candidates and nominees must be notified before confirmed candidates are announced.

It is not necessary to notify and get consent from all confirmed candidates together.

A nominee may not know they were a candidate. This permits a candidate to be rejected by a confirming body without the nominee knowing about the rejection.

Rejected nominees, who consented to their nomination, and rejected candidates must be notified prior to announcing the confirmed candidates.

It is not necessary to announce all confirmed candidates together.

The nominating committee must ensure that all confirmed candidates are prepared to serve prior to announcing their confirmation.

5.16. Archives

The nominating committee should archive the information it has collected or produced for a period of time but not to exceed its term.

The purpose of the archive is to assist the nominating committee should it be necessary for it to fill a mid-term vacancy.

The existence of an archive, how it is implemented, and what information to archive is at the discretion of the committee. The decision must be approved by a quorum of the voting volunteer members.

The implementation of the archive should make every reasonable effort to ensure that the confidentiality of the information it contains is maintained.

6. Dispute Resolution Process

The dispute resolution process described here is to be used as indicated elsewhere in this document. Its applicability in other circumstances is beyond the scope of this document.

The nominating committee operates under a strict rule of confidentiality. For this reason, when process issues arise, it is best to make every reasonable effort to resolve them within the committee. However, when circumstances do not permit this or no resolution is forthcoming, the process described here is to be used.

The following rules apply to the process.

1. The results of this process are final and binding. There is no appeal.
2. The process begins with the submission of a request as described below to the Internet Society President.
3. As soon as the process begins, the nominating committee may continue those activities that are unrelated to the issue to be resolved except that it must not submit any candidates to a confirming body until the issue is resolved.
4. All parties to the process are subject to the same confidentiality rules as each member of the nominating committee.
5. The process should be completed within two weeks.

The process is as follows:

1. The party seeking resolution submits a written request (email is acceptable) to the Internet Society President detailing the issue to be resolved.
2. The Internet Society President appoints an arbiter to investigate and resolve the issue. A self-appointment is permitted.

3. The arbiter investigates the issue making every reasonable effort to understand both sides of the issue. Since the arbiter is subject to the same confidentiality obligations as all nominating committee members, all members are expected to cooperate fully with the arbiter and to provide all relevant information to the arbiter for review.
4. After consultation with the two principal parties to the issue, the arbiter decides on a resolution. Whatever actions are necessary to execute the resolution are immediately begun and completed as quickly as possible.
5. The arbiter summarizes the issue, the resolution, and the rationale for the resolution for the Internet Society President.
6. In consultation with the Internet Society President, the arbiter prepares a report of the dispute and its resolution. The report should include all information that in the judgment of the arbiter does not violate the confidentiality requirements of the nominating committee.
7. The Chair includes the dispute report when reporting on the activities of the nominating committee to the IETF community.

7. Member Recall

The following rules apply to the recall process. If necessary, a paragraph discussing the interpretation of each rule is included.

7.1. Petition

At any time, at least 20 members of the IETF community, who are qualified to be voting members of a nominating committee, may request by signed petition (email is acceptable) to the Internet Society President the recall of any sitting IAB, IAOC, or IESG member.

All individual and collective qualifications of nominating committee eligibility are applicable, including that no more than two signatories may have the same primary affiliation.

Each signature must include a full name, email address, and primary company or organization affiliation.

The IETF Secretariat is responsible for confirming that each signatory is qualified to be a voting member of a nominating committee. A valid petition must be signed by at least 20 qualified signatories.

The petition must include a statement of justification for the recall and all relevant and appropriate supporting documentation.

The petition and its signatories must be announced to the IETF community.

7.2. Recall Committee Chair

The Internet Society President shall appoint a Recall Committee Chair.

The Internet Society President must not evaluate the recall request. It is explicitly the responsibility of the IETF community to evaluate the behavior of its leaders.

7.3. Recall Committee Creation

The recall committee is created according to the same rules as is the nominating committee with the qualifications that both the person being investigated and the parties requesting the recall must not be a member of the recall committee in any capacity.

7.4. Recall Committee Rules

The recall committee operates according to the same rules as the nominating committee with the qualification that there is no confirmation process.

7.5. Recall Committee Operation

The recall committee investigates the circumstances of the justification for the recall and votes on its findings.

The investigation must include at least both an opportunity for the member being recalled to present a written statement and consultation with third parties.

7.6. 3/4 Majority

A 3/4 majority of the members who vote on the question is required for a recall.

7.7. Position To Be Filled

If a sitting member is recalled, the open position is to be filled according to the mid-term vacancy rules.

8. Security Considerations

Any selection, confirmation, or recall process necessarily involves investigation into the qualifications and activities of prospective candidates. The investigation may reveal confidential or otherwise private information about candidates to those participating in the process. Each person who participates in any aspect of the process must maintain the confidentiality of any and all information not explicitly identified as suitable for public dissemination.

When the nominating committee decides it is necessary to share confidential or otherwise private information with others, the dissemination must be minimal and must include a prior commitment from all persons consulted to observe the same confidentiality rules as the nominating committee itself.

9. References

9.1. Normative References

- [RFC3710] Alvestrand, H., "An IESG charter", RFC 3710, February 2004, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3710>>.
- [RFC3777] Galvin, J., "IAB and IESG Selection, Confirmation, and Recall Process: Operation of the Nominating and Recall Committees", BCP 10, RFC 3777, June 2004, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3777>>.
- [RFC4071] Austein, R. and B. Wijnen, "Structure of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)", BCP 101, RFC 4071, April 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4071>>.

9.2. Informative References

- [Err232] RFC Errata, "Erratum ID 232", RFC 3777.
- [Err4179] RFC Errata, "Erratum ID 4179", RFC 3777.
- [RFC3797] Eastlake, D., "Publicly Verifiable Nominations Committee (NomCom) Random Selection", RFC 3797, June 2004, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3797>>.

Appendix A. Changes Since RFC 3777

- o Converted source file from nroff to XML, resulting in some reformatting.
- o Applied errata for RFC 3777 ([Err232] and [Err4179]).
- o Applied RFC 5078 update.
- o Applied RFC 5633 update.
- o Applied RFC 5680 update.
- o Applied RFC 6859 update.
- o Corrected a few grammatical errors.
- o Added a reference to RFC 3710.

Appendix B. Oral Tradition

Over the years, various nominating committees have learned through oral tradition passed on by liaisons that there are certain consistencies in the process and information considered during deliberations. Some items from that oral tradition are collected here to facilitate its consideration by future nominating committees.

1. It has been found that experience as an IETF Working Group Chair or an IRTF Research Group Chair is helpful in giving a nominee experience of what the job of an Area Director involves. It also helps a nominating committee judge the technical, people, and process management skills of the nominee.
2. No person should serve both on the IAB and as an Area Director, except the IETF Chair whose roles as an IAB member and Area Director of the General Area are set out elsewhere.
3. The strength of the IAB is found in part in the balance of the demographics of its members (e.g., national distribution, years of experience, gender, etc.), the combined skill set of its members, and the combined sectors (e.g., industry, academia, etc.) represented by its members.
4. There are no term limits explicitly because the issue of continuity versus turnover should be evaluated each year according to the expectations of the IETF community, as it is understood by each nominating committee.

5. The number of nominating committee members with the same primary affiliation is limited in order to avoid the appearance of improper bias in choosing the leadership of the IETF. Rather than defining precise rules for how to define "affiliation", the IETF community depends on the honor and integrity of the participants to make the process work.

Appendix C. Nominating Committee Timeline

This appendix is included for the convenience of the reader and is not to be interpreted as the definitive timeline. It is intended to capture the detail described elsewhere in this document in one place. Although every effort has been made to ensure the description here is consistent with the description elsewhere, if there are any conflicts the definitive rule is the one in the main body of this document.

The only absolute in the timeline rules for the annual process is that its completion is due by the First IETF of the year after the nominating committee begins its term. This is supported by the fact that the confirmed candidate terms begin during the week of the First IETF.

The overall annual process is designed to be completed in seven months. It is expected to start nine months prior to the First IETF. The time is split between three major components of the process roughly as follows:

1. First is the selection and organization of the committee members. Three months are allotted for this process.
2. Second is the selection of the candidates by the nominating committee. Four months are allotted for this process.
3. Third is the confirmation of the candidates by their respective confirming bodies. Two months are allotted for this process.

The following list captures the details of the milestones within each component. For illustrative purposes, the list presumes the Friday before the First IETF is March 1. Numbers shown in square brackets indicate the expected number of weeks at each step.

1. BEGIN Eight Months Prior to First IETF (approx. June 1); Internet Society President appoints the Chair. The appointment must be done no later than the Second IETF or eight months prior to the First IETF, whichever comes first. The Chair must be announced and recognized during a plenary session of the Second IETF. [0]

2. The Chair establishes and announces milestones to ensure the timely selection of the nominating committee members. [1]
3. The Chair contacts the IESG, IAB, and Internet Society Board of Trustees and requests a liaison. The Chair contacts the prior year's Chair and requests an advisor. The Chair obtains the list of IESG, IAB, and IAOC open positions and descriptions from the IETF Executive Director. [0]
4. The Chair announces the solicitation for voting volunteer members that must remain open for at least 30 days. The announcement must be done no later than seven months and two weeks prior to the First IETF (approx. June 15). [6]
5. After the solicitation closes, the Chair announces the pool of volunteers and the date of the random selection, which must be at least one week in the future. The announcement must be done no later than six months and two weeks prior to the First IETF (approx. July 15). [1]
6. On the appointed day, the random selection occurs and the Chair announces the members of the committee and the one week challenge period. The announcement must be done no later than six months and one week prior to the First IETF (approx. July 22). [1]
7. During the challenge period, the Chair contacts each of the committee members and confirms their availability to participate. [0]
8. After the challenge period closes, the Chair announces the members of the committee and its term begins. The announcement must be done no later than six months prior to the First IETF (approx. August 1). [1]
9. The committee has one month during which it is to self-organize in preparation for completing its assigned duties. This must be done no later than five months prior to the First IETF (approx. September 15). [6]
10. END the Committee Member Selection Process; BEGIN the Selection of Candidates; Time is at least five months prior to the First IETF (approx. September 22). [0]

11. The Chair establishes and announces the milestones to ensure the timely selection of the candidates, including a call for nominations for the open positions. The announcement must be done no later than five months prior to the First IETF (approx. October 1). [1]
12. Over the next three months, the nominating committee collects input and deliberates. It should plan to conduct interviews and other consultations during the Third IETF. The committee is due to complete its candidate selection no later than two months prior to the First IETF (approx. January 1). [17]
13. END the Selection of Candidates; BEGIN the Confirmation of Candidates; Time is at least two months prior to the First IETF (approx. January 1). [0]
14. The committee presents its candidates to their respective confirming bodies. The presentation must be done no later than two months prior to the First IETF (approx. January 1). [0]
15. The confirming bodies have one month to deliberate and, in communication with the nominating committee, accept or reject candidates. [4]
16. The Chair notifies and advises unsuccessful nominees that they have not been selected. [1]
17. The Chair announces the confirmed candidates. The announcement must be done no later than one month prior to the First IETF (approx. February 1). [4]

Acknowledgments

A great deal of work went into the RFCs that preceded this one. The 2014 nominating committee and this editor would like to thank all of them once again for the time and energy it took to get us to where we are now. In no particular order, we acknowledge:

Jeff Case	Fred Baker	John Curran
Guy Almes	Geoff Huston	Mike St. Johns
Donald Eastlake	Avri Doria	Bernard Adoba
Ted T'so	Phil Roberts	Jim Galvin
Harald Alvestrand	Leslie Daigle	Joel Halpern
Thomas Narten	Spencer Dawkins	Barry Leiba
Lars Eggert	Ross Callon	Brian Carpenter
Robert Elz	Bernie Hoeneisen	John Klensin
Danny McPherson	S. Moonesamy	Scott Bradner
Ralph Droms	Pekka Savola	

Allison Mankin and Russ White provided early reviews and feedback about this document.

Jari Arkko was very helpful by independently verifying that the previous text from all the merged documents was marshaled correctly into this one, and Adrian Farrel and Brian Carpenter caught the nits that fell through the cracks.

Author's Address

Murray S. Kucherawy (editor)
270 Upland Drive
San Francisco, CA 94127
United States

EMail: superuser@gmail.com

=====

Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)
Request for Comments: 8318
BCP: 10
Updates: 7437
Category: Best Current Practice
ISSN: 2070-1721

S. Dawkins
Wonder Hamster
January 2018

IAB, IESG, and IAOC Selection, Confirmation, and Recall Process:
IAOC Advisor for the Nominating Committee

Abstract

This specification formalizes an ad hoc practice used to provide advice to the IETF Nominating Committee (NomCom) about the operations of the IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC).

This document updates RFC 7437.

Status of This Memo

This memo documents an Internet Best Current Practice.

This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has received public review and has been approved for publication by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Further information on BCPs is available in Section 2 of RFC 7841.

Information about the current status of this document, any errata, and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8318>.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2018 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Background on 'IAOC Liaisons' to Nominating Committees . . .	3
3. BCP Text Changes	4
3.1. Change to Section 4.3 of RFC 7437, 'Structure'	4
4. Security Considerations	4
5. IANA Considerations	4
6. Normative References	5
Appendix A. Discussion Points	6
A.1. Why Is This Role an Advisor?	6
A.2. Why Is This Role Not a Liaison?	7
A.3. Why Is This Role Not Required to Be a Sitting IAOC Member?	8
A.4. Why Does the Nominating Committee Request an IAOC Advisor?	8
Acknowledgements	9
Author's Address	9

1. Introduction

This specification formalizes an ad hoc practice used to provide advice to the IETF Nominating Committee (NomCom) about the operations of the IAOC (described in [RFC4071]).

This document updates [RFC7437].

Proposed future changes to BCP 10 should be discussed on the public IETF NomCom discussion mailing list, at <https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/ietf-nomcom>.

2. Background on 'IAOC Liaisons' to Nominating Committees

When RFC 7437 [RFC7437] was approved, it explicitly charged the nominating committee with selecting and reviewing certain members of the IAOC. However, [RFC7437] did not provide for the IAOC to send a liaison to the nominating committee.

This was not thought to be an obstacle because [RFC7437] allowed any committee member to propose a liaison from the IAOC:

Any committee member may propose the addition of a liaison from other unrepresented organizations to participate in some or all of the deliberations of the committee. The addition must be approved by the committee according to its established voting mechanism. Liaisons participate as representatives of their respective organizations.

Beginning in 2010, the IAOC provided a liaison to each nominating committee. In 2016, the IAOC did not provide a liaison because the nominating committee was not appointing an IAOC member. The previous nominating committee had filled a mid-term vacancy (using the process described in Section 3.5. of [RFC7437]) by appointing an IAOC member for a term longer than two years. In 2017, the NomCom was selecting an IAOC member, but the opportunity to request a liaison from the IAOC was overlooked, because this practice wasn't part of the documented process in [RFC7437].

This specification adds the previously ad hoc role to [RFC7437] so that future nominating committees will be less likely to overlook it.

Although past ad hoc practice has characterized this role as a "liaison", this specification labels the role as an "advisor". The rationale for this change in nomenclature is provided in Appendix A.1.

3. BCP Text Changes

This section provides the updated BCP text for [RFC7437].

For each OLD text selection, NEW text is provided that replaces the OLD text in [RFC7437].

3.1. Change to Section 4.3 of RFC 7437, 'Structure'

OLD

Any committee member may propose the addition of an advisor to participate in some or all of the deliberations of the committee. The addition must be approved by the committee according to its established voting mechanism. Advisors participate as individuals.

NEW

Any committee member may propose the addition of an advisor to participate in some or all of the deliberations of the committee. The addition must be approved by the committee according to its established voting mechanism. Advisors participate as individuals.

Committee members are encouraged to propose the addition of an advisor who is knowledgeable about the operations of the IAOC, whether or not that nominating committee is reviewing an IAOC position. The nominating committee may choose to ask the IAOC to suggest an advisor who is knowledgeable about IAOC operations but may select any advisor they vote to approve.

4. Security Considerations

This document updates an IETF process BCP and has no direct Internet security implications.

5. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA actions.

6. Normative References

- [RFC4071] Austein, R., Ed. and B. Wijnen, Ed., "Structure of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)", BCP 101, RFC 4071, DOI 10.17487/RFC4071, April 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4071>>.
- [RFC7437] Kucherawy, M., Ed., "IAB, IESG, and IAOC Selection, Confirmation, and Recall Process: Operation of the Nominating and Recall Committees", BCP 10, RFC 7437, DOI 10.17487/RFC7437, January 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7437>>.

Appendix A. Discussion Points

This section preserves discussions and explanations that came up during document discussions. Ordinarily, this section might be deleted during the evaluation process, but some questions came up repeatedly, so the editor has included them for anyone who also shares those questions.

A.1. Why Is This Role an Advisor?

The editor of this document briefly considered proposing a new and IAOC-specific role to [RFC7437] but considered such a proposal to be complex. Anticipating every corner case in IETF process BCPs is challenging and prone to error, and as this specification was being written, the IETF Chair was sponsoring a design team reviewing all aspects of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA). Therefore, the structure and membership of the IAOC itself could change in the near future. Instead, the specification describes how the nominating committee requests advisors and builds on mature text that has survived many nominating committee cycles.

After choosing to reuse existing roles defined in [RFC7437], the definition of "advisor" in Section 4.9 of [RFC7437] seemed appropriate.

An advisor is responsible for such duties as specified by the invitation that resulted in the appointment.

Advisors do not vote on the selection of candidates.

The position described in this specification could be filled by an advisor who would be a non-voting member of the nominating committee, who is knowledgeable about the operations of the IAOC, and who has duties that could evolve over time as the IAOC itself evolves.

The only difference between this advisor that requires an update to [RFC7437], and any other advisor is that committee members are explicitly encouraged to suggest that this advisor be appointed as described in this specification. The text updating [RFC7437] is found in Section 3.

A.2. Why Is This Role Not a Liaison?

Discussions on the IETF NomCom mailing list led to the recognition that "liaison" was not the best description of this role.

The role of liaison defined in Section 4.7 of [RFC7437] places some significant obligations on liaisons beyond what is necessary for someone to answer questions from the nominating committee about the IAOC. These obligations include the following:

- o Liaisons are responsible for ensuring the nominating committee in general and the Chair in particular execute their assigned duties in the best interest of the IETF community.
- o Liaisons from the IESG, IAB, and Internet Society Board of Trustees (if one is appointed) are expected to review the operation and execution process of the nominating committee and to report any concerns or issues to the Chair of the nominating committee immediately. If they cannot resolve the issue between themselves, liaisons must report it according to the dispute resolution process stated elsewhere in this document.
- o Liaisons may have other nominating committee responsibilities as required by their respective organizations or requested by the nominating committee; such responsibilities may not conflict with any other provisions of this document.

Finally, as mentioned in Section 4.6 of [RFC7437], all of the liaisons are included in the pool of people who are eligible to be selected as a replacement for a Chair.

There are a variety of ordinary circumstances that may arise from time to time that could result in a Chair being unavailable to oversee the activities of the committee. The Chair, in consultation with the Internet Society President, may appoint a substitute from a pool comprised of the liaisons currently serving on the committee and the prior year's Chair or designee.

Note: During discussion of this specification, we noted that any liaison would be part of the pool of potential substitute nominating committee Chairs. It wasn't clear to the discussion participants whether there was an intentional decision to make liaisons voted onto the nominating committee eligible to be substitute Chairs. That potential change is out of scope for this specification but may be a conversation worth having separately.

All of these obligations are important, but there are always at least two full liaisons from the confirming bodies that are already responsible for those responsibilities. It is simply not necessary to make the job of helping the nominating committee understand the role and operational practices of the IAOC more demanding than it must be.

So, requiring the IAOC to name a formal liaison to the nominating committee isn't justified.

A.3. Why Is This Role Not Required to Be a Sitting IAOC Member?

In addition to the reasons given in Appendix A.2, the requirement that the IAB and IESG liaisons to the nominating committee be sitting members of the organizations they represent, whose positions are not being reviewed by this nominating committee, is especially challenging for the IAOC.

Many IAOC positions are filled by members who are already members of IETF leadership and are subject to review by the nominating committee. This means that limiting an IAOC liaison to one of the sitting members would mean that in some years the only individuals eligible to serve as liaison for the nominating committee would be sitting members of the IAOC that a) were appointed by the previous nominating committee and are not being by the current nominating committee, or b) were appointed by the IAB or IESG and are not being reviewed by the current IAB or IESG. "Eligible" does not also mean "willing and able to serve", so it is possible that an IAOC might find itself with no sitting member to send as advisor in some years.

Although all IAOC liaisons to the nominating committee have served as sitting members of the IAOC, given 10 years of IAOC operation, this specification assumes that other members of the community have sufficient experience to provide guidance if the IAOC chooses to suggest such a person. If any given IAOC thought that was important, they could certainly continue to suggest sitting members, but if no sitting member was willing and able to serve, the IAOC would be free to do the next best thing and would likely be the best qualified group to decide who to send.

A.4. Why Does the Nominating Committee Request an IAOC Advisor?

This specification could have described the mechanism in one of two ways:

- o the IAOC could simply provide the name of the advisor to the nominating committee, or

- o the nominating committee could request the name of an advisor from the IAOC.

Either choice could work. The reason that this specification chose to have the nominating committee make the first move is that this is more similar to the way other advisors to the nominating committee are selected, except that the nominating committee is asking the IAOC for a suggestion before inviting the advisor to join the nominating committee.

The suggestion is, in fact, a suggestion; the nominating committee still votes to invite this advisor as they would vote to invite any advisor, as described in Section 4.3 of [RFC7437].

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Adrian Farrel, Alissa Cooper, Andy Malis, Alvaro Retana, Joel Halpern, John Klensin, Leslie Daigle, Michael Richardson, Robert Sparks, Russ Housley, S. Moonesamy, Scott Bradner, Stephen Farrell, and Ted Hardie for providing feedback on early draft versions of this document.

The input provided by Joel Halpern (2008-2009 nominating committee Chair) and Michael Richardson (2014-2015 nominating committee Chair) is especially appreciated because only a few people can provide a nominating committee Chair's perspective on how useful representation from the IAOC has been in practice.

Author's Address

Spencer Dawkins
Wonder Hamster Internetworking LLC

Email: spencerdawkins.ietf@gmail.com

