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Level-setting

● IESG asked for feedback on the way we evaluate new work proposals
  ○ Pre-IETF 100 Thread on IETF Discussion List starts [here](#)

● After discussion with the community, we told them
  ○ We would ask for earlier notice about incoming new work proposals
  ○ We would ask for "Maps and Gaps" analysis in the BOF Wiki
  ○ We would assign more IAB shepherds early in the process

● Step One is to do what we already told the community we would do
Why "early notice for new work proposals"?

- Give more time for ADs to guide work in their own areas
  - Anecdote: individual ADs often DO get informal early notice
  - We may not be asking for a big change to current requester behavior
- Give more time for ADs to request IAB to provide BOF shepherds
- Inform other ADs to head off conflicting proposals
- Inform other ADs to head off "AD shopping" the same proposals
- Inform any other new work proponents with overlapping proposals
  - Possibly complimentary, possibly conflicting, etc.
Why "maps and gaps"?

- The IETF is set up to work on protocols and procedures
- The IETF is set up to charter work within a single area
- "Maps and gaps" would help charter proposals sooner and better
- IESGs get new work proposals that span areas
  - That can happen because the proposal is to design a system
  - That can happen because proponents are proposing "the next big thing"
- IESGs get new work proposals from new IETF participants
  - May not be familiar with previous IETF work, especially rejected work
  - May not be familiar with IETF process, very different from other SDOs
Why assign more IAB shepherds? Why earlier?

- From "IAB Member Roles in Evaluating New Work Proposals"
  - "A BOF Shepherd takes a more active role in helping BOF proponents prepare for a BOF than IAB members who “cover” a BOF. A BOF Shepherd provides architectural guidance on the ideas proposed in the BOF. The BOF Shepherd might help BOF proponents produce an arrows-and-boxes scheme, as described in RFC 4101, “Writing Protocol Models”, for example."
  - "A BOF Shepherd may work with BOF proponents to create and/or improve a BOF request."
- IAB members may be involved in other ways - that's fine, just different
Where we are now

● Past successes
  ○ Better support for onsite semi-formal "side meetings" - FCFS rooms
  ○ We've updated BOF Wiki template to ask for "maps and gaps"
  ○ We've opened the IETF 102 BOF Wiki much earlier than previously

● We've talked about adding a proposal Abstract deadline for IETF 103
  ○ Recognize that complete proposals may not be ready weeks in advance
  ○ (IMO) This would need to be advisory - "if you tell us, we can help more"
  ○ It could help us do the things we told the community we wanted to do
  ○ If we want to do this, it could be pretty easy (IRTF uses EasyChair now)
Do We Need To Do Anything Else Now?

*Note: The "S" is for "Steering"*
Ideas we haven't talked about or agreed on yet

- Post-mortems for BOFs beyond "are these guys ready for a WG?"
  - "What would have helped this BOF work better?"
  - EKR: "Based on experience, is there a problem?". We have anecdotes
- Datatracker support for BOF requests, etc.
- Changes to existing BCP procedures for BOFs
- Changes to existing INFO guidance for BOFs and "side meetings"
- REALLY early interaction with HotRFC participants
  - Individual ADs can do as much of this as they want to do on their own
- Orthogonal proposals to "tag" documents/working groups
Background Slides from IETF 99 IESG
“The IETF is too slow”

- We want to produce work on something important and urgent
- We could start working on it, but it’s not chartered/re-chartered
- We could request a charter/re-charter, but we need a BOF first - or two
- We could request a BOF, but we think we need a side meeting first - or two
- (See a problem yet?)
- If we’re trying to finish quickly, waiting to start is the wrong thing to do
Mismatch Between “Hot Topics” and IETF Structure

"Please charter a Clouds Working Group!!!"

"That’s a Great Idea! What Will It Work On?"

Cloud Applications (APP)

Cloud Transport (TSV)

Cloud Request RTG (RTG)

Cloud Hop by Hop (INT)

Cloud Security (SEC)

Cloud Operations (OPS)

THIS REALLY HAPPENED IN 2010 - and this is why we can't work on "nice things"