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Early X-functional Review

- Cross-functional: cross-WG + cross-area
- 2 ways today:
  - community
  - "management" (IESG and IAB)
- One of the core values of the IETF
- Ensures high quality, security, scalability, healthiness for the Internet
- Needs to be preserved and encouraged
Current Issues

- IETF Last Call and IESG review happen late in the process:
  - late surprises -> frustration
- Early formal IESG review as it is today would not scale
- Involved expert groups are not widely known
- No general process support for pre-IESG review
What we've been doing

- Cross-area technical advisors: Security, MIB, Routing "doctors"
- Early reviews by directorates and "doctor" groups (informal)
- Early review by ADs (informal)
- Ad hoc expert reviews (usually initiated by ADs or WG chairs)
- Cross-WG discussions and Last Calls
- Pilot early review tried (DCCP in Vienna)
What we need

- Encourage more community review across WGs and areas early in the process
- Establish a mechanism for structured review:
  - *Early*: when ideas are still in the formation stage, before WG Last Call time
  - *Significant*: want less issues during IESG review
  - *Consistent* with later IESG review
  - *Scalable*:
    - controlled load/state on a given individual
    - prevent bottlenecks and single points of failure
Why do we need this?

- Improve document quality
- Decrease load on individual AD
- Decrease overall IESG load
- Speed the process
- Minimize late surprises
- Foster cross-functional expertise
- Grow future leadership
How should we do this?

- Several proposals floating:
  - draft-carpenter-solution-sirs and modifications
  - draft-allman-problem-wg-revcomm
- Several proposals within the IESG
  - Will outline them in this presentation
  - No single one “from the IESG”
- Comments are encouraged
Proposal 1: draft-iesg-hardie-outline

- Part of a bigger proposal
- CREW: Committed Reviewers of Early Work
  - Individuals who take on reviewing work outside their groups in order to give cross-area or cross-functional perspectives.
  - The group is drawn from document editors, working group chairs, and committed working group participants.
- CREW members are willing to put cycles into review of work in other areas
- WG chairs solicit comments from the CREW early in the process (see Margaret's talk)
Proposal 1: draft-iesg-hardie-outline (cont.)

- Area Boards: Among other duties, each reviews all INFO and EXP drafts assigned to their area and returns its review to the RFC Editor.
- May propose that individual submissions in their area be considered for the standards track, and so offload early review of those documents from individual ADs.
- IESG approves STD track documents
- See the draft for more details
Proposal 2: draft-iesg-alvestrand-twolevel

- Part of a bigger proposal
- Review team: headed by "area supervisor", includes one "council" member from each other area, and IAB
- One review team per area
- Each review team approves documents for that area, ensuring cross-area review
- IESG transforms into "Leadership Team", that does NOT approve documents as a body
- The Leadership Team serves as backstop for cases where a review team does not get all issues resolved
- See the draft for more details
Proposal 3: draft-zinin-early-review

- Based on experience with directorates and "doctor" teams
- Each area has an ART composed and trained by the ADs
- ARTs perform doc reviews with hosting area specifics in mind for docs in that and other areas
- WG chairs (or ADs) initiate cross-area review process before WG LC, during WG LC, IETF LC by requesting review from ARTs in the same and other areas
- 2 ART members are assigned to each document as responsible
- Reviews are completed within 2 weeks (default)
Proposal 3: draft-zinin-early-review (cont.)

- ARTs provide their ADs with recommendation on each reviewed document for consistency with IESG review (even if initiated by a WG chair in the same or another area).
- ADs can off-load review of documents from WGs and IESG by delegating it to ART in part or in full.
- Informal review is improved by soliciting comments from ARTs instead of sending a review request.
- IESG is responsible for document approval.
- ADs are accountable for quality of approved documents.
- See the draft for more details.
How we get there?

- There == improved cross-functional review (can be pursued independently from other changes)
- Discussion venue: solutions@alvestrand.no
- Have an open discussion of the proposals: NOV--JAN 2004
- Make a decision on which mechanism (or a set of mechanisms) to implement: JAN/FEB 2004
How we get there? (cont.)

- Work out the transition strategy: FEB 2004
  Likely to include:
  - introducing the process to WG chairs and community (area meetings)
  - "hiring" reviewing folks
  - training reviewers and WG chairs
  - learning period, testing in certain areas
  - bug fixing
- The transition: at least two IETF meeting periods?
- Start it: 59th IETF
Proposal: draft-carpenter-solution-sirs

- SIRs: senior reviewers committing to perform IETF document review
- Doesn’t act like a body, members review specific documents
- Member selection: by qualification and nomination & voting
- WGs or individual authors solicit comments from SIRs they think should be involved
Proposal: draft-allman-problem-wg-revcomm

- Review committee: group of experts chosen by WGs and agreed to review its documents
- One per WG
- Members:
  - from different areas
  - no formal rules on who can serve
- Provides cross-functional review before the document goes to IESG