

RIPE

Furniture selection procedure

How will APWG choose its chairs?



RIPE

WG chair (re-) selection procedure

How will APWG choose its chairs?



Background

- The working group chair collective realised that
 - Once selected a chair could remain forever
 - Barrier to become a chair is high as long as existing chairs don't step down
 - When the WG is unhappy with a chair there is a huge barrier to removing them
 - So chairs just have to assume/hope they are doing a good job
- This is not a healthy situation

Up to now...

- The WG chair collective tried to write a proposal
- But not all working groups are equal...
 - We couldn't find a single proposal that would fit all working groups
 - RIPE works bottom-up!
- Every WG will define their own procedure
 - Let's see what works
 - Maybe we can merge things in the future



First proposed text (1/2)

The RIPE Address Policy Working Group should attempt to maintain two Chairpersons whenever possible. Once per year one of the chairs will offer to stand down to allow new candidates to become chair. This will be announced by sending an email to the working group mailing list at least two weeks before the start of a RIPE meeting.



First proposed text (2/2)

Anybody is allowed to volunteer for the chair position, including the chair who offered to step down. At the next RIPE meeting those present at the working group session will determine by consensus who will take the available chair position. If no consensus can be reached in the working group session then the current chairs will stay to ensure the continued stability of the working group.



Issues mentioned on the mailing list

- Which chair steps down? Do they take turns?
- What if/when chair(s) leave unexpectedly?
- Shouldn't this be done on the mailing list?
- Is Consensus the right way to select chairs?
- Not changing chairs as long as no consensus has been reached still makes it possible for a chair to stay indefinitely

Do chairs take turns stepping down?

- Although this was not explicit in the proposed text this was indeed the intention
- We'll make it explicit

Mid-term changes

- If a chair leaves mid-term then a replacement will be selected at the next RIPE meeting

Deciding on mailing list

- APWG has always made decisions on the mailing list, not at RIPE meetings
- But live discussion at RIPE meetings helps
- Keep selecting chairs at RIPE meetings
 - Make sure remote participants are included

Consensus

- Who determines consensus?
 - The working group chairs
 - Chairs that are also candidates will abstain
- Difficult to publicly discuss consensus about people
 - We expect that the candidates and the rest of the working group to come to consensus together
 - If this doesn't work we need another solution (we'll come back to this on the next slide)

What if consensus can't be reached?

- Getting consensus on a chair position hasn't failed so far
- With the current text a chair could theoretically get friends to block consensus so he/she can stay on indefinitely
- If there is no easy clear consensus then hold a secret ballot. Ask the RIPE NCC to do the counting. Simple majority wins.

Discussion!

