

Workgroup: shmoo
Internet-Draft:
draft-ietf-shmoo-cancel-meeting-03
Published: 17 May 2021
Intended Status: Best Current Practice
Expires: 18 November 2021
Authors: M. Duke
F5 Networks, Inc.

Considerations for Cancellation of IETF Meetings

Abstract

The IETF holds three in-person meetings per year to discuss and understand issues. However, various emergencies can make a planned in-person meeting infeasible. This document provides criteria for making this judgment.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 18 November 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 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](#)
- [2. Conventions](#)
- [3. Decision Criteria and Roles](#)
 - [3.1. IETF LLC](#)
 - [3.2. IESG and IRTF Chair](#)
- [4. Remedies](#)
 - [4.1. Relocation](#)
 - [4.2. Virtualization](#)
 - [4.3. Postponement](#)
 - [4.4. Cancellation](#)
- [5. Refunds](#)
- [6. Security Considerations](#)
- [7. IANA Considerations](#)
- [8. Informative References](#)
- [Appendix A. Acknowledgments](#)
- [Appendix B. Change Log](#)
 - [B.1. Since draft-ietf-shmoo-cancel-meetings-02](#)
 - [B.2. Since draft-ietf-shmoo-cancel-meetings-01](#)
 - [B.3. Since draft-ietf-shmoo-cancel-meetings-00](#)
 - [B.4. Since draft-duke-shmoo-cancel-meetings-01](#)
 - [B.5. Since draft-duke-shmoo-cancel-meetings-00](#)
 - [B.6. Since draft-duke-remote-meetings-00](#)
- [Author's Address](#)

1. Introduction

One highlight of the IETF calendar is in-person general meetings, which happen three times a year at various locations around the world.

Various major events may affect the suitability of a scheduled in-person IETF meeting, though for some this may not be immediately obvious. For example:

*The meeting venue itself may unexpectedly close or otherwise be unable to meet IETF meeting requirements due to a health issue, legal violation, or other localized problem.

*A natural disaster could degrade the travel and event infrastructure in a planned location and make it unethical to further burden that infrastructure with a meeting.

*War, civil unrest, or public health crisis could make a meeting unsafe and/or result in widespread national or corporate travel bans.

*An economic crisis could sharply reduce resources available for travel.

*Changes in visa policy or other unexpected governmental restrictions might make the venue inaccessible to numerous attendees.

This document provides procedures for the IETF to decide to postpone, move, or cancel an in-person IETF meeting.

2. Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [[RFC2119](#)].

In this document, the term "venue" refers to both the facility that houses the sessions and the official meeting hotel(s).

3. Decision Criteria and Roles

The IETF Administration LLC (LLC) assesses whether or not an in-person meeting is logistically and financially viable in light of events, and assembles information about various travel restrictions that might impact attendance. The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) and IETF chair assess if the projected attendance is sufficient for a viable in-person meeting.

3.1. IETF LLC

The LLC is responsible for assessing the suitability of a venue for an IETF meeting and is responsible for any reassessment in response to a major event that leaves the prior conclusion in doubt. Where such an event occurs more than twelve weeks before the start of the scheduled meeting, it is deemed a non-emergency situation. Later events, up to and including the week of the meeting itself, are deemed an emergency situation.

In non-emergency situations, if the LLC determines the scheduled meeting clearly cannot proceed (e.g., the venue has permanently closed), then it **MUST** consult with the community on the reason(s) and its proposed remedy. In less clear cases, the LLC **SHOULD** conduct a formal reassessment process that includes:

- *Consulting with the community on the process timetable.
- *Consulting with the community on criteria to assess the impact of new developments.
- *Consulting with the community on the form of the assessment report.
- *Publishing an assessment report and recommended remedy.

*Seeking approval of the IESG for the recommendation.

In emergency situations, which lack the time for a consultation process, this document provides an IETF consensus on criteria the LLC MUST apply in its assessment.

The LLC will collect information about the likely impact to in-person attendance of national travel advisories, national and corporate travel bans, quarantine requirements, etc. and report the results to the IESG.

The criteria in Section 3.1 of [[RFC8718](#)] apply to venues that are re- evaluated due to an emergency. Specifically:

*Local safety guidelines allow the venue and hotels to host a meeting with the expected number of participants and staff.

*It MUST be possible to provision Internet Access to the Facility and IETF Hotels that allows those attending in person to utilize the Internet for all their IETF, business, and day-to-day needs; in addition, there must be sufficient bandwidth and access for remote attendees. Provisions include, but are not limited to, native and unmodified IPv4 and IPv6 connectivity, and global reachability; there may be no additional limitation that would materially impact their Internet use. To ensure availability, it MUST be possible to provision redundant paths to the Internet.

*A reasonable number of food and drink establishments are open and available within walking distance to provide for the expected number of participants and staff.

*Local health and public safety infrastructure should expect to have adequate capacity to support an influx of visitors during the meeting week.

Finally, the LLC MUST assess the impact on its own operations, including:

*The number of critical support staff and contractors who can be at the venue.

*The financial impact of continuing the meeting, or implementing any of the possible remedies.

The LLC SHOULD cancel the meeting if it judges the meeting to be logistically impossible or inconsistent with its fiduciary responsibilities.

In the event of considerations this document does not foresee, the LLC should protect the health and safety of attendees and staff, as

well as the fiscal health of the organization, with approval from the IESG and a plan to seek a later update of this document.

3.2. IESG and IRTF Chair

If the LLC assesses there are no fundamental logistical or financial obstacles to holding the meeting, the IESG and IRTF chair assess if projected attendance is high enough to capture the benefit of an in-person meeting.

The IESG is discouraged from relying on a simple head count of expected event attendance. Even dramatically smaller events with large remote participation may be successful. In addition to the LLC's estimate, the IESG might consider:

- *Are many working groups and research groups largely unaffected by the restrictions, so that they can operate effectively?
- *Is there a critical mass of key personnel at most working group meetings to leverage the advantages of in-person meetings, even if many participants are remote?

4. Remedies

If the event cannot be held at the scheduled time and place, the IETF has several options. The remedies below should be considered in light of these principles, presented in no particular order:

- *Hold the scheduled sessions of the meeting in some format.
- *Provide benefits of in-person interactions when possible.
- *Avoid exorbitant additional travel expenses due to last minute flight changes, etc.
- *Ensure the available time and resources allow the alternative to be adequately prepared.

4.1. Relocation

For attendees, the least disruptive response is to retain the meeting week but move it to a more accessible venue. To the maximum extent possible, this will be geographically close to the original venue. In particular, the IETF should strive to meet the criteria in [\[RFC8718\]](#) and [\[RFC8719\]](#).

Relocation that requires new air travel arrangements for attendees SHOULD NOT occur less than one month prior to the start of the meeting.

4.2. Virtualization

The second option, and one that has fewer issues with venue availability, is to make the meeting fully remote. This requires different IETF processes and logistical operations that are outside the scope of this document.

4.3. Postponement

Although it is more disruptive to the schedules of participants, the next best option is to delay the meeting until a specific date at which conditions are expected to improve. The new end date of the meeting must be at least 30 days before the beginning of the following IETF meeting, and the meeting must begin no earlier than 1 month after the postponement announcement.

Due to scheduling constraints at the venue, this will usually not be feasible. However, it is more likely to allow attendees to recover at least some of their travel expenses than other options.

4.4. Cancellation

As a last resort, IETF may cancel the meeting totally. This is a last resort in the event that worldwide conditions make it difficult for attendees to even attend remotely. Not holding a meeting at all can have wide implications for the rhythm of IETF personnel policies, such as the nomination process and seating of new officers.

Cancellation is likely the only practical alternative when emergencies occur immediately before or during the meeting, so that there is no opportunity to make other arrangements.

5. Refunds

The IETF SHOULD NOT reimburse registered attendees for unrecoverable travel expenses (airfare, hotel deposits, etc).

However, there are several cases where full or partial refund of registration fees is appropriate:

- *Cancellation SHOULD result in a full refund to all participants. It MAY be prorated if some portion of the sessions completed without incident.

- *Upon postponement, the LLC SHOULD offer refunds to registered attendees who claim they cannot attend at the newly scheduled time.

*When the meeting becomes remote, the LLC SHOULD attempt to recover whatever venue-related payments, past or future, it can and rebate this to registered attendees, up to a maximum of their total cost of registration.

*The LLC SHOULD offer refunds to attendees whose nation of residence forbids, or has issued a safety advisory against, visits to the host venue, even if the in-person meeting will continue. It SHOULD NOT refund cancellations due to employer policy or personal risk assessments.

These provisions intend to maintain trust between the IETF and its participants. However, under extraordinary threats to the solvency of the organization, the LLC may suspend them.

6. Security Considerations

This document introduces no new concerns for the security of internet protocols.

7. IANA Considerations

There are no IANA requirements.

8. Informative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.

[RFC8718] Lear, E., Ed., "IETF Plenary Meeting Venue Selection Process", BCP 226, RFC 8718, DOI 10.17487/RFC8718, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8718>>.

[RFC8719] Krishnan, S., "High-Level Guidance for the Meeting Policy of the IETF", BCP 226, RFC 8719, DOI 10.17487/RFC8719, February 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8719>>.

Appendix A. Acknowledgments

Appendix B. Change Log

B.1. Since draft-ietf-shmoo-cancel-meetings-02

*Added IRTF to IESG responsibilities

*WGLC Nits

B.2. Since draft-ietf-shmoo-cancel-meetings-01

*Added refund principles for hybrid meetings

B.3. Since draft-ietf-shmoo-cancel-meetings-00

*Jay Daley's nits

*Distinguish the emergency and non-emergency process

*Eliminated USSTATE/UKFO references

*Clarified roles of LLC and IESG

B.4. Since draft-duke-shmoo-cancel-meetings-01

*Change to WG draft

B.5. Since draft-duke-shmoo-cancel-meetings-00

*Added mention of IRTF

*Discussed consensus on cancellation

B.6. Since draft-duke-remote-meetings-00

*Defined "venue"

*Added principles for selecting remedies and rewrote alternatives.

*Added local authority travel advisories

*Added some criteria from IETF 109

Author's Address

Martin Duke
F5 Networks, Inc.

Email: martin.h.duke@gmail.com