IETF 107 Plenary Minutes

25 March 2020, Virtual

1. Welcome

Slides: [IETF 107 Administrative and Operations Plenary](#), slides 1-4

2. Meeting Host presentation

Slides: [IETF 107 Virtual Host Presentation](#)

3. Brief Updates

Note: Reports available in the [Datatracker](#)

3.1. IETF Chair Update

Slides: [IETF 107 Administrative and Operations Plenary](#), slides 6-13

3.2. IRTF Chair Update

Slides: [IRTF Plenary Report](#)

3.3. Temporary RFC Series Project Manager Update

Slides: [Temporary RFC Series Project Manager Report](#)

3.4. NomCom Update

Slides: [IETF NomCom 2019-2020 - IETF 107 Update](#)

3.5. IETF LLC Board Update

Slides: [IETF 107 IETF LLC Report](#)

3.6. IETF Trust Update

Slides: [IETF Trust Report IETF 107](#)

4. IETF Administration LLC Open Mic Session

Victor Kuarsingh: When we saw the registration count [in the slides], 703, was that lower than we had originally anticipated for that meeting and do we feel the building challenges we face would have been part of that number? I recall North America meetings being a little higher typically in terms of in-person registrations. So that was my original question; do we feel there's a connection there or was that about normal for what we expected?

Jay Daley: Initially, registrations were tracking our expected number for a North American meeting. It wasn't too far into that when concerns around COVID-19 started to appear and it then deviated. My short answer would be no, I don't think there were any problems apart from Covid-19. I think we would have been on track for a similar North American meeting in terms of registration numbers.

*

John Klensin: I had two issues and I just settled one in jabber. The appointment of an anonymous whistleblower channel and a contractor to manage it came as a surprise to many of us. It's probably a wonderful idea, but it also looks like a sign that the LLC is evolving in the direction of a corporation rather than the way IETF has traditionally run, even under the IAOC. Are there more moves like that in the plan consistent with your "policies coming" comment?

Jason Livingood: We created a whistleblower policy when we did the open policy consultation that was in the fall of last year. Through the October-December timeframe we worked on that and had the policies up on Github and took questions and comments through different channels. There was a whistleblower policy as part of that and this is one of the requirements we had in the formation documents. It's not necessarily a whistleblower policy that is IETF participant-wide, but you can see it on Github and getting the third party in place was just the final step there. Not only was it recommended but it was required by the formation agreement by ISOC. So what you're seeing is the net result of us executing on all those requirements and then putting into force the policies we communicated and developed with the community last year.

John Klensin: I wasn't objecting to anything you've done, and I was vaguely aware of that in the fall. Some of us were preoccupied with the IASA2 working group. I was asking if there were more things like that in the queue that we're anticipating and you could tell us about an outline, either today or on the IETF list.

Jason Livingood: No, there are not any other policy things in the queue right now. As you saw on the list of things we're working on, it's really just executing on the structure we've already got; figuring out sponsorship and fundraising for the future, so on and so forth. No plans for additional policies any time soon; the key is just putting everything into force, really making sure those are real policies and not just paper.

John Klensin: Okay, thanks very much.

*

Tony Rutkowski: What is the IETF LLC doing to ensure compliance with antitrust laws other than having a process examined by its lawyers? I see nothing on the IETF website other than the 2012 list archives. Second question is what is the LLC process for addressing conflicts of interest when they're raised? Some of them have been raised but not carried forward and the reasoning was opaque. A clear reporting process should be established for the next IETF meeting and transparency. Related to transparency follows from John's question about getting better organized. A few plenaries ago a question was raised about transparency of Area Director funding. It's a great idea, had a couple of ADs committed on the spot, and could be extended to chairs. The IETF chair said it would be looked into. What is the result?

Jason Livingood: I think I caught three separate questions there; antitrust, conflict of interest, and AD funding. Alissa, maybe you want to address AD funding first and then I'll hit antitrust and conflict of interest?

Alissa Cooper: Where this landed was indeed with the IESG. It was during the time when the LLC was starting to develop its conflict of interest policy. Our conclusion I believe was to see what that looked like, and I think the IAB had the same conclusion. We were all waiting in cascade to see if we could harmonize the policies, in terms of disclosing peoples' conflicts, which naturally would disclose their main sources of funding. The LLC completed that a while back and the IAB has just completed its own process and published its statement about conflict of interest, so now the ball is in the IESG's court to sort out what we will do and whether we will follow either of them or develop our own. It's still a pending item for the IESG to tackle.

Jason Livingood: So that may have covered the last two and three. If there are other COI concerns send them over email and we can take a look. The first question pertained to antitrust and we have a number of times looked at antitrust and whether we wanted to revisit that. We did that in the fourth quarter one last time and there were a

bunch of discussions on email. Jay, I think you also had been talking to counsel about this. Do you want to provide any additional information?

Jay Daley: At the IETF 106 plenary, a comment was made on an open mic session about major upcoming antitrust issues that the IETF ought to be aware of. I asked our counsel to get in touch with the person directly about that and see if there were any specifics we ought to be aware of. Those specifics emerged so no further action was taken. Our counsel do keep a watching brief on any emerging antitrust issues but otherwise there's nothing else.

Tony Rutkowski: Maybe I can help. I performed this activity to some extent in conjunction with ITSI and as some of you know I funded at the Internet Society the first review of this. Arguably there's a continuing problem and it could get worse.

*

James Gruessing via jabber scribe: What is the target date for a go/no go decision for IETF 108, or is there one?

Jason Livingood: That's an excellent question. I'm not certain there is a definite date as yet. Jay, do you want to speak to that based on your discussions with the Secretariat and so on? I think at a high level I'd say we were trying to get through this meeting first and based on what we learn, do a major reassessment. Jay, what would you like to add?

Jay Daley: This is, to be clear, a conversation across the LLC, Secretariat, and IESG. So far no, we do not have a target date. We want to get through this meeting. We're reaching out to various people that we need to speak to, hosts, sponsors, etc, and trying to work backwards from the time so we understand implications better. That's going to be quite intense work as soon as this meeting finishes, and then we'll hopefully have a better idea within a week or two from there.

*

Larry Masinter: I just want to urge you to do contingency planning for the possibility that face to face meetings won't be possible in the foreseeable future, because of travel restrictions. Add that to your list of contingencies.

Jay Daley: Thank you. We are doing that contingency planning. This of course is the first time this has happened and the LLC is relatively new so there is no existing

thorough contingency plan in this regard, but that is something that we and the IESG are working together on and developing over time.

Jason Livingood: I would just add, from the mailing list discussion about this question as well, it's certainly important that as those come together in draft form that they're shared for community comment and get the benefit of a lot of people taking a look at them and commenting.

*

Pete Resnick: Going back to this question of antitrust, I just want to get the order of how things happened. Someone brought up a comment at IETF 106 that this should be looked into. Who directed legal counsel to go look into this?

Jay Daley: That was a comment made from the open mic session. I instructed our counsel to speak to that person so that we could understand what they were talking about and understand what they were saying. They were suggesting there was some new legislation or something coming that was going to be a problem. That's the conversation we had, fact gathering; but no new information came from that so it stopped at that point.

Pete Resnick: My concern being of course any policy around antitrust would go over to the IESG, it wouldn't be in scope for the LLC to take that on. Correct?

Jay Daley: I believe that's the case. It's an issue for both organizations because I believe the LLC carries some legal liability in this case so it's something that needs to be worked across both organizations. But in terms of substantive issues, we would defer to the IESG. Our role is to make sure we have the information so that we can present the options, and do the research, so the IESG doesn't have to become lawyers.

5. Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG)

5.1 Recognition of Outgoing Members

Slides: [IETF 107 Administrative and Operations Plenary](#), slides 20-22

Alissa Cooper thanked outgoing members of the IESG; Ignas Bagdonas, outgoing Management Area Director; Adam Roach and Alexey Melnikov, outgoing Applications and Real-Time Area Directors; Suresh Krishnan, outgoing Internet Area Director; and Mirja Kuehlewind, outgoing Transport Area Director.

5.2 Open Mic Session

Slides: [IETF 107 Administrative and Operations Plenary](#), slides 23

Alissa Cooper: The queue is open.

Michael Richardson: I wanted to know about the openstand.org project. Is this still an IESG project? Or what exactly?

Alissa Cooper: Thank you Michael, and thank you for submitting your question in advance. The openstand project specifies some principles that open standards organizations abide by, for those who are not familiar with it. If you look at the openstand Web site you can see that the web presence has been archived. The principles are there, they continue to remain up on the site for people to reference and understand and potentially use again in the future. But there is not any active promotion that's going on right now. It's an effort we engaged in together with other standards development organizations and with ISOC. We're still coordinating with those bodies but there isn't any active development or promotion of the principles at this point.

Michael Richardson: There is no plan to go forward with it?

Alissa Cooper: I'm not sure what you mean by "going forward," but the principles are there to be used by people who need them. But we're not actively doing anything with them right now.

Michael Richardson: Okay. Thanks.

*

Tony Rutkowski: I have two questions. One relates to the relationship with other SDOs. I was wondering what concrete steps have been taken to address the competition taking place amongst the SDOs and the potential attrition of newcomers and diverse stakeholders and that's related to the kind of hostile atmosphere here the IETF has compared to other SDOs. Second question I'm not sure if it's IESG or IAB, but it has to do with lawful interception that's likely to become increasingly important. Will a position paper be prepared on that? Or is everyone so intransigent on the subject that's not likely to occur?

Alissa Cooper: Thanks Tony, let's take the second one first, do we have a Security AD who wants to talk about lawful intercept?

Roman Danyliw: For me, I guess we would like to better understand what kind of position paper and for whom you like us to publish that on.

Ben Kaduk: We already have RFC 2804, which as far as I can tell is on the same topic.

Tony Rutkowski: There has been an RFC. There has been an ongoing controversy going back to the 1990's when CALEA was first passed and its counterparts in Europe and other places. I'm aware of the RFC, but it is unclear who would have the ball here on ever changing the position, whether it would be the IESG or the IAB or whether it's possible to do a position paper.

Ben Kaduk: I'm not seeing any incentive or desire from the community to reopen the established consensus. I don't think there is anything to do here.

Tony Rutkowski: Okay. You are aware particularly in respect to 5G, the FCC has asserted as a requirement as a part of all 5G implementations. That is going to be quite interesting and it raises the issue again, particularly with respect if the IETF is going to do anything in the 5G world.

Ben Kaduk: Okay. Thank you.

Alissa Cooper: And the question on how we work with other SDOs. We tend to take a bottom up approach. The most fruitful thing we do is we collaborate with individuals who are working across SDOs to make sure our work aligns with what other SDOs are doing. Having people who are participating in multiple bodies and able to translate back and forth in terms of what the requirements are and the standards being produced elsewhere. I think that's the most important thing we do from the bottom and building up from there we have liaison managers who manage relationships across the board between the work of the IETF and other SDOs. The IAB has the responsibility for shepherding those liaison managers checking in with them and making sure those relationships are solid. With some of the SDOs we engage with on a more frequent basis, we also have some leadership coordination, so with IEEE 802 for example, we have an ongoing communications channel. We have regular sync ups where we go through a shared list of items of interest and try to make sure we maintain alignment, and find people who can contribute on one side or the other who might not be made aware of new work that's coming from either body. So in specific cases we make it a

little more high touch. That's the general approach. And then we send liaison statements just like any other SDO, but we tend to prefer more informal communication, just getting people working together as opposed to these formal liaison statements unless we really have to.

Tony Rutkowski: That sounds like a great idea, and in the 5G world that will be increasingly important with respect to 3GPP and that whole constellation of bodies that are involved in that effort. The extent you can be proactive and informal that's great.

Alissa: Yeah, absolutely. 3GPP is one of those we have a standing mechanism for coordination and a mailing list where a bunch of interested individuals, not just the liaison managers are involved. I know that tends to revolve around an in-person lunch meeting, and that may need to change a little bit going forward, but that's another we've tried to be a little bit more hands on with. Thanks.

*

Toerless Eckert: I would ask the IESG to come up with the more liberal guidance for the ability to use the IETF tools with virtual side meetings. In the same way that rooms were usable in the physical meetings, I think it would be great that would apply to the wiki, the jabber, the etherpad, maybe the WebEx. When we're doing virtual meetings right now, there is no statements about that. Rather one would fear to use etherpad or wiki to arrange unofficial side meetings. And WebEx and jabber wouldn't be usable by themselves right now at all.

Alissa: Thank you for the question. I think at the moment, as previewed earlier we have been focusing on the short order to make this go off smoothly. We have a lot of decisions that need to be made going forward. This question about side meetings is something we will need to tackle, but this is not something we have had time to discuss in the context of more meetings that are happening. I'll let Suresh follow up.

Suresh Krishnan: Thanks, Toerless. I think when we originally started off with the side meetings, the intent was to clearly delineate the meetings from the official meetings, because it was easy for people from outside the IETF to confuse them, so that's why we decided this was not something we wanted to encourage at that time. As Alissa said, times are changing and we'll need to look at that. But the original reason why we did not do specific remote support for this.

Toerless Eckert: I understand. It wasn't a complaint. I understand why this couldn't be a priority for this so far, but towards 108 it would be great to give it thoughts and definitely I think there should be clear distinction so people won't get confused.

*

Stewart Bryant: I'm not sure whether people in other areas feel the same, but as a long-term contributor, I always thought that security reviews were something akin to a GenART review by someone who knows about security. They're not, at least in my experience, a review by someone who is a specialist in both security and routing. This leads to a great deal of frustration and a great deal of time spent educating the reviewer on things that we take as read in the routing area. It also ultimately leads to a reduction in the quality of security reviews because if you know about the subjects, you would be able to drill down on what is really important and not apply a standard rota of what to look for. So can I ask the security ADs to look at either training some of their reviewers in routing, or recruiting some extra reviewers who are skilled in both subjects, or training some routing specialists in security so that they would understand the security issues in routing drafts?

Ben Kaduk: Hi Stewart, thanks for the question. I really appreciate one of your suggestions in there, to try and train some people who are existing routing experts in security issues. I would love to talk to any volunteers who want to come forward and get some training in that regard. I think the topic of assigning reviewers to what documents to review and what policy to use when doing that has come up several times in our security directorate meetings in the context of do we want to find people who are specifically domain experts versus more round robin style assignments. Pretty universally, the consensus of the directorate is the round robin assignment is better. It's better because you get a completely fresh perspective. Sometimes, they might have to put some extra work in to learn the topic, and they might come out a little confused sometimes. But you also get the really invaluable benefit that sometimes you have someone with a fresh perspective who can find things not visible to people who have the domain expertise. And we think that the benefits from having a fresh perspective outweighs the cost of sometimes not having as good of a review or having to do a bit of training for it. Not directly responding to your particular question but on a related topic that comes up in many of the routing drafts which is that me as the AD, and the directorate we really want to make sure that the security properties of the protocol as a whole, including whatever extension is in the draft in question as well as the core protocol. We want to make sure that the security properties are well documented. That's one of the key things we're looking for when we do the directorate review. And if there is

an existing reference that has the security considerations for the base protocol, that's amazing. We love that, whether that's in the specification of the core protocol, or in a separate document. But unfortunately, for many of the existing and legacy protocols, that security considerations in the core protocol spec are kind of inadequate and there hasn't been a follow up stand alone document for the security considerations. So a lot of the basic security considerations are not written down anywhere. So when we're doing the directorate reviews we need to have this discussion about what is the best path to getting these security considerations really documented properly. A lot of the time that's not going to be documenting all of the considerations of the base protocol in the document for the specific extension. But I think that's a discussion worth having and having the discussion in the review thread, we can get a better handle and you can start to write down what some of those considerations are. So while I sympathize with your frustration, I do think we should try and look for the path towards the best outcome in the future.

Stewart Bryant: I agree we need to look for the path to get the best outcome. No question about that. I think that quite often reviewers fail to understand the fundamental knowledge that you need to just go to the party, and fail to recognize that actually a lot of these networks are pretty secure because they are the hottest areas to attack. And operators have a long, long history of securing their networks. I also feel that the expectation of the review team is that we write the document for the complete novice instead of assuming that someone needs a certain level of experience to begin to read the document. And I think that's reasonable. I think if you're writing a modification or an extension to a complex protocol you should be assumed to know all about that protocol before you start.

Ben Kaduk: I think that is generally the case to be able to assume a reasonable level of familiarity with the base specification to work on an extension. But I think it still needs to be documented in terms of some reference or initial statement that "we rely on this base specification so if you're confused by what you read here, go read this other document." Of course, not in those words, and I don't remember specific cases of this off the top of my head to be able to comment more.

Mirja Kühlewind: I would like to add a more general note. For us, having directorates and getting reviews in is very valuable. I think in general getting more reviews for the documents is a plus. And this is a service to the community, so I am very thankful for people doing this in volunteering and spending their time on reading these documents. It is challenging to review a document from a different area where you are not an expert. It is a lot of time commitment if you have to look up the background. And it's also hard

sometimes to find the right tone, but in general I think all the reviews and all the comments can actually improve the outcome of the document, and I hope that people receive it that way and try to be constructive and try to take into account that someone from a different expertise is trying to bring in their own expertise and cannot be an expert of a protocol that they are reviewing. But the end goal really is to improve the protocol. To improve the document. And to improve the RFC.

Alissa Cooper: Thank you. Last call to get into the queue to ask the IESG. We invited questions in advance, we got one from Michael Richardson which we spoke about at the open mic. We got a second one which was more of an LLC question so we directed it over to Jay. But in the future we would be happy to receive questions in advance of the open mic as well. And with that I think we have Tony back in the queue. Tony?

*

Tony Rutkowski: I thought I would be different. Just to say it's been a pleasure to be here and involved again. I was reflecting. I think the last time I was at an open mic to the group was in 1994 as the ISOC Executive director trying to convince the community to have a relationship with the Internet Society. So twenty-five years later, things have changed a little bit.

Alissa: Thanks for your participation. I think we can move to the IAB.

6. Internet Architecture Board (IAB)

6.1 Recognition of Outgoing Members

Slides: [IETF 107 Administrative and Operations Plenary](#), slides 24

Ted Hardie thanked outgoing IAB members Christian Huitema, Erik Nordmark, Melinda Shore, Martin Thomson, and Brian Trammell. Alissa Cooper thanked outgoing IAB Chair Ted Hardie.

6.2 Open Mic Session

Slides: [IETF 107 Administrative and Operations Plenary](#), slides 25

Mirja Kühlewind: At this point, I want to take one or two minutes to just introduce myself and also say, thank you for selecting me and trusting in me to serve in this position. That's mainly for the IAB, who selected me [as Chair], but also to the community,

because the community and NomCom actually gave me the opportunity to go directly from the IESG into the IAB, which is already rare, and it's even more rare to start as the IAB Chair in this position. The reason I can do this is I was already the liaison from the IESG to the IAB, so I at least know what's going on, and I can serve in this position. I'm also aware that it's not easy to transition from one group to the other directly. I'm very open for, and will try to be careful about being clear about what role I'm talking in. I would be grateful for any kind of feedback or comments that people have for me. So with that in mind, let's open the mic.

*

Tony Rutkowski: ETSI has instituted a change to attract diversity and more people by creating these informal groups, where it doesn't actually require a membership; in some ways, it's a little bit like the IETF. I was wondering whether there was some way, through the IAB, perhaps, or another appropriate mechanism, to get more collaboration with the new ISGs [Industry Specification Groups] that are being created, for which I think there would be a common interest and utility.

Mirja Kühlewind: Thank you. I have to say that I'm personally not aware of these ETSI groups. But we do have a liaison with ETSI, so I think that's something we could look at. We also have a liaison manager for ETSI, so if that person is here and has the knowledge they can speak up. Or, actually, I just realized we might not have a liaison with ETSI, so maybe that is the first step to consider here, actually.

Tony Rutkowski: Yeah, there is an agreement, basically for communication and sharing, but it could be improved, particularly with this kind of sea change they are creating with these ISGs and trying to broaden the participation and diversity. It's something that brings us more into a kind of common interest at my end, especially since I am also the liaison for some other groups. I'll see what I can do to facilitate that.

*

Dominique Lazanski: I have a couple of questions about the Model-T Program, which I'm a part of, and I'm very excited about. It's an IAB Program that was recently set up, and I was curious about what the process was to get that up and running, and if you have to be on the IAB to get an IAB Program running. I wanted to ask to see how that whole process works. Thanks!

Mirja Kühlewind: I can answer part of your question, and there will be other IAB members who are more in touch with this program who can give more information. But one part is that this program has an open membership--everybody can contribute and everybody can engage in the discussion. It's different from what we usually have as programs, but there's a discussion ongoing in the IAB about how we want to organize programs in the future. For this program, it's open. If Stephen or Jari want to add some more here?

Stephen Farrell: I'm afraid I missed part of the question because of some audio drops, but yeah, the program is open. Maybe if you repeat the question I might be able to give you an answer.

Dominique Lazanski: Actually, I am asking about future IAB programs. Like, let's say I wanted to set one up and I'm not on the IAB, how would I go about doing that, or is that even a possibility with how it's set up, if that makes sense. I'm not talking about Model-T in particular, because I'm excited about that and it's moving forward, but just in general about the process. Thanks.

Stephen Farrell: I guess the IAB, from my point of view, if somebody has an interesting thing that they want to talk about, I'm happy to talk about it. And if I think it is something worth bringing up with the IAB, I would do that, and then the IAB would decide to pursue it or not. It's that sort of semi-formal thing that's pretty normal. Maybe other people want to answer, but that's how I would view it.

Mirja Kühlewind: The idea about the IAB programs was a tool to help the IAB do technical work and have discussions not only with IAB members, but with people from outside the IAB. But as I said, we are also discussing internally about how we want to organize programs in the future, and probably there will be a change in the next coming months and years.

Jari Arkko: I just wanted to add that there is a difference between different programs, of course. Some are about managing a relationship, and those may be a little more closed in nature. But if it's sort of a broader issue in the Internet, like with Model-T, then Stephen and I, at least, feel it's really important to have open participation and community engagement. And it can, of course, go in multiple different directions at the same time. If someone in the community gets excited and says, hey, we have this issue, why don't we do something, IAB? And then, hopefully, the IAB would also go along with that, depending on their opinions.

Mirja Kühlewind: Does that answer your question, Dominique?

Dominique Lazanski: Yes, thanks, and I might follow up offline anyway because it's so late where I am. Thanks again.

*

Larry Masinter: I wanted to take the opportunity to advertise a W3C community group that I'd like more IETF participation in for helping people suddenly going online and where to find resources. Especially technical advice on what kind of bandwidth you need, and those kinds of things you need to coordinate best practices. I put the URL for the group <https://www.w3.org/community/covid-19/> in the Jabber room. Thank you.

Mirja Kühlewind: Thank you, Larry.

*

Simon Hicks: I wanted to note as the past chairman of ETSI about the comment in Jabber that we're not a regional organization. We have members from 80 countries in the world which are outside Europe. Yes, we have "Europe" in the title, but we're not just a regional organization. We operate globally.

Mirja Kühlewind: Thank you for that note. That's the current end of our queue.