

shmoo
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Best Current Practice
Expires: 29 January 2021

M. Duke
F5 Networks, Inc.
28 July 2020

Considerations for Cancellation of IETF Remote Meetings
draft-duke-shmoo-remote-meetings-00

Abstract

The IETF firmly believes in the value of in-person meetings to reach consensus on documents. However, various emergencies can make a planned in-person meeting impossible. 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 29 January 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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
2. Conventions	3
3. Decision Criteria and Roles	3
3.1. IETF LLC	3
3.2. IESG	4
4. Remedies	4
4.1. Relocation	4
4.2. Postponement	4
4.3. Virtualization	5
4.4. Cancellation	5
5. Refunds	5
6. Security Considerations	5
7. IANA Considerations	5
8. Informative References	6
Appendix A. Acknowledgments	6
Appendix B. Change Log	6
Author's Address	6

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 events could make a scheduled IETF meeting impossible, in that a particular time or place can be largely closed to travel or assembly. These conditions do not always have obvious thresholds. For example:

- * The meeting venue itself may close unexpectedly 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 or civil unrest could make a meeting unsafe.
- * A political, economic, or public health crisis could result in widespread national or corporate travel bans.

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].

3. Decision Criteria and Roles

3.1. IETF LLC

The LLC is responsible for assessing if it is safe to hold the meeting given the following criteria. This assessment SHOULD occur eight weeks prior to the first day of the meeting, though events may require reevaluation as late as during the meeting itself.

The criteria in Section 3.1 of [RFC8718] apply to venues that have changed status. 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 full number of participants and staff.

Additionally, there should not be any US [USSTATE] or UK [UKFO] travel advisories for the location of the meeting. These sources are chosen to be easily accessible in English. This should not be interpreted as requiring cancellation due to a warning about a different region in the host nation, or in the rural area surrounding a host city provided transportation to the airport is secure.

Finally, the LLC should assess the impact of various travel restrictions, legal and corporate, on the ability of critical support staff and contractors to enter the host nation. The LLC can cancel the event if it concludes it cannot adequately support it.

3.2. IESG

The IESG assesses if projected attendance is high enough to capture the benefit of an in-person meeting. In some cases, corporate travel restrictions may lower attendance in the absence of any formal guidance from authorities. If it concludes that attendance is too low, it can cancel the meeting regardless of the LLC's safety assessment.

The IESG is discouraged from relying on a simple count of expected event attendance. Even dramatically smaller events with large remote participation may be successful. The IESG might consider:

- * Are many working 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

In the event cannot be held at the scheduled time and place, the IETF has several options.

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].

4.2. Postponement

Although it is more disruptive to the schedules of participants, the next best option is to delay the meeting until 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.

Note that due to scheduling constraints at the venue, this will usually not be feasible.

4.3. Virtualization

The final option is to make the meeting fully remote. This requires different IETF processes and logistical operations that are outside the scope of this document.

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 has wide implications for the rhythm of IETF personnel policies, such as the nomination process and seating of new officers.

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.

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>>.
- [UKFO] Office, U.F., "Foreign Travel Advice", n.d., <<https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice>>.
- [USSTATE] State, U.D.o., "International Travel", n.d., <<https://travel.state.gov/content/travel/en/international-travel.html>>.

Appendix A. Acknowledgments

Appendix B. Change Log

Author's Address

Martin Duke
F5 Networks, Inc.

Email: martin.h.duke@gmail.com

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: 1 May 2021

M. Duke
F5 Networks, Inc
28 October 2020

Specification for a show of hands tool
draft-duke-shmoo-show-of-hands-00

Abstract

This is the specification for an experimental show of hands tool for the Meetecho system to be used in online meetings to help chairs quickly poll the meeting. This tool is different from the previous experimental virtual hum tool as it addresses a different use case with different functionality. Following mixed feedback in the IETF 108 post-meeting survey, the experimental virtual hum tool has been withdrawn from the Meetecho client for IETF 109.

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 1 May 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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
2. Definition and usage of "show of hands"	2
3. Tool specification	3
3.1. General	3
3.2. Opening and closing show of hands	3
3.3. Taking part in a show of hands	3
3.4. Calculating and displaying the result	4
3.5. Implementation notes	4
4. Alternative approaches	4
4.1. Multiple options	4
5. Security Considerations	4
6. IANA Considerations	5
7. Informative References	5
Appendix A. Acknowledgements	5
Author's Address	5

1. Introduction

This is the specification for an experimental show of hands tool for the Meetecho system to be used in online meetings to help chairs quickly poll the meeting. This tool is different from the previous experimental virtual hum tool [DRAFT_VIRTUAL_HUM] as it addresses a different use case with different functionality. Following mixed feedback in the IETF 108 post-meeting survey [SURVEY_108], the experimental virtual hum tool has been withdrawn from the Meetecho client for IETF 109.

2. Definition and usage of "show of hands"

In the context of this document, a "show of hands" is a simple, fast and anonymous mechanism for asking a yes/no question of a large group of people, with the common understanding that this mechanism is not a means for calling consensus and therefore only minimal formality of process is required.

3. Tool specification

This specification is intended to be feature complete, which means that what should be implemented is only what is explicitly stated here and nothing else.

3.1. General

- * There is only one type of show of hands
- * Only one show of hands can be open at any one time in a session.
- * The Secretariat are excluded from the show of hands and are not able to participate and do not feature in the calculations:

3.2. Opening and closing show of hands

- * A session chair can open a show of hands.
- * A session chair can assign a title to a show of hands to be made visible to session participants.
- * A session chair can open a show of hands at any time during a session, except when a show of hands is already open.
- * A session chair can open multiple shows of hands per session.
- * A show of hands is closed when the session chair closes it.

3.3. Taking part in a show of hands

- * While a show of hands is open an indicator needs to be shown to all participants that includes the title, if assigned, and either the options below or a link that goes directly to them.
- * When a show of hands is open each participant in the session may take part through the following mechanism: Each participant is presented with the following options from which they can select one. None of the options is selected as a default. "Raise hand" "Do not raise hand" No confirmation action is required. A participant can change their chosen option at any time while the show of hands is open.
- * When a participant selects any option then they are considered to have participated in the show of hands.
- * If a participant joins the session during the show of hands then they can take part.

- * If a participant leaves the session during the show of hands and they are considered to have participated then their show of hands is still used for data calculation.

3.4. Calculating and displaying the result

- * In real time during a show of hands the following data is calculated: The total number of participants who selected the "Raise hand" option. The total number of participants who selected the "Do not raise hand" option The total number of participants who have not selected either option.
- * All totals are displayed to all participants in real time.
- * When the show of hands is closed the totals are left displayed along with the relevant title.
- * When a new show of hands is opened the totals from the previous show of hands are still shown, along with their assigned titles, in an ordered list.

3.5. Implementation notes

- * The way in which the options are presented and selected and the way in which the totals are presented are left to the implementer. However, the text for each option should appear as above.

4. Alternative approaches

The following alternative approaches were considered.

4.1. Multiple options

Consideration was given to allowing more options (e.g., thumbs up, neutral, and thumbs down) and to allowing the chair to specify the list of options to be used in a show of hands. These alternatives may increase the use cases of the tool but also may increase its complexity. At this stage these alternatives have not been included, nor have they been ruled out.

5. Security Considerations

Meetecho participation is restricted to people who have datatracker accounts, providing some assurance of identity. Potential attacks against this tool will either subvert Meetecho admission control, or involve multiple datatracker registrations (and Meetecho logins) to amplify the voice of a single individual.

The integrity of this tool is dependent on the integrity of the registration and fee waiver processes. In particular, they must weed out duplicate registrations, bots, and so on.

6. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA actions.

7. Informative References

[DRAFT_VIRTUAL_HUM]

"Specification for a virtual humming tool", 2020,
<<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-duke-shmoo-virtual-hum/>>.

[SURVEY_108]

"IETF 108 Survey", 2020,
<https://www.ietf.org/media/documents/IETF_108_Meeting_Survey.pdf>.

Appendix A. Acknowledgements

Alissa Cooper, Jay Daley, Colin Perkins, and Alvaro Retana made significant contributions to this document. There were also numerous informal conversations at IETF 108 that influenced it.

Author's Address

Martin Duke
F5 Networks, Inc

Email: martin.h.duke@gmail.com

shmoo
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: 17 October 2021

C. Eckel
Cisco Systems
15 April 2021

Running an IETF Hackathon
draft-eckel-shmoo-ietf-hackathon-04

Abstract

IETF Hackathons encourage the IETF community to collaborate on running code related to existing and evolving Internet standards. This document provides a set of practices for running IETF Hackathons.

Discussion Venues

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

Discussion of this document takes place on the Stay Home Meet Only Online Working Group mailing list (manycouches@ietf.org), which is archived at <https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/browse/manycouches/>.

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at <https://github.com/eckelcu/internet-drafts>.

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 17 October 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	3
2. Timing	4
2.1. Agenda	5
2.2. Hackdemo Happy Hour	6
2.3. Code Lounge	7
2.4. Code Sprint	7
2.5. Online Only	7
3. Funding	8
3.1. Sponsorship	8
3.2. Expenses	9
3.2.1. In-person Event Expenses	9
3.2.2. Remote Participation Expenses	11
4. Project Presentations	11
4.1. Project Pitches	12
4.2. Results Summaries	12
4.2.1. Templates	12
4.3. Upload to GitHub	13
4.4. Presenting in Person	13
4.5. Presenting Remotely	13
5. Tooling	14
5.1. Datatracker	14
5.2. IETF Website	14
5.2.1. Hackathon Webpage	14
5.2.2. Meeting Webpage	14
5.3. Registration	14
5.3.1. Participant List	15
5.3.2. Caps on Registrations	15
5.4. Meeting Wiki	15
5.4.1. Hackathon	15
5.4.2. Lost and Found	16
5.4.3. Results Presentation Schedule	16
5.4.4. In Person Only	16
5.4.5. Online Only	17
5.5. Mailing List	17
5.5.1. Hackathon Chairs Email Alias	17
5.6. GitHub	18
5.7. Meetecho	18

5.8.	Network	18
5.8.1.	Remote Networking	19
5.9.	Webex	19
5.10.	Gather	20
6.	Statistics and Metrics	20
6.1.	IETF Survey Results	20
6.2.	Hackathon Survey Results	21
7.	Roles and Responsibilities	21
7.1.	Hackathon Chair(s)	21
7.2.	Secretariat	22
7.3.	Sponsor	22
7.4.	Champions of Projects	23
7.5.	IETF LLC, Director of Communications and Operations (was ISOC)	23
7.6.	Judges	24
8.	Security Considerations	24
8.1.	Privacy Considerations	24
9.	IANA Considerations	24
	Acknowledgments	24
	Author's Address	24

1. Introduction

IETF Hackathons encourage the IETF community to collaborate on running code related to existing and evolving Internet standards. IETF Hackathons aim to:

- * Advance the pace and relevance of IETF standards activities by bringing the speed and collaborative spirit of open source development into the IETF
- * Bring developers and young people into IETF and get them exposed to and interested in the IETF

IETF Hackathons are free to attend and open to everyone. Software developers are the primary audience, but participation by subject matter experts who are not necessary developers is encouraged and very important as well. Similarly, while the Hackathon is meant to attract newcomers and those who do not typically view themselves as standards people, long time IETF contributors, including Internet-Draft authors, working group chairs, and subject matter experts, are key participants as well. Group dynamics and blending of skillsets and perspectives are extremely valuable aspects of IETF Hackathons.

In addition to the running code created and improved as a result of each Hackathon, the exchange of ideas, extensions of human networks, and establishment of trust, respect, and friendships are some of the most valuable outputs of each Hackathon. Code written in a

programming language can be more illustrative and less confrontational than opinions expressed during a meeting or in an email. Working together to find common understanding of proposals, concerns, and solutions that result in improvements to evolving Internet standards is as important as the development of running code that implements or validates the correctness of these same proposals.

Consequently, IETF Hackathons are collaborative events, not competitions. Any competitiveness among participants is friendly and in the spirit of advancing the pace and relevance of new and evolving Internet standards.

This document provides a set of practices for running IETF Hackathons.

2. Timing

The first IETF Hackathon was held the weekend before the start of the IETF 92 meeting. The rationale was to avoid conflicts yet make it relatively convenient for those attending the IETF meeting to participate in the Hackathon as well. Holding the Hackathon on the weekend was also viewed as making it more accessible to non IETF meeting participants, including students and working professionals who would have other commitments during the week. The weekend before was viewed as better than the weekend after so that things learned during the Hackathon could be shared and discussed with the rest of the IETF community during working group sessions and the like. This worked well at IETF 92, was repeated at IETF 93, and quickly became an established norm with the IETF meeting being officially extended to include the Hackathon at the start. An additional benefit of this timing noted and appreciated by participants is that it serves as a more informal and social way to physically and mentally acclimate to changes in time zones, surroundings, and subject matter.

2.1. Agenda

The IETF Hackathon is a strenuous event. Though not a competition, participants want to make the most of their time together, much as with the IETF meeting in general. Competitive Hackathons typically run non-stop for on the order of 40 hours. There is a strict deadline and teams are judged and winners declared at the end. Afterward everyone is wiped out and heads off to briefly celebrate or commiserate, but mainly to recuperate. As the IETF Hackathon serves as the start of the overall IETF meeting, we aim to strike a compromise that provides enjoy time to get valuable work accomplished without exhausting themselves before the main IETF meeting even starts. While some people participate in the Hackathon only, the majority of people remain and plan to be actively engaged in the rest of the IETF meeting.

The typical agenda is as follows:

Saturday before IETF meeting week

- 08:30: Room open for setup by project champions
- 09:00: Room open for all - Pastries and coffee provided
- 09:30: Hackathon kickoff
- 09:45: Form Teams
- 12:30: Lunch provided
- 15:30: Afternoon break - Snacks provided
- 19:00: Dinner provided
- 22:00: Room closes

Sunday before IETF meeting week

- 08:30: Room opens - Pastries and coffee provided
- 12:30: Lunch provided
- 13:30: Hacking stops, prepare brief presentation of project
- 14:00: Project presentations to other participants
- 15:45: Closing remarks and opportunities for next time
- 16:00: Hackathon ends
- 17:00: Tear down complete

The time on Saturday morning provides team champions time to setup and participants time to socialize and learn more about projects and team they might want to join. The kickoff presentation and formalities are kept to minimum to leave as much time as possible for team to work together with their team on their projects. The proximity of teams to each other fosters communication and collaboration across teams as well.

Lunch and dinner are provided as a convenience and an incentive to remain at the Hackathon. Participants are free to come and go as they like. It is well understood and accepted that there are other things vying for time and that meeting with friends or colleagues outside of the Hackathon is an entirely reasonable thing to do.

The room closes Saturday evening to give hotel staff unfettered access to the room and to encourage people to pace and take care of themselves. There are no rules against continuing work on Hackathon projects outside of the Hackathon room. Similarly, working on projects long before and after the Hackathon is allowed and encouraged.

The end of the Hackathon on Sunday is driven by other IETF meeting events. There typically are Newcomer events that start at 16:00. The IETF Hackathon typically includes many newcomers in its list of participants. It is important to provide them time to participate in the Newcomer events. The opening reception typically start at 17:00, and we want to make it easy for all Hackathon participants to join that as well.

Hackdemo Happy Hour (ref) and the Code Lounge (ref) exist to facilitate ongoing discussion and work on projects beyond the official end of the Hackathon weekend.

2.2. Hackdemo Happy Hour

Hackdemo Happy Hour provides an opportunity for more in depth sharing and discussion than is possible within the time constraints of the result presentation that occur at the end of the Hackathon. This opportunity is made available to all teams. As with the results presentation, participation is optional.

Initially, we did something similar as part of Bits and Bites. This worked well for the Hackathon but the Bits and Bites event was eventually abandoned for other reasons. Hackdemo Happy Hour was created as a low cost, informal event to provide a venue for the IETF community to engage with the Hackathon teams in more in depth discussions related to their projects.

Hackdemo Happy Hour is typically Monday evening, roughly from 18:00 - 19:30, often overlapping a bit with the last working group session of the day but continuing long enough to allow everyone an opportunity to join. The goal is to make it convenient to attend by not conflicting with other meetings but also no running too late into the night.

Light snacks and non alcoholic beverages are provided, and a cash bar is available to align with the spirit of a happy hour.

2.3. Code Lounge

The Code Lounge provides space for groups to gather and continue to collaborate on running code after the Hackathon. It is typically in the IETF Lounge and open the same hours as the IETF Lounge. Champions are encouraged to look at the final agenda and determine time slots best suited to ensure successful attendance of Code Lounge sessions as well as any traditional working group sessions. It is okay for multiple teams to sign up for the same time slots. This is in fact encouraged for work that spans multiple working groups or projects.

2.4. Code Sprint

Some efforts were made to have the Hackathon and the Code Sprint work together or potentially be combined into a single event focusing on the development of IETF protocols and IETF internal tools. There is some concern that the events currently compete for resources. There is also a great deal of synergistic potential. Several Hackathon projects, such as those related to YANG model validation, involve the creation or modification of IETF tools.

The Code Sprint existed long before the Hackathon and has its own identity and way of doing things. The Code Sprint organizers are against combining the events and potentially losing this identity the benefits of a customized event. The practice that exists today is to locate the events physically close to each other to facilitate switching back and forth between the two events.

2.5. Online Only

The IETF 107 Hackathon was originally scheduled to be the weekend at the start of the IETF meeting in Vancouver. When COVID-19 hit and it became clear the IETF meeting could not occur in person, the Hackathon already had 23 projects and 176 registrations. With only 10 days until the anticipated start of the Hackathon, a survey (<https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-9HLRXN8M7/>) went out to the Hackathon community, including all project champions and registered participants, to see if they wanted to participate in the Hackathon exactly as planned except with everyone participating remotely rather than in person. A relatively small number of people expressed interest in participating, with even fewer wanting to continue to champion their projects. The fact that the Hackathon was planned for the weekend before the IETF meeting and in the local time zone, both of which were historically very convenient and attractive to

Hackathon participants, suddenly became huge obstacles. Consequently, the IETF 107 Hackathon was cancelled.

We knew more in advance that IETF 108 would be an online only meeting. We moved and expanded the schedule to run the entire work week before the rest of the IETF meeting. The Hackathon kickoff was set for Monday, the closing for Friday, with all the time in between left for individual project teams to arrange to meet how and when was most convenient for them. The kickoff and closing sessions were schedule to align with the time frame established for the IETF 108 meeting. All of this was, of course, not ideal, and it worked much better for some people than for others, but at least everyone knew the plan and corresponding time commitment well in advance and had the ability to plan accordingly.

We ultimately had 19 projects and almost 300 registrations. It is hard to say how many people actually participated and for how long, but many projects were able to get substantial work done. For the closing, 10 teams produced and shared presentations summarizing their findings and achievements. All presentations as well as the agenda and a recording of the closing session are available via the IETF 108 Hackathon wiki (<https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/108hackathon>). This level of participation was strong enough to be considered a success and justify including the Hackathon in future online only IETF meetings.

Hackdemo Happy Hour and the Code Lounge are not applicable for online only Hackathons.

3. Funding

The Hackathon requires funding, and that funding increases with the number of participants. Participating has always been free; therefore, funding from other sources than participant fees is required.

3.1. Sponsorship

The initial funding model was to have Hackathon sponsors sign up to sponsor and fund the Hackathon for one year. As part of starting the Hackathon, Cisco volunteered to sponsor and fund the Hackathon for its first year (i.e., three Hackathons, one at each IETF meeting during a calendar year). This sponsorship was to rotate. Huawei volunteered to sponsor the second year of the Hackathon. After the second year, a sponsor for the 3rd year was not found. However, the Hackathon had become a proven success. Consequently, the IETF decided to fund the Hackathon as part of the IETF meeting, with Hackathon sponsorship being on a best effort basis.

Online only Hackathons in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and increased remote participating in general, result in increased cloud infrastructure requirements that make Hackathon sponsorship more attractive to cloud infrastructure providers.

Hackathon sponsorship is available at different levels as part of being an IETF Running Code Sponsor (<https://www.ietf.org/about/support/#running-code>).

3.2. Expenses

The primary expenses associated with the Hackathon are those for hosting an in-person event, e.g., meeting space, food and beverage, etc. It is often challenging to quantify the portion of this associated with the Hackathon from that incurred for the IETF meeting overall.

3.2.1. In-person Event Expenses

The following expenses are associated with in-person participation in a Hackathon. When the IETF meeting is online only, these expenses are eliminated.

3.2.1.1. Meeting Space

The meeting space for the Hackathon is sometimes included as part of the overall contract for the IETF meeting. Other times, additional expense is incurred to secure a large enough space earlier than would otherwise have been required. Typically, the space is needed for setup from Friday afternoon before the start of the IETF meeting until Sunday afternoon. After the Hackathon, the space is typically repurposed for the IETF Lounge. If the size of the Hackathon continues to increase, it might be necessary to use the same space as is later used for the IETF plenary.

3.2.1.2. Food and Beverage

Some portion of the food and beverage expense is often included as part of a minimum spend the IETF is obligated to make. When a Hackathon sponsor is identified, funds resulting from this sponsorship are typically used to offset food and beverage expenses, or to increase the food and beverage budget.

The minimum food and beverage for the Hackathon has been,

- * coffee, tea, and water Saturday and Sunday morning
- * lunch Saturday and Sunday

Additional items, in order of importance, include,

- * beer Saturday evening
- * dinner Saturday evening
- * continental breakfast Saturday and Sunday
- * afternoon snacks Saturday and Sunday

3.2.1.3. T-shirts

Hackathon t-shirts are an important part of the Hackathon. They have been provided for all in-person Hackathons and greatly appreciated by many participants. They also serve as great advertising for the IETF, the Hackathon, and sponsors. Cisco or other event sponsors have often covered expenses associated with t-shirts. The current model is that the secretariat covers the expenses using whatever funding is available.

The number and size distribution of t-shirts for IETF 107 is provided here as an example.

- * 380 t-shirts at a cost of roughly \$10 USD / t-shirt with shipping to the Secretariat included
 - 50 Small
 - 120 Medium
 - 110 Large
 - 75 XL
 - 25 XXL

The t-shirts are all standard cut. We previously tried providing fitted cut t-shirts as an option for Hackathon participants, but these were not well received.

3.2.1.4. Stickers

Laptop stickers are popular with developers. Stickers have been made available at the Hackathon for those that want them. Expenses have been covered by the IETF LLC, Director of Communications and Operations.

3.2.2. Remote Participation Expenses

The following expenses are associated things done primarily to facilitate remote participation in a Hackathon. This includes participation when the Hackathon is online only as well as remote participation when the Hackathon is in-person.

- * Meetecho: cost associated with Hackathon kickoff and closing
- * Gather: costs associated with premium service, required to enable more than 25 concurrent users. This has not been necessary, but will almost certainly be if Gather becomes a valuable way for Hackathon participants to meet within and across teams.
- * Webex: IETF Webex accounts are made available to champions for the duration of the Hackathon and some period beyond that encompasses at least the rest of the IETF meeting. These accounts are available at no additional cost to the IETF at present
- * Network: setup and support of the IETF network, and remote access to it

The change in timing and extended duration of the Hackathon at an online only IETF meeting increases the duration and use of remote participation facilities from 7 days to 12 days. This may result in increases to the cost of providing these facilities.

4. Project Presentations

Project presentations are an important mechanism for capturing what each team intends to accomplish, what they actually accomplished, and sharing the results and findings with the IETF community.

For the first few Hackathons, we had two very distinct types of presentations,

1. Presentation that served as project pitches at the start of the Hackathon
2. Presentations that summarize results at the end of the Hackathon.

4.1. Project Pitches

The project pitches were 5-10 minute presentations by a champion of a project describing what they wanted to do and how they proposed to accomplish it. This gave everyone in the room a better understanding of all the projects and helped participants match themselves with appropriate projects. This worked well when we had a small number of projects, but it became unwieldy as the number of projects increased. As knowledge of the Hackathon grew and advanced planning became more common, many participants knew exactly which team they planned to join and wanted to get to work as quickly as possible rather than spend a couple hours listening to presentations. Project pitches were dropped from the Hackathon. Champions are encouraged to share this type of information in advance via the Meeting Wiki (Section 5.4) instead.

4.2. Results Summaries

The results summaries are brief presentation by each team of what problem they tried to solve, what they achieved, and highlights that include lessons learned, feedback to associated working groups, and collaboration with open source communities and other standards organizations. They also highlight individuals who are participating in their first IETF Hackathon or first IETF event to facilitate their introduction into the IETF community. The production and presentation of results summaries is optional. Fortunately, despite the lack of awards and prizes, most teams participate.

As with the project pitches, results summaries can become unwieldy as the number of projects increases. With this in mind, the total time for all results summaries is limited to 2 hours. The maximum duration of each presentation is calculated based on the number teams that have indicated the desire to present. This maximum is strictly enforced to ensure all teams have the opportunity to present their results. Maximum durations of 3-5 minutes are typical.

4.2.1. Templates

Project results presentation templates provides guidance on what to cover. The use of these templates is optional. They are made available in various in various formats in a GitHub repo created specifically for the presentations for each IETF Hackathon, e.g., <https://github.com/ietf-hackathon/ietf110-project-presentations> (<https://github.com/ietf-hackathon/ietf110-project-presentations>).

4.2.1.1. PPTX

For portability, presentations that use this template should be made exported into PDF format as well.

4.2.1.2. HTML format

This template should render within any browser. It can be rendered as a slideshow using remark (<https://github.com/gnab/remark>).

4.3. Upload to GitHub

All presentation are uploaded to the GitHub repo created the Hackathon, e.g., <https://github.com/ietf-hackathon/ietf110-project-presentations> (<https://github.com/ietf-hackathon/ietf110-project-presentations>). The contents of this repo are used as the source for all project presentations at the end of the Hackathon and remain as a reference after the Hackathon.

One must be a member of the IETF-Hackathon GitHub org to upload a new presentation or update/replace an existing presentation.

To be added as a member, presenters are asked to

- * include the name by which they are known in their GitHub profile
- * enable two factor authentication (2FA)
- * send your GitHub user name to the Chair(s)

Presenters are asked to do this at their earliest convenience as the Chair(s) typically get very busy as the start of presentations approaches.

4.4. Presenting in Person

Presentations are run from a shared ChromeBook at the front of the Hackathon room. This Chromebook is provided by the Secretariat.

4.5. Presenting Remotely

Remote presenters are welcome to run their own presentations using the screen sharing functionality in Meetecho. Alternatively, the Hackathon Chairs can share the presentation and advance slides for the presenter.

5. Tooling

The IETF Hackathon uses the same tooling used by the IETF community for its work and meetings.

5.1. Datatracker

The datatracker (<https://datatracker.ietf.org/>) supports the notion of Teams that are not a part of the standards development process. The Hackathon exists as one such Team. From the datatracker menu, navigate to "Other" -> "Active Teams" -> "Hackathon". Here exists a datatracker space for the Hackathon similar to what is available for working groups, including meeting materials, agendas, etc. Initially, there was some attempt to copy materials hosted in GitHub (<https://github.com/ietf-hackathon>) to the datatracker. Now this is done only when required for integration with other IETF tooling, including:

- * requesting sessions (<https://datatracker.ietf.org/secr/sreq/>) for the Hackathon kickoff and closing, and for Hackdemo Happy Hour
- * posting agendas (<https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/agenda/>)

5.2. IETF Website

5.2.1. Hackathon Webpage

The IETF website includes a dedicated page for the Hackathon webpage (<https://www.ietf.org/how/runningcode/hackathons/>). This page contains information about the Hackathon in general as well as links to past, present, and future Hackathons. The relevant links are updated after each IETF meeting. Other content on the page is updated on a more ad hoc basis.

5.2.2. Meeting Webpage

Each IETF meeting webpage (<https://www.ietf.org/how/meetings/>) contains information about the corresponding Hackathon, including the dates of the Hackathon in the header, a link to the Hackathon webpage in the "Additional Events" section.

5.3. Registration

Registration for the Hackathon is through the IETF meeting registration (<https://registration.ietf.org>) system. Participant registration for the Hackathon is

- * independent of participation registration for the meeting

- * free
- * required

As with meeting registration, registrants for the Hackathon acknowledge the Note Well (<https://ietf.org/about/note-well/>) during the registration process.

5.3.1. Participant List

An active list of all registered participants, e.g., <https://registration.ietf.org/110/participants/hackathon/> (<https://registration.ietf.org/110/participants/hackathon/>), is maintained by the Secretariat. Important information displayed for each registrant includes the set of projects and technologies in which each participant is interested and an email address. This information is optional at the time of registration and may be updated or removed by editing one's registration.

5.3.2. Caps on Registrations

Registrations were capped for the first several Hackathons. This was done both for space and costs considerations. The cap was hit multiple times, each time resulting in temporary confusion and frustration among would be registrants, followed by the cap being increased. Currently, there are no caps enforced by the registration system.

5.4. Meeting Wiki

The meeting wiki serves as the primary source of information for each Hackathon.

5.4.1. Hackathon

A page within the meeting wiki, e.g., <https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon> (<https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon>), is created by the Secretariat for each Hackathon and initialized with information that is based largely on the information from the previous Hackathon. Once created, the Hackathon Chairs update and moderate this page. Champions are requested and responsible for adding information about projects for which they are a champion.

Anyone can edit the wiki by logging in using their datatracker login credentials. Credentials can be obtained by requesting (<https://datatracker.ietf.org/accounts/create/>) a new datatracker account.

5.4.2. Lost and Found

A Lost and Found wiki page, e.g., <https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon/lost&found> (<https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon/lost&found>), is created by the Chairs for each Hackathon. Participants looking for a team are encouraged to add themselves to the "Skills to Offer" table, providing some information about their skills and interests. This will help others with matching needs and/or interests find them. Champions wanting help on their projects are encouraged to add their teams to the "Skills Needed" table, providing some information about the skills they seek.

5.4.3. Results Presentation Schedule

A Results Presentation Schedule wiki page, e.g., <https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon/resultspresentationschedule> (<https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon/resultspresentationschedule>), is created by the Chairs for each Hackathon. Hackathon teams are welcome and encouraged to present their results during the Hackathon Closing. Hackathon teams add the name of their project and the name of the presenter to the table at the bottom of this page.

5.4.4. In Person Only

The following wiki pages are applicable for in-person Hackathons only.

5.4.4.1. Hackdemo Happy Hour

A Hackdemo Happy Hour wiki page, e.g., <https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/106hackdemo> (<https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/106hackdemo>), is created by the Chairs for each Hackathon. Champions are welcome and encouraged to add their project by entering the project name/acronym and a contact name and email address in the table displayed on the page.

5.4.4.2. Code Lounge

A Code Lounge wiki page, e.g., <https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/106codelounge> (<https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/106codelounge>), is created by the Chairs for each Hackathon. Champions are welcome and encouraged to add their project by entering the project name/acronym and a contact name and email address in the table displayed on the page.

5.4.5. Online Only

The following wiki pages are applicable for online Hackathons only.

5.4.5.1. Team Schedule

A Team Schedule wiki page, e.g., <https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon/teamschedule> (<https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon/teamschedule>), is created by the Chairs for each online only Hackathon. Online only Hackathons take place globally for an entire week. It is up to individual project teams to determine the preferred dates, times, and ways to meet to work on their project within the context of that week (e.g., Zoom, Webex, Slack). This page is meant to help facilitate coordination of schedules within and across teams.

5.5. Mailing List

The Hackathon mail list, hacakthon@ietf.org (<https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/Hackathon>), is used for all email communication and announcement related to the Hackathon. All registrants are given the option to subscribe to the list. Anyone interested in staying up to date on the Hackathon is able to subscribe at any time.

5.5.1. Hackathon Chairs Email Alias

The email alias hackathon-chairs@ietf.org (<mailto:hackathon-chairs@ietf.org>) was created and is maintained by the Secretariat. It is used on hackathons webpages and wiki pages to provide a single point of contact for the Hackathon.

5.6. GitHub

The IETF-Hackathon (<https://github.com/ietf-hackathon>) is used to share code, presentations, and other artifacts at IETF Hackathons. The Hackathon Chairs are responsible for administering the GitHub org.

Code for Hackathon projects often exist elsewhere, which is perfectly fine. Anyone needing a place to host code for the Hackathon can request the creating of a repository for their project.

A repository is created and maintained by the Chairs for each Hackathon, e.g., <https://github.com/ietf-hackathon/ietf110-project-presentations> (<https://github.com/ietf-hackathon/ietf110-project-presentations>). This repo is for participants to upload project presentations. The contents of this repo are used as the source for all project presentations at the end of the Hackathon and remain as a reference after the Hackathon.

5.7. Meetecho

Meetecho (<https://www.meetecho.com/>) is used for the kickoff and closing sessions of the Hackathon. This provides many capabilities, including the following:

- * allows participants to join Hackathon sessions in person or remotely
- * validate registration of participants at time of joining Hackathon sessions
- * enable remote presentations of project results
- * capture recording of Hackathon sessions

5.8. Network

Access to the IETF network is an important aspect of the Hackathon. The IETF network provides unfettered Internet access that is not typical within many residential, corporate, and university environments. For many of IETF participants and projects, access to the Internet and each other via wireless access to the IETF network is sufficient. However, due to the nature of the work done in the IETF, wired access and special networking capabilities are often required.

The NOC has graciously met the needs of the Hackathon since its inception and continues to add more capabilities over time. Champions are able to request in advance wired access and special networking functionality, including static IPv4 and IPv6 addresses, IPv6 only networking, a closed user group, NAT64, and IPv6PD. All of this, and the IETF network in general, is made available by the start of the Hackathon and in advance for setup to the extent possible.

5.8.1. Remote Networking

Online only meetings present both a personal networking challenge and a computer networking challenge. The NOC came to the rescue for the latter with remote networking options to join the IETF network while attending the meeting remotely. With a Raspberry Pi 2B, 3B, or 4B, the NOC has a recipe that allow teams to be virtually connected to the IETF network with all the previously mentioned options. This remote networking capability is available for in-person and online only Hackathons.

Virtual connectivity to the IETF network remains generally available between meetings. Individuals or project champions can request access through the IETF Ticketing System (<https://tickets.meeting.ietf.org/newticket>).

5.9. Webex

Champions can request a Webex account (<https://ietf.webex.com/webappng/sites/ietf/dashboard?siteurl=ietf>) they can use to schedule meetings for their team. These are similar to the Webex accounts allocated to working group chairs to be used for virtual interim meetings. An account can be requested by a team champion at any time. Accounts remain active and available throughout the duration of the Hackathon and the associated IETF meeting. A project name may be used in place of "Working Group Name" in the request form.

5.10. Gather

Gather (<https://gather.town/>) facilitates virtual hallway interaction during IETF meetings. A dedicated area within the overall space is created by the Secretariat for the Hackathon. The area includes tables, identified by letters of the alphabet, that teams are free to self assign and use as and when they like. Eight to ten seats around each table facilitate group discussions within the team. A whiteboard or shared notes tablet (via CodiMD) at tables facilitates sharing of information within the team. The tables also facilitate collaboration across teams. One cautionary note, Gather has relative high network bandwidth and CPU requirements, and as such may not be well suited for some Hackathon participants.

The Gather space remains available between IETF meetings, with incremental improvements and additions made during this time. The space is cleaned about a month prior to the start of the next meeting, removing anything left over from the previous meeting. Hackathon teams are encouraged to make a copy of anything they want to retain within a week of the end of the IETF meeting.

6. Statistics and Metrics

Statistics for the Hackathon have been gathered informally from the first Hackathon, at IETF 92, and more formally since IETF 101. Registration is required but it is also free, which can lead to misleading statistics. Starting with IETF 101, an effort has been made by the Secretariat to validate registrations for all in-person participants by checking registrations at the main entrance to the Hackathon room. Badges similar to those issued for the rest of the IETF meeting are now issued for the Hackathon as well. There is still no good mechanism for determining the number of remote participants.

Hackathon participation has grown from 45 at IETF 92 to a maximum of 406 at IETF 104. Participation tends to be slightly higher when the IETF meeting is located in Europe. Recent in-person Hackathons have had roughly 30-40% as many participants as the corresponding IETF meeting. For roughly 20-30% of Hackathon participants, the Hackathon is their first experience at any IETF event.

6.1. IETF Survey Results

For each IETF meeting, there is a post event survey that often includes a question or two about the Hackathon, e.g., IETF 106 Survey Results (https://www.ietf.org/media/documents/IETF_106_Meeting_Survey.pdf).

6.2. Hackathon Survey Results

Hackathon specific surveys have been used on some occasions to obtain more detailed feedback about the Hackathon from the IETF community. This has been especially useful for feedback on online only Hackathons. Survey have been short with most questions being optional, e.g., IETF 110 Hackathon Survey Results (<https://ql.tc/8KlJeZ>).

7. Roles and Responsibilities

This section provides a summary of the roles and responsibilities of individuals and groups involved in a successful IETF Hackathon. The summary provided here is not meant to be exhaustive. Some responsibilities are described entirely or in more detail throughout the rest of the document.

7.1. Hackathon Chair(s)

The role of a Hackathon chair is similar to that of a working group chair. As with working groups, it is typically best to have co-chairs share responsibilities and workload. The Chairs work very closely with the Secretariat on all responsibilities. Key responsibilities include:

- * Organize and deliver a Hackathon at each IETF meeting, soliciting help from all other roles to do much of the heavy lifting
- * Encourage and provide guidance to champions who volunteer to lead projects
- * Maintain the Hackathon wiki, e.g., <https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon> (<https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon>), and all of its child pages.
- * Moderate hackathon@ietf.org (<mailto:hackathon@ietf.org>) email list
- * Request sessions (<https://datatracker.ietf.org/secr/sreq/>) for the Hackathon opening and closing in the IETF meeting
- * Emcee the Hackathon, including the opening and closing sessions and announcements in between
- * Create and manage the GitHub repo used for each Hackathon, e.g., <https://github.com/ietf-hackathon/ietf110-project-presentations> (<https://github.com/ietf-hackathon/ietf110-project-presentations>)

- * Serve as main point of contact for all Hackathon questions and concerns

7.2. Secretariat

Key responsibilities include:

- * Configure and manage Hackathon registration system
- * Maintain Hackathon web page (<https://www.ietf.org/how/runningcode/hackathons/>)
- * Create and maintain web page for each Hackathon, e.g., <https://www.ietf.org/how/runningcode/hackathons/110-hackathon/> (<https://www.ietf.org/how/runningcode/hackathons/110-hackathon/>)
- * Create wiki page for each Hackathon, e.g., <https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon> (<https://trac.ietf.org/trac/ietf/meeting/wiki/110hackathon>). This is initialized and updated at times by the Secretariat, but the Chair(s) are ultimately responsible for maintaining it.
- * Handle venue logistics for Hackathon, Hackdemo Happy Hour, and Code Lounge (e.g., reserve room, food and beverages, AV, etc.)
- * Internal IETF promotion (e.g., email messages to IETF community)
- * Assist with external outreach, as needed, including finding sponsors
- * Validate Hackathon registrations for in-person participants, including issuing badges and participant t-shirts when available

7.3. Sponsor

Key responsibilities include:

- * Provide some funding to help offset costs of Hackathon (either per meeting or per year, depending on model)
- * Optionally provide t-shirts or other giveaways
- * Optionally provide support staff to assist with Hackathon

Key benefits include:

- * Sponsor logo on Hackathon t-shirts

- * Sponsor logo on Hackathon signage
- * Sponsor logo on Hackathon webpage and wiki
- * Sponsor logo and call out in Hackathon kickoff and closing presentation
- * Sponsor logo and call out in IETF Plenary presentation
- * Sponsor logo and call out in Hackathon recap on IETF blog (<https://www.ietf.org/blog/>)
- * Recognition in IETF community for helping the IETF Hackathon remain free and open to everyone

7.4. Champions of Projects

Champions of projects are the key to a successful Hackathon. Key responsibilities for champions include:

- * Volunteer to lead a project at the Hackathon
- * Serve as primary contact for the project
- * Add and manage information on the Hackathon wiki for the project
- * Promote the project to appropriate groups inside IETF and outside as well
- * Welcome and organize members of the team
- * Provide focus, guidance, and leadership for the project

7.5. IETF LLC, Director of Communications and Operations (was ISOC)

Key responsibilities include:

- * External promotion outside of IETF, including web search engine ad words, social media posts, and listing on external event calendars such as <https://www.ripe.net/participate/meetings/calendar> (<https://www.ripe.net/participate/meetings/calendar>) and <https://nsrc.org/calendar/> (<https://nsrc.org/calendar/>).
- * Outreach to local universities
- * Provide photographer, including optional team photos and candid photos of collaborating during in-person events

- * Laptop stickers (Section 3.2.1.4) at in-person events

7.6. Judges

The first several Hackathon involved judges who listened to summary presentations by teams at the closing of each Hackathon and identified winning teams for an arbitrary number of project categories. Prizes were made available to members of winning teams. This was done as an incentive to participate in the Hackathon and present results, and to provide a fun yet informative end to the Hackathon that could be appreciated by the entire IETF community. Judging and awarding of prizes led to confusion regarding the nature of the Hackathon, making it appear to some overly competitive. Procurement of appropriate prizes was financially and logistically challenging. Arrangement of judges, determination of winners, and awarding of prizes all became more time consuming, especially as the number of projects and participants grew. Ultimately, it was deemed best to eliminate judging, awards, and prizes entirely. Apparently the IETF community has an innate incentive to participate and present results in the Hackathon.

8. Security Considerations

None.

8.1. Privacy Considerations

Participant names and email addresses are displayed publicly in the Participant List (Section 5.3.1). Participants may opt-in or opt-out of the display of their email address as part of their registration.

The email addresses of individual champions are often shared publicly by the champions on the wiki. This is done voluntarily by individual champions to make it easier for others to contact them.

9. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA actions.

Acknowledgments

Michael Richardson and Benson Muite provided valuable contributions to this document.

Author's Address

Charles Eckel
Cisco Systems

Email: eckelcu@cisco.com

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Best Current Practice
Expires: 22 July 2021

M. Kuehlewind
Ericsson
J. Reed
R. Salz
Akamai
18 January 2021

Open Participation Principle regarding Remote Registration Fee
draft-kuehlewind-shmoo-remote-fee-02

Abstract

This document proposes a principle for open participation that extends the open process principle as defined in RFC3935 by stating that there must always be a free option for online participation to IETF meetings over the Internet.

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 22 July 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
2. Principle of open participation	2
3. Financial impact	3
4. Considerations on Use and Misuse of a Free Participation Option	4
5. Acknowledgments	4
6. Normative References	4
Authors' Addresses	4

1. Introduction

Remote participation for IETF in-person meetings has evolved over time from email-only to live chat and audio streaming, and, currently, to a full online meeting system that is tightly integrated with the in-room session and enables interactive participation by audio and video. Due to this evolution, and because most in-person attendees paid registration fees and this has been sufficient to support the meeting, online participation has historically been free for remote attendees.

Given this more full-blown participation option, the IETF has started to observe an increasing number of remote participants. This increase can be explained by the ease with which new participants can join a meeting or only attend selected parts of the meeting agenda, and also by a less strongly perceived need to attend every meeting in person, either due to financial reasons or other circumstances. In order to better understand these trends the IETF started requiring registration as "participant" (in contrast to an "observer") for remote participation, still without any registration fee applied.

With the recent move to full online meetings, however, there is no distinction between remote and other participants anymore which lead to the introduction of a meeting fee for all participants, removing the free remote option.

This change led to concerns about the impact both on those who regularly remotely attend meetings, as well as people looking to attend IETF meetings for the first time. In both cases, even a small registration fee can be a barrier to participation.

2. Principle of open participation

This document outlines the principle of open participation and solicits community feedback in order to reach consensus on this or a similar principle that the IETF LLC can use to guide future decision about registration fees for full online meetings.

The principle this document states is simple: there must always be an option for free remote participation in any IETF meeting, whether or not that meeting has a physical presence.

This principle aims to support the openness principle of the IETF as defined in [RFC3935]:

"Open process - any interested person can participate in the work, know what is being decided, and make his or her voice heard on the issue. Part of this principle is our commitment to making our documents, our WG mailing lists, our attendance lists, and our meeting minutes publicly available on the Internet."

It should be noted that opennees as defined in [RFC3935] should be seen as open and free. While the principle in RFC3935 is explicitly noting that this principle includes a requirement to open basically all our documents and documentation and making them accessible over the Internet, it was probably written with mainly having email interactions in mind when talking about participation. This document extends this principle to explicitly cover online participation at meetings.

In order to fully remove barriers to participation, any free registration option must offer the same degree of interactivity and functionality available to paid remote attendees. The free option must be clearly and prominently listed on the meeting website and registration page. If the free option requires additional registration steps, such as applying for a fee waiver, those requirements should be clearly documented.

3. Financial impact

Online meetings have lower costs than in-person meetings, however they still come with expenses, as do other services that the IETF provides such as mailing lists, document access over the datatracker or other online platforms, or Webex accounts for working groups and other roles in the IETF.

These and other running costs of the IETF are also cross-financed by income generated through meeting fees. The intention of this document and the principle stated herein is not to make participation free for everyone but to always have a free option that can be used without any barriers other than the registration procedure itself.

It is not in scope for this document or the shmoo working group to make suggestions for changing the IETF's overall funding model. This is the responsibility of the LLC Board taking agreed principles like the one proposed in this document into account.

4. Considerations on Use and Misuse of a Free Participation Option

This document does not provide specific requirements on when to use or not use the free option. The purpose of the free option is to enable everybody who is interested in participation to join meetings without the meeting fee imposing a financial barrier. These cases cannot be limited to a certain group, like students or "self-founded" participants, nor to any specific other restrictions like the number of meetings previously attended or previous level of involvement. The purpose is simply to maximise participation without barriers in order to make the standards process as open as possible.

It is expected that participants who have financial support to use the regular registration option will do. Paying a registration fee is a way for their sponsor to support the sustainability of the IETF. For example, a higher late payment charge can be used to maximise this financial support. However, this document does not comment on the actual payment structure of the IETF meeting fee other than the requirement for a free option. The fee payment structure is set by the LLC such that the viability of the IETF and the need of IETF participants to work productively within the IETF can be warranted.

Aggregated data on the number and percentage of free registrations used should be published, as this will permit analysis the use and change in use over time of the free registration option without revealing personal information. If the number of paid registrations decreases, this can however also have various reasons, such as restrictions on travel to physical meetings due to cost savings or environmental reasons, general cost savings and lesser focus on standardization work, or simply lost of business interest. These are risks that can impact the sustainability of the IETF independent of the free registration option due to its dependency on meetings fees to cross finance other costs.

5. Acknowledgments

6. Normative References

[RFC3935] Alvestrand, H., "A Mission Statement for the IETF",
BCP 95, RFC 3935, DOI 10.17487/RFC3935, October 2004,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3935>>.

Authors' Addresses

Mirja Kuehlewind
Ericsson

Email: mirja.kuehlewind@ericsson.com

Jon Reed
Akamai

Email: jreed@akamai.com

Rich Salz
Akamai

Email: rsalz@akamai.com

shmoo Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Best Current Practice
Expires: 1 June 2021

M. Richardson
Sandelman Software Works
28 November 2020

How often and how long should IETF virtual meetings be?
draft-richardson-shmoo-how-many-fine-dinners-02

Abstract

This document recommends a model for IETF virtual meetings that emphasizes new work, community building and cross-area concerns.

This document recommends virtual meetings be planned a reduced amount of overlap among sessions, with short sessions with generous gaps.

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 1 June 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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
1.1. IETF 107 experience	2
1.2. IETF 108 experience	3
1.3. IETF 109 experience	4
2. Suggestions for future meetings	5
2.1. Principles for Recommendations	5
2.2. Recommendations on meeting structure	6
2.2.1. Encourage Virtual Interim meetings for ongoing work	6
2.2.2. Allow IETF Virtual meeting week to focus on community-wide activities	7
2.2.3. Number of Tracks for virtual meetings	8
3. Security Considerations	9
4. IANA Considerations	9
5. Acknowledgements	9
6. Changelog	9
7. Normative References	9
Author's Address	9

1. Introduction

IETF107 (Vancouver) was the first pandemic IETF virtual meeting held in March 2020. IETF108 (Madrid) was the second pandemic IETF virtual meeting held in July 2020. IETF109 (Bangkok) was the third pandemic IETF virtual meeting held in November 2020.

IETF110 (Prague), will be held as a virtual meeting in March 2021. It is unknown at the time of this writing whether IETF111 (San Francisco) will be possible.

1.1. IETF 107 experience

IETF107 consisted of a light week with no more than about 4-hours of sessions over Monday to Thursday. There were multiple tracks simultaneously, but not more than three sessions at any one time. Priority was given to newly formed WGs that had not yet met, to Birds of a Feather session, and to cross-community sessions including specifically "dispatch" sessions.

These sessions were done with XXXX (webex? right?)

The timezone was approximately "Vancouver"-ish. Most sessions started in late morning, which turned into mid-evening in Europe (going into midnight), and middle of the night in Asia.

All other WGs were assigned a day in the weeks following IETF107 from March 30 to April 30. The WGs were asked to pick a time (and time zone) convenient to them, and they scheduled webex meetings on "ietf.webex.com", although a few WG chairs decided to use "Zoom". Many meetings occurred in the North-America/Europe optimal time slot of 1500UTC ("10am EDT").

Despite the "pick a time", a small number of WGs managed to pick times when other WGs were meeting, and there were in fact collisions.

IETF 107 would be best described as a marathon rather than a sprint.

1.2. IETF 108 experience

IETF108 consisted of a very heavy week.

Eight simultaneous tracks were scheduled, although with slightly shorter meeting times of 50 minutes and 100 minutes. The plenary occurred at the normal Wednesday afternoon time, and other constants like "saag" being on Thursday afternoon were also maintained.

The day started in late-morning "Madrid" (Central European) time and ended before dinner time. The longest break was a 30 minute break after the first session. Other breaks were in the 10 minute range.

This accommodated East-coast North-Americans, but Pacific coast participants had to get up for 4am. The schedule accommodated those in Asia slightly better, but it was still middle of the night in New-Zealand for all but the first sessions.

All WG sessions used meetecho with additional features having been added to support things like humming, and some slightly better queue management.

Many participants experienced a typical number of conflicts. See, for instance https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/suit/OcyNDcssHW8NUrCxGMzCJMX73_M/

Some WGs declined to schedule meetings at IETF108. This was due to a combination of scheduling, timezones and the fee to attend. WGs that did this usually had a healthy and regular set of virtual interim meetings that were ongoing.

To some, IETF 108 felt like a sprint: others felt that the pace, while intense was okay if one paced oneself well.

1.3. IETF 109 experience

IETF109 consisted of a heavy week similiar to IETF108.

Eight simultaneous tracks were scheduled. Each day had a two hour slot, a thirty minute break, a one hour slot, another 30 minute break, and then a two hour slot.

Survey feedback said that participants perferred that the meeting time be as compressed as possible, so the total meeting duration was 6 hours long.

The day started in afternoon "Bangkok" (UTC+7hours: 1pm) time and ended before dinner time.

Participants on the West coast of North America (California, Vancouver, Seattle, etc.) were 16 hours behind, so the meeting time of 0600 UTC worked out to start at 2100 (PST) the night before, and went until 0300 (PST). It was a late night for those participants.

Participants on the East coast of North America (Toronto, Boston, NYC, Atlanta, etc.) were 13 hours behind, so the meeting time of 0600 UTC worked out to start at 0000 (EST) the night before, and went until 0600 (EST). Participants either slept during the day (7am to 3pm) and then got up and spent the evening with their family, or they slept during the afternoon/evening (3pm to 10pm), and got up and joined "first thing". Those who slept during the day usually did so because that's when their house was quiet (partner at work, children at school): they did the meeting at the end of their day. Those who slept in the evening, seemed to cite being able to collaborate with European colleagues after the meeting, during the European "day"

Participants in Europe found the meeting start time of 0600UTC meant that they had get up a bit early. (This experience was similiar to the IETF108 experience for East Coast north Americans) They meeting then occupied most of their day.

At the time of this writing, no feedback from Pacific/Asian participants was received. Input is sought.

Side meetings were a challenge: a few had side meetings during the 30 minute breaks, but many people socialized on gather.town. This was also used for one on one follow-up discussions. Getting more food, drink, and attending to washroom needs were also important to most participants.

A few side meetings were called for after the meeting time, that is after 1200UTC. This was convenient for Europeans and Asian participants, and East Coast participants who slept in the evening, but it did not work for West Coast participants at all.

IETF109 seemed much better attended than IETF108.

2. Suggestions for future meetings

2.1. Principles for Recommendations

There is great utility in having all of the IETF members present and available together. Doing this in-person has many great benefits (and many costs internal and external), not enumerated here.

An unconstrained meeting with few conflicts and a few empty slots in each individual schedule maximizes the benefit of the togetherness. Some call it Working-Group "tourism", others call it "impromptu cross-area review", but there are significant benefits to having "bored" participants with time on their hands wander into a WG to which they have little knowledge.

To be fair, there is some significant negative experience with mic comments like, "I haven't read the document, but..."

Yes, often these comments do lead to significant amounts of friction. Time wasted at the mic explaining that that were covered in the document.

Sometimes, though, they lead to an understanding that two WGs are facing the same issues, and that they should work together. And getting this understanding is really quite valuable.

This is PARTICULARLY the case for new work (BOFs), and for the first few meetings of a newly formed WG. One of the important thing for many individuals to internalize what the boundaries of the new work is, and what the overlap with the work they are doing is. This often comes about from the discussions that go around slide ware, to seeing who else cares about this work, and why.

Heavily conflicted (physical) meeting schedules have been a growing issue, with the result that many people do not have the time (due to conflicts), or the energy (due to exhaustion) to pay attention to the new work.

2.2. Recommendations on meeting structure

2.2.1. Encourage Virtual Interim meetings for ongoing work

This document therefore recommends that the IETF encourage a healthy growth of virtual interim meetings which are:

1. heavily focused.
2. frequent participant-time-zone optimized
3. typically occur at twice-monthly to monthly intervals appropriate for getting work done.

There is a significant self-selection problem with virtual interims and participants.

In groups where the use of virtual interim meetings are used a lot, the choice of time zone in which to hold the virtual interim meeting can determine who attends. When the virtual interim time zone selects against participants from a particular part of the world then they tend to participant less. If the working group then does a poll of participants as to what time zone to use, then having lost participants from the less popular time zone, the result is likely to reinforce this selection.

This suggests that virtual interim meeting time zones should not always be chosen according to popularity (such as "doodle" poll). But, at the same time, a working group which is highly focused and doing good work should be forced to work at inconvenient times. There is a definite tussle here!

The IESG is encouraged to find ways to insert some variation in meeting time. This needs to be done with care, and with some amount of sharing of the pain among different working groups as well.

2.2.1.1. 1500UTC

The 1500 Central European time (in whichever Daylight Savings is active), corresponds to 7AM Pacific, 10AM Eastern, 2PM (UK), 3PM (Paris), 4PM (Helsinki), and 10PM Beijing. This time period is used for IESG Thursday meetings, and is popular because it accomodating to many participants. It is hostile to Eastern Australia, New Zealand and Hawaii participants. Fundamentally, the lack of people who live in the Pacific ocean biases the time zones to those which are daytime in Europe, which is essentially in the middle.

It is therefore difficult to "share the pain" -- those at the extremes (Pacific North America, and Asia/Pacific) will find the times picked to almost always be annoying. To be clear: while a meeting could be planned for early evening (16:00) in San Jose, which is early morning in Tokyo (9AM), it would be outside of office hours, or even night for most everyone else in the world.

2.2.2. Allow IETF Virtual meeting week to focus on community-wide activities

While the IETF mission statement is very outcome focused, that doesn't mean that every activity needs to be only outcome focused. I think that the IETF "plenary" meeting times should be arranged to not just permit, but encourage cross-working-group participation.

This document suggests that the IETF virtual meeting week be focused on:

1. governance and meta-activities like IESG, IAB, NOMCOM
2. *DISPATCH activities
3. BOFs for new work
4. growing the virtual Hackathon
5. newly formed WG meetings,
6. maybe WGs who have gone through some major milestone, and are for instance, rechartering

Rather than attempt to compress the schedule down so that the time between the beginning of the day and the end of the day is as short as possible, we should instead arrange the schedule with generous break intervals to accommodate adhoc 1:1 or rather-small-group meetings.

That is, the "hallway session" needs some time and space to be useful.

In particular, having some gaps where a person can reasonably expect to track down someone else to chat about a specific thing, or just to catch up.

We used to stimulate the "hallway" discussion using cookies and beverages.

Often this is the best way to talk though DISCUSSES among ADs and document authors.

Those that used the gather.town system, found it was exceptionally useful for this.

2.2.3. Number of Tracks for virtual meetings

This document recommends that we have fewer tracks. Somewhere between two and four.

That is, like IETF108 and more like IETF107. A few more tracks, and slightly longer days.

This document does not recommend that the schedule be adjusted to accomodate all the time zones. Because of where the Pacific Ocean is, that pretty much always puts noon somewhere near Greenwich.

The 1-1-1-* process should mean that the locale chosen for the cancelled physical meeting defines the time zone. Participants should be expected to "travel" to that time zone: many physical trips take 24 to 36 hours of airplane time, and asking participants to take a similiar amount of time to adjust their body clocks is not unreasonable.

Once a year, the participants will find they have to do almost no adjustment, when the meeting is "near" them.

Meetings should be restricted to between a 4 and 7 day period though, which gives them some time to adjust before "returning" to work the next week.

Historical meetings have accomodated in excess of 200 hours of session time. (Eight hours/day X 4.5 days X eight tracks = 288 hours, minus some for the plenary).

The virtual meeting should restrict itself to approximately 100 hours of session time. 6 sessions of 50 minutes, with ~30 minute breaks between, over 4 tracks, and over 4 days gives 90 hours of session time. This calculation does not count time for a plenary where there is only one track. This formula is intended to be a guideline only.

Note that for many, conflicts mean that they have to view the session after the fact via Youtube. While the "play back at 2x speed" can be effective for some listeners, this can result in significant number of extra hours of time for the meeting.

Rather than compete for available plenary-week WGs slots, WGs should compete to demonstrate that they don't need a slot.

Having a plenary-week slot should mean that additional "supervision" is required :-). Either because the WG is very new, or because the WG is old and has lost it's way.

3. Security Considerations

The excessive use of caffeine and sugar to adjust jet lag may have health effects on the participants. In addition, there is some possibility that decisions made under such influence might negatively affect the security of the Internet. Multiple reviews after periods of "sober second thought" should catch any such poor decisions.

4. IANA Considerations

This document makes no requests to IANA.

5. Acknowledgements

YOUR NAME HERE.

6. Changelog

7. Normative References

[RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

Author's Address

Michael Richardson
Sandelman Software Works

Email: mcr+ietf@sandelman.ca

shmoo
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: May 6, 2021

M. Knodel
CDT
K. Novotny
Association for Progressive Communications
November 02, 2020

Meeting asynchronously with mailing lists
draft-shmoo-async-00

Abstract

For when we can't meet in person, when there's interim work to be done, or just because the task calls for it, an asynchronous text-based meeting can sometimes be perfectly productive and useful. Given how much the IETF uses email already [RFC3934] this document aims to create additional guidance for co-chairs and meeting facilitators who might want to host a meeting asynchronously with mailing lists. Drawing from decades of facilitation experience in global networks, the document also treats unique considerations for facilitators that are introduced by this meeting methodology.

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 May 6, 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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: Why?	2
2. How	3
2.1. Before: Meeting preparation	3
2.2. During: Facilitating and participating	4
2.2.1. Welcome	4
2.2.2. Mixed methods	5
2.2.3. Polling and reaching consensus	5
2.2.4. Threading and subject lines	5
2.2.5. Social/AOB	6
2.3. After: The destination	6
2.3.1. Closing threads	6
2.3.2. Meeting reports	6
2.3.3. Meeting feedback	7
3. Considerations	7
3.1. Defining participation	7
3.2. Translation and accessibility	7
3.3. Netiquette and participant instructions	7
3.4. Compliance	7
4. Annexes and examples	8
4.1. Guidance from "Closer Than Ever"	8
4.2. Sample welcome message and agenda	9
5. Security Considerations	10
6. IANA Considerations	10
7. Informative References	10
Authors' Addresses	10

1. Introduction: Why?

Meeting online introduces new and novel challenges to in-person meetings. Getting people online in a synchronous meeting is generally difficult and demanding on everyone. High costs include logistics and The difficulty grows exponentially with the number and diversity of desired participants. If the meeting participants cut accross different timezones, participation to such a meeting requires a real committment and sacrifice from many participants. Although the synchronous voice/video meetings imitate face-to-face meetings, they fall short in terms of productivity in serious ways. Particularly when meetings are large, synchronous discussion at scale is usually questionable, and the real outputs rarely justify the investment needed from everyone in orser to participate.

By contrast, well-structured asynchronous meetings have pacing and mixed-methods that gives participants an opportunity to participate in the ways which work for them, and when they can. Especially during a global crisis, but really whenever one is expected to participate in remote work, asynchronous meetings are more compatible with individuals' limitations because they can adapt their participation to their realities - removing the likelihood of the clashes, which are seemingly ever present in synchronous meetings.

Since email is ubiquitous, mailing list software can be the centerpiece of an asynchronous meeting toolchain. This is particularly smooth for IETF participants given the established and disciplined use of mailing lists for IETF work. Throughout the 2020 pandemic arrangements for virtual IETF meetings there has been a noticeable persistence in "taking it to the list" when co-chairs seek to build consensus, even though in theory there are a reduced number of barriers for an engaged IETF participant to join an online meeting. This indicates that even during synchronous, online IETF meetings that activity on mailing lists is still important.

2. How

This document outlines how to, over a time-bound period, cultivate productive mailing list activity, in order to rely less on synchronous moments, or not at all.

2.1. Before: Meeting preparation

Preparation for any meeting is key. However there are particular opportunities with an asynchronous meeting in which chairs can take extra care to ensure productivity for the group, but also efficiency for their work as facilitators during the meeting itself.

First, set up an organising space. Perhaps the datatracker is enough for IETF meetings, but perhaps with the addition of a wiki space, or creative use of Meeting Materials. Participants will be switching their attention radars on and off in different moments - that's the point! But they won't be present when you ask them to, or when you email key information. The ongoing flow of participants and presenters asking for clarifying details need to be gently directed to one place with all of the meeting instructions and resources to all these details somewhere visible (header or footer of all messages during the meeting, etc).

Next, determine distinct discussion topics. It will not be enough to have each presenter or document author write to the mailing list to start a discussion about their work. Chairs will need to create a structured agenda, with threads for each topic (see next section)

opened with a clear message detailing the topic's purpose, objective and process. This implies that "agenda review" needs to happen well in advance of the beginning of the asynchronous meeting.

For each topic it is critical to agree ahead of time on this topic-opening message, ideally with the presenter(s) and author(s). The message should contain enough background and context such that all participants start with clarity on prior discussion, recent decisions, and most importantly the "POP" of the thread, or asynchronous discussion, itself. What is the purpose of getting everyone's focussed attention on this threaded discussion for the next few days? What's the objective- perhaps a set of decisions- for the chairs, and possibly the author(s)? Each thread needs its own process, too, explained- eg watch the presentation, read the draft, compare versions, look at the open issues, take a poll, etc. Make sure materials are managed: drafts should be listed on the meeting materials page, presentations uploaded, and if other videos or resources are needed that they are clearly linked from the same place.

Plan to give participants a social outlet during the meeting. Advanced planning could help the chairs facilitate moments throughout the meeting that happen spontaneously in an in-person meeting, and even sometimes in online conferencing. The chitchat about current events, our private lives, or something everyone cares about. Creating space for this on an agreed agenda will set the expectation for participants that the meeting will be interesting and include moments of humanity and levity.

2.2. During: Facilitating and participating

2.2.1. Welcome

An opening welcome message is very important and should be the first thread opened. It should list the purpose and objective of the welcome message, which is to start the meeting and ensure everyone knows the agenda and how to participate. It's the place where compliance, bluesheets and other information is shared for the first time. The details outlined in the welcome message should be available in the meeting space as the agenda, or reference materials, for easy reference.

It's recommended that basic instructions to participants include being present some fixed number of hours for the duration of the meeting, eg plan to set aside 10-15 minutes per day for a week to engage in this meeting.

2.2.2. Mixed methods

An agenda item might require a mixed method, for example a presentation about a draft delivered by the draft's author. In each topic thread, the process should be clear for all participants, eg watch the presentation and reply to the topic thread with questions (like a mic line). It may well be that a synchronous moment is needed, over voice, video conference, jabber, etc. For these moments, and for the benefit of meeting participants unable to attend, both record the session and create notes immediately and use them as the basis for the continuation of the thread. Mixed method can be powerful, but hard to get right. You don't want to keep participants unable to participate synchronously waiting 2-3 days for a readout on what happened.

2.2.3. Polling and reaching consensus

The first step to reaching a destination is knowing where you're going. Facilitators and chairs will have an easier time building consensus from the list if from the beginning it's clear what is being built. Perhaps employing silence procedure is wise given list subscription sizes.[Silence]

There may be innovations beyond a simple polling tool to substitute humming that others in the shmoo WG may be keen to adopt and that would be appropriate in an asynchronous space.

2.2.4. Threading and subject lines

As mentioned in the above section on meeting preparation, allocating each agenda item to a topic thread allows the facilitator to open distinct discussions on the mailing list with clarity of purpose, objective and process. A clear subject line should be used for each threaded topic. Forking discussion topic threads by pre-pending can be a useful way to identify sub-topic areas, but chairs might consider whether they would like to be in control of those changes or allow spontaneous forking by any participant during the time-bound meeting.

It is generally assumed that the mailing list be used only for the meeting during the meeting dates, eg no other threads should be opened without checking with the chair. Likewise, when the meeting has ended, that no one should reply to, eg continue discussion of, meeting topic threads.

2.2.5. Social/AOB

Chairs can facilitate social exchange during the meeting, emulating the in-person experience to some small degree. That includes allocating separately a welcome and agenda message, so that the welcome message can give participants a chance to "check in" on others, offer up personal anecdotes, or share links. There may be a current event that has its own topic thread, but is only tangentially related to the meeting that would compell meeting participants to check in on the meeting.

Any other business is often part of an IETF WG/RG meeting agenda, and creating a topic thread can allow for asynchronous proposals for other topics to discuss from participants themselves, though as mentioned in the meeting preparation section above, agenda review should ideally be done well in advance of the first day of the meeting.

2.3. After: The destination

After the closing message ends the meeting, it's a useful and helpful thing to take a few extra steps to ensure all objectives of the meeting were achieved, that leaders and authors are clear on their next steps, and that participants know they shouldn't reply to meeting threads anymore.

2.3.1. Closing threads

While notetaking isn't really necessary, since the list archive itself is a verbatim account of the meeting, having a summary of each thread will be useful. Especially since each thread should already have outlined a clear purpose and objective, the summary should easily address whether or not those were fulfilled.

Participants should be given a chance to correct the closing thread summary for inaccuracies only.

2.3.2. Meeting reports

A meeting report might be a compendium of all closing threads, and constitute the official notes for the meeting that appear in the data tracker. It might also helpfully include statistics on participation.

2.3.3. Meeting feedback

In all cases, but especially with new methodologies like MAML, it's recommended to conduct a short post-meeting evaluation with all participants that can help facilitators determine what worked, what didn't and to collect any other meta views that participants might want to share. Rather than an open thread, meeting evaluations are best conducted with anonymous surveys.

3. Considerations

3.1. Defining participation

There are yet unexplored models for how to host a full IETF meeting held only on mailing lists given subscription to lists isn't monetised. It isn't recommended to hold an asynchronous meeting over several days, and encompassing an IETF virtual synchronous moment for which participants would need to pay, as this would put list-only participants at a disadvantage.

Another consideration is how to handle bluesheets for an asynchronous meeting held on a mailing list with hundreds of subscribers. For those not reading the list carefully, they may be surprised to know that their commentary on a mailing list thread constitutes official participation in an IETF meeting. Likewise it would be difficult to ask participants to sign in when attention will be rather fluid.

3.2. Translation and accessibility

Text-based communications present opportunities for increased accessibility of discussions because they can be fed into machine translators and screen readers; read, reread and referenced more easily. Asynchronicity removes time-related constraints sometimes present in accessibility tools.

3.3. Netiquette and participant instructions

While most IETFers are well versed in proper mailing list netiquette, perhaps reminders of how the chairs would prefer the meeting flow in its discussion could be

3.4. Compliance

Lastly delivery of the Note Well and other compliance considerations when meeting only on a mailing list need to be explored further.

At all times, but especially when faced with potentially a huge increase in list traffic, chairs should be ready to enforce the IETF Code of Conduct [RFC7776].

4. Annexes and examples

4.1. Guidance from "Closer Than Ever"

The Association for Progressive Communications was founded in 1990 and has used mailing lists in creative ways to connect its global network. Their publication on working remotely was rebooted in 2020 and here's a relevant excerpt [APC]:

When the email lists are used for meetings, we always establish a clear procedure so that everyone involved in the meeting knows how long we will be discussing the topics addressed, what topics will be discussed each day or each week, and how subject lines will be handled.

A typical online meeting can take place over three weeks: * Week 1: signing in and posting of discussion topics * Week 2: discussion of topics * Week 3: voting.

These are the basic steps that we follow for our online council meetings:

1. Two weeks prior to the meeting, the meeting facilitators will post the proposed meeting agenda and motions to the Board of Directors for approval.
2. One week prior to the meeting, the executive director will post the meeting agenda, including the full slate of proposed motions, to the council email list.
3. Then we start the discussion by sending out one message for each point of the agenda, so that members may reply accordingly to each subject line. The first messages are for checking in: each member that will participate in the meeting sends a short message stating their name and organisation, so that we all know who is participating. Then we continue by replying to messages according to the subject headings of the agenda.
4. Once the meeting is finished there is an official message closing the meeting and thanking everyone for their participation. All council members will then receive a summary of the points discussed and the agreements reached.

5. During the meeting the facilitator has a key role in making sure everyone is participating, clarifying any doubts in the procedures, and asking relevant questions to those members who have been silent (sometimes off list, encouraging them to participate).

4.2. Sample welcome message and agenda

Subject: shmoo-IETF109 0: Agenda and process overview

This message is to open the _shmoo Meeting at IETF 109_. The meeting will take place on this list between _DD-DD Month YYYY_.

The process for the meeting is the following:

The chairs will open specific topic threads by sending opening messages to this list.

Reply to any thread at any time, just make sure to keep the subject line intact so it is clear on what topic you are responding.

Below is the agenda. Please use this topic thread only if you have something to say about the agenda or the process.

Remember that all relevant information and all documents shared in this meeting are available on the datatracker: _URL_

Please shout with any questions.

Welcome to the meeting! :)

AGENDA: Stay Home Meet Only Online IETF 109 Meeting, _DD-DD Month YYYY_

- shmoo-IETF109 0: Agenda and process overview (this thread)
- shmoo-IETF109 1: Check in and social space
- shmoo-IETF109 2: draft-shmoo-firstexample-00
- shmoo-IETF109 3: draft-shmoo-secondexample-07
- shmoo-IETF109 4: draft-thirdexample-03
- shmoo-IETF109 5: Any other matters
- shmoo-IETF109 6: Closing the meeting

5. Security Considerations

Security is dependent on a wide range of actors that are implementing technical documentation. Therefore it is crucial that language is clear, and understood by all that need to implement this documentation. Correct and inclusive language is therefore conducive for secure implementations of technical documentation.

6. IANA Considerations

This document has no actions for IANA.

7. Informative References

- [APC] Association for Progressive Communications, . and ,
"Closer than ever: A guide for social change organisations
who want to work online",
<<https://www.apc.org/en/node/36145/#tools>>.
- [RFC3934] Wasserman, M., "Updates to RFC 2418 Regarding the
Management of IETF Mailing Lists", BCP 25, RFC 3934,
DOI 10.17487/RFC3934, October 2004,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3934>>.
- [RFC7776] Resnick, P. and A. Farrel, "IETF Anti-Harassment
Procedures", BCP 25, RFC 7776, DOI 10.17487/RFC7776, March
2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7776>>.
- [Silence] Wikipedia, . and , "Silence procedure", 2020,
<https://simple.wikipedia.org/wiki/Silence_procedure>.

Authors' Addresses

Mallory Knodel
CDT

EEmail: mknodel@cdt.org

Karel Novotny
Association for Progressive Communications

EEmail: karel@apc.org