IETF 110 Plenary Minutes

10 March 2021, Online

1. Welcome

Slides: [IETF 110 Operations and Administrative Plenary](#), Slides 104

2. Host Presentation

Slides: [IETF 110 Operations and Administrative Plenary](#), Slide 5

3. Updates

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

3.1. IETF Chair Update

Slides: [IETF 110 Operations and Administrative Plenary](#), Slides 7-16

3.2. IAB Chair Update

Slides: [IAB Report to the Community for IETF 110](#)

3.3. IRTF Chair Update

Slides: [Internet Research Task Force Plenary Report](#)

3.4. NomCom Update

Slides: [NomCom 2020-2021 Report](#)

3.5. IETF LLC Board Update

Slides: [LLC Briefing - IETF 110](#)

3.6. IETF Trust Update

Slides: [IETF Trust - IETF110 Update](#)

4. Applying and Evolving QUIC

Slides: [IETF 110 Operations and Administrative Plenary](#), Slides 22-25

5. Recognition

Slides: [IETF 110 Operations and Administrative Plenary](#), Slides 26-29

6. IESG open mic session

Slides: [IETF 110 Operations and Administrative Plenary](#), Slides 30-32

Lars Eggert: This is the incoming and outgoing IESG will be here got the open mic. We got some questions from the email. I will read them in no particular order, and we will have responses, and you are also free to ask questions over MeetEcho. We didn't clarify if these emails were going to be anonymous or not. If the person who sent it in wants to identify themselves in the chat or come to the microphone for response, please feel free. The first question:

Lars Eggert: From email: *"Are you, the IESG, satisfied there's a suitably robust procedure to ensure a clear separation of roles when a WG co-chair is a (co-)author of an I-D? Just posting email with a "no hats" disclaimer sometimes seems a little weak. For instance, when emails relate to progressing the document (call for adoption, consensus decisions, WGLC, etc) rather than the document's contents. These potential conflict of interest issues sometimes arise at WG sessions too."* I think Barry was going to speak to this question. Barry go ahead.

Barry Leiba: Yes. Hi. Yes, I think we are satisfied in general. The general thing of having chairs having technical contributions in their working groups and we expect that. And for that, I think giving a "no hats" statement is adequate. When a chair is an author on a document, that's why we have co-chairs and that's why we have responsible ADs. There is always somebody to take over the management of the document process, so that the chair who is an author does not have to make the decisions on consensus and any further processing of the document. I think we're pretty good on that. In the IESG we've had situations where an AD is an author on a document and asks a co-AD to handle the processing of that document. In general, we have a good system for handling this with all the different people with their responsibilities and their backups on that.

*
Lars Eggert: Thanks, Barry. I will wait to see if there is followup. Doesn't seem to be. The next question: From email: *"Having asked the question a couple sessions ago, I just wanted to ask - given increasing antitrust enforcement efforts, including recent litigation. Are there any updates on the efforts to enhance the transparency of potential conflicts of interest within the IETF standards development and approval processes? Rather than asking on open mic, it seemed a question worth asking in advance for possible reaction at the session or elsewhere. Some similar transparency concerns are raised in draft-gont-diversity-analysis-00."* I think Barry also agreed to speak on this.

Barry Leiba: Yes. The LLC Board led this with setting up a conflict of interest policy for LLC Board members. And the IAB has since also done a conflict of interest policy, and the IESG has been working on one for a while and is just about finished with it. You should see something public about that very soon. The disclosure policy specifies the conditions under which we are supposed to disclose conflicts. What sorts of conflicts we are talking about and I think that will increase transparency on that. For a long time Of course we've been disclosing who our affiliations are with. This goes a bit beyond that and expands on that, so expect to see a conflict of interest policy officially from the IESG soon.

Lars Eggert: Thanks. And I'm again going to wait a few moments if there are followup questions from the participants. Alright. The third question we were sent was about what the plan for IETF 111 is and I think Jason talked a little bit about pointing out there is a consultation going on. But in any case this is mostly a question for the LLC and for Jay, which is why we're punting it over to that open mic session. And with that we come to the end of the questions we got by email, so if there are any questions from the audience, please get in line and we have Andrew in line already. Go ahead Andrew.

*

Andrew Campling: We see more groups moving work to GitHub and using it different ways and strays from usual work. And only has conclusions copied to the list. I wonder whether the IESG leadership has comments on this on the appropriate use of GitHub. With more and more groups moving work to Github, use of it is varied and often strays beyond the original stated use of purely editorial discussions. In some places, almost all the meaningful discussion is on Github with just conclusions being posted back to the mailing list, potentially excluding some contributors, impacting diversity. Does the leadership have any comments on this and whether a standardized approach is needed?

Lars Eggert: I can speak to this. Since the QUIC working group is the worst offender here in recent memory and I am one of the chairs. So QUIC is a very complex protocol, and the short answer is that I don't think we could have done QUIC if we hadn't used GitHub in the way we've been using it. We tried hard not to exclude anybody, for example we set up a second mailing list that basically mirrored the GitHub issue discussion and PR discussion on GitHub. So every comment on the GitHub elicited an email to that IETF mailing list that people could then be subscribed to and follow along if they didn't want to join GitHub. It was also possible to reply by email and have that reflected back into the GitHub discussion effectively. I don't think we've seen that used much. I think I remember off the top of my head one or two participants that initially used the email feedback but then quickly switched to GitHub. I have no data on people who never replied to the email, but I simply think we could not have done this without a way to track issues and allow discussion and the ability to refer to the text in the specification as part of the discussion in a way that didn't involve copy and pasting text. I think that some of that is reflected in the RFCs we have that talk about how working groups should use GitHub. If anything else should be clarified, we should do that. I don't think the use of GitHub is going to decrease in the IETF. Magnus already mentioned in his section on

QUIC that how we're going to be extending the GitHub process into the IESG and then the RFC Editor phase of the document life cycle is an open question at the moment. We have one example of where we did this with QUIC, but we don't know if that's the best way to do it. I think Barry also wanted to speak to that, too.

Barry Leiba: I want to expand on one thing that Andrew brought up. If using Git excludes some people; I think over time the IETF has to modernize and move it's tools into different tools, and this is an example of a situation like that where we are moving to some hybrid of email and GitHub. Anyone can get a GitHub account, so I don't think we're actively excluding anybody. Some people may not be comfortable in using GitHub - we've seen that in the IESG as the QUIC documents came forward and the discussion between the IESG and the authors started happening in GitHub not all of us were comfortable with that. I think the community will have to move toward becoming more comfortable over time and I don't think it's a bad thing.

Lars Eggert: Thanks, Barry.

Ben Kaduk: I wanted to add to that we have people using GitHub for issue discussion. But the text ultimately makes its way into the draft. Now we have a lot of places that we can discuss drafts and it's also not the case that GitHub is sort of uniquely privileged in this regard. Discussion can happen in the bar, or in unicast email, etc. So yes, it is a way to have discussion that is not in the email list, but we have lots of those as well so this is a change, but not a fundamental change. I think we have enough steps in the process where people can see what is happening and provide comments on it that it's not a foundational change, so as Barry says there will be some level of evolution and we can't stay fixed in our static ways.

Lars Eggert: Thanks, Ben.

*

Andrew Campling: Hitting on diversity allowing people to be involved. There is a lot of work being done in interim meetings. This will reduce the diversity of use in the IETF. So again, does the leadership have thoughts on how to get more representation into interims. To ensure a broader range of representation. Since COVID-19, a lot of work is now going on in interim meetings, and there's a risk of shutting busy people out of discussions. Plenty of people with valuable contributions don't have time to follow all of the mailing lists and attend interims, but will turn up to IETF meetings. This can end up reducing the diversity of views to just those whose sole focus is the IETF. Does the leadership have thoughts on how to either get more representation in these interims, or on an approach to ensure that important discussions happen in full IETF meetings with a broader range of participants?

Roman Danyliw: Great question. Certainly the cadence of meetings can be challenging to include folks, but I don't think we have a new situation here in Covid. Pre-Covid, there was the ability to have the cadence of meetings at any particular time as long as it followed the

process. I think that's really the thing we need to be very cognizant of during Covid times, as everyone becomes very comfortable with the various kind of remote meetings that we keep to practices of two weeks notice, minutes as required so people can follow up as required. I will also say anecdotally where I've seen working groups have frequent interim meetings, we actually see higher quality specs, and we're talking more about it. We're getting documents pushed, and pushed at a faster pace.

Mirja Kühlewind: I wanted to mention something that we discussed in the IESG but also in the IAB. Of course the dynamics are different when you meet only online. And you have to manage your time and so I think it makes sense for the chairs and participants to rethink on how to use their meeting times. It is good to see in interim meetings to be much more focused on specific issues while we use plenary meetings to have more cross-area participation. I think we can do more in making sure on the one hand we can use meetings most efficiently and be able to make progress on our work, and then also have sync up times from time to time to keep others aware of the work and work together. This is something we can learn from the current situation, on how to improve how we use our meeting time.

John Scudder: At the risk of being glib, I will parody the question so you know, can everyone stop working so hard it disadvantages people who don't have the time to work that hard on the working group's work, which I expect is not really the intention. The interims I have been participating in tend to have a more focused and interactive agenda. If we are just reading slides at each other that's a negative, but if we are moving work forward I see that is a positive.

*

Phillip Hallam-Baker: I want to follow up with that. I'm used to other standards organizations where the bi-weekly conference call is the usual way of doing things. I am fully on board with more frequent interims. I think this is coming up because of Covid, it has changed the way people are working. For example I've not been involved in QUIC or HTTP3. Not because I didn't have anything to say, but because there are hundreds of other people trying to say stuff, so I said what I had to say and went away. I think that's one way of interacting, and you don't need to be a hundred percent engaged in a particular working group. However, what we need to do is rethink the way we use interims vs plenary meetings. Instead of thinking the plenary and the interims as being the same thing, the interim being more akin to an editors meeting in which anybody who wants to can participate and you work the issues list and the plenary meeting being more outreach explaining yourself to the wider community explaining where you are, what you're trying to do and the consequences of design decisions made so the wider group can say "oh right, yes, you've decided to do this, but that makes your protocol not work for green foots with soles." And the other thing I'd say is we really could do with some sort of tool that would aggregate information in when all these meetings are taking place so that when I'm planning out my calendar I can look in one place and see oh, right, the six interim meetings in the next three weeks; these are the ones I'm really interested in and I

will schedule that time. If we thought of this as an opportunity to rethink we can be more productive.

Lars Eggert: Thank you Phillip. The one thing I want to quickly point out is that the IETF datatracker has an ical subscription that has all the upcoming IETF Interim Meetings, so you can at least see them in your calendar. I use that quite a bit, and someone has probably already put the URL in the chat. If not maybe someone could do that, that's quite helpful. Let's go to the next person in the queue.

*

Abdussalam Baryun: I have a question and an expectation. I am expecting from the directors of the areas to direct the working groups. I worked with some working groups and attended some meetings and there are some documents that get to Last Call or the Working Group Last Call. I'm expecting the Area Director to have a meeting with the chairs and direct that document. It may be interacting with other working groups or other areas or out of the area of the director. At the same time I'm expecting feedback that this has happened. But if I don't know what's happening between the director and the chair, how can I interact with other areas or working groups? I am in this one working group which is my interest, and I'm expecting there is some kind of interaction or some kind of information getting to me. Also some kind of window or a channel that I can go to that has this kind of drafts or documents which is in the Working Group Last Call, and it is interacting with other areas or other working groups and this way I will make sure I interact with these people or this working groups participants to make the document more efficient for the IETF and be helpful for the IESG when we are participating and giving our comments. I was expecting that, but I did not see that much in IESG. I would hope in the next meeting the IESG gives us a report for which documents that went through some kind of process to make it more efficient and more helpful for our areas. Because usually the internet technology that needs some kind of integration--usually now technologies are more integrated. So we have to focus on the integration. One chair was interested in the cross WG thing. I think this has been proposed before. This is my question. Thank you.

Lars Eggert: Thank you. Éric?

Éric Vyncke: This is an interesting question. We should address this cross working group or cross areas connection and reviews as early as possible. It does not always happen. In the Internet Area, we see documents about DNS or IPv6 that are lacking a lot of things, but we only see them in the IETF Last Call. So basically, the earlier this cross area or cross working group is addressed, the better. There is no real process on this, as it relies on the working group chairs and for working group chairs and participation here, you can ask for early review from any directorates right for the group. Such as the YANG Doctors, the IOT Directorate, or whatever because you know the content of the drafts and so you can address it to the different directorates, and that will help a lot. On the other hand in the IESG we also have the IESG telechats where we discuss when a document is linked to for example QUIC or IPv6 or DNS or whatever, and then suggest there to request another review in a working group last

call, or a specific last call review to a specific working group. So yes, it relies on the human beings to make it work, so it is imperfect, but it is really close to our hearts in the IESG for sure.

Lars Eggert: Thanks, Éric.

Eliot Lear: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I want to come back to the discussion Andrew started on the use of interims. I am chairing the RFC Editor Future Development Program, which is an IAB program activity, but we are running it like a working group. This is a highly contentious topic as people know, but we've made, I think, great strides in the group. All the members should be really proud in terms of just how far the group has come. In this regard, I don't think we could have done that without interims. It took a long time for us to level set our views. It took a long time to find common ground and having "face time" if you will has really helped us. We had to come to a consensus on how often to meet--I wanted to push for every two weeks, people thought that was too often for this topic and they needed time to digest and to consider--and of course there are other things going on in the world, especially this last year. The one or two aspects that I'd like to bring forth is that I think the group was hampered a little bit that we could not meet in person. Sometimes, when you have contentious issues, it helps to break up the meeting with a beer in between or a coffee. The other point I was going to make is that the interim activities I think have actually opened up the group to people who might not have otherwise participated simply because they couldn't travel to the meetings that we might have had. This relates to the discussion in GENDISPATCH in how we are inclusive. I don't claim to have an answer there. But maybe other groups work differently; they don't need those interims quite as much and they just do work in email. There is a nice synergy when everyone is pushing in the same direction. But if you do have contentions it helps people to talk it out. Thank you very much.

Lars Eggert: Thank you for the input, Eliot.

*

Jim Fenton: Hi, thanks, I'd like to go back to the topic of GitHub. There is RFC 8874 and 8875, which are great and tell working groups how to use GitHub. And thanks to the Secretariat for reminding the chairs of that recently. But there is also a GitHub organization just called IETF and there's several repositories there. I have a couple of concerns, one is that it's not clear what the status of those documents are, just the fact that the repository that the organization being called IETF makes it seem like they have some official status, more so than others. And that needs to be made clear at least in the individual repositories. I also don't see that the NoteWell is consistently displayed there. I'd like to get some clarification on how is that used, what it is used for, and that we have all those usual processes in place to make sure that contributions are appropriate and that the status of documents there is clear. Thanks.

Lars Eggert: So I think one part of your questions is specifically about the github.com/IETF organization we actually recently sort of started in the background. It's to bring the use under a little bit more rigor in terms of making sure the repositories satisfy a certain rough set of criteria such as they're a broad organizational applicability and that they have descriptions and they have websites, and the NoteWell is displayed and so on. This is an ongoing process that we started and it takes a little bit of time because some of those repositories need to migrate outside of the organization. But some of them belong to documents in working groups that would be a little bit disruptive , so this is ongoing. The second part of your question is a little bit more about the broader use of GitHub. I think we talked about this already in that we have the two RFCs you've mentioned that give us some guidance on what we should be doing, but I don't think they're the end state. I think they're sort of a good start that give us some rules that have proven to work well. But I think we will need additional guidance on how we're going to use GitHub better in the future. Right. I think Toerless is next and I'm going to cut the mic line after him since we have other open mics to get to.

*

Toerless Eckert: Yeah, I'm not sure if this is the right open mic. Let me quickly propose something to the organization, and maybe the IESG would be the best ones to drive it in terms of looking back and celebrating the organization. Around IETF 112, think about setting up a one-day workshop to bring in people we may not have any more in ten years to basically give presentations, maybe 20 minutes each, about the core technologies and things that happened in the organization. If it is not clear what the opportunity is, then look at the publishing date of RFC 791 [Internet Protocol, published September 1981], which to me for the IETF would be the best opportunity to celebrate something and as I said it's 40 years and in 10 years more we won't have a lot of the people who started it.

Lars Eggert: That's a good suggestion. I agree it is unclear if it is the IESG activity. There is probably also an IAB angle to it, but we'll take that up. Keep in mind that IETF 112 may also be the first we've had in a while that is hopefully going to be a physical meeting again, so there might be some already additional complexities in organizing that so we will see what we can do. I will take the action item to start an email thread about what people would would be willing to do.

Toerless Eckert: If it was maybe before IETF and would be virtual, I think there would be a lot of people world-wide to join in and be on a video, or live stream of that so it's certainly something for a much broader community of interest that the ones who made it happen in the IETF itself.

Lars Eggert: If you would email to the IETF mailing list. Whether it is in the IETF Meeting week, or we do a separate event at some other time and have a smaller IETF-focused event during the meeting week. Thank you. And with that, I think the IESG open mic is at its end. Let's move on to the next open mic.

7. IAB open mic session

Slides: [IETF 110 Operations and Administrative Plenary](#), Slides 33-34

Mirja Kühlewind: As always, you can send emails to iab@iab.org, or to me personally if you want to know something. But now we're here for the open mic, so please join the queue and ask questions.

Andrew Campling: I've got a question related to when new standards are proposed. Should proposed standards be assessed for their negative impact on centralization, e.g. whether they are likely to exacerbate it, much like security aspects are reviewed? It may be that a proposal should still go forward as the trade-offs are deemed worthwhile, however, they would at least be understood and, ideally, documented. In my view this drift towards centralization is unlikely to be in the long-term interest of end-users (RFC 8890) and, therefore, it would be helpful if it wasn't made even worse by the introduction of new standards. Does the leadership have any views on this? Do you agree that action is needed?

Jari Arkko: Good question, thank you. I think there is going to be differing opinions on this in the IAB, as well as in the IETF. I personally do believe that it's a big issue and we should be concerned about that. I think some of the discussions we've been having in some of the WGs are about that, to some extent. Of course, that's not the only issue in front of us. I should also mention that the IAB has promised to write, or, return to the topic of consolidation and centralization, and write a document. People have requested that; the token is on me, and I have failed to deliver so far. But, it is still on the task list. So, that is something that we are looking at.

Mirja Kühlewind: Yes, I just wanted to ask, Andrew, because I wasn't sure what you had in mind or were proposing, but we definitely talk about this from an architectural point of view. And as always, we try to understand what the issues are and provide guidance to the community. Hopefully we'll see an update of Jari's draft very soon, and keep the discussion going. But I'm not sure if you're asking about process changes. I think if it impacts process, it's definitely also a question for the IESG.

Wes Hardaker: Thanks, good question, and it's certainly a topic that's been hot on my mind. In fact on my whiteboard behind me, I have a list of different ways the Internet is centralized, because I've been thinking about it for a while. The one thing that I've learned a lot in the last couple of years of thinking about it, though, is that it's very much a tradeoff. It's not just that centralization is all bad. I personally don't use many centralized services because I think it's bad for me, but the other thing you have to recognize is that it's actually enabled a lot of strong usage of the Internet that wouldn't exist today without it. Centralized file sharing services, and centralized easy-to-manage web pages, and things like that end up in very, very centralized services, which has greatly benefitted users. In a recent academic paper I co-authored, we actually measured ways where security was suddenly fixed for a large quantity of users because a centralized service fixed some pretty severe security bugs. They

deployed DNSSEC or deployed HTTPS everywhere on all of their sites all at once. It's a big tradeoff issue, and centralization is a huge risk to privacy, though. You have to balance all of those. The thinking is long and arduous. Thank you.

Mark Nottingham: I am concerned about centralization as well. I do get concerned that if we have a bar for centralization or some other measure like that, effectively, we would never have standardized the Web, because the Web can be seen as just a big engine for centralization, if we're being honest. Because of that, and how it makes it work. I am interested in more concrete kinds of measures. Especially--Brian Trammell and I have a draft that we have been letting languish for too long about choke points in the Internet architecture and how we can prevent their formation, and I think that's a concrete thing that we as a community can look at: where does this centralize power so much that it gives someone inordinate power over people's experiences of the Internet? But having said that, I think we also have to recognize that technical limits on centralization are often not going to be effective. Competition law ones may be. And we should be looking to work with the folks who are looking into that now, and giving them good technical advice where we can.

Tommy Pauly: On this topic, I'd also like to chime in that I think that centralization concerns that people bring up oftentimes are pointing at certain protocols that in and of themselves are not fundamentally related to being centralized or not. I think that, Andrew, we've had these discussions around the use of encrypted DNS and DOH, and I think those are often pointed at. Fundamentally, these pieces of technology are not necessarily centralized, but it's kind of the market and the deployment models. I think as far as what is appropriate for the IAB to do, or the IESG to do, I don't think we're going to be able to say, "thou shalt not have centralization." Probably what is more useful is to point out the areas where we can provide mechanisms and technical solutions to help decentralize things, to help make it viable to have a non-centralized model. Let's not focus on demonizing any technologies that happen to work well with centralized models and decentralized models; let's focus on what are the missing pieces that make it hard to create generic decentralized solutions. It's more of a call to action than a call to stop working on things.

Phillip Hallam-Baker: I'd like to address this and kind of recast this a little bit, in that if you obsess about--don't just look at centralization, look at the driver for centralization, which is that the user doesn't have autonomy. I cannot change my email provider because if I do, my email account address will change, and the stuff will be going to a different place. So, of course, I own my own domain name because that's the only way that I can own my account, but that costs me $10 a year, which is a significant fraction of many people's annual incomes. Maintaining a domain name is a significant technical barrier for many people. A lot of the time when I see people trying to design systems that are decentralized, they obsess about the decentralization piece, and eliminating any possibility of centralization imposes an enormous cost on that design. An extreme there, of course, is blockchain, which is currently consuming as much electricity as the entire nation of Argentina. And so, what I would urge people to look at is how do we give the user the ability to own their own account, so that they can have a lifelong email address that they can take from one provider to another, that follows them

around so that they can switch without incurring a penalty. And if you provide that capability, I can also switch my social media account around, so that instead of being forced into the same network that everybody else is, I can go somewhere else. So, I'll be making a proposal in that area in the near future. It's not decentralized, but what I'm trying to do is to shrink the border of the centralized piece to the absolute bare minimum, and then curate an infrastructure around that that makes that public goods in the way that we tried to do with ICANN and completely failed.

Mirja Kühlewind: Thanks, and I'm looking forward to that proposal, although it might be of interest to the IETF as a whole and not just the IAB, but we also have the IABOpen meeting tomorrow where we can have more of these technical discussions if needed.

Dominique Lazanski: I am hoping we can pick this up a bit more tomorrow in detail. I just wanted to say that this definitely sounds like a call to action, and it's not about demonizing one technology or the other, it's about listing the problem space, right, and all the different issues that are coming up, and I've started to do; both Mark and Eliot and I have a draft on consolidation that I can point everyone to. But yeah, let's definitely continue to talk about it, because I think there's quite a lot of interest, so I look forward to tomorrow. Thanks.

Jari Arkko: A lot of wise things have been said by many people. I want to pick up on something Tommy said. It's not that we want to ban some things, but find the missing pieces and work on that. I think that's exactly right. This is not about extremes. A lot of people bring these examples, like we can't have the Web, or we shouldn't have the Bitcoin architecture. It's kind of like extreme ends of the spectrum. But it really is about the choice that you have. In the situation where something works well if you configure one IP address somewhere, or one name somewhere that doesn't have discovery mechanisms. And Tommy, for instance, has worked on some discovery mechanisms for some protocol cases. So I think those are the kinds of things that help us, and Dominique of course was also right that documenting the issues is key in understanding it. It's like the pervasive surveillance discussion. We document the issues and then we try and evaluate the situation when we produce documents, and then we have some understanding. It's not that we can prevent some outcomes, but we can at least be a little bit more aware. I think that's the key.

Jiankang Yao: About centralization, I think the Internet is still distributed architecture. What is centralized is the services; Internet applications are centralized. For example, we use Facebook for social service, and Gmail for our email service. Because we are very--Internet service applications service providers provide very good service, so a lot of users are attracted to use these Internet service providers or applications. I think in the future, IETF would provide more good application protocols so there will be more Internet service providers, so maybe Internet services will be decentralized. My point is that the Internet is still decentralized, but Internet services are centralized. That's my point.

Mark McFadden: This is in response to Jari, and I'm really glad to hear that he will pick up the pen and do some writing. But, one of the observations I have in listening to this conversation

is that there are a lot of voices in the room, and, as Jari noted, some conflicting voices. I think instead of trying to find a middle ground, I think it's time to let those voices speak. Perhaps--and this is a suggestion to the IAB--this is a natural subject for a workshop on this topic, so that the IAB can hear, in a workshop setting, from a variety of voices on this topic. And perhaps to committing the IAB to do that before documenting a particular architectural stance. I do think that the pervasive surveillance example is a good one, because it actually jumped the chasm between the IAB and the IESG and resulted in real protocol design, and criteria for protocol design. I think that is what's needed here--some architectural direction that jumps that chasm again, that leads to criteria for good protocol design. That's what engineers want in this space. Thanks.

Mirja Kühlewind: I really want to add and be clear that this is a topic that the IAB has discussed for a while already. We also discussed, I believe, the opportunity to have a workshop. But it's also a very broad topic with a lot of different thoughts, as you can see right now. For a workshop, you have to narrow it down to make it productive, but I can guarantee that we will keep discussing this and see what we can do beyond just continuing to work on the document that we already have in there.

8. LLC open mic session

Slides: [IETF 110 Operations and Administrative Plenary](#), Slides 35-36

Jason Livingood: One quick note: I forgot to mention during our slide presentation that there are LLC office hours this week on the agenda and they are occurring on Thursday and Friday of this week. I don't see anyone in the queue just yet.

Lars Eggert: There was one question the IESG punted over to the LLC Board, and that was on what the plan is for IETF 111.

Jason Livingood: I will say a few things. One, what is "return to normal?" is one of the topics for the strategic offsite. SHMOO is working on that as well and there will have to be a lot of consultations. For the next meeting, the process has kicked off; we agreed on a process for assessing whether a meeting can proceed or not right after the beginning of the pandemic, so we're using this standard process for that. The operative question is whether the "return to normal," whether that's 111 or 112 or whenever, is a blended sort of thing with a mix of online and in person. I think we would all conclude the answer to that is very likely yes. But exactly what that will look like and when we can return to normal really mostly depends at this point on vaccination. Any other questions? Hearing none, I think we're finished with this section. Thank you.