

IETF 115 Plenary

Wednesday, 9 November 2022, 1700-1900 London (UTC)

All Slides: [IETF 115 Plenary](#)

Video: [IETF 115 Plenary](#)

1. Welcome

Lars Eggert welcomed the community to IETF 115.

2. Host Presentation

The IETF thanked Cisco for hosting IETF 115. Ted Hardie invited the community to attend Thursday's Host Speaker Series session on Project Callisto.

3. Brief Updates

3.1. IETF Chair & IESG

Slides: [IETF Chair & IESG Report](#)

3.2. IAB

Slides: [Internet Architecture Board \(IAB\) Report](#)

3.3. IRTF

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

3.4. NomCom

Slides: [NomCom Update](#)

3.5. IETF Administration LLC

Slides: [IETF Administration LLC Report](#)

3.6. RSCE Introduction

[Alexis Rossi](#) was introduced as the new RFC Series Consulting Editor (RSCE).

3.7. IETF Trust

Slides: [IETF Trust Report, IETF 115](#)

4. IETF 116 Preview

Slides: [IETF 116 Preview: Yokohama](#)

Osamu Nakamura and Hirochika Asai invited the community to IETF 116, hosted by WIDE, in March 2023.

5. Jonathan B. Postel Award

The Jonathan B. Postel Award was presented to George Sadowsky.

6. Open Mic Sessions

6.1. Internet Architecture Board (IAB)

IAB Open Mic

[Introductions]

Pete Resnick: Hi all. So, when you posted the announcement for Warren [Kumari] taking over the liaison [for ISO/IEC JTC1 SC6], it caused a conversation, and I thought I would send email, but you're all here. I want to encourage you to do more, in particular with liaisons. When you made the announcement, it would have been great to not only have that he was doing this and that Allison [Mankin] was stepping down, but what that liaison is about and why it's still important to keep, because I assume you folks review them every so often. Warren happens to be an AD, and I know we generally don't generally assign ADs to be liaisons because of possible conflict of interest reasons, so why that was an okay thing. I think that would be a great opportunity every time you make a change, to let us know what is going on, but I also encourage you to talk to some working groups when they are doing work that impacts liaisons, and kind of let people know that you're there. That would be a really good thing over the long term.

Mirja Kühlewind: Actually, that feedback reached us already, so we are aware of that. I want to say a couple of things: we already know that we can improve the information we provide about liaisons; that is something we're working on, and as always, the IAB is slow on this, but we're working on it. The other thing is that we didn't really consider taking the liaison down, because that might give the wrong signal to the other organization, right? This is something that has to be treated very carefully, so we usually try to replace people, but it's not that easy to find people in this space, because we need experts that are knowledgeable in both organizations, so the set is very limited. Gladly, a lot of the liaisons are working very well. And to your point about working

groups, it's not always required to have an official liaison to do good work. We encourage people to just work on a technical basis and talk to each other, because that gives us the best outcome. The cases where we have liaisons, there is some kind of formal requirement, where we otherwise cannot access certain documents in the other origination, or where it's just that the process of the other organization requires this kind of closeness. It doesn't usually come from our side. From our side, we usually just try to work together and do good work. That's the main incentive.

Wes Hardaker: Pete, thanks for the question; it's a good one. I think in the process of revamping the liaison coordination role over the last couple of years, we've made a lot of positive changes, and we're not done yet. A couple of ones to point out, one is that this IAB Open was the first time where we had a presentation from a liaison manager about what that organization does--about IEEE.

Someone off-mic: It was a good presentation.

Wes Hardaker: Thank Russ [Housley] for that.

Mirja Kühlewind: And it was the second time we did a presentation like that.

Wes Hardaker: Okay, second time. We are trying to do this at every IAB Open meeting, assuming there is time on the agenda to do so. That's actually a high priority for us, because of exactly what you said. I have learned a lot over the last couple of years as the liaison coordinator, that the vast number of things that we have relationships with--there is a lot to learn, and we are continuing to ramp that up, so expect to see more of that in the future. One of the other things that we are doing a lot of lately is asking the liaison managers who are the other IETF members that might be participating in both organizations, so that we can sort of, start building a list, an understanding of who is available to fill these positions. In the case of Warren, he was actually the only person that volunteered. We did make a call for volunteers, and Warren was like, "I'll do it if no one else does." So, Warren got the job. There are a couple of organizations that are much more remote and less familiar. I mean, Russ talked about IEEE [yesterday], and I think most people here at least have some knowledge of IEEE, whereas with some of the other organizations that's not true, so our goal is to continue that education over time, so thank you for the question.

Lars Eggert: A quick point from the IETF side of things. So, obviously, the IAB establishes and maintains these relationships, but they are critical to the work of the IETF. For some of these organizations, especially the older, more formal SDOS, they are quite difficult to establish, and once you have one, it's worth holding on to it even though it might go dormant for a little while, because sometimes it can take a long time to get it back, and if you need it and you don't have it--it's a little bit like insurance. It's not a bad thing if a liaison is quiet for a while. It's probably actually a good thing. But giving it up, as you mentioned, is a very deliberate choice, and we need to be careful when we do that.

Andrew Campling: It was great to see the recent M-TEN workshop, although I could politely say that nine years after the publication of RFC 7258--great to see it, but maybe could have been done quite a few years earlier. I wonder, is there a mechanism for the community to sort of identify things where the IAB could help get ahead of the curve in considering big, sort of, architectural issues, to give direction, rather than catching up. What can we do to help?

Mirja Kühlewind: I think that the one tool that we use--actually, there are multiple tools we use to engage with the community, but the one that is the most predominant is that we have these IAB Programs, which we try to set up on topics where we think conversation with the IAB [and the community] is needed. But I also have to say that what the IAB is driving also depends a bit on the members of the IAB, of course. The NomCom does a great job of trying to cover broad expertise on the IAB, but that always influences where we are focusing on, because we have limited capacity, of course. I am not sure that answers your question?

Jari Arkko: One way is to send us email. There are some recent examples, like this environmental impacts workshop that we're now setting up for next month. That actually came about through several channels. There was some IAB members who were interested about a topic and who felt that this was important. This was seen in some parts of the industry as an important issue to solve. But we also got connections from other people outside the IAB. A couple of different groups were thinking about this, and proposing a workshop on this topic, so we put our efforts together, and now we are looking forward to a very interesting workshop with 30 or so papers submitted from different angles. So, talk to us. It's not always just about what I'm interested in right now. I might be interested after you explain why this is important for these and these reasons, and other IAB members would get into that. Yeah; we'd like to hear from you. Thank you.

Wes Hardaker: One other quick point is that we try and have workshops where we believe that progress can be made, and a lot of times if there is already progress happening in the industry, it doesn't make sense for us to hold something when there's already a lot else going on. Or there are other times, where it's often too early, where we don't think progress can be made because the technology is not there yet. Getting the timing right has been a struggle. We've thought about many other workshops that we've not actually put out, because it didn't seem like the right time, or it wasn't going to be a productive conversation. I'm very happy that the last few went off so, so well.

Mirja Kühlewind: I really want to second, please reach out and talk to us. We are here.

Mirja Kühlewind: Our queue is empty, thank you very much.

6.2. IETF Administration LLC

There were no questions for the IETF Administration LLC during their open mic session.

6.3. Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG)

IESG Open Mic

[Introductions]

Yoshiro Yoneya: My question is, I don't think this is an IESG responsible thing, but I'd like to hear the mood of the community. So a few days ago there was a new mailing list announcement that the name of storytelling AG. So I wonder what kind of story we are collecting for this IETF especially for the local story telling, because as a Yokohama resident, I'd like to talk something about Yokohama for the next year, but if what kind of story are you willing to know. For example, if you want to see cherry blossoms, I'd like to introduce Ookagawa which is a very famous place or something like that, or very old story, like reclaiming Yokohama and such things.

Lars Eggert: Thanks for the question. This is a non-working group mailing list, which is not technically under the purview of the IESG other than we approve it and we are very generously approving almost anything. But I think we have a moderator or initiator of the list slowly walking up to the microphone so Adrian can tell you exactly what the list is for.

Adrian Farrel: Hi, I'm Adrian Farrel, and we asked for this list. This was Olle Johansson and I. We asked for the list under I think Warren's care as sort of supervisor of affiliate groups. The purpose of this type of mailing list is to just bring people together from the community that have shared interest so like there is a list for people who go running, God help them, and we have an interest in stories, Olle particularly in storytelling, and me writing stories. We are just interested to see if there are people who like stories, sharing stories, and one possible thread to all this is stories about the history of the Internet and the IETF that we're aware maybe getting lost in time and it might be fun to collect.

Lars: You should definitely talk to Mr. Sandusky over there. I think there will be plenty of stories for you to start on.

Warren Kumari: Thank you. So seeing as you talk about affiliate groups, a quick bit of background on them. We all spend a lot of time together like a couple weeks a year and it seems silly to me that we don't have a way to sort of find other people in the IETF community with shared interests so that is kind of the purpose of affiliate groups. If you're interested in something and you think there are other people in the IETF and you want to form sort of a social group or a way to find each other and self-organize - that is the purpose of affiliate groups. They're linked somewhere in the datatracker if you search for IETF affiliate groups you'll find the page. We would like there to be a community of people interested in the topic. They're really

easy to set up, it's basically a mailing list and then whoever organizes it sort of makes sure that it's doing something and people are being friendly and personable and that's it.

Mirja Kühlewind: I want to thank you Yoshiro, for coming to the mic. Because this reminds us that we should as a community be telling stories. We should together have good experience and work as a community. And I think that was your intention of coming to the mic. Thank you for reminding us for that.

Warren: I'll also point out that reading some of the drafts, I think we often are telling stories.

[Laughs]

Lars: Abdussalam Baryun is remote I believe, could you start your video and ask your question?

Abdussalam Baryun: I have asked the question before regarding the crosslayering of the cross-area documents. And I am interested to know how the AD, or Director for each area deals with the active documents which may become in the future interrelated to other working groups and how do they, between them, how do they work together to make a better standard? I have seen some new working groups established as Computing Aware or other protocols or another layer, so there are some cross area issues here, so could you give me some overview?

Lars: Sure. There are often different approaches right, so some new work like squarely fits into one area, and there is no need to really discuss whether TCP work belongs in transport. But for things that cross the areas it gets interesting as you note. There is a bunch of different ways in which we do this like one principle for example, is that you look at where are the harder problems, right, So for example if it's a thing between say Security and Transport we should say you know, the security side is the hard of the thing, or is the transport side and so we would then place it with the area where we believe the harder problems lie so that those experts have it a bit more visible on their radar as they look at working groups and agendas. There are other principles. I see Éric has his hand up.

Éric Vyncke: Yes, basically first note that the areas are not isolated silos and ADs talk to each other. But basically there are also directorates like YANG. Any working group chair can request a YANG Directorate review or DNS Directorate review which I am sure already have some cross area relationships and quite often when we spot this when we talk with chairs as an AD. I understand that the chairs have some documents in my areas in my working groups and I'll say, please request the working group last call and also forward to another working group and essentially some of the cross-area collaboration. There are multiple ways of doing it.

Warren Kumari: Éric covered a lot of it already, but there is also sort of when new work starts up we have BoFs we try and schedule them when lots of other people can show up so we share that information. And what Éric said you know, about ADs chat amongst themselves a lot

especially about cross-area stuff. We're also trying to do things like the technology deep dives, things to try to get more discussion between areas and make sure we don't end up in silos.

Roman Danyliw: To add on all the other techniques we're talked about, we've had a lot of success planning upfront, and we do that in two ways. Lars has alluded to this idea of where the problem is harder, we have a tendency to send it to that area. But we have even further refinement of that is to make sure we get that cross-area collaboration and the work is seen by both areas. We often assign an AD outside the area of the place where the work is homed. We have a couple of examples, we recently weren't sure about the TIGRESS working group, which is housed in the ART Area but there is a responsible SEC AD. We've done that with SCIM, we've done that with OHAI, so this model kind of works in planning up front in that. Another mechanism we use upfront is to think through when we charter to explicitly build into the structural considerations of the working group about what other working groups whether it is IETF or even liaison and partnerships we need to think about up front and then we name parties based on how things are chartered.

Rob Wilton: Another example we have is the IOTOPS working group which covers technology which spans multiple working groups in the IETF and the purpose of that working groups is not necessarily to produce lots of documents but to act like a coordination point between the different sorts of work that is happening elsewhere, so that is another example of how we try to solve this sort of cross area across working group problems.

Lars: Are there other questions? Okay, we're 13 minutes early, thank you for spending your time with us. Enjoy your dinners, see you in the hallways.