

IETF116

March 29, 2023

Plenary

Captioning Provided By:

Caption Pros

20701 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 107-245

Scottsdale, Arizona 85255

[www.captionpros.net](http://www.captionpros.net)

\*\*\*



[CAPTIONPROS.NET](http://CAPTIONPROS.NET)

>> LARS EGGERT: All right. I think we're five minutes over. If you could make your way to your seats, that would be appreciated.

These lights are really bright.

By you, I mean you standing, if you would please make your way to a seat so we can start.

I will give everybody half a second. So you should all be sitting. If you're not, you're doing this wrong.

My name is Lars Eggert. I chair the IETF. Welcome to Yokohama. We're very happy to be back. We're very happy that WIDE is hosting us again here. These are always my personal favorite meetings because I got to hang out with a bunch of Japanese people during the IPv6 days when WIDE was doing the common stack and other things and I was a student at ISI. And a bunch of them came out to spend some time with us in the U.S. I have fond memories, and many of them are actually still around, which is amazing. So am I, which is a little bit less amazing.

Welcome to Yokohama. This is the 116 plenary. We're going to go ahead.

Please wear a mask. Hopefully, we'll get to this in a little bit. But this is the last time I'm going to show that slide. But for this last meeting, if you're participating somewhere that's relevant to the standards track in a meeting room, you have to wear your mask. There's a capital "MUST" there to make this a bit clear.

If you're out in the common areas, we recommend that you wear one but you don't have to.

We're doing pretty well on COVID cases. I have a few stats on that later, but they're not zero. So there is some COVID going around, which isn't surprising. And since most of us want to get on airplanes at the end of the week, it's a good idea to mask up so that we can all go home together. That would be nice.

You can eat food and drink in here or in the meetings. Obviously, take off the mask to take a sip or a bite, but please don't leave them off for extended periods. And if you see somebody who seems to have forgotten that, you can remind them or you can talk to an area director or chair or something.

We don't recognize any exemption from that rule. We're happy to discuss it at length. I'm not aware of any case here, which is nice. But you've got to wear a mask. If you cannot wear a mask for any reason, we ask that you participate remotely. And you've got to wear the good mask. Medical masks are not sufficient.

Free masks are available outside, third floor registration area. There's also tests and various other mask-related paraphernalia that you can use to tweak your mask, if you desire.



And as I said, hopefully this is the last time. There's an ongoing LLC consultation. I think Jay is going to talk about this a little later where we ask for IETF 117 in San Francisco, what should we be doing.

The proposal from the LLC is that we go to a baseline of doing whatever the local regulations at the venue are, which for San Francisco at the moment would mean more or less nothing. We're welcome for you to send us input on that. I don't quite remember until when the window is open, but it's certainly still open.

There's a Note Well which is a little bit of an eye chart, but you've seen this before. There's basically two components to that. One is that we have a code of conduct or guidelines for conduct. You should, please, adhere to that. It makes life a lot easier for everybody involved, and it makes the environment nicer for everybody to feel like they can participate freely and openly.

The second part is the more legalese things; right? Do your IPR disclosures on your contributions and so on. If this is new to you, you probably really want to read this before you come to the microphone or send an email or otherwise participate.

Online meeting tips, for those of you out in Meetecho land, your audio will be off and your video will be off when you join the call. And we ask that you keep that off to keep the bandwidth low for everybody. You can unmute when it's your turn to speak in the queue. We ask that you also turn on your video. It's always nicer when there's a face with a voice.

And if you have a headset, please use it. It makes the audio generally a lot better. There's a whole bunch more details that you can look at while I'm rambling here.

The agenda is pretty much the usual. We have presentations. Those are typically the brief updates, which means that we're only going to talk about the highlights from the different bodies here. There are longer written reports or longer slide decks that are available for you to look at from all the different bodies that we have. For some of them, we have the opportunity to take questions from the floor and do a Q&A.

This is the March meeting, which means we have the turnover in leadership. So there will be a lot of thank yous and plaques and thoughts passed and so on. The first time we did this in person, I think. We did it in Vienna but it was kind of not such an exciting affair because it was a much smaller meeting back then. This is the first real one, I think, that I'm chair.

Thank you to everybody who helped make this week happen. From our side, the secretariat, the Meetecho staff, the NOC who has done a fantastic job as always. When we have meetings in Japan, the network is really good in general. As far as I know, there were no hiccups.



The LLC and the staff, the Tools team, volunteers, and hackathon support -- the hackathon, the weekend, again was a great success. I have some more stats on that later on in the talk, which brings us to Murai-Sensei.

Thank you WIDE for hosting us again in Yokohama. You've hosted us many times. It's always a pleasure. The floor is yours.

(Applause)

>> JUN MURAI: Thank you very much, Lars.

Welcome back to Yokohama, everybody.

I'm very glad to host you again in Yokohama, in Japan, being the WIDE Project and the team of the host and the supporters.

How the slides work? All right.

You've been looking at the locals everywhere. So first of all, I really want to thank all the sponsors listed in here. I'm not telling all their names, but I really appreciate. Without their support, then we cannot achieve this conference.

Then I see a lot of food again. I hope you enjoy it, but, also, you know, coming from all the support.

Thank you very much for the sponsors. Thank you.

(Applause)

Without their support, we cannot make it.

And one more. Let me briefly talk about the WIDE Project. The WIDE Project has been the research consortium in this country since the mid '80s. So it's been a project, but it's been kind of long-term project. And we do have some -- I'm very glad to report to you that the WIDE Project has been more than 35 years we've been running very successfully. And during the COVID period, we turned out to be a pretty much stable background organization. Therefore, we started during the past two years, the infrastructure called the ARENA-PAC, for the Asia-Pacific Research and Educational Network.

We've been working on a Quantum Internet thing and N-root server operation and the operation of the Research and Educational Network as well as research and education in many ways.

So let me briefly introduce, there is a host presentation series as a Quantum Internet, which is a large portion of the WIDE Project activities. Probably the presentation is going to be tomorrow by Shota Nagayama and Rod Van Meter. So please enjoy.

And finally, enjoy IETF.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)



>> LARS EGGERT: We have a plaque for Jun. We're going to hold it right here.

(Applause)

Normally, we also give a gift to the host. And we don't do that tonight, and the reason is that Murai-Sensei is spending his birthday with us today. And he's getting his present later at dinner.

Happy birthday! Thank you for being here.

Japan consistently sort of gets, I think, amongst the best feedback of the venues we go to. I'm happy that we're here, and I'm happy we're hopefully going to be back sooner than the last time. The gap was a little long. COVID didn't help in coming back here soon.

Next up, we're talking about IETF 117 very briefly, which is going to be in San Francisco at the end of July. The host for that is Nokia, who I used to work for actually for a while. So I'm very pleased that Nokia is still around as one of the global hosts --

(Laughter)

Not as a company! As a global host for longer than I've participated in the IETF, has really supported the organization. They're one of the global hosts, which is our select category of top sponsors that are really making all of this possible. Without the global hosts, there wouldn't be any IETF. Nokia is one of them. They're hosting us in San Francisco, which is always a good location for the IT industry for some reason. We're happy they're doing that.

Nokia, we're looking forward to being there in July.

While Nokia is a global host, we have a number of other sponsorship opportunities because we have the hackathon. We have diversity and inclusion. You might have seen the child care, for example, up there on the fourth floor. If that's interesting to you and your companies, it's possible to sponsor that. Come talk to us. There's an email address on the slide that you can email right now. We'll take it from there. Thank you.

And thank you, Nokia, again.

(Applause)

Next up, we have the IETF Chair and IESG report. And, as I said before, this is a short version. The long version has been emailed out. It has been available in the Datatracker so you can find it there under meeting materials. You can send us feedback. There's a bunch of questions in there that we have.

We're going to start with the usual slides on participant statistics and, unfortunately, COVID. I'm looking forward when we don't have that slide anymore, but that's just me. Well, it's not just me.

Planning for future meetings, sort of an overview of what the IESG has been up to in terms of making announcements and statements and some sort of teaser of the other topics that are in the written reports that are not here.



In terms of statistics, we had a very good meeting. Do we have actually have exactly 1,000 people registered for onsite? Since the weekend when I arrived, we're going to make a thousand, we're going to make 1,000. I guess we did make it to 1,000, which is excellent. So I think we're back to almost pre-COVID levels, I think especially for an Asian meeting which always have a little bit mix in the attendance records. But this is very strong.

We had 300-something, if I remember, in Vienna a year ago. We were about 600-something in Philadelphia. And I think we were roughly the same in London, I want to say. Cindy is checking us. This is a bump up now, going back to the four digits, which is very good. We had a really strong remote participation also with 740.

You know that there are fee waivers for in-person and for remote attendance. Just reporting, there were 382 for remote attendance that we granted. And out of them, 250-something were used, which is a pretty sizable amount.

For the onsite fee waivers this time, Colin Perkins, the IRTF Chair, and myself, we basically give them out based out of our discretionary budget. The IETF, I only received two for this meeting and I granted one. Colin, seven and six.

I haven't talked to Colin, but I assume a lot of those went to local universities where people wanted to come, and that's typically what they're for. Colin is shaking his head, so he can tell you later where they went.

The hackathon, I mentioned before, is very strong, over 400 people participating, 360 onsite, and a very solid remote participation as well.

Seventy-two of the people that were at the hackathon were only there for the hackathon, which might seem a little bit surprising. But I found that especially with the open-source projects, really the hackathon is the thing that they come for. Most stay around for a little bit, but some of them actually sort of really see the value in the hackathon and not so much the IETF, which is an interesting trend because originally we thought we would do the opposite, but this is really, really nice to see.

You can see the usual breakdown by country. Unsurprisingly, this time Japan is a much larger slice of the pie than normal. But, otherwise, it's the usual mix of countries, I think, that we would expect here.

And we're going to obviously collect statistics so it's a snapshot as of sometime today. Friday, we might have 1,001, who knows.

This is the breakdown of those participant stats again, because we were interested in seeing what the differences are between the onsite and the remote participant groups. They're roughly the same size, at least the same order of magnitude. And you can see not surprising there, the mix is slightly different. But I'm sort of interested to see that apparently the U.S. is still quite a bit remote. It



might be that people are not traveling here because it's a long flight and they have San Francisco coming up.

This is the first time I've seen those as well. I would have expected maybe a little bit more of the U.S. on the onsite. Japan, obviously, very strong representation, which is very nice to see.

As I mentioned before, we always had a solid participation from Japan since the '90s. And it's very good to see that this has been kept up all the way through COVID. And now it's really, since we're here, obviously going really high.

This is a slide that comes from Greg Wood's report that he did on the IETF in 2022. On the left column, we talk about participants, it's basically aggregate. On the right column, it's unique.

So, overall, we had 6,650, roughly, people that participated in meetings. If you went to all three, you count three times in the left column. If you went to all three and you were a unique participant, you count once on the right column here.

As I said, meetings had like between 300 and maybe 700 participants. If you add that up to 2,047, you can see there's actually quite a bit of people that remained more local still in 2022. That means there's a discrepancy between the unique and the overall.

There's statistics about documents and working groups and a whole bunch of other things. I'm not going to go through them all other than to say there's a written report that's available, I think, from the LLC website.

Greg is saying there's a URL on the slide. Is that the pointing?

So if you're interested, you can find that and a lot more statistics, in terms of what happened in 2022 with the IETF.

There's one more slide here. This is taken from all of the IETF survey that we've done for the second time last year. And we're sort of breaking down out of those participants that we had, that had an interaction with us, what's their geography and what is their gender identification.

You can see that geographically, it's North America and Europe and then a whole bunch of Asia and other countries. This is more or less, I think, what we were expecting.

The right-hand side, just looking at identify gender, that's a little bit disappointing because if you look at the male-to-female and male-to-male ratio, it's actually worse than the tech industry.

The tech industry is not a very high bar to reach, but we're significantly off from that, right? That's a problem, and the LLC is specifically really thinking about what we could do here because this is not how it should be. If you have opinions about that or suggestions about what the LLC specifically could do, we're very happy to talk about this.

This is the COVID cases. We have a bar graph that I also see for the first time here. So you can see that we are surprisingly tracking. I should say that for the past meetings, the numbers are



cases at the end of the week. For this week, for obvious reasons, it's cases up until today, I'm guessing. The number might spike up. If you have a good memory, you might remember when I was in London, I said, we only had three cases. At the end of the week, we had 32 cases. So there's quite a bump at the end of London.

I'm confident we can avoid this in Yokohama. I really hope we can stay at the four. But I mentioned masking before. COVID is still a thing. Maybe don't get casual at the end of the week because you already feel like you're halfway home.

It's good to see the in-person attendance has obviously gone up while our COVID cases have remained quite low. I remember in Vienna, we had a COVID officer from the city that was with us for the week. And we were significantly, by an order of magnitude, I think, under what the City of Vienna estimated we would have based on their experience of other meetings in Vienna at the time. So we did a really good job in Vienna. And I think we have sort of managed to do a really good job throughout the last year when we talk about the COVID cases at the IETF.

Good job, everybody. It's really paid off.

IESG statements and announcements, we did one announcement, and that was basically appointing Stephan Wenger as the IESG representative on the IETF Trust. This came with some delay because, frankly, it was forgotten for a while that the IESG had to reappoint or appoint somebody. And Stephan was really nice and just kept serving in his role while we caught up and managed to reappoint him.

So his term, if I remember correctly, now ends next spring, I think, at the March IETF.

Thank you, Stephan, for serving and thank you for continuing to serve while we forgot that we had to do something. That was extremely nice of you. Thank you.

And we published two IESG statements. One is the report on the RFC 8989 experiment. If you don't recall, that's for the experiment for NomCom eligibility that counts remote participation and fully online and hybrid meetings as NomCom qualifying.

Rick Salz, the NomCom Chair this year, wrote this for us. Thank you for that.

It's pretty extensive. You can take a read. With the impending publication of the new eligi RFC that basically takes that eligibility of remote participants forward. We will end this experiment. So it's the second year, and this is the final year of this.

The second statement is basically an update of a previous one that talks a little bit more about you as a working group chair. If you're hosting an interim meeting, especially one that has an in-person component, where you're inviting your working group to come somewhere in between the IETF meetings, what you should know about and what you should consider. Especially if you're a working group chair, take a look. If you're not a working group chair, you can also read it and remind





your working group chair what they did wrong. That's also highly appreciated. It's specifically meant to guide the work of the chairs.

Other topics that I'm not going to go into.

We did not have any appeals. This is where we get applause for not having appeals.

(Applause)

You get applause for not appealing anything. (Applause)

Thank you very much. And there's a whole slew of additional reports from the IAB, the LLC Board, the secretariat and IANA available in the Datatracker URL.

And there's a blog that Greg Wood, our communications director, has been filling with content. That's sort of meant to go out into the greater universe and talk about the IETF and promote us. If you have topics that you think should be on that blog, you're very welcome to talk to Greg who is always sort of on the lookout for hot topics in the IETF that might have some broader implications and could be presented to a more general audience. It's important that we remind people that we exist and the work we do. Greg is the person to talk to about that.

Right. This is a little joke slide. Greg took a photo. We had the eBPF BOF, and there's a question: What the hell does eBPF mean? And then we had a great idea. As we're renaming it, like we're renaming everything in the IETF, and we're going to call it UNIX Beauty Innovation, which is kind of what eBPF is. It's going to make the Linux people really angry.

It took us a while to actually determine what the Japanese characters underneath meant because we didn't want to show anything that's particularly offensive. I think we got convinced that it was okay because it apparently means the same thing.

If you wonder what that is, you're welcome to go to it. It's in one of the malls, I hear. I think it's a hairdresser. Welcome, UBI.

Also welcome, kids. As I mentioned before, for diversity and inclusivity, we have a sponsor category. And one of the things that gets sponsored there is childcare, which is free to all participants, kids, that want to take advantage of that.

We ask that you please let us know early, if you can, because that way we can sort of talk to the caregivers about what they need to provide and what kind of age levels and languages they need to support.

LLC is trying to take this forward into perpetuity. So we're definitely going to do it for all of this year's meetings. I have not heard anyone say we shouldn't do it going forward, so you can basically plan on that being available at an IETF meeting.



So feel free to take advantage of this. If that makes your participation in person easier for various reasons, please do use it. It's there to be used. There's no point in having a room that's empty. The caregivers have a lot more fun if there's actually kids there.

I think we had six or seven this week. I don't know if we had any walk-ins, but that's a pretty good number. We're happy with that. But we can support more if there's more demand. There's no limit that's been reached here yet.

So, please, let the secretariat know. You can email support at any time. You can also apply to the announcement that will go out before 117 specifically. Do use it.

Next up I will pass over to one of the former IETF chairs, Russ Housley.

>> RUSS HOUSLEY: Thanks, Lars. So a little over 15 years ago, when I was in my first term as IETF chair, we went out and competed at the contract for the secretariat and picked someone who was not the incumbent at that time. And so in February 2008, AMS became the contractor serving as the IETF secretariat.

So, of course, on this slide with the "February-today," all the work is in the "dash." And that is the great work they continue to do. They do every day. They pivoted to make it all work during COVID, and they've done tremendous things as a partner with the IETF.

And so we just thought we'd put up a slide with some pictures as the staff has changed over the years and so on. But I'd appreciate it if the people from the secretariat that are in the room could stand up.

And give applause for 15 years of good work.

(applause).

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you, Russ. That was very kind. And I kid you not, so the IETF would fall apart if we didn't have them. Specifically, the IESG and IAB would grind to a halt if weren't handled correctly. It's not visible from the outside. You always think it's us that is doing all the work, but it's actually AMS that's keeping us on track and saying "did you do this," "did you remind to do this."

Thank you personally for doing that. We all benefit greatly and I most of all.

The next one is also a pleasure. So our friends at the ITU, which is a standards body that we have a very long and very good relationship with, recently had a new leadership selection. Since we were in Japan, we thought it would be a good opportunity to have one of the incoming ITU leadership come talk to us for a few minutes.

So Onoe-san, who is the director of the ITU-T SB, thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule and coming by to say hi.

(Applause)



>> SEIZO ONOE: Thank you, Lars-san.

Hello, everyone. I also very much appreciate this opportunity to be here and to talk to you a little bit.

You give me four minutes? Okay.

Yes, I am Seizo Onoe. Until recently, I lived in Japan. But now I moved to -- in February, I moved to Geneva and I started working for the ITU as a director of telecommunications standardization bureau.

So this morning I came to -- came here to Japan. So thank you for the opportunity to be here in Japan. I could meet my wife for the first time in three months.

(Laughter)

Thank you.

And actually, my priority is promote the adoption with new technologies, supporting standards every corner in the world. And another United Nations specialized agency for ICT, ITU works to ensure that everyone benefit from advances in ICT.

We are supported by our collaboration with IETF. Actually, one of my commitments during my election campaign is new collaboration frameworks. So I wanted to meet standard organizations, as many and as early as possible. So that's why I'm here. So very happy to meet you, Lars-san and also you. Very great opportunity to strengthen our collaboration for the future. Thank you.

And let me take this opportunity to highlight my gratitude to all experts that participate in the work of both ITU and IETF. This participation is very practical and highly effective way of coordinating our work.

ITU standards makes much more references to IETF RFCs. And also, our work on transport networks with the video as well as the audio coding receives essential support from ITU in collaboration with IETF.

Other key areas of the collaboration include are MPRSTP/OAM, media gateway protocol, I.P. performance, measurement, and quality of services, x.509, cybersecurity, and IANA.

I just read this here.

But, anyway, we need to collaborate more and more. In some cases, some problems, I would need to improve that.

In our collaboration, we continue to grow in importance alongside the acceleration with digital transformation across the economies. ITU standards are supporting this digital transformation in areas include energy, mobility, health care, financial services, agriculture, and smart cities. Our standards are also helping everyone to capitalize on the advances in 5G and beyond, AI, information technology, and blockchain.



ITU's strategic plan rests on only two pillars: Universal connectivity and sustainable digital transformation.

The speed of collaboration and consensus that drives international standardization is exactly the speed we need to achieve this.

We must continue to foster collaborative space among standards developers and the growing range of stakeholders in standardization.

Our collaboration helps to position everyone for success. And I thank you all very, very much for the key parts that you play in that. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you very much. We had assumed you were still in Japan. I feel humbled that you flew extra special for us back home. And I hope you got something on top of it in just coming to our plenary. Thank you, again.

I fully agree that the collaboration between the IETF and ITU and other standards bodies is vital. We're not in this isolation. We're building the global network together, and opportunities like this where we can reach out and talk to each other are really important to meet and also to maybe later on avoid misunderstandings that make everything just very complicated, and sometimes painful. So I'm very pleased that we're going to have a strong continuation of the relationship that we have had. Thank you for coming and welcome.

All right. This brings us to the IAB, which I should have known because Mirja is coming.

Thank you.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: So hello, everybody. My name is Mirja Kühlewind. I'm the chair of the IAB. And I'm here to give you a very short update, as always.

So all the important information is in the report that you find online but just like to provide some highlights. You might have noticed we have been working on a couple of IAB statements lately. And this is probably because we've seen a lot of interest from the policy side in the Internet, so we try to actually provide some input there and give our views where we can, depending on our capacity.

So that's just something I wanted to highlight. But, again, you can find more information in the report.

Then as always, I take this opportunity to thank some people that are serving in certain positions for us. So good news, we reappointed Colin Perkins as IRTF chair.

(Applause)

And then we also worked on some of the liaison management. So Warren was reappointed as ICANN Technical Liaison Group appointee. And then we have new liaison managers for 3GPP, which is WHOIS, Charles Eckel. And a new liaison manager for IEEE 802.1 with János Farkas.



Sorry. I should know your name.

And then I also have the pleasure to announce that the IAB reselected me for another year as IAB chair. Thank you for that.

(Applause)

So I'm serving as IAB chair already three years now, and so I took the opportunity when I was thinking about do I want to do it for another year to look back at about what the IAB is doing. And I asked Cindy to prepare these really nice slides for me to actually show that we're doing a little bit of work.

So these are three slides for three years. And it gives just some high-level overview of what we're doing. They are actually not complete. We're doing much more stuff. But it shows you that we're doing something, right?

So, like, this is when I started as a chair. And you might remember three years ago, this was, like, a huge handover and three people were -- six people were changing positions in the IAB. So it took us a while to get started.

But as soon as we heated up, we did a lot of work. This included that we established, for example, the IAB Open Meeting, which I hope you all enjoy and continue doing since then.

We created the new program, the EDM program. We finished some RFCs. We worked some statements and so on. If you have time -- you probably can't really read this. So you will have time later to look at this on your own.

If we go to the next year, it looks even a little bit busier. Again, some work on closing groups but also opening regroups -- reopening -- not reopening, just opening groups. Some RFCs, some statements, all these kinds of things we're doing.

And then if we go to year three, it's, like, even more busy. So we're keeping up taking more work. We have a couple of documents going on, and I'm quite proud that this is working so well. And I would thank everybody on the IAB for their work.

Okay. And then continuing that path, I just want to quickly announce other IAB stuff that's going on this week. So the IAB Open Meeting that I already mentioned is happening tomorrow, so please join us there if you want to discuss with us about some of the technical topics or provide other kind of feedback.

And then we have something new, which is the IAB Liaison Coordinators Office Hours on Thursday. So if you are interested or if you have any question or concern about liaison management, that's the place where you can come and talk to us.

And that's it from my side. Thank you.

(Applause)



>> LARS EGGERT: So there were a lot of exclamation marks on those slides, Mirja. That's because IAB is doing really good job. So thank you for that. Maybe we need more exclamation marks on the IESG side of things, which brings up Colin Perkins, the reappointed Chair of the IRTF.

>> COLIN PERKINS: Thank you, Lars. I will try to be more excitable. Try to get some more exclamation marks going. I just can't do it.

Just a reminder to start of the goals of the IRTF, the IRTF is the parallel organization to the IETF, which is here to conduct research rather than as part of the standards process.

As part of that, we're organized as a number of research groups. And I'm very pleased to announce that we've got two new research groups meeting for the first time at this IETF meeting.

The first of these is the Usable Formal Methods Research Group, which met this morning. Had a really excellent meeting trying to look at some of the issues with using formal methods to develop protocol standards and try to understand what are the benefits of doing this and why it's difficult, trying to improve this and try and improve the usability of formal methods for protocol standards.

The second of these groups is the Research and Analysis of Standards-Setting Process Research Group which is meeting tomorrow for the first time. The goal of this group is to explore how the standards-setting process works, to try and understand the process, the composition of the community, its diversity, the impact that diversity has on the standards process, understand the process by which the community makes decisions, the interactions between the IETF, the other standards-developing organizations, and the interactions within the IETF community. The goal here is to understand the standards process and by understanding, hopefully, be able to improve it and to make the process work better.

In addition to the research groups, we also run the Applied Networking Research Prize. This is sponsored by the Internet Society, and we're very grateful also to Comcast and NBC Universal for their support for the ANRP.

The prize is awarded for the best recent results in applied networking, for interesting new research ideas to potential relevance to the Internet standards community, and to potentially support upcoming people that are likely to have an impact on the Internet standards process and Internet technologies.

I'm very pleased to announce the two winners for the Applied Networking Research Prize for this meeting: Boris Pismenny for his work on novel NIC offloading architectures and Arthur Selle Jacobs for his work on evaluating machine learning for network security.

We had two really excellent award talks in the IRTF Open Meeting on Monday. If you weren't able to attend that meeting, I would really encourage you to watch the recordings, which are available on the IETF channel on YouTube. There were some really great talks there. Please do congratulate



the awardees, and please do watch the talks.

(Applause)

And then in addition to the prize talks, we also run the Applied Networking Research Workshop which co-locates with the July IETF meeting and is organized in conjunction with ACM Siggraph.

I am also pleased to announce that the TPC chairs for this meeting with will Francis Yan from Microsoft and Maria Apostolaki from Princeton. Call for papers for that workshop is out just now, and you should see an announcement for that very shortly. Please do consider submitting your research to the workshop.

I'm also pleased to note that both of the TCP chairs are previous ANRP winners, which is good to see people coming back to the community.

And with that, that's all I have. So I'd like to hand over to Rich Salz for NomCom.

>> LARS EGGERT: Thanks, Colin.

While Rich comes up, I'm very happy that the ANRP and ANRW have such a strong continued presence in the IETF and they really brought in a bunch of excellent people. Many of them are actually sticking around.

I think we recently looked at whether we are able to keep the participation up, and it's been working really well. So very pleased with that. Thank you.

Rich, these are your slides.

>> RICH SALZ: Okay. My last time in front of you. We are all relieved.

Okay. So I'm going to give a summary on how things went with the past NomCom. Some things happened. We got a late start because of COVID illnesses. We got a late start because of our own standards got in the way of our own implementation.

Yeah, DMARC made us start to use mailing lists rather than aliases for the internal communications. And we didn't really notice because every time, for example, I tried to mail somebody, it worked. But when somebody sent mail through the mailing list, it got silently dropped.

So I made a bunch of mistakes that wasted some time and effort. We had a couple of appeals. I'll talk about those on the next slide.

Scheduling was very hard. We had, I believe, four people in China. We had a couple -- we had one person in Australia. We had three people in Europe, both coasts of America. So it was -- it's really tough to do scheduling. I think we should just come up with a single time zone and it would make it a lot easier.

We met pretty regularly. First, while we were setting things up, almost weekly. We had good attendance. Very few people made all of the meetings. There were a few that made all of the





meetings and all of the interviews, to which we will thank them later -- or we thanked them internally.

We shortened -- what we did to compress the schedule is we shortened the time for the questionnaires. Basically, you had a little under two weeks as opposed to five weeks.

The interviews we made 45 minutes, and we synced it to the IETF session times during London. That worked really, really well. I suggest next year's Chair does that.

We made it. We got -- we were able to get the slates -- fix slates, get them confirmed all by the deadlines in the RFC.

Appeals. So there were two appeals. One was that when a volunteer stopped responding -- and this was a voting volunteer, one of the ten. When they stopped responding, I had written them and said, yes, they want to do it. Lost track of them. Turns out they were away for the weekend, whatever.

So I said, okay. I went down to the next person on the slide. This was after consulting with the past four NomCom chairs. So I said, Okay, I'm going to go to pick the next person, the 11th. That was appealed. Somebody had said -- somebody raised the issue that, well, according to the RFC 8713, we should rerun the whole selection process, announce the seats, wait a bit, run the process again.

After a decision, Andrew who was the appealant -- top appeal authority upheld the decision. The action, so this doesn't happen again, is I filed an errata that says the RFC is unclear. It doesn't follow what the practice is.

The second appeal was I had to disqualify an incumbent who said they did not see the emails that came from my personal account. They did not see the reminders to send in the questionnaire.

One of the points in their appeal was that previously we tried a lot harder to reach candidates. Let me in. I should be considered even though I haven't gotten the questionnaire done.

The decision was also upheld. During the Codesprint, we made the change to remind people when we accept their nomination that you should be subscribed to IETF-announce. This person was not subscribed to IETF-announce.

And, also, as we've said several times, including earlier this evening, the IETF conducts its business on its mailing lists. And if mail to IETF-announce gets dropped into spam folders or what have you, it's hard to say it's our fault.

Candidates and feedback. We had 45 individual candidates. I think we interviewed 25 of them during the IETF in London. We had 748 comments from the IETF community and that seems like a lot to me.

People like numbers. So the number of comments we got a range from 3 to 40. The mean was 16 standard deviation. I don't even what know that is. I just ran it through a Python script.

Pretty much all of the comments were read by all of the volunteers, and the community





feedback more importantly was taken very seriously by the voting people.

At the start of every deliberation, we had a chart -- summary chart of the comments and some analysis of what were positive, what were negative, what were neutral or indeterminate. "I like Lars but I really hate his shoes," is that a positive or a negative? I don't know.

It's a negative.

(Laughter).

Net positive.

We had a task for 16 positions. Four of them ran unopposed. Some were more understandable than others. Among those, we picked an AD who was on his third term. That means he will be doing years five and six. Another AD was picked for their fourth term, which means, I guess, seven and eight. And then there was a potential fifth term, which would have been years 11 and 12, 9 and 10. But instead we put them on the IAB because that's the way it goes.

You will see the results. They were announced -- they were posted in a public blog, and you will see them all appear in front later on.

So for more information, one of the things we did this year, we decided to make our Wiki publicly readable for a short period of time at any rate. So if you want to see the mechanisms and the mechanics of what's involved, you can skim the Wiki. It's in [nc2020.private.wikis.ietf.com](https://nc2020.private.wikis.ietf.com). It was posted to the IETF-announce -- or IETF@ mailing list or ask me what the URL is and I will show it to you.

Read the second RFC 8989 report. End result is, yeah, we probably could have dropped one of the paths but overall, it was successful and it's okay that we've been trying that in 8989bis.

Skip that.

The GenDispatch session, I presented some issues and concerns that we had. We are going to come back with some more specific information that's requested.

The forthcoming tell-all, one of the things I promised Andrew is that I would document this because nobody really understands what's involved in the NomCom. You might know what's involved in being a NomCom member. But being a NomCom chair, you have to understand that basically you are unavailable for the November IETF meeting and that between November and January or until you are done, it's a full-time job.

Fortunately, several potential candidates have come up to -- people who were nominated have come up to me and I have talked with at least one and I have two more scheduled over the rest of the week.

With that, I am done. Thank you. Thank you all for contributing and, in particular, the NomCom for their service.



(Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you. The work of the NomCom is really essential to the operation of the IETF. And very glad that year after year, we are able to run the process and we get a good selection at the end.

If you have a chance, thank the members of the NomCom, again, if you have done it before. It's really a vital role that they play in the organization.

Next up is Jason -- Jay actually talking for the IETF LLC.

>> JAY DALEY: Thank you. So I'm Jay Daley, the IETF executive director, doing the first part of the IETF LLC report.

So, first of all, thank you very much to our meeting host WIDE. Thank you. We could not have done it without WIDE.

(Applause)

It's been a fabulous meeting so far, our largest since COVID. This is going very well.

For those of you that don't know, WIDE Project is a consortium. So it has within it -- it went out and did the fundraising amongst its own sponsors. So we have a number of sponsors to thank within WIDE. We will do them on a slide basis.

We have the Platinum sponsors: Internet initiative Japan and NTT, two very large ISPs in Japan. Thank you very much for your support for this meeting.

(Applause)

And then we have multiple Gold sponsors. Thank you very much as well for that.

(Applause)

And then, finally, the Silver sponsors from WIDE. Thank you. And the Bronze sponsors, thank you very much. (Applause)

As you can see, that's over 20 companies, so that's a great consortium.

Our connectivity has been provided by Docomo and KDDI, so thank you very much for that.

(Applause)

We always -- we always find ourselves getting excellent free Internet connectivity from local providers. It's one of the nice things about the IETF that people feel that they should support it within their businesses in this way. Thank you.

As some of you know, we have a number of meeting sponsorships that are related to specific values where some companies feel an alignment with the IETF. And so one of these is diversity and inclusion that pays for such things as the child care that we have today and for fee waivers and other things. So thank you very much to our Gold Diversity and Inclusion sponsors for making that available.



(Applause)

And we have the Running Code sponsorship that pays for the hackathon, amongst other things. Thank you very much to our sponsor there.

(Applause)

And then we have sustainability, which is a new sponsorship and Oracle on our new Gold Sustainability sponsor. And that will be used to pay for some of our carbon-offsetting work and other things later on, which I will talk about later on in other slides. Thank you very much there as well.

(Applause)

And, of course, just to mention our other sponsors. So we have various different levels of sponsorship, and we are pleased to see the organizations come in at the level that suits them and still are able to support us. So thank you very much for that to our sponsors.

(Applause)

We receive an enormous amount of equipment and services for free. I think I've mentioned this before. But Cisco and Juniper give us extraordinary amounts of equipment and services. Cloudflare have been fantastic. Every time we ask them can we use a new part of your service for free, they say yes.

And then we started to recognize some of the smaller organizations as well that provide things.

And then we are missing one as well, Identity Digital that do things for us as well.

So thank you very much for all those people that provide free services for us.

(Applause)

So we have a number of volunteers and a number of members of staff that put on the production of an IETF meeting. So the Codesprint are those people that come in and spend the Saturday and Sunday working on Datatracker, which, of course, is our main piece of software that people use all the time.

So thank you very much for those volunteers there.

(Applause)

And then thank you to the NOC volunteers and the NOC local volunteers. This is a new list on the right. You may not be aware of this. So these are local volunteers, largely found, I think, through WIDE who helped with the NOC this time, supplementing the work of normal NOC volunteers. And, of course, I know a number of volunteers are supported by their companies. In most cases, able to come here and work extensively on the network. So they spend the entire week largely in the NOC office making sure that things run smoothly. So thank you very much to all of the NOC volunteers.

(Applause)

And then, finally, the team largely, most of the team. We have the secretariat who we



introduced earlier. We have Meetecho, again, who spend the entire time watching large screens with multiple people talking at once, one of the most difficult jobs here.

The Tools team, we have the NOC contractors and we have LLC staff. Thank you very much, everyone, who makes this a success for us.

(Applause)

And that -- don't need to clap on this one because my picture is on it. But that's the staff of the IETF LLC for you, a diverse bunch.

(Applause)

All right. Oh, thank you.

And then, finally, thanks to our global hosts and global supporters. These are the people who have a long-term support of the IETF and who enable us to meet regularly. Without them, really, there will be very a little of this type of interaction. So thank you very much to all of them for their support.

(Applause)

So as noted, we have IETF 117 coming up in San Francisco in July. And registrations will open, I think, about a month from now. So we should have that.

We understand, of course, that some people will be anxious about visas for going to that. We'll be doing what we can with letters of invitation to support and help people to come there.

So we look forward to seeing you all in July in San Francisco. Thank you.

So for future meeting locations and venues, we have San Francisco in July of this year. We have Prague in November. And we're still looking for a meeting host for Prague, if anybody is interested.

IETF 119 in Asia next year, the negotiations have been a bit tricky so we're not able to announce that yet, but we're hoping that will resolve itself soon.

Then we have Vancouver, one of our rearranged meetings, in IETF 120. IETF 121 is in Dublin in the Convention Centre Dublin. Again, we are looking for a meeting sponsor for that -- meeting host, sorry.

We then have Bangkok and Madrid which are also two rearranged meetings.

And then the first of our meetings that we're now planning ahead is North America, IETF 124 in November 2025. So we have a reasonably full set of meetings, just one gap with 119 there. But we have a relatively large gap of meeting hosts, so we're hoping to pick that up soon and have that arranged.

So one of the things that the IETF LLC is charged with is the financial management of the IETF. And one of our goals here is long-term financial stability -- sustainability, sorry.



And our main vehicle for that is the IETF Endowment. We have a goal of trying to reach 50 million by 2027, and currently we are around the 4 million mark.

For that, we want to thank some of our donors here. We have ARIN, Internet Society, and RIPE NCC, our flagship donors, who give us very large contributions, which is enabling the endowment process. Thank you very much to them.

And then to our benefactor donor LACNIC who gave us a large donation last year.

And then to all of those of you individual donors who donate when you register for the meeting. This time around, we had 75 gifts and a total of \$3,300. Each of these donations is matched two-to-one by the Internet Society. So thank you very much to all of those donors for supporting our long-term sustainability.

(Applause)

So one of the projects that the IETF LLC is working on is towards a net-zero IETF. So we have been working on calculating IETF emissions and developed -- had some consultants develop a tool for us to be able to do that with.

We're working on more sustainable in-person meetings using eco-friendly materials and trying to reduce food waste. I'm sure you can help with that.

We are also aiming to offset emissions. We are still to decide what schemes to support. And we are very much considering schemes that fit with the IETF. So some of the more financially oriented schemes, I would suspect, would not fit with the IETF culture.

We have a side meeting tomorrow 8:30 a.m. for anybody who wants to come along to talk about this to help us understand what type of schemes we should be going forward with for offsetting emissions. So this is now going to be a part of our strategy ongoing to help try to reduce our emissions.

And then just a note that we have two key consultations under way. We have a meeting fee review. For those of you who have not seen this, we are proposing an increase in fees for meetings across the board. It's quite a significant increase as it's intended to catch up with inflation over several years. And we are proposing that take effect from IETF 117 San Francisco. The feedback period for that closes on Monday. So you can see the announcement on our announcement archive.

And the other one, as Lars has already mentioned, is that we are proposing a change to our COVID policy, again, from IETF 117 San Francisco where we will stop imposing our own requirements and switch to following the local requirements, whatever they are, which in San Francisco will mean no mask wearing.

And the feedback period for that closes on Monday, 17th of April. And for both of these, you are welcome to send me feedback directly or to the public admin discuss list.



And, finally, not on this slide, but we have run an experiment, as some of you may have seen, at this meeting with closed captioning. We have used some live transcription services in some rooms, and we've used automated ones in the other. This is one step we're expecting to develop this further over a number of meetings to get to a position where we think it is as useful as possible. And if that means that we have to invest much more in live transcription, then we will do. That's just the way forward with it.

So we'll be asking about that in the post-meeting survey. But you are also welcome to let me know how that goes.

So over now to Jason Livingood, Board Chair.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Thanks, Jay.

So as we're getting started, I did want to make one observation and thank the Tools team that has done a lot of work over the past couple of years to improve the tools. This is the first meeting I can remember when I click from the main homepage to the meeting page and then the agenda, just happens in a snap. And I always remember being bothered by that being a few seconds or longer, especially when we're all clicking on the same thing. So I really appreciate all their work and hope they keep it up.

So let's move on here. First, I'd like to thank one of our departing Board members who's term limited and completed his service earlier this month, Peter van Roste.

Peter's not here today. He's based in Belgium. But we really appreciate his service and thank him very much. So if we could just have a round of applause for Peter.

(Applause)

Thank you, Peter. And he was on the board from the first formation of the LLC formally. So appreciate his long service.

In terms of current Board members, these are everyone here. The new one is someone that you probably all recognize from different venues, both here and maybe at RIPE and elsewhere, Mirjam Kuhne. She is online right now. She wasn't able to attend in person, but we welcome her to the board. And she attended her first meeting just earlier this month. So we appreciate her and welcome her to the community in a new way.

(Applause)

So let's talk about the current work of the LLC. We are planning a June retreat. We do this annually, a strategic planning retreat. We're doing the typical update of the risks and issues and strengths and so on. We're also looking at financials, which we will talk about in a second. And, of course, the future of hybrid meeting administration and the cost basis for that. I will also speak to that in another slide.



And then we look at our annual survey results. We build action plans based on the community feedback that's found in there. And we continue to chip away at administrative and technical debt. That list has dramatically declined over the years, which is great. But we keep chipping away at it, especially the technical debt, but a lot of strides have been made there, of course.

In terms of financial focus, the primary issue that we're focused on at the moment, of course, is fund-raising progress. And, of course, Lee-Berkeley Shaw is here and hard at work. We had a wonderful event for some sponsors and prospects just yesterday.

But we are also focused on the timeliness and the accuracy of the financial statements. And this is one of the reasons that Jay is working hard to recruit someone to be a part-time finance person.

The challenge that we have found is that we often get financial statements later than we would like and then we find errors in them and they have to go back and forth -- or Jay finds errors and there's this back and forth.

And we anticipated that a little bit when that contractor came on board, that third-party firm. But the fact that that has persisted for this amount of time is not satisfactory in our view. And so we're trying to improve upon that, and that's an important one for us.

And, of course, we did issue a statement on remote participation, which you can see on the blog.

In the next slide, of course, you know, the typical board meetings. Please join our meetings.

I will just say, like, it is extremely rare that anyone joins our meetings. And I would encourage you to do so if you are, for example, very outspoken on an issue on admin-discuss or somewhere else, come to a meeting. Ask to be added to the agenda. We would love to have you.

It is disappointing when we hear lots of feedback and discussion on the list. Then we have a topic maybe in the general session and there's really no one that is joining to comment. So please do join the meetings. We do like your feedback. And it's great discussion when we can have it.

So here's the 2022 fiscal budget. This was an interesting one. I think you can put aside the investment portfolio because we're not selling anything anytime soon. And most of your retirement accounts probably look much the same in terms of maybe not the dollar amounts but the decline (chuckles).

But really, the main issue here is onsite meeting registration. So if we think about when was the 2022 budget set, it was in 2021. We were all still in sort of lock-down mode. People were all working remotely and we were doing completely hybrid meetings.

And so without any kind of precedent historically to say, well, how many people might come back and when, we really had to guess at things. And as in all things, when you guess, you get things





wrong.

So looking back at the numbers, Lars hinted at this, Vienna was 300 or so people in person. Philadelphia was roughly double to 600. London was a little below 850 or so, so a little below 900. Now we're at 1,000. So that's a humongous increase in one year, 300% or more.

But it made it very difficult for us last year because we really just had no idea what people's level of comfort was in returning to in-person; of course, what the virus was doing and so on. And that really was the driver for revenues being down dramatically.

And, of course, a corollary is the hotel comps and the sort of room penalties that you pay for room blocks. And this has partly motivated some of the work that Jay introduced that was up at GenDispatch to look again at the room-booking policies that sort of come along with and ride the coattails of decisions like one roof, how close do different hotels have to be. And there's a lot of data that Jay and others have collected about that that we'll be using as that work progresses.

So we're hoping that we have better predictability for this year. That is the major variable. And hopefully, we get to a better level of precision in terms of variants year over year. We'll see. Hopefully, it doesn't get any worse from a health standpoint.

And, of course, these are the many, many ways you can contact us. I think we all know that.

So that's it. Thank you very much. And I think we're ready for the next part.

Thanks.

(Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you. While Glenn makes his way to the stage, I want to point out the LLC will be back for open mic later so you can ask questions about anything that Jason and Jay talked about.

Over to you, Glenn.

>> GLENN DEEN: Hi there, everyone. I'm Glenn Deen, and I'm the chair of the IETF Trust. And these are your five trustees. I was reappointed by the NomCom this year. And, as Lars noted, Stephan was reappointed by the IESG. So we have a nice, stable group of trustees managing the IETF's IPR.

So what does the IETF Trust do? And this is a question most people don't know. So I keep saying it whenever I get up here and do these presentations. We manage the IP assets for the IETF, and a few other people, but primarily for the IETF. That consists of all the copyrights on the IETF RFCs. This consists of when you make submissions and you do that RFC 5378 part and you get the boilerplate in your IVs, that's us.





So since IETF 115, we do licensing. We've issued zero licenses. That may seem odd for a group that manages IP rights. The reason for that is because of the way the IP rights are structured, there's an automatic license program that basically allows the IETF to make use of its own IP.

There's a series of ways that you can, if you're not part of the IETF, make use of IETF RFCs. For instance, if you take an entire RFC, feel free. Go take the thing. Don't modify it, but you can publish it. You can translate. You can do all these things. You don't have to come for an individual license. This is covered in what we call the Trust Legal Provisions, the TLP that is on our website. But it's a great model because it means that we don't have to individually negotiate licenses for people. So we've done zero, which is awesome. But our stuff is being used all over the place under license, so it's working.

We've done a couple of other changes. Problems come up along the way. We've discovered things that fell through the cracks in the past. One of them was a YANG security module template. There's a template out there for these things. And it turns out they were not properly labeled inside the RFCs that were published in the past.

One of the things we've done is we've corrected that. We have got a draft out there in process to formalize the correction. But FYI, I will cover this in a little bit, but there's this new tag -- or older tag called Template Text. If you wrap something inside of an RFC with this tag, it allows you to modify it later on, which is something you normally cannot do in RFC. But it sort of turns out that it's a little bit of a template code section, something that's a bit more like code. And you take it out of there and use it.

We've also renewed a couple of trademarks. So one of the things we manage for the IETF and other parties is trademarks. Since we met in London, we have actually done one for IANA. We did a renewal. There's the actual trademark for the IETF. We did a renewal for that one in Canada.

The other update is we have published our 2023 Budget and Guidance for going forward. I will cover that in the next slide.

This is a little bit, if you want to read about how to use the Template Texts in RFCs. We're planning on doing a proper education session probably for working group chairs at IETF in San Francisco. So stay tuned. We're going to try to help everybody understand how to use this tool effectively so you can publish templates and make use of them after the publication of an RFC.

So this is our budget. There's a bump here. If you pay attention to the numbers, 2022 was pretty low, but there's this big jump in 2023. Then it goes back down in 2024 as our guidance.

Why are we spending so much money in 2023? We're restructuring. We're turning the IETF from a trust that's in Virginia into a Delaware corporation for a bunch of reasons we've covered



previously in consultation on doing that. There's been some costs for doing that, so that bumped it up a little bit, lawyers.

The other reason we have a big jump here is one of the things we're doing with the budget is establishing a two-year reserve. This is basically money we're going to put in the bank. And if we need it for any reasons, we'll have two years of reserve to tap into without having to go do individual fund-raising to cover something that happened in a particular year. So there's going to be this sort of one-time bump in 2023 while we build up the reserve to a two-year limit.

In 2024, the guidance is that we're going to go back down to pretty much where we were at before we did this restructuring, before we built up the reserve with, you know, some fudge here for inflation because everybody is feeling the pains of inflation.

So, as I mentioned, we are restructuring to a Delaware corporation. The corporation has been created. Here is a bit of an update as to where we're at in the process.

So we did a consultation back the other year with the community. We're going to go do this. Input, feedback, we got all of that. Took it into account.

We created this new entity. That entity is now created in Delaware. So right now we have two things. We have the IETF Trust as a trust in Virginia and we have the IETF Intellectual Property Management Cooperation -- that's a mouthful -- over in Delaware.

We tried to call it the IETF Trust. We originally got permission from them to call it the IETF Trust. But they said you can't call a corporation a trust, that's too confusing. So we had to come up with a new name.

The current status is waiting on -- we're working through with the U.S. IRS to get the new corporation established and recognized as a not-for-profit corporation. The IETF Trust in Virginia is a not-for-profit entity. So we're trying to create the same tax styles for the new entity. We don't anticipate this will be any problem. It just takes a little bit of time for the paperwork to run through.

Once that's done, we're going to step back and then start the really hard work, which is transferring of the assets from the old entity over to the new entity. Does that make sense?

We expect this work to continue on through 2023. You will be hearing from me again in San Francisco and in Prague.

And that's it. If you want to get ahold of us, here it is. I will tell you our office hours will be coming up, but we actually had office hours today from 3:30 to 4:30. Nobody came and visited us. So we were lonely.

Next time we do office hours in San Francisco, we want visitors to at least come and say hi.

(Applause)



>> LARS EGGERT: All right. Let's get the LLC back on stage for Q&A. Thank you for the outgoing leadership.

I think it's just the three of us and Sean, who is somewhere but not here.

(Laughter)

Okay. So apparently things were done. You paid attention. We're just going to do the open mic. If you have a question for the LLC, minus Peter and plus Mirjam, please come and join us.

Take this time to move yourselves to the microphones.

>> Question regarding -- or feedback regarding the childcare. So I think six to seven so far this week, right? Five of those were my offspring, so I have a lot of feedback I would like to give over email, I think you said.

But just summarizing two main points, first is thank you. It was great. Usually I'm leaving my wife and kids. Right now is Spring Break here in Japan. So the kids are all home. If I'm attending IETF somewhere, they're all going crazy in the house and my wife is trying to figure out what to do with them. So it was nice to be able to bring them and show them the IETF and give my wife a break. So big thank you.

The second point was I don't know who is doing the sign-up. It was all left up to the company where the IETF was involved, but this time it was a PDF that I had to print out and fill out and then scan and email. So if the IETF can, like, support them in giving them a Web form or something, that would be nice. That is all. Thanks.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Put it in the queue for the Tools Team.

Okay. Great thank you. Sounds like we've got it.

Who's up next?

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you, yeah. Our apologies to our colleagues from the ITU. You should not be needing to use a fax to do this. We're going to work on this.

Next up is the IESG, old and new, please make your way to the stage.

While they're walking up, I'm going to start saying thank you to Alvaro. And you can already make your way over here, if you'd like.

So Alvaro Retana was mentioned earlier. But he's been serving as a routing director for a very long time. He was incredibly helpful also personally to me because I had a 10-year gap between being on the IESG as an area director and then being on the IESG as a Chair. Things have changed, and, also, I forget things more now.

Alvaro was very helpful in sort of reminding me that things I remember from the 2007-'08 period have changed in the meantime. He was very nice about it, and he supported by Amy and Cindy who also helped to remind me. So thanks for that.



Alvaro, we have a gift for you and we also have a plaque, which is, as usual, the fake one that you have got to give me back. The other one is in the mail.

Let's give him a hand. This is a tough job to do for six years.

(Applause)

>> ALVARO RETANA: Thank you.

(Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: I left it up to him if he wants to stay up on stage or he wants to enjoy his gift. I think he's going to stay on stage. I think he's going to stay on stage.

So thank you for the extra credit at the end there, Alvaro.

So this is us. We have an incoming AD on the routing side, which is Jim Guichard.

I hope I'm pronouncing your name correctly. I will practice it.

The eagle eye amongst you will notice that we have another incoming security AD, which is the IESG applying ChatGPT to the security area. We called him the Enforcer. You might have seen him wander around. He's very friendly. He's here to help. He will automatically generate Discusses on all your documents that are coming to the IESG to offload some of the work that the Security area has to do because they really do have to review everything. It's not like Transport or something where you look for does it say "timer" or "window" -- what? Sorry?

>> We're going to call it Ben Kaduk.

>> LARS EGGERT: We're going to call it Ben Kaduk, okay. Ben Hartman is also a good name for that.

Anyway, so this is us. This is open mic for the IESG. If you have questions, please come to the microphone.

I see Ted over there.

>> Do we do introductions?

>> LARS EGGERT: Yes, that's an excellent suggestion.

Let's start over there with Mr. Kline.

>> ERIK KLINE: Erik Kline, Internet Area Director.

>> JIM GUICHARD: Jim Guichard, Incoming Routing AD.

Speaking of Alvaro, who I personally want to thank very much. And I have very big shoes to fill. So I want to like to give you a round of applause again for everything you've done.

(Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: This will be the time, Alvaro, to pass on the dot. We can keep going doing the introductions.

The funny thing is Alvaro's dot is not coming off the badge. It's been there too long.



(Applause)

>> ZAHEDUZZAMAN SARKER: Zaheduzzaman Sarker, Transport Area Director.

>> ROB WILTON: Rob Wilton, Ops Management Area Director.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Mirja Kühlewind, IAB Chair.

>> PAUL WOUTERS: Paul Wouters, Security.

>> ALVARO RETANA: Alvaro Retana, outgoing routing AD. And I have some extra dots in case someone wants them.

>> Give that man a dot.

>> MURRAY KUCHERAWY: Murray Kucherawy. I'll be continuing ART AD.

>> LARS EGGERT: Lars Eggert, IETF Chair and Gen Area Director.

>> ÉRIC VYNCKE: Éric Vyncke, INT AD.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Roman Danyliw, security AD.

>> JOHN SCUDDER: John Scudder, routing Area Director.

>> ANDREW ALSTON: Andrew Alston, routing Area Director.

>> LARS EGGERT: And some people are remote.

>> WARREN KUMARI: Warren Kumari, AD. I'm stuck in the hotel with COVID. Weeee!

>> LARS EGGERT: Martin?

>> MARTIN DUKE: Martin Duke, transport.

>> FRANCESCA PALOMBINI: Francesca Palombini, ART AD, with Leonardo.

>> Hello.

(Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: Thanks for waiting, Ted, while I was forgetting to do the introductions. It's your turn.

>> TED HARDIE: No worries. First, to the audience, I know Alvaro offered you a dot. Let me just warn you, it's a trap.

(Laughter)

Second, back on slide 21, you pointed out that there was a new policy for interim meetings. And a few slides later, you pointed out that there were no appeals. While there were no appeals, we did have kind of a conversation about whether the policy on interim meetings might need a bit of a rethink, especially with regard to letters of invitation, a subject pointedly raised later by Jay.

I would like to ask if the IESG has considered further the matter I placed before them in this regard; and, if so, when I might have the favor of a reply.

>> LARS EGGERT: Point well taken, Ted. So we did discuss it further.



So for those of you who are not aware, we didn't update to an earlier statement, IESG statement, on what we expect in-person and hybrid or remote meetings to be like.

And one of the changes that we made was a clarification. We thought it was a clarification. And that's that the IETF LLC is not set up to issue invitation letters for interim meetings. I forget the exact wording, but I think it was implied strongly that the convener of the interim meeting should do so.

And that raised some concerns because it wasn't apparently a clarification. It was apparently perceived as a change in policy that wasn't intended. But since we didn't say anything about that previously, I well understood that's a reasonable reaction.

We did discuss it. We had a call where Jay -- and I don't know if Brad was there -- where we talked about it with the LLC. There was a few things that came out of this that we still have to get back to you on.

One of them was that the LLC is a U.S. corporation, and so we would be in a position to issue letters for interim meetings that happen in the United States. But that might actually create a certain easiness to having a meeting there that might centralize interim meetings there simply because the LLC can do it in the U.S. but not elsewhere. And we really want to have the ability to have working groups meet elsewhere. So it felt a little bit unfair to other regions for the LLC to do it in one country.

It turns out the LLC, depending on which country we're talking about, some of them actually allow a non-local entity to issue invitation letters.

And so another approach would be for the LLC to do a legal analysis for every country where somebody wanted the LLC to issue these letters to figure out whether we could do it, what the constraints are, and basically what we're allowed to say and not to say. And then we would over time then sort of build up an allow list of countries, if you will, where the IETF could do that.

I think the end of the discussion there -- this is where it stalled because we were getting pretty close to this meeting -- is that we weren't actually sure if it's worth the trade-off because we still couldn't do it everywhere, and we would still then maybe have two sets of countries, one where it's easy to do it because the LLC can issue the letters and one where, A, there's maybe extra work and delays, and, B, we find out we can't and somebody else has to do it anyway.

But we do owe you a reply. I fully agree with that.

>> TED HARDIE: So thanks for that, but I think you missed some of the discussion we actually had in the meeting, which was that it's not just a question of whether the LLC issues the letter of invitation but whether there's a requirement to the host to do so. Because as we pointed out during the meeting, it can be very difficult for the host legal organization to wrap its head around the fact that it has nothing to do with the content of the meeting. It's just providing facilities. And, yet, it's being



asked to both waive any normal NDAs and provide a letter of invitation, which normally says the person receiving it is coming to do business with or have a meeting with that particular organization.

So even if you decide that the LLC cannot issue letters of invitation, full stop, I still think you need to revisit the policy as it imposes a burden on potential hosts that many of them either will not or cannot meet.

I think that, in turn, makes it more difficult for us to host interim meetings.

>> LARS EGGERT: Right.

>> TED HARDIE: I think perhaps, taking a step back and looking at the whole policy again and figuring out whether or not what you've asked the host to do is fair if you're not willing to do it yourself.

Thanks.

>> LARS EGGERT: Correct. One clarification that I think we could make is that the wording was maybe misleading because I think we actually meant the convener of the meeting, i.e., the person, like the chair, who is asking people to come to this interim because it's not typically a company that's doing it or an organization. It's typically the working group chair that's arranging that meeting.

We can still talk about whether that's a fair barrier, right? But just to clarify, it wasn't necessarily meant that it was the venue where the meeting is held should do this.

>> TED HARDIE: So that doesn't make any sense, Lars, because the whole point of the letter of invitation is that the person issuing it is able to say that the person that's coming is going to be engaged in a particular type of work.

And as you well recall, the IESG has made decisions in the past about limiting issuing letters of invitation to people who had not previously been involved in the IETF without them at least registering and paying.

You're now asking individual members of the IETF, the chairs of working groups, to stand up and take individual responsibility for issuing those. That's very strange.

And I think you really need, as a group, to go back and rethink this from the beginning, if that's your answer.

>> LARS EGGERT: Fair point. We have actually heard from chairs who have been doing this all along and who thought that was the process, right? So it's apparently not a problem for some chairs, at least.

>> TED HARDIE: That's great.

>> LARS EGGERT: But we would like to hear from other chairs whether this is a boundary. So what is your ideal outcome, Ted, if you don't mind me asking?





>> TED HARDIE: My ideal outcome is that you work through the LLC to figure out when you can do it. Do it when you can do it. When you can't do it, note to the community that you weren't able to do it because of an issue related to it but it's proceeding either with host support or some other lack of support and going ahead.

But as it stands right now, having done this in other organizations, you can always send a letter supporting something. The formal letter of invitation is slightly different. If you don't want to do that, I'm totally cool.

But I think you can't put the burden on other people if you're not willing to do it. If you're going say there's this theoretical problem that maybe more of these happen in one region than another because the LLC can do it there, let's tackle that when it happens. You're basically putting a burden on other people for a very theoretical outcome compared to other potential issues. Realistically, some of these countries we go to are much easier to get into than, say, the U.S. or Canada. And there will be a natural flight to going to places like Singapore, for example, which is much easier, if we're going to start going down that path.

But don't bind burdens to the backs of people that you aren't willing to take up yourself. That's just not fair.

>> LARS EGGERT: It's not so much that we're not willing to do it. I think it's really that the current state of analysis is we don't know where we can do it other than the U.S.

I think for some countries in Europe, we looked and it's possible for us to do it. But there's a lot of interims that are happening. We're also going to go back to in-person more now, so we need to think this through. It's not clear if it's actually worthwhile or whether it's a theoretical or practical issue, in the end, that it would favor meetings in some regions versus others.

>> TED HARDIE: I started by asking by when do you think you would have thought it through. I agree that we need to think it through. I'm happy that you're taking the time to do that, but I think you're leaving up a policy right now that's deeply flawed. By when do you think you will readdress this issue?

>> MARTIN DUKE: It's technically on our agenda for our May retreat. I can't promise that we'll have a conclusion at that point, but we're going to spend a significant amount of time on it, I would think.

>> LARS EGGERT: That's a good suggestion, actually. I don't recall, off the top of my head, whether it is on the agenda. But if it's not, we can certainly put it there.

>> MARTIN DUKE: We don't have a final agenda, but there's a list of potential topics and it's on that list of potential topics.

>> LARS EGGERT: Okay. You're a little bit hard to hear, but I think I got it.





Is that an acceptable answer for now?

>> TED HARDIE: So what I heard -- and I'm sorry. I'm quite far away from him. It was a little hard for me to hear.

What I think I heard was after the retreat, you will come back to the community?

>> LARS EGGERT: I think that was it, yes.

>> TED HARDIE: That's great. Thank you very much.

>> LARS EGGERT: We'll have time to talk at the beginning.

Of May. For those of you who don't know, the retreat is at the beginning of May.

>> TED HARDIE: No, no. That's perfectly sensible. Thank you very much.

>> LARS EGGERT: And I understand that you're a little bit dissatisfied that there was silence for so long. Sorry about that.

I think Torlis (phonetic) was next. I'm not quite sure.

>> There's somebody in the queue.

>> LARS EGGERT: Has he been first, though, or has Torlis been first? It would help us if you could also use the queue tool.

So I need to do something here?

>> STEPHEN FARRELL: Mine is a different topic, so you could finish this one first, maybe.

>> LARS EGGERT: Oh, you're here. Okay.

Is there anybody who wants to speak on that particular topic.

Leslie has her hand up.

Torlis, if you don't mind waiting just a little longer, Leslie, if it's on topic, let's go to you.

>> LESLIE DAIGLE: Leslie Daigle, private individual. And I would have used the queue tool if I could have managed to log in.

But I just wanted to agree, I guess, with Ted that it sounds like it's deeply flawed. The current policy is deeply flawed because what I heard you say was in order to be a working group chair, I had to be able to write letters of invitation for people to come to an interim meeting. Thinking Cat Enterprises is not in a position to do that.

I think you need to take a step back and think of the whole picture and then figure out how to apply the legal mechanics.

>> LARS EGGERT: Thanks. That's a good suggestion.

Just to be clear, the current policy doesn't say anything about letters of invitation. And the change we made was to clarify what we thought the current situation was.

Point taken. We're going to talk about it at the retreat in May.



I still think Torlis was first, but I haven't looked over there in a long time. I see nodding for Torlis was first, but Stephen is in the queue.

I want to go to Torlis because then we're back to Farrell and Nottingham and that's there.

>> Go ahead and break the rules.

>> I'm only going to change the topic slightly. In the wake of the discussion from Ted, I was also starting to get worried about the visa invitation letters for IETF 117. Given how we have not been to the U.S. for several years for exactly the visa reason, at least in part, one of the interesting datapoint there visas were rejected were made to happen with the sponsor getting active with the embassy, right?

I think that would be work I would love to see for the IETF and the host to exercise so that we don't run into the same situation that we had before we stopped going to the U.S. for 117.

Maybe in this particular case, it is a lot easier for the IETF to issue the invitation letters than any particular host, however good they are, because you folks can build up the knowledge for how to deal with U.S. embassies much easier than every time we go there, a different host.

>> LARS EGGERT: We got the email. I forwarded it to the LLC because I think it's actually an LLC issue and not an IESG issue. But yes, the second issue was raised.

>> It's certainly not something that always works out. If you, as we've seen evidenced, put your work behind it, you will probably get more visas through than if you just send an invitation off. If it's a no, it's a no.

>> LARS EGGERT: Correct. We want to be able to have people from all over come to our meetings. We're going to try and work towards that.

Mr. Farrell.

>> STEPHEN FARRELL: There's a draft new remote fee, which I guess basically just is a very simple thing that says there should and free remote attendance option, which seemed to kind of not have any controversy in the working group, at IETF last call, that I noticed. And then it got to you guys and then boom! You had five yeses and five abstains, some of which turned into emails, 200 emails. And it's, like, a very simple statement.

How would you characterize what went wrong or nothing went wrong?

>> LARS EGGERT: That is my document that I'm generating.

If it was that simple a statement, it wouldn't need so much text. So there was a lot more text and I think that was part of the problem. And partially some abstains were overly simplified a bit. We said, This could be much shorter. Some said, Why does the community feel like they need to give this guidance, which I don't disagree with them. I'm just summarizing it.

The problem really is -- and the LLC also had a bunch of concerns about this draft, and the



LLC has formally no say in this, right, because it's about publication of a document. However, the addressee of the guidance that the document intends to give is the LLC. And so if the LLC indicates it doesn't quite understand what the guidance means to say, that's sort of a concern.

I send it back -- no, first we actually cycled a little bit in the IESG evaluation and hoped that we could address the concerns with patches. But it seemed at the time that it wouldn't resolve. So I decided to punt it back to the working group.

So that's the state it's in now. And then I've proposed some text that I wrote to try to be more minimal and sort of proposed that and see if the working group would agree that's the way to take forward. I don't think that has concluded.

I got asked by the authors whether I would take a small revision to the current document forward again, and I agreed to that. And I'm hoping it will get better support in the IESG.

I find it sort of personally dissatisfying that we're trying to say something very similar that everybody agrees on and I have, like, a whole bunch of abstains. I think one more and it wouldn't have had enough ballots to pass, which is very dissatisfying for a process BCP.

I hope you agree with that so far.

>> STEPHEN FARRELL: I agree there's something dissatisfying. I still don't understand how you end up with five yeses, five abstains, abstains turning into yeses.

I think you are right, the way the LLC and the IESG kind of interacted on this is how a bit odd. Because the community was trying to make a simple statement and the LLC was kind of suggesting text and changes as well as the IESG. And that seemed a bit mixed up to me.

>> LARS EGGERT: I think really at the heart of the problem is that it's a simple statement but it's just using a lot of words to say that simple statement.

And I suggested that maybe we could sort of remove some of the words, but I heard some pushback from the working group saying those words were added while we were discussing this and they shall stay. But I'm intending to move this forward.

>> STEPHEN FARRELL: I'm sure it will get sorted in the end.

>> LARS EGGERT: That's what happened with it. Maybe some other ADs, because I'm speaking constantly, want to explain their position a little bit, if that might help you.

>> STEPHEN FARRELL: That might help me, yes.

>> ROBERT WILTON: I ended up holding (indiscernible) for a brief period of time. It was, because for me, it felt like it was very prescriptive on setting and telling the LLC how to do this rather than saying this is what we want to achieve. For me, I was hoping the community would say, This is like what we would like the outcome to be and leave it to the LLC to sort it out.

Now, the actual discussions I was holding on were on a very particular thing on language,



about whether the fee -- any fee that was charged for remote participation would restrict -- maybe enabling some of the functionality to a limited set of people. It felt like everyone was trying to get to the same thing, and it was just the particular aspects of text that various members of the IESG were unhappy with.

I could have gone to abstain on it, as in not trying to block it from going through, but that would have meant we would have reached the five abstains and that would have blocked the document. So I went to a "discuss" to not block the document so that we could hopefully resolve the text and move it forward.

Then there was further discussion. Lars had proposed alternative shorter text that looked better to me. I think that was sort of the steps, as I understood it, as how it got back to the working group.

Also, as part of that process, Mirjam had been working on providing some sort of alternative text to try and resolve my "discuss," which I was okay with but there were some responses on that in terms of whether that had consensus or not.

But I was happy with what was in the document. I said yes, I will remove my "discuss" so it was able to progress in that sense. I hope that helps.

>> STEPHEN FARRELL: I saw the mail go by. It doesn't help too much because I saw the mail go by.

I'm guess I'm more asking: Have you thought about why this was so difficult? I think partly Lars touched on it. It's this combination of the community wanted to say something. The LLC are more active than previously would have been the case. I think that's correct. Not that it's wrong that they're more active, but I think it's who they are.

It felt a bit like the IESG was kind of not paying as much attention to the community as maybe it should have, from my perspective. I'm sure that's not what you guys were thinking. I hope you would consider was there something that went wrong, was there some other way that could have been handled better, as opposed to just becoming history.

>> LARS EGGERT: I want to do a quick handshake because we still have the IAB that needs to come up and we still have a bunch of people in the queue.

So I don't know if it's worthwhile digging deep here. We hear that there's frustration in the community and in the working group that the document got stalled and got kicked back. We will take it forward and see what happens.

>> STEPHEN FARRELL: If that's the case, I'm asking you to think about why it was so difficult.

>> LARS EGGERT: I tried to explain it to you why it was so difficult. I think you are



disagreeing with me. That's all I can say. That's my impression of it. Too many words, too short message.

>> STEPHEN FARRELL: I think the same applies to your answer.

>> LARS EGGERT: That's pretty short, though.

Mark.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: I think Rich had a response on the same topic.

>> RICH SALZ: Rich Salz, one of the authors. It had fewer words before we tried to respond to the IESG statements. I just want to point that out.

It was pretty short. I'm not saying it was short because it got bigger as people tried to remove ambiguities in the working group. And then we went through another cycle of that. That's all.

>> LARS EGGERT: Correct. I did try to suggest that maybe we remove text that is controversial rather than add more words to it, but that --

>> RICH SALZ: No, what was said was, We should maybe start over with a short document. And I'm saying we started with a not-so-short document. It got bigger in the working group, and then the IESG with the concerns about ambiguity and direction made it even bigger. So I think the IESG --

>> LARS EGGERT: Yeah, yeah. Let's switch the topic. Thank you. The concern was certainly heard. And I want to close the mic line after Mark since we still need the IAB to come up.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: Mark Nottingham.

So during the recent processing -- IESG processing of a document, there was a rather persistent "discuss" regarding the alignment of the output with the charter. And it was based upon different readings of sometimes very small words, single-letter words and sometimes things that weren't in the charter, as I could understand it. It was based upon out-of-band agreements.

I was surprised by this. I think many other people who were doing the work were surprised by this. And I'm very concerned about it. I think it's very concerning for a community when we have that kind of interaction.

So I'm wondering: How does the IESG feel about that? What are you doing to prevent these kinds of misunderstandings and misalignments in the future? Because if a working group goes and does a substantial piece of work and then comes to the IESG and says, Oh, well, you didn't follow your charter because we had something different in mind, that's not a great situation and something we should really try to avoid.

>> LARS EGGERT: Could you say which document and which working group?

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: No HTTP.

>> I guess the question was for me, right?

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: I think it's response for the IESG as a whole.



>> I have seen that -- as an IESG member, I'm a human being. I react as human being. I sincerely believe that what I wrote in my initial "discuss" is true. We can disagree with the words. It's not really precise somehow.

You will notice that I have changed my mind on this after the execution because I think that's the role of the IESG as well, to DISCUSS, with all uppercase, get a consensus. And talking to the authors here, I think the end is better than before. So I would say that's okay.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: I'm not sure I agree it's better than before. But I think the point is: How do we avoid these misunderstandings?

>> It's a much broader problem, indeed.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: I would hope that IESG members, when they have these expectations for a charter that they actually get reflected into the charter. That would be my hope.

>> Mark, I think I agree with you with what you are saying. So for me the key is what's written in the charter text, and that's the sort of process we get to that, that we all work to agree on that text and that exact text gets approved. And that's what these sorts of things should be evaluated against.

So I do understand at times, with all these things, you occasionally get documents where two people interpret the text differently and that's a tricky situation. And I guess in those situations, resolving it through dialogue is the answer really.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: But it's tricky here because the IESG is the body who approves the original text. They create the charter. They are responsible for the charter. They are also responsible for interpreting the charter at the end of the process. And so that is a position of considerable power.

>> There is always the appeal, right? We can discuss again.

>> We also have a slight problem that the IESG that approved the charter may not be the one interpreting the charter some years later. It's hard to go back and -- or look forward and say, I'm going to be on the IESG in four years. I'm going to have a say about this now. So there's got to be a bit of give and take here.

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you.

Thank you, IESG. I think the IAB is next.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Before the IAB comes to the stage, I will go to the thanks part. We have four outgoing members this time that I would like to thank for their service on the IAB.

And I start with Russ White. He joined the IAB for one term, so two years ago. And he is one of our routing experts there. And I think he made a very good job making the IAB aware about difficulties in routing securities, so that's a topic that we're still discussing. And unfortunately, he was not able in his one term to solve this problem. But still a very big thanks from the IAB side.



Russ is unfortunately not here. But as a thank you, we will ship him a bottle of sake and we will also get him these really nice sake glasses with it. So thank you, Russ.

(Applause)

And then I would like to thank Deborah. So Deborah also joined for one term two years ago and she's been very active. She acted first as a NomCom liaison and then she was also active in the ISOC coordination -- and in our new-formed ISOC Coordination Group because she was serving us very well with her experience from the organizations, especially the ITU. So thank you for being on the IAB.

And I would like you to come up here because I have a nice sake bottle to give you.

(Applause)

Okay. And then I would like to thank Zhenbin for his service. He was serving on the IAB for two terms, four years. He was one of the other routing experts we have. He was also active helping in the aid workshop. He was also active as a BoF shepherd and he was specially trying to promote the IETF in China so being very dedicated to that part.

Thank you, Zhenbin, for serving on the IAB.

(Applause)

Okay. And, last, it's Jari Arkko who has been serving on the IAB for three terms, so six years, and he was extremely active on there. He organized multiple workshops either as a chair or program member. And he was a member of the IANA group and also co-chair of RFC 9120 about operations of name servers proper.

He was sharing the Model T program, and he was authoring a couple of IAB drafts and so on and so on and so on.

So you get a bottle of sake, but we will ship you something extra. Originally we discussed we should go skiing with you or whatever, but that would have been slightly too expensive. There is an indoor skiing here, but I think you have done that already as well, right, and the timing was a little bit difficult.

So what we want to get you is actually a little bit of a ski hat with IAB branding. So every time you go skiing, you will hopefully remember the IAB.

(Applause)

Okay. With that, I ask the rest of the IAB to join the stage.

And we'll start with introductions from this side this time.

>> CULLEN JENNINGS: Cullen Jennings.

>> DHRUV DHODY: Dhruv Dhody, IAB.

>> DAVID SCHINAZI: David Schinazi, continuing Internet architecture enthusiast.





>> COLIN PERKINS: Colin Perkins, IETF chair.

>> WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker, IAB.

>> QIN WU: Qin Wu, IAB.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Mirja Kühlewind, IAB Chair.

>> LARS EGGERT: Lars Eggert, IETF chair.

>> ALVARO RETANA: Alvaro Retana, outgoing IAB.

>> DEBORAH BRUNGARD: Deborah Brungard, outgoing.

>> JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko, continuing Internet Architecture Board enthusiast, but outgoing IAB member.

>> ZHENBIN LI: Zhenbin Li, outgoing IAB.

>> CHRIS WOOD: Chris Wood, incoming IAB.

>> SURESH KRISHNAN: Suresh Krishan, incoming IAB.

>> TOMMY PAULY: Tommy Pauly, continuing IAB.

>> MALLORY KNODEL: Mallory Knodel, continuing IAB.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: And, Jiankang, do you want to introduce yourself?

>> JIANKANG YAO: Jiankang, IAB.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Okay, we start the open mic.

Yes, Spencer, sorry, you're in the queue.

>> SPENCER DAWKINS: Yes. I'm Spencer Dawkins. And I just wanted to thank the current and, hopefully, future and past IABs for the amount of effort you've made in making what the IAB is doing more visible to the community and more accessible to the community.

I especially appreciate even tonight where you're talking about the side meeting for the liaison coordinators, I mean, again, that's new.

So it's not that you've been doing a good job, it's that you've continued to do a better job for a period of years, which has continued up to this week. And I just want to thank you all for that.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Thank you. I see my time line slides really worked out.

(Laughter)

>> I'd like to point out that a lot of that is Mirja's fault for doing such a good job of making the IAB generally more open. So I have to thank her for that in general.

All of our meetings have been open and transparent except for very few executive sessions that have to be private. But we've pushed really hard to make everything happen. And the IAB Open Session, I think, was all Mirja's suggestion. So thank you.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: You can also ask questions if you want, or you can come to IAB Open tomorrow if you want a more cozy atmosphere to talk to us.





Okay. Then let's have dinner. Thank you, everybody.

(Applause)

