

IETF118
Prague, Czech Republic.
8 November 2023
Plenary

>> LARS EGGERT: All right. Welcome, everybody, to the IETF118 plenary. My name is Lars Eggert. I am the IETF Chair. And we still don't believe in kings, presidents, and voting, but apparently, we're kind of okay with massive stages that are sort of really high up. I don't think I've had a view of the room like this in a long time. And I've been to many of these. So let's see what we find in Brisbane.

This is the Note Well that you've seen many times. This is a session at the IETF. The Note Well applies. They are various policies in effect about IPR and the need to disclose your knowledge of it if you participate in a discussion that touches upon it. You agree to follow that rule and all other rules and policies on that eye chart slide. Most of all, we're going to, especially tonight if you go to a microphone, take a video of you. There's a photographer here. If you wear a white lanyard, that means you're okay with having your photo taken. If you're not okay, go outside and grab a red one. Richard is really good at respecting that.

Personal information that you provide to us, we will handle with the utmost care according to all policies that are relevant to that.

And you agree to work respectfully with one another. And so far this week I think that has worked reasonably, as far as I know. So thank you very much for that. Keep it going for this meeting and all future meetings and all interactions on the IETF. Be nice to each other.

If you're joining us online, there's some tips on the slide for you. Your audio will be off and also your video will be off. So no need to get dressed or anything like that.

When you're joining the queue, get ready to, when you're recognized, unmute yourself. And if you have the ability to be dressed at that point and send us video, we would appreciate seeing you and not just hearing you. But that's optional. If you have a headset, use it. Or if you're reasonably sure your audio setup works, try that. And there's more details on the link below.

Also in the room -- I don't know what's on the next slide, so I'm going to say it now -- use

the onsite tool to get in queue. Scan the QR code that you see up there. You should be familiar with how this works and use that. There's a chat which is available to you if you get too bored during this initial part of the presentation. Be nice to each other also in the chat.

This is our agenda. You notice we don't have the usual plaque hand-over, clapping, thanking the host thing. That's because, unfortunately, we don't have a host for this meeting. This is -- no, Colin.

So Cisco has sponsored many meetings. This is not one of them. So if you want to get applause for Cisco, you should have gotten out the checkbook earlier.

So therefore, we also don't have nice things like T-shirts, but the LLC has tried to provide other nice things like coffee. But if you're wondering why there's no T-shirts, it's because we don't have anybody who pays for them. And they are expensive.

But we have a store at ietf.org which sort of self-launched, I guess, with this meeting.

And you can buy the semi-official T-shirt of this meeting, and I guess a bunch of other T-shirts that have IETF stuff on them. Trying to figure out what merchandise we might be able to overcharge you for. So if you want anything with a logo on it to support the IETF, the prices are not just recovering cost. You're also supporting the IETF if you buy something at the store. So tell us what you want to buy. We'll gladly put a logo on it, and you can buy as many as you want for all your friends. Christmas is coming, by the way. Just saying.

(Laughter)

You know, your partners have probably heard all about these acronyms, and now you can get them T-shirts that have these acronyms on them. I mean, just imagine the look. You know, don't you just want to try it out just for the look? You do want to, right? Anyhow, so we have -- I can ramble a little bit since we have a little extra time because no host.

Agenda is longer than I thought. So I try to do -- we have two hours. I'm going to try to do the first part in one hour, so that we have an hour combined for open mic at least. I hope that's going to work out.

Thank you, as always, to everybody who made the meeting happen, not just meeting here but the meeting week. That includes the secretariat that's awesome, as always.

Meetecho team, we are using a nicely updated Meetecho client this week, which I heard a lot of good things about. So thanks for that. Was always complaining about the UI. You have fixed the UI. Thank you.

The NOC has provided a great network as always. The LLC is doing things behind the scenes as is the Trust. The tools team has been busy fixing various bugs at the last second. So thank you for that. And we had great support for the hackathon on the weekend. Thank you.

(Applause)

So that gets me to the IESG report and chair report which go over the usual participant statistics for this meeting. That, in the grand edition of these things, I haven't seen yet, and some other items of interest.

So we had 1700 registrations, 1748. That includes 1,060 onsite, so excellent. That's, I think, the biggest onsite we had since COVID. And I think also the 688 remote is the highest number we've seen since COVID. And also, I think during COVID, that was still pretty high up there. So a big meeting, as usual, when we go to Europe. And usual when we go to Prague, so well done.

351 fee waivers were granted. Almost all of them were used. Those were the remote fee waivers. Colin and I have a very small number of in-person fee waivers that we are giving out. I think each of us has ten, if I remember correctly. Somehow I managed to give out 12. Don't ask me how that happened. And Colin has stuck to his allotted limit.

And we got more requests. And some of them, you know, we decided not to grant for various reasons.

And we had a substantial hackathon presence, again, on the weekend if you were here for that. And I guess many of you were. That seems to be still one of the draws of this week.

And we're going to post final stats later.

On the breakdown between onsite and remote is surprisingly symmetric in the big colors this time, Others and USA leading. Taiwan is pretty big there and China, nice. Seems like the usual global spread is adjusted for European location.

Meeting registrations over time, this includes all the meetings we had post-COVID.

The dark blue is people onsite. The light blue is people remote. And you can see that it is the biggest meeting we've had since we came out of COVID, both in terms of onsite and in terms of remote. Except for that Vietnam meeting, which I would count still kind of as a special event because it was the first one. So that is very good. I do hope we see lots of people in Brisbane and later meetings onsite and remote as well.

IESG statements are always a great source of interest to the community. We keep trying to provide them to you for your diligent review. We've updated one on in-person and online meetings. We also did one on support documents in IETF working groups. Both of those were updates of existing ones. We did one that I have later slides on, which was to merge parts of the ART and Transport areas. Going to say a few more words on that. And we did one on the results of the community consultation.

We had an appeal on the revised statement on the earlier slide that the IESG rejected. And as far as I understand, it's now raised again with the IAB, and they are deliberating it. And there's more reports from the IAB, the LLC Board, the secretariat, and IANA at that URL. And there's a blog which is not run by the IESG, but it's an IETF activity so it's in my deck.

If you want to write a blog about something you're doing in the IETF or your group is doing that you think is of broader interest, talk to Greg.

Greg, where are you?

Greg's here. He's always very happy to have authors -- guest authors for the blog posts.

We have childcare again. This is now -- we've been doing this ever since COVID, I want to say. And we'll keep doing it in the foreseeable future. So if you have children, and it would help you if you could bring them along, help you attend in-person, please do so. I think we had ten kids this time. And I get really good feedback. We all got really good feedback, both about the nannies and about the program being offered. It's supported by the sponsorship category that a lot of companies are graciously supporting. It really helps the people that have kids at that age that allows them to come and participate in-person. This is a great event. It's not an event. It's a program.

The WITAREA. I alluded to this earlier. This a merger. The W comes from web and

the IT comes from Internet Transport. What we're doing is the IESG has done internal analysis of what's happening in terms of the growth of various areas. And ART has always been -- for a while, has been the largest, by far. And also, if you look at where do BoFs happen and where does new work start, it's typically ART and SEC that have the strongest attracter for new work at the moment.

And that became a problem. ART already had two ADs now. We added a third. But looking at the curve, we could almost justify a fourth, and that felt a little unbalanced. And ART is also, because of that growth, spreading out into quite a few topic areas. So as part of the retreat we did earlier in the year, we sat down and figured out is there something we can do in terms of restructuring how the work is organized in the IETF so it doesn't change the content of what you're doing in the working groups. This is just basically giving you -- giving your area a new label or putting you, potentially, in a new area. So the Web-related pieces of ART are going to move to WIT. And the Internet Transport-related pieces of Transport will move to WIT and Transport will close. This is what this slide is saying.

In more detail, the green acronyms on the slide are the groups out of ART that are going to move into WIT. And the red ones are the ones from Transport that are moving into WIT in the first bullet.

There's some other working groups out of Transport, ALTO, IPPM, that are going to move to OPS. And I think one might also close. DTN is going to move to INT. And a few areas in ART that are security-related, and already, I think, have responsible area directors from Security, are moving to SEC.

So that was outlined in these emails I pointed to earlier. We got a bunch of feedback. Most of it was in favor. I think we talked about it at least at TSVAREA this week. I don't know if it was talked about in ARTAREA yet or will be. I'm seeing -- it was or will be. Thumbs up. Okay.

So we're going to go ahead with this timeline-wise -- nope, no slide.

Timeline is before Brisbane. So we're probably going to -- before we start the agenda-planning process for Brisbane, do this reshuffling where the WITAREA exists and working groups are in it so we can properly deconflict. As you go into Brisbane, you will no longer see Transport sessions. We already had the last Transport area this

week, so it's done. So keep that mind if you're wondering why is my area named different. It's because of this.

This is a slide I was going to update. More of a reminder to myself, but you can see it now too.

So we're doing the Friday experiment this week, which were basically because there's so much pressure for session time that we had to do -- we have to sort of satisfy somehow. And the experiment in Prague was to treat Friday as a full day and schedule sessions Friday afternoon. And we decided we're going to already now -- before the results are in and decided, we're also going to do it in Brisbane so that you can all book your flights correctly.

That is sort of the most important conversation. And also, turns out, we probably want data from more than one IETF meeting before we make a final decision. So for Brisbane, you can book your travel under the assumption that Friday is a full day ending at 5:00-ish, I think.

Right, that brings us to Keep Ukraine Connected.

So we're in Prague, and this is a group of people that has quite a few IETFers involved that have been collecting equipment from various parts and sending it to Ukraine to keep them on the Internet. And Jan is going to say a few words about that effort.

>> JAN ŽORŽ: Thank you, Lars. My name is Jan Žorž. I'm from Global NOG Alliance and 6Connect. I have a few minutes to tell you about this stuff.

So many moons ago, we started the Global NOG Alliance. That's a not-for-profit organization to help network operators group around the world. And this is our motto.

Next slide, please.

I can press. Okay.

Okay. This is our motto. Our IT/Tech community is one big family. We don't think in colors. We don't think in races or genders. We don't think in borders. And we try to be as neutral and non-political as possible.

And after the conflict in Ukraine started, and we started receiving images like this, seeing people in the trenches to trying to connect fiber to the other to keep people connected to the network.

And we thought it would be nice to help keep people connected and have access to the

information. So we started the Keep Ukraine Connected Task Force under the Global NOG Alliance. And this is a not-political, neutral project that is aimed solely to help operators keep people connected. And it is based on the premise from the operators for the operators.

As you see, the working conditions here are not great. So I will never again complain about my working conditions. Yeah.

So then we asked the wider Internet operators community to donate equipment they don't need, if you do a technology refresh on your network and you don't need routers, switchers, servers, and that stuff, to send it to us. And we have volunteers that load this equipment on the trucks and vans and drive them into the Ukraine to hand them over to the operators that need equipment to rebuild the network.

And the reaction was amazing.

If you participated in this project and are in this room, thank you very much. It was really, really helpful because we managed to gather a lot of stuff.

So for the equipment that we sent, you have the numbers there. I will not read them all. But one of the most important one is fiber splicers, because they need to connect the fiber together in the trenches. And we managed to ship 41 fiber splicers. This is quite expensive. This is where the money donations went, mostly, to buy the fiber splicers to send them there.

Also, 490 access points to install in the shelters when the bombing is happening, when bombs are coming down, so people can still be connected. So when they lose the mobile signal and talk to their families, to say that they are still alive.

Yeah, we shipped there. Nowadays, probably around \$3 million worth of equipment.

And Ukraine and operators are very, very happy for this help.

We're also helping Sudanese people a little bit right now, because there's a conflict there. We are doing some stuff for them. And we're also reflecting about other situations around the world, but our resources are very limited as this is a completely voluntary work and just a bunch of us that are coordinating this stuff.

And if you can help in any reasonable way, contact us. Come to us. And we will try to also help other places around the world to receive the same sort of help like Ukrainians did because we thought that this would be a good blueprint to also help in cases of

other disasters, conflicts, civil unrest, and so on.

So if you're interested in this, please come to talk to us. Here is the information. And thank you.

(Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: Thanks, Jan.

And that brings us to the IAB presentation. And I think Jan is sitting up here in the corner if you want to give your time later.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Thank you. My name is Mirja Kühlewind. I'm the Chair of the IAB. And as always, I want to give you a brief update about what we did since the last meeting. There's more extended information in the report, which is in the proceedings. You can read all that. This slide just shows a couple of highlights if you're interested in it.

So we have a new IAB program, the E-impact program. The program met yesterday, lunchtime already. But there's also mailing lists that you can sign up if you're interested in this.

Last time I was standing here, I was mentioning that we sometimes write statements to give input to things that actually happen outside the IETF but might impact what we're doing here. So we published one of those statements again.

And then just to give an example about outreach activities, we also had a session at IGF last month where we were showing what the IETF is doing and providing visibility about our work.

And this one, I really would like to take the opportunity that I'm standing here to make you aware of a workshop we are planning. The workshop will take place in January and will be online. But we are looking for input from you. So if you would like to participate in the workshop, you have to send us a position paper. We need these position papers in order to create our agenda and figure out what we want to talk about. This workshop is about barriers to Internet access of services. So kind of what we want to figure out is actually what does the Internet actually mean to the user. What do you need to use the Internet? What are barriers in terms of blocking and filtering or other limitations where you can't use all the protocols and all the stuff we're developing

here? And we really would like to collect information about this, report measurement data, and have a discussion about it.

And then this is also a good opportunity to say thank you to a couple of people who support our work. In this case, I would like to introduce that we have a new liaison manager for ITU-T, SG15, that's Deborah. Deborah, thank you for serving. And at the same time, also thank you to John who served in this position previously.

And then also, the second point, I don't have a picture here for the second one on the slide because it's a little bit something inside the IAB, but I would anyway like to take the opportunity to mention it here.

So we have the new liaison from ISOC, who is Sally Wentworth. But I also would like to say thank you to Karen who served in this position for many, many years on the IAB. And we were really glad to have you. Hope you're here. Where are you? There you are. Little applause for you. Thank you.

(Applause)

And then, the third point here is about also something, a person who is on the IAB, so you know his face. So Dhruv is serving as outreach coordinator now. This is a new position on the IAB in order to be a little more coordinated about outreach. And if you have any questions about outreach -- and this is coordination about outreach of leadership when we go outside and talk about the IETF. So if you want to know anything about this, then talk to Dhruv.

And lastly, please watch out. Very soon we will start the call for candidates for the ISOC Board of Trustees. That's a very important position. And we are really looking for candidates. This time we have two people to fill the seats. Please nominate people. Please nominate yourself, and then also, later on, provide feedback in the process. That's coming very soon. Probably next week.

That's actually mostly my report. We had a couple of other related meetings this week. We had also the EDM program meeting on Monday. We had the IAB open meeting yesterday. And we have office hours for the liaison coordinators tomorrow. So plenty of opportunities to talk to us or just send us an email. Talk to me directly. Whatever, yeah. Hope to get input from you. Thank you.

>> LARS EGGERT: That brings us to Colin with the Internet Research Task Force. I'm

trying to, like, bridge the gap here. I'm failing. You could speed up a little bit. That would be helpful.

(Laughter)

>> COLIN PERKINS: You were so good earlier. A little more ad lib remarks, Lars.

Yeah, so I'm Colin Perkins. This is the IRTF Report.

So as many of all know, in addition to the research groups, the IRTF in conjunction with The Internet Society -- slides seem to have disappeared -- organizes the Applied Networking Research Prize.

The ANRP is awarded to --

Clearly should not let a researcher near it. There we go.

See if I can do this without breaking it for the rest of the time.

The Applied Networking Research Prize is awarded to recognize some of the best recent results in applied networking research. It's awarded to recognize interesting new research ideas with potential to have relevance to the standards community. And it's also to recognize upcoming people that are likely to have an impact in this community.

Okay. Carefully.

Very pleased to announce that we will be awarding three ANRP prizes this time. The first is to Siva Kakarla who will be talking about his work on verifying the correctness of nameservers. This talk, some of you will remember, was originally schedule for the San Francisco meeting but had to be postponed because of illnesses. So will be happening this time instead.

We also have talks by Dennis Trautwein and Ramakrisnan Raman. Dennis will be talking about IPFS and content-addressable peer-to-peer storage. Raman will be talking about his work on identifying and locating the network censorship devices.

The papers on the slides are on the IETF website. I think we've got three fantastic talks tomorrow. So please do come along, and congratulations to all the winners.

The ANRP relies on your nominations. The reason we have such a successful set of talks and fantastic set of talks every year is because people nominate the papers. So if you know of any people, any papers, any work which you believe are worthy of a nomination for the ANRP for 2024, the nomination deadline is the 19th of November,

end of next week. So please do go to the website. Make your nominations. Encourage people to self-nominate if you know of good work. Without the nominations, we won't have these fantastic talks going forward.

And finally, before I finish, I also want to mention the Applied Networking Research Workshop. 2024 version of this workshop will take place co-locating with the Vancouver IETF in July next year. The chairs will be Simone Ferlin from Red Hat Ignacio Castro from Queen Mary University of London. Let's -- I'm sure he's here somewhere. Ignacio is at the IETF this week, right at the back over there. So if you have questions about the ANRP, please find him in the hallways. And look out for the calls for papers in early 2024. Thank you.

Next is NomCom.

>> MARTIN THOMSON: So hello. Martin Thomson, NomCom chair this year. The IETF is weird in that every year we take a random bunch of ten people and ask -- put the fate of the organization in their hands. This is those ten people. We should be very grateful that they are excellent and reasonable and are taking the job very, very seriously. So if you get the opportunity, thank them. Give them feedback. And keep them happy because they're working very, very hard right now. And we also have a number of liaisons that have been excellent help in helping us do the difficult work of choosing who it is that will lead this organization in the next couple of years.

We had something of an exceptional turnout this year. We had everyone wanting to be on the IAB.

(Laughter)

And we also found that there were a number of excellent candidates here for -- I should say nominees for the IETF LLC Board, Trust, and various area director positions. Something of a little bit of a churn. The IESG report talked about the areas. That disrupted our operations somewhat. We now have to fill two ART positions and no Transport positions, and we have the honor of filling the IETF Chair position as well. And I would like to thank everyone involved for making that process very, very smooth. And in particular, Lars has been a great help on that one.

This week we've been going through the process of interviewing all these wonderful

people who have accepted nominations. And we are most of the way through those interviews. Thank you to everyone who has dedicated some time away from their work that they're doing and coming and talking to us, including those who have provided some excellent feedback on those people.

I think we hope that we will make some decisions soon. And we'll be able to let people know the conclusions to those things next year. That sounds a bit odd, but there's confirmations and a bunch of other things we need to do.

So feedback is still open. But we will be closing that feedback at midday on Friday. We may extend that if we find we don't have enough feedback, but thus far, the database has well over 900 pieces of feedback sitting in there. And we are probably more concerned about being able to read all of it than the fact that there is a lack of it. So, thank you, everyone.

And back to Lars.

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you, Martin and all the NomCom participants. It's a critical role, and you're doing an excellent job.

Jay and/or Jason with the LLC.

>> JAY DALEY: Sorry, I just recovered from a coughing fit. Hello, I'm Jay Daley. I'm the IETF executive director. And nice to see you all again. Thank you for coming. Thank you all for making this such a large meeting. Lovely.

So we're going to start off with our Gold Sponsors. As I think you know, we have this values-based sponsorship program where we have Diversity and Inclusion, Running Code, and Sustainability as three separate areas or values that people support us on. Diversity and Inclusion, as we know, pays for such things as fee waivers and childcare and other things. Thank you.

The Running Code for the hackathon and other things like that and the Sustainability is going to be paying for our carbon offsets. And we're also moving very shortly away, hopefully, from plastic bottles and possibly away from plastic badges, and other things, and using the money to did that with.

So these people are very important to us. It's a very significant commitment. And it is helping us to, you know, just make that kind of transformation of the meeting process that is not related to -- directly to the standards side of things, but it's an important part

of modernization and change of any organization.

So also, on the same set of things, the same set of diversity things as well as the Gold Sponsors, we have a set of Silver and Bronze Sponsors. So if I could just have a little round of applause for all of the sponsors. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Thank you very much for your contributions.

We also have a number of people who support us with equipment services and connectivity. This is -- there are a number of people on here who actually have been supporting us for some years and haven't been properly recognized before. So Isode who provides the IMAP server that we use, for example.

These people just give us their services. It's generous of them. And many of them do it just on a very, very, friendly, straightforward basis. No contracts involved. No anything. It's lovely of those people.

So once again, thank you to these people for their online support of the IETF.

(Applause)

I know this is the bit you love, the clapping. Thank you very much.

So we now have an online store. So far we are only selling T-shirts on there. We will, of course, you know, expand into mugs, stickers, various other things over time. As Lars mentioned, we don't have a host for this meeting. So there are no free T-shirts, but you can buy the T-shirt for those who need to maintain the set. And for all those previous T-shirts where we own the rights or have the rights to sell them, we either have those there or beginning to add those on to the store as well.

If there are any other good ideas of things you think we could sell, then please tell Greg. I'm sure he would love to hear those ideas. That would be great.

We don't make a lot of money off this. I think we did roughly \$20,000 worth of sales at some point -- sorry, \$5,000 worth of sales and made \$20 out of it. So it's not meant to be us trying to make the money out of it. It's meant to be so you can get the things and go out and represent the IETF and that sort of stuff afterwards.

So there are lots of volunteers, as we know. You're all volunteers here. But we have a number of specific sessions where volunteers directly contribute to the running of the -- either of the tools or the network during the week

So we have the codesprint volunteers who come on Saturday and work on Datatracker and who write new things for Datatracker. And then we have the NOC who run much of the NOC throughout the week for us. So thank you to these people. And thank you also to their employers who support them coming and have supported many of them coming for some years. That's very good of you. Thank you.

(Applause)

There are a number of staff around as well working on things. So we have the secretariat staff. I'm sure you know, some of these people in secretariat staff have been here longer than many of us have been coming.

We have the Meetecho team. And as we've seen, as Lars has mentioned, they're continuing to invest in it, continuing to develop it. So we have a much better tool now. We have the -- some tools contractors. And then we have the contracted NOC staff as well who, I don't know if you know, but they work for a number of other standard development organizations, so they have expertise in doing this in various other places. And I'm sure this the one that they like doing best. You know, definitely. So thank you, again, to all of those people.

(Applause)

Then you have us staff. So as I'm sure many of you are worried about, yes, we're growing the empire. This is going to be ten times this within the year. No, we are slowly adding on technical people, largely developers. And that seems to be our particular need in the future moving forward. Obviously, I'm on there. But if you could clap for the others on there, that would be lovely. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

And then, so finally, thank you to our Global Hosts and Global Supporters. So these are the people who make a long-term commitment to the IETF to fund us and to host our meetings. These are the people who go out of their way to help introduce us to other sponsors, to help us get access to, say, resources within their organization that might understand diversity and inclusion and, you know, who are using their money -- sorry, trusting us with their money to deliver a better meeting experience for all of you. So thank you very much to the Global Hosts and Global Supporters.

(Applause)

So IETF119 will be in Brisbane from March 16th to March 22nd. I'm reliably informed the monsoons will finish on March 15th, but it will be very warm.

It's a lovely city, Brisbane. If you've never been to, it has a lovely waterfront. It's all been redeveloped. It's just got a nice, modern feel to it. It's friendly.

It is Oceania so all of the coffee is good. You do not have to search around trying to find specialist coffee. I know it's a long way, but it's actually very cheap hotel rooms for which we think will substantially offset the extra cost of flights for most of you, which is like a little plea for you all to come along to that meeting.

We'll be opening registration soon after this meeting. We'll give you some idea of those room costs as well. We think this is going to be a great meeting. We haven't yet quite signed the meeting host, but we're in negotiations with people. So it won't be too long, we hope, before that is arranged.

And we have at least one IETFer who lives locally who has an outstanding motorbike collection and has promised to try to bring some of those along. So definitely, this is a meeting to come to.

So here's our list of future meetings. 119 is in Brisbane. 120, as we know, is in Vancouver. And Huawei will be host for that one. And 121 is in Dublin. And we just announced Cisco as a host for that meeting. Thank you very much, Cisco. That is going to be a fantastic meeting as well. Bangkok, which is one of the re-arranged meetings, which is probably why you think that we've been to Bangkok at least ten times. But it's mainly that we rearranged twice to move to this one.

We have Madrid, which is another re-arranged meeting. We should have a host sorted for that, but it's just a little far out to sign the contract. And then, we're working on 124 North America and 125 Asia. And then we're back to Vienna because those who were there thought we enjoyed it so much, we thought the rest of you should come too and enjoy it. So we'll be going there.

Right. That's for me. Over to Jason.

(Applause)

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: All right. Thanks very much, everybody. Let's see here. So these are the folks that are currently serving on the Board. I think you probably know all of us. I think everyone but Maja is here. Maja's remote.

So, what are the things we've been working on lately? First, the timeliness and accuracy of financial statements. So thankfully, our new part-time Director of Finance, Debbie, has helped us tremendously.

What we ended up having a problem with before was our monthly statements would come several months after we expected them in some cases. And they were sort of riddled with errors that we would have to go back and correct, and that took a lot of time. And Debbie has magically solved all that stuff for us. And things are really cracking now, which is great. So that is basically complete at this point.

We continue to focus on fundraising. That's certainly important to us. These are everything from small donors to very large donors to help fund operations. And that's a continuing focus that is going to follow through into next year as well, and of course beyond.

We have been doing a bit of work around board member continuity, which essentially means making sure that we've got the right expertise on the board as people roll off over time, as they're term-limited. So nothing too magical there. But making sure we have sufficient coverage.

And the Board has always had the ability to appoint, I think it's up to two independent members outside of the NomCom process. And then they have to route in through the NomCom process if they want to continue after a certain period. And we're considering that as well to make sure that we've got the adequate skills coverage when certain folks roll off the board.

And, of course, I think Glenn Deen will be speaking later about the Trust. Maybe? I don't know. Right after me, as usual.

We gave final feedback to the Trust on their proposed structure, which they're working hard on. And Glenn will tell you all about that. But, you know, I think we had a good outcome there. And we've got a breakfast meeting tomorrow morning with them.

We had a couple of community consultations, one on venue selection and another on the administrative strategic plan, which I think is still open for comment for about another few days. I think until the 13th or something like that? Yeah.

And we continue to have discussions with ISOC. So when we began as the LLC, we struck a multi-year agreement with the Internet Society. That had two components:

Support for operational funding, so to keep meetings going and those kinds of things, as well as a matching program for grants that other organizations might make to us.

So there are two things going on with respect to that. One is as we look to that expiring in a few years in the future, how can we revise that so that we have an operational support program in place? Particularly post-COVID as we've recognized some of our costs have increased and making sure that, you know, we don't have to dramatically change the way that we charge, you know, our attendees.

And then secondarily, the matching program is going to change a little bit. We're sorting out the agreement now. But in essence, some of that relates back to some of the changes that have happened recently from a staffing standpoint at ISOC.

I'm sure Andrew has talked about it on a number of lists. And some of that relates to things related to taxes and nonprofits and the important public support test that nonprofits have to pass. So we're working closely to make sure, you know, we can help to the extent that we can.

So a lot of work to go there. But those are important things because we're obviously a key part or, you know, key aspect of what ISOC's mission is. And we want to make sure that we've got a multi-year agreement in place that goes long into the future to provide that, you know, strategic funding stability for us.

And then finally, we had a readout at the last board meeting about the recent report on the experience of women in IETF. And we've got a follow-up discussion set for the next board meeting to see if there are any actions or things that we need to do as a board as a result of that. Maybe there are, maybe there aren't. That's a discussion we'll have next week. And that's it on this topic.

These are the normal board meetings. I'll once again say, we hardly have anyone come to a board meeting. If you ever have any questions, if you're curious about any of these issues or if you want to challenge us about something, what have you, come to a meeting or send us an email or find us on Slack if you have access to that. Lots of ways to get in touch with us.

In terms of the operating budget, this is sort of where we stand. These are always difficult because it's sort of what happened directly after a meeting. We've got these three big meetings every year which means we have this really lumpy spending pattern

and really lumpy income pattern. But at the moment, I mean, first and foremost, I would say, put aside the investments. We're not actively selling investments. We put the money away for years. And you see what happens to the stock market. There's interest rates going up. The stock market goes up and down. These are sort of paper gains and losses. So it's not like we're having a big party, like we made some great decision here. We're sort of at the whims of the market to some extent.

But in any case, in terms of things we can control, revenue and expenses, capital investment, the primary thing is that capital investment is trending a little bit lower. I think as I looked at the September one, it was a bit lower as we projected for the future. But, you know, we're -- we'll come close to budget. Everything seems on track reasonably at this point.

And as I said, lots of ways to get in touch with us. Email. You know, admin discuss is always a good one if you want community to chime in as well.

And we'll certainly have questions later on.

That's it. Thank you very much.

Glenn, you're up.

>> GLENN DEEN: Hi, everyone. I'm Glenn Deen, and I'm the Chair of the IETF Trust. There are five trustees. Several selected by the NomCom process. One is appointed by the IESG, and one is appointed by the ISOC Board of Trustees.

What is the IETF Trust? I always talk to the slide. A lot of people go: We develop standards. What are these guys doing with copyrights? We hold the IPR, copyrights, trademarks, and a bunch of other assets, like several licenses, for the IETF and other parts of the Internet community. We protect them. Keep them safe. So that we, here at the IETF and other places, can continue to freely use them. So that's what we do.

We protect things. So we license things.

Since we last met, we've issued zero direct licenses, and we've had zero direct license requests. Now that may seem like we're not doing anything. That's kind of a goofy number. Let me explain a little bit.

We have a built-in licensing scheme for all the RFCs and all the contributions made to the IETF that says, Hey, you don't need to come negotiate a license with us. You can just use it to do your work at the IETF. And if you did an RFC and you want to use the

RFC without editing it or modifying it, you can just do it. You don't need to negotiate a separate license. So the beauty of that scheme is that we don't have to write licenses to every one of you and everybody that wants to use the work of the IETF. They can just use it. It's a beautiful model. And the Trust is at the heart of that. So we didn't do anything special last quarter, and that's a good thing.

So the big thing we've been working on -- and I've talked about this for the last few meetings -- is the restructuring of the Trust. We are currently a Virginia trust. And we're restructuring for a bunch of reasons, which we've talked about before, to a Delaware not-for-profit corporation. The great news is, last time I talked to you, we were on this hold waiting for approval from the IRS in the U.S., because we're a U.S. entity, to become a full, legitimate nonprofit. We have been approved by the IRS. And we are now a nonprofit 501(c)(3). The new corporation -- the current Trust, of course, already was a 501(c)(3). But now this means that we can proceed with the next phase of the operation, which is transferring the assets from the current Trust -- this is the RFC, copyright, all that kind of stuff, transfer those assets over to the new corporation and have the corporation own them and run them, and basically become what we call the IETF Trust. But it's going to be a different legal entity.

What you guys know as the IETF Trust and the five trustees, they're all going to stay the same. And you're all going to be able to keep using the materials you already have.

So you want to know more, hit me up in the hallway. But it's really boring. But the good news, we're near the end. And to that point, we anticipate that the current IETF Virginia Trust, the plan is to have it shut down and say good night after serving us very well for many years, by the end of 2024.

If you want to come talk to us, we have office hours tomorrow from 2:30 to 3:00 p.m., Liben 2.

One thing I want to bring to your attention, and Jason mentioned a little bit, we did this -- we have a new corporation. Corporations have to have bylaws. And these are the rules of the road for how you operate the corporation. When we created the corporation last December, we had a set of bylaws that were entirely based off how the current Trust operates.

When we spent some time talking with our parties, in particular, with the LLC and

various attorneys, we said, Hey, we can make this better. So one of the things we have done is the following. In order so that there is a control point so that you couldn't have a rogue set of board trustees go off and do crazy stuff, the process we've put in place is proposed. And we're not going to vote on it yet. But we put into the new bylaws that we're proposing that there would be a 60-day notice period before any modifications are made to the bylaws. So how this will work -- and by the way, we're going to try this out, even though we haven't approved this. We're going to try to follow the process for the change itself. We're going to post it. It's posted on the Trust website. If you look today, you can see it. And we're going to send out notices. So I'm going to send out a notice to the NomCom Chair and I'm going to send it to Lars and various other places that appoint the trustees and say, Hey, we're going to do a change the bylaws. The clock is ticking. 60 days from now, we're going to vote. And it may or may not get adopted. But we wanted to let you know in case you had a problem with it. So that's going to kick off tomorrow.

So NomCom, when you get a note from me, it's not advice. And I'm not trying to get a new position. Read it. Read the bylaws. But you need to do nothing else. And it was there. And you can all go take a look at them yourselves. The areas in the bylaws that have changed are highlighted in the green. So we did the red lines and green. We're a little crazy. We really mix it up in the Trust.

If you want to get in touch with us, email is there. The Trust website is there. And we're all -- several of us are around here this week, so hit us up in the hallway. Thanks.

>> LARS EGGERT: So, is Rifaat here? Great.

So, this is always the sad part. We've been around as an organization for 40 years almost. I think 2026 should be our 40th anniversary. And that means we have participants that have been around for a long time, and some of them sadly pass away. And that happened since the last IETF. And Rifaat's going to say a few words about one of them.

>> RIFAAT SHEKH-YUSEF: Okay. Buongiorno, everyone, and welcome. That's how Vittorio used to start his talk or presentations. But he had a really musical Italian accent, so I'm sure I butchered that.

Vittorio was really a digital-identity guru with very long history and experience in the identity space. He was -- because of that beautiful hair that you see here, he was an icon also in the Identity community. And in addition to that, he was a hair product expert, because of that beautiful hair. Unfortunately, I didn't benefit from that expertise. (Laughter)

Vittorio was an author. He wrote a number of books in the identity space. He also published two RFCs with the Auth0 group. The last one actually was in September. And he was really looking forward to seeing that published before he passed. And luckily, it was published before his passing. And he was really happy to see this. He was also an amazing educator. He knew how to make the topic of digital identity accessible to many, many people. And he has ton of videos on Auth0's website. He used to work Auth0 recently. And he also hosted a podcast called "Identity Unlocked," and sharing his knowledge with everyone that's interested in that space.

Vittorio, he was a mentor. He was a colleague. And he was a friend. A friend to me and to many people here at the Auth0 group. We miss him. And rest in peace, my friend.

We miss you.

(Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you. We're going to do a brief moment of silence for Vittorio.

[Moment of silence]

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you.

Next up we have the open mics. We have an hour for open mic. We have three open mics coming up, so roughly 20 minutes per group.

The IAB is first, if you come up to the stage, please.

If you want to ask a question, please remember to use the Meetecho queue to get in queue. And that way we can also have participants from remote land join in the discussion. Thank you.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: I'm back here, but we also have an introduction round for the rest of the IAB. Please start here.

>> CULLEN JENNINGS: Cullen Jennings.

>> CHRIS WOOD: Chris Wood, IAB.

>> DAVID SCHINAZI: David Schinazi, IAB.

>> MALLORY KNODEL: Mallory Knodel, IAB.

>> TOMMY PAULY: Tommy Pauly, IAB.

>> LARS EGGERT: Lars Eggert, IETF Chair.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Mirja Kühlewind, IAB Chair.

>> DHRUV DHODY: Dhruv Dhody, IAB.

>> COLIN PERKINS: Colin Perkins, IETF chair.

>> WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker, member.

>> QIN WU: Qin Wu, IAB.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: I'm not used to remote anymore. Please go ahead.

>> ALVARO RETANA: Hi, this is Alvaro Retana, and I am also on the IAB.

>> JIANKANG YAO: Hello, Jiankang Yao, IAB.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Thank you for joining remotely. And we have time for questions apparently.

>> Please don't all rush to the mics at the same time.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: You are all absolutely happy with what we're doing? You can also say good things. It's not a problem. Just confirming to make sure I understand the feedback correctly.

No? Okay, then we are done. Thank you very much. (Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: Next up is the LLC. As somebody who is on all of these open mics, I am getting nervous for the last one. We have too much time for IESG. I'm sure we will find something to fill it with.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Any questions? I thought we had -- Nevermind. Go ahead.

>> SEAN TURNER: Sean Turner. I'm on the LLC Board.

>> LARS EGGERT: Lars Eggert.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Jason Livingood.

>> MIRJAM KÜHNE: Mirjam Kühne.

>> JAY DALEY: Jay Daley, IETF Executive Director.

>> MAJA ANDJELKOVIC: Maja Andjelkovic, Board Member.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Got it. All right.

We have Rich in the queue first. Had to figure out if you were here in person or virtual.

>> RICH SALZ: I think the icon changes.

Rich Salz, Akamai. Maybe this will take all the time. (Laughter)

It shouldn't.

I wanted -- I don't know who was responsible because I've heard different conflicting stories. But I want to thank you whoever is responsible -- and that's probably some of the people up there -- for the best improvement to the quality of life at an IETF meeting, which is having real coffee.

(Applause)

Also, I'm a little worried that there was an implication that Brisbane wasn't going to have it.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: No, I think the opposite. I think Jay was suggesting it should be brilliant.

>> JAY DALEY: The point is that in New Zealand, in Australia, all of the coffee is good. No need to panic. Well, not all true. While there are some Starbucks there. I can say that because they'll never be a sponsor of ours. If you see someone go into them, they are a tourist.

>> RICH SALZ: This is why this will take the whole time, you are not an unbiased observer.

(Laughter)

Anyhow, seriously, thanks for changing. It's the best thing to happen since we had enough cookies.

(Applause)

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: I do wonder if the key question is: Is it more important to have good coffee or good cookies?

(Laughter)

Could be an angry hum. Abdussalam, you were next.

>> ABDUSSALAM BARYUN: I will go for the cookies actually.

I have a question regarding the LLC. And I agree with the first comment that there is improvement actually in the IETF, and thank you for the work done.

But my question is as we listen to the Trust -- who was speaking about the Trust, is if there was a procedural way they do the work or they need some kind of -- you know, the points on, let's say, the way they do their work or the way -- how do they work as a team.

Is there something like that? Because normally I'm not aware. This is a question for me. Maybe there's already a procedure you can just answer for me. Thank you.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Like, a procedure for consulting on bylaws changes or something? I'm not sure I understand the question.

>> ABDUSSALAM BARYUN: The way of your work. Let's say, your objectives and how you target you -- how you target -- as you said before, you had some financial statements needed some kind of correction and you had help from -- I think you named Debbie or some financial companies I have worked with before. They have some financial steps they have to go through. It's just like they have somebody to audit, somebody to do this stuff.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Ah, yes.

>> ABDUSSALAM BARYUN: Simple steps.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: So we have a few things in that respect.

Obviously, we have Sean and then the board that review the financial statements and approve them. At the end of the year, when we close our books, those get audited and they also have to get reviewed and approved by The Internet Society. There's a bunch of sort of checks and balances along the way for making sure everything is accurate, appropriately accounted for, et cetera. Thanks.

Andrew is next in the queue.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: I am Andrew Sullivan, and I have my Internet Society President and CEO hat on, although it is invisible.

There are two things I got up here to say. The first is I really want to thank the LLC board and Jay for the work that's gone on over the year about financial results. We had some difficulty over the past year with some of the numbers not coming when we needed them. And, of course, we have to file with the IRS and that makes our lives harder. So I really appreciate the improvement there. Thank you very, very much and please keep it up.

The other reason I'm up here is not actually for you but to acknowledge Martin who was up earlier from the NomCom, because every year I get the happy job of appointing the NomCom Chair. And I go around and beat all of you until one of you says "Yes, please."

And this year I did have the same difficulty I always do, but Martin stood up. And it turned out this was a much more difficult one than even normal. So I really want to acknowledge -- Martin was very kind to acknowledge everybody else's work, but I think he's done a lot. Thank you very much, Martin.

(Applause)

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: John, you are next.

>> JOHN LEVINE: John Levine. I guess I'm going to be the equivalent of I haven't read the draft but I have an opinion about it anyway.

I noticed your investment results were up about 15%, which is not bad for this year.

But I guess I have two sort of related questions. I understand the investments are partly reserve, like in case there's another epidemic, which is presumably managed to preserve cash. And the other is an endowment, which is forever, which is managed for overall return.

So I'm wondering -- the questions are: What's the breakdown between those two parts? Are the investment policies different? And how's the endowment doing?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: The investment policies are definitely different. I think you can find that on the website.

>> SEAN TURNER: We have four of them actually as it turns out. Relatively -- the split between what's in the endowment, I think, is relatively well publicized. It's actually the smaller of the percentages at this point, because, again, it's the smaller one that started out with you people donating hundreds of dollars.

>> JOHN LEVINE: I put in 500 bucks, yeah.

>> SEAN TURNER: Yeah, thank you for your donations.

And then the additional funds that we have gotten from ARIN and RIPE and -- I think LACNIC gave us some money. And there's the magic funds we've gotten from ISOC. It's slowly growing. I do not know the numbers off the top of my head. I'll have to get it to you.

What was the final question?

I will have to get the percentages to you. I know that.

>> JOHN LEVINE: Oh, basically, what's the split? I know you've been going out and rounding up money for the endowment. How's that going?

>> SEAN TURNER: Slowly. Yeah, but we did get matching funds. And obviously it gets into the -- it gets immediately deposited into our account. The nice thing is we just got a procedure for what we're going to do with it. We set up a procedure. It gets invested. There's a load delay of basically me responding to an email to get it invested appropriately. Depending on the amount we figure out how to tranche in, so you don't spend it all at once. You can kind of spread it out, dollar-cost averaging it.

>> JOHN LEVINE: I presume the policies are on the website somewhere?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah. It's all there. As you would imagine, the funds that we need access to on a regular, rolling basis for, like, continuity are going to be capital preservation-focused, right, not taking risk with it. Others are going to be more focused on growth because they're long term, measured in years and decades. I know you know.

>> JOHN LEVINE: I ask because another organization we all know with an acronym that also starts with I can't tell the difference between the two, so I'm glad that you can.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah, I know. As we all know, interest rates are a thing again, right? So even your capital preservation now has some interest which isn't zero.

>> JOHN LEVINE: Since you are making interest, we are looking forward to having the registration fees go down.

>> SEAN TURNER: Yeah. We can have that discussion later.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: I see Mark Nottingham in the queue. There he is.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: Hi. I didn't have anything I felt strongly about, and then Jay starts making assertions about the quality of coffee in Queensland. So I got very emotional for a moment.

I wanted to actually talk exactly about that, about registration fees.

As we all know, they've become quite high. I think for some people who might want to participate in this work, they're prohibitive, especially if they don't come from a Western

country.

And whilst we have the waivers, those are somewhat opaque in how they operate. I think arguably you could say there's a stigma associated with them.

So I'm wondering, as an update, what's your thinking about the meeting fees? Are you seeing that they're being exclusive or exclusionary in the work? Are we looking at bringing them down? Are we looking at other strategies to mitigate the effects that they might have?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: First, let's maybe double click on waivers, which I think is your domain.

What are the numbers looking like this meeting and the last few?

>> LARS EGGERT: So Colin and I, as the chairs -- sorry?

So we each have a discretionary budget. It's not terribly large. And so the largest part of mine -- and I think also the largest parts of Colin's goes towards paying these waivers. So each of us sets aside money for ten waivers. I think we increased the discretionary budgets to be able to do that, and I think they pretty much get maximized out.

Colin and I have a discussion because sometimes it's not always clear when somebody applies for a waiver.

Academically focused participants, Colin is usually the person to pick that up.

Everybody else, it's me. I personally try to find people who are either local to the venue or are coming here cheaply, from nearby and they're staying not at the hotel but basically where that is really sort of the largest expense for them and they are sort of somehow economically in distress.

And what exactly that means is always a case-to-case decision. And the gray area, as you might imagine, is huge. And I think everybody that asks for a waiver, I would be happy to give them one but at some point, we have a financial barrier.

We are in discussions with people that might give us money for the endowment that come maybe with a regional background that would maybe donate a larger amount of money to the endowment but would like to see some sort of effect in the region happening. And that might be a travel waiver program or something where there's a story where the donation to the endowment increases participation for the region.

And we're trying to build those sort of things out into maybe a program, but those discussions are still under way. But the thing is, we cannot do, for example, what ICANN is doing and pay hundreds of people to come to the meetings because otherwise our budget would double.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: That said, I think we have a new process that we can revise the meeting fee annually so that it can be adjusted to normal cost of living types of things.

We would love for it to be dramatically lower or even nonexistent. That would be the ultimate thing, but we need to get big blocks of money to do that. There are a few places where, you know, we know that are sort of in the community that we can get those things.

But even if we think about -- take the example of The Internet Society, for example, they couldn't give us every dollar that came from PIR. There are obviously tax-accounting problems from a support test standpoint.

ICANN has a big foundation to give out grants, but I don't know that they've, yet, finalized the process around how that's even going to work or that they're ready to start giving those things.

So we have a number of things that we want to do, and that's a pretty big focus of the board at the moment and for the next few months and the next years. Where can we go to raise more money so that the rate of that growth can, if not slow, stop maybe decline? We would really like that to be a de minimus cost.

Jay, do you want to say something else?

>> JAY DALEY: A couple of things, Mark. Firstly, we do everything possible to make it clear to people the way the online fee waiver process works is no questions asked. We do everything possible to avoid that dignity issue for other people there.

It's difficult to see. If you have any ideas for improvement how we could do that without effectively significantly undermining ordinary sales, then please let us know about that. But that's the dilemma we're in there.

The one important thing to note about the IETF is that this is the only point to which you need to pay to interact and then we do whatever possible to help people to interact without doing it. Everything people who go to other SDOs tell me this is one of the

lower-cost SDOs to be engaged with when you look at all those other considerations put together.

Now, that is -- we do not receive money through anything else other than donations. We can't be in the process where we have an ongoing deficit. We run our meetings as close as we can to neutral. For a year, we probably ran them under and we're getting to the stage where we're just about breakeven. We should hopefully be publishing meeting budgets for last year, proper ones, now like that.

If you take a meeting like this where we don't have a meeting host, that's a \$360,000 hole immediately. It's made up by the fact that we have probably at least 150 to 200 people more than we were expecting onsite, so that could be close to \$100,000 or more there, take off taxes and stuff. It gets better.

But we have to make some various different trade-offs here. And what we think we're doing is something reasonable putting all of that together. It's been discussed with the community in not so different ways.

I mean, the board can arch on the long-term trajectory of this, where want to go. But in the short term, I don't think there's anything else that can be done.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: I am well aware you have to balance the budget, but you used the word "trade-offs." And I think that's an interesting way to look at it.

So, for example, Lars talked about sponsorships. We have diversity and inclusion sponsors. Is any of that money going towards this cause, for example?

>> JAY DALEY: That's what pays our fee waivers.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: Ten? I heard that there were ten for each of them.

>> JAY DALEY: No, no, no, for the online fee waivers as well.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: I see.

>> JAY DALEY: There are -- some people do give us money for grants as well.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: I just expected it to be a larger component.

The other thing I would suggest you maybe look into is other organizations index the fees based upon where someone is coming from and the economic status of that place. So me, as a person from a relatively rich place, I would be happy paying more than I pay now, even though it's a lot, if I knew that other folks could pay less.

(Applause)

>> SEAN TURNER: The only other thing I want to add -- I probably shouldn't say this. Hotel costs, right? Things are getting more expensive. Some of the requirements we have on picking a hotel mean that we pick a place that's more expensive.

So one of the reasons we're doing the meeting venue cycle and looking through and seeing what our requirements will allow us to pick smaller hotels in other cities that maybe are a little harder to get to but may be a little cheaper. So we're not coming back here for a long time because it's getting more expensive. There's other places like, for example, in the U.S. where the hotel costs are astronomical.

So unfortunately, some of the costs that we have to run the meetings come from meeting fees. So that's unfortunately how we have to get some of the money. I get your point.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Thank you for the suggestion. Wherever Michelle is, can you make sure it's on our agenda to talk about at our meeting next week. Thank you. We have Corrine Cath next.

>> CORRINE CATH: Hi, Corrine Cath, University of Delft. As one of these very sad academics that Lars just mentioned for whom it's very expensive to get here, I really appreciate the comments that Mark just made, especially so because I come from a place that relatively has the money to do these kind of things. But there is a real need there. It's nice to see that the community is recognizing that.

I had a question that's slightly separate to this, which was around the investments that the IETF has and where those are placed. And mostly because I know there is a large community here either working on sustainability or questions of anti-censorship, or I think the workshop was bias.

And I was wondering if you've given any thought to how these investments are placed. And is there space there, for instance, to think about how can we make sure that whatever we invest the IETF money in is, for instance, sustainable companies and not --

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Not companies trying to break encryption algorithms?
(Laughter).

>> CORRINE CATH: I guess not shell to bring one close to home.

>> SEAN TURNER: So we do have an ESG investing strategy, which some people

love, some people hate. Basically, that is where we go.

So we are not at the level of picking individual stocks. So there's a screen that they run over to try to make sure that they have -- they're inclusive and those kind of things. And there's some component of it. Is it a full component? No. To be overly honest, to say company X we'll never invest in, no, we don't get to that level.

>> CORRINE CATH: There's a middle way there?

>> SEAN TURNER: That's where I think we kind of are, yeah.

>> CORRINE CATH: There are these kind of ESGs that do offer fully sustainable options. This is an easy way to make money go towards that goal.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Thank you. Jim?

>> JIM FENTON: I hope this is the right section of the meeting to make this comment.

But at the opening reception, it seemed really crowded in that room. And the room seemed smaller than it had been at some receptions previously.

COVID isn't entirely behind us and part of it -- a lot of us are not used to being around crowds of people as a result of that.

I was wondering if there were -- first of all, had that been noticed? And second of all, are there plans to try and make sure that we have somewhat more space in future meetings?

>> JAY DALEY: We can certainly take that on board. Yes, Jim.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: All right. Next up we've got, looks like, Mike Bishop online. There he is.

>> MIKE BISHOP: I have a question about the online fee waivers. I remember last time around, it was a bit of a discussion around why we budget for the fee waivers when the incremental cost is negligible, smaller anyway. I'm not trying to reopen that piece of it.

But I noticed that there was also an option to sign in as a guest speaker for a working group. And I'm wondering if you could speak to the distinction between those two.

And do we also budget for those, or do we treat that as just cost of running the IETF?

>> LARS EGGERT: The budgeting question is one for Jay.

So the guest passes are basically an experiment because we kept having people that

were invited to sessions, many of them newcomers, remote participants. And they did not understand they needed to make a Datatracker account or register and take a fee waiver. They basically showed up at 9:00 a.m. in the morning and couldn't get in, and that caused a lot of chairs a lot of stress. And it also caused the secretariat a lot of stress and Meetecho a lot of stress and so on.

So we created this guest passcode option where you can quickly get a code for a speaker so you don't have to postpone your meeting for a long time. That's where they came from.

We do this for the first time in this way, and I guess we would be happy to know whether they worked and what the problems are. I noticed one problem, I don't need to be in the approval loop for that during the IETF week because I'm not going to do anything other than to say yes.

The budget question is for Jay.

>> JAY DALEY: So these passes are all an interim step, as Lars said, in order to solve a problem. They're not intended to be the future step.

We do have a tension here. Everybody that comes to the IETF and participates in the IETF does so voluntarily and supports the IETF in that way. They dedicate their time. They give us some of the money, resources, and other things.

So everybody is a contributor to the IETF, net contributor when you look at it. That's the way the IETF works.

Now, there is a tension in that there are some people who believe that there are speakers who come just for one session and who come and just do that, are an even stronger net contributor than others and, therefore, should be able to come for free and be allowed to do that for free.

And the tension here is, of course, that if you start to measure the value of people's contributions, it gets very, very messy. And that's not necessarily that box that we have now, up until now, which is that everybody contributes and does that.

So, yes, when we have the final mechanism in place, we will budget for it and that we understand it as a cost to the organization for providing that.

You are right to a degree, it is -- it can be seen as funny money, but it's also a genuine cost to the organization in terms of opportunity and the cost of infrastructure, all sorts of

things.

As you know, we've invested heavily so that the remote experience is as good as the onsite experience. And many of the community have gone along with the process changes that have come as a result of that. So you have used Meetecho to join the queue to talk now, rather than just walking up. So it's not without cost in that sense to do those things.

So that said, the best answer I can give you is it will be budgeted. But we still have this tension around perceptions of value around that and they need to be resolved as a result of that.

>> MIKE BISHOP: I had not realized, when I saw it initially, that it was essentially the emergency interrupt.

>> SEAN: If you remember last time where we had a ten-minute fail on one of the chair's part on my fault. This was to fix that problem where somebody showed up and was like, "Oh, geez." This is the punch the buttons to make it work.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Was that working group named because of you?

Andrew.

>> ANDREW CAMPLING: Andrew Campling, 419 Consulting.

One comment and then a question. The comment, in the spirit of, I think, the one about the coffee being a big improvement. I think Meetecho, amazing. Personally, a really good tool. And congratulations to the team for continuing to evolve that.

My question, though, I'd be interested to know what the LLC's, board's view is on whether we're making any substantive progress on diversity in the community. My sense is at best it's modest, but I don't have the data to substantiate that. So I would really appreciate your thoughts on: Are we actually doing anything really meaningful that's moved the needle? And if not, is that a focus? And do you have thoughts on what more we could do to actually make a difference?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: It's certainly a focus. I think some of our survey data that we do post-meeting creates an opportunity to collect some data there.

I think the most recent data point that we had that was very qualitative was the report on the experience of women coming to IETF meetings. Some sections of it make for sobering -- sober reading, I should say. And it's very interesting.

We continue to see behind the scenes certain behaviors that are less than professional amongst the community, and we work hard to try to help correct those things or improve them. But it's clear that there's a lot more work to do, and it's on a number of fronts.

And it's a strategic item that we're focused on because, in part, it relates to things that are not just the quality of the work that comes out of the organization because that heavily interacts -- excuse me, relies on social interactions that occur and the openness of those things.

But it relates to the newcomers that are willing to come to the IETF, that people that decide to come back and stay, how welcoming and open is that environment, how friendly is it.

So things -- some of the Guides Program, for example, has been helpful for some of the newcomers. It's going to be a long process, and we're not alone in tech groups for having this challenge. But that doesn't mean we can't do anything about it, right? We should be doing things about it, and we're trying to keep moving the ball forward.

We're always open to suggestions, of course. But I think all of us here view that as a priority, indeed.

Next up is Mallory.

>> MALLORY KNODEL: Hey, Mallory Knodel. Just wanted to respond to your call for comments on the code thing you were just talking about because while it happened last time, it's been happening in my research group for a very long time. And so I knew that and, I just wanted to give the feedback that it's really helpful to have it.

Now, I didn't use it as an emergency parachute this time. I, in advance, had at least one of my speakers that I knew was going to have a challenge in getting on, so I kind of gave them the option. I was like, If you can take these five steps to register and do this, that would be ideal. And in the end, they got tripped up and then they asked me to request a code. I did. I got it, I passed it on, and everything worked really well.

So I just wanted to say for my use case anyway I really appreciate this feature. Thank you.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Cool. All right. Thanks.

And Greg next.

>> GREG CHOULES: Hi, Greg Choules, ISC. As an IETF virgin, I have to say that it was very welcome having the newbie events to try and provide some kind of induction.

And the one thing I would ask is since there's a bewildering number of things that go on here in committees and all sorts of stuff to understand, IETF for Dummies would be really nice.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Do you want to say anything?

>> LARS EGGERT: I like the suggestion. IETF Bananas was suggested. That is also a good idea.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Thank you. We hope you come back. Thanks for coming. Any other questions? All right. Thank you very much for your time.

(Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: IESG.

All right. Since you guys are already sitting, let's start the introductions down with Jim.

>> JIM GUICHARD: Jim Guichard, Routing AD.

>> ROBERT WILTON: Robert Wilton, Ops AD.

>> MARTIN DUKE: Martin Duke, soon-to-be ex-Transport.

>> ANDREW ALSTON: Andrew Alston, Routing AD.

>> ÉRIC VYNCKE: Erik Vyncke, Internet AD.

>> FRANCESCA PALOMBINI: ART AD.

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

>> ERIK KLINE: Erik Kline, Internet AD.

>> WARREN KUMARI: Warren Kumari, the real Ops AD.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Mirja Kühlewind, IAB Chair.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Roman Danyliw, Security AD.

>> PAUL WOUTERS: Paul Wouters, routing enthusiast.

>> MURRAY KUCHERAWY: Murray Kucherawy, applications realtime.

>> ZAHEDUZZAMAN SARKER: Zaheduzzaman Sarker, soon not-to-be transport AD.

>> LARS EGGERT: All right. Michael.

>> MICHAEL RICHARDSON: Hi, Michael Richardson here. So I asked all these questions online as the IAB, but the IESG has the final say on the session planning, the

Friday afternoon, and all that stuff.

So we had two IAB programs run at lunchtime today. And as someone said, I kind of call them normative sessions as opposed to informative sessions like host speaker or other things like that. Specifically, I think of a normative session as one that might that produce an RFC that you might want to have an opinion about or something like that. I think this is the first time we have run of those at lunchtime.

And I'd just like to know the parameters of this experiment, I guess. I think it's quite stressful for some people to feel fear of missing out, as they go and actually put nutrition in their body, that they're missing something. On the other hand, I'm not opposed to preordering my lunch and having it show up or something like that for that session.

So we've moved into Friday afternoons. What other experiments are we going to do in scheduling? And, again, what are the parameters for this lunchtime session?

>> LARS EGGERT: I mentioned that the agenda pressure that's caused us to have the Friday afternoon experiment. And you notice that even with that, we ran out of space for some things, right? And so the IAB requested the lunch slots. And the IESG is not really involved in it anymore, other than saying there's no conflict with IETF work.

But Mirja has more details on what the thinking.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: I'm really excited to get a question for the IAB.

[Laughter]

So this is not the first time actually we are doing program meetings during lunch breaks, but we announced it more openly. That's the difference. We will not keep doing it like this.

First of all, we do not have all the meetings -- all the programs meeting all the time, blocking all the lunch slots. And then we also noticed this is not ideal, so we do kind of try to involve an experiment with how we want to run the programs. And we are discussing that, and it will change and it will not be the same next time.

>> MICHAEL RICHARDSON: So let me just add that one of the things that was brilliant about doing it this way is both programs are very broad input, especially evolvability, right? Everybody should be at that meeting in some sense, right? So that

was a really brilliant thing.

But as we had very little questions to the IAB, maybe you should consider some of these things should actually take this time now, okay? And there's ways to have these long, into-midnight plenaries with Perry Metzger doing Nixon at the back. >> LARS

EGGERT: You want to go back to that?

>> MICHAEL RICHARDSON: I don't know that I want to go back to that, but I'm saying the pendulum has maybe gone the other way.

We have had Monday morning opening plenaries at distant times past. There's all sorts of things. What I'm saying is there's a bunch of different things, and I think we're very fragmented. And any attempt to bring a little bit more unity would be also good, with the constraint that we have so many sessions, right? It's a real problem.

>> LARS EGGERT: And plenary time specifically kills all other parallel slots. Keep that in mind as you ask for it because we are already running out of space, right? It's hard to square a circle.

This time we tried the IAB programs on Tuesday. We also have some actually meetings on Thursday because we don't have a host speaker session. We stuck something there.

But really, the demand for time at the IETF, especially post COVID, has gone up. You also see the side meeting wiki is exploding with sessions. It's great you are all so interested in having meetings here, but it makes it difficult to pick and choose.

Plenaries, right, two hours is already quite long. We had them with a break and all of that. So I'm not opposed to actually discuss that the IAB hold a technical plenary. It's an option. We would need to probably cut out a lot of the first hour and you all need to be okay that we're then doing that only online, right?

But we can discuss this. We can't magically make more time available.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: I want to make one more point. So program is not a working group. It's mainly a venue where we want to have external expertise into the IAB and things we're doing on the IAB from the community.

There's also balance between getting this targeted expertise or having a broad community discussion with everybody. And we are really discussing trying to figure out how to get this balance right, and it might be something where we report back from

time to time more broadly but then do work in other ways or whatever. It is a process we're trying to figure out how to do it right.

>> SEAN TURNER: I will add on behalf of the LLC, there will be a post-meeting survey to catch conflicts, either this one or for everyone, that we will be able to aggregate and get a sense for what the community would like.

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you.

Pete.

>> PETE RESNICK: This is Pete Resnick. To continue that thread, RSWG is the one that's meeting tomorrow at noon. There's some discussion about whether groups -- now RSWG, like the IAB stuff, is not an IETF thing. But even Gen Area, Gen Dispatch, things which are very cross-area, having those meetings during lunch, having them during breakfast, maybe having them in the evenings. If you want to have cross-area participation, which is kind of required for some of these -- especially those people up there are going to be stuck any time there's any conflict. Any time anything else meets, the ADs have to go cover their own meetings. They can't go to these General Area meetings.

So I think it's definitely worth considering as a broader point. And I think it's worth doing to get some space where maybe it's not exactly as pleasant to have to eat your lunch while you're doing these things but it's okay.

>> LARS EGGERT: I will point out that a few years back, we had the exact opposite discussion and the community wanted way more side meeting time and way more time that wasn't taken by formal session. So there's a pendulum here, and it keeps going this way and that way, which doesn't mean that we can't do anything sensible now. Maybe the demand has shifted for what we need. But it is -- there's only so many things we can do within the constraints of the space and the time we have.

Daniel.

>> DANIEL KAHN GILLMORE: This is Daniel Kahn Gillmore. I was coming up to manage the pendulum in the opposite direction as well. Please do not overschedule all of our lunch times. One of the advantages and one of the reasons why it's worthwhile to come to the meeting in person is because you actually manage to find people who are here who have been thinking about the same thing and you can have a

little brainstorming session either before a meeting or after a meeting. And the hallway track is an important track. So please don't overschedule.

(Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: Rahul.

>> RAHUL GUPTA: I am Rahul. I am one of the beneficiaries of the travel grant program. Thank you very much for having me here.

I have had a very good time here. However, coming here was a nightmare. It seems to me, all the interventions that happen are reactive and not proactive. So there is a failure to understand what are the barriers to entry for people coming from developing countries.

I had given up three weeks ago. Had it not been for Dhruv here, who kept encouraging me, I would not have come here. So, I mean, this should be, please, looked into because there are many more people who would like to participate here but they just won't have the opportunity if things are managed in the way they are currently.

>> LARS EGGERT: The travel grants are given out by the IETF. And Colin is down there on the floor.

>> COLIN PERKINS: Yeah, hi, Colin Perkins.

This is always a difficult challenge. We have been running this travel grant program for a while. We learn, I think, something new every time we run it and some new challenge every time we try and run it.

It's something we are certainly trying to improve. I'm meeting with Alexa and some of the rest of the people from the secretariat on Friday to discuss how we can try to improve some things for next time.

If there's feedback on what worked well and what didn't work well, please do send it to us. We will do what we can to improve it in the future. But it's a learning process and we are doing the best we can.

>> LARS EGGERT: You have talked or are going to talk --

>> COLIN PERKINS: We spoke briefly. I'm happy to chat further.

>> LARS EGGERT: Sorry you had a hard time getting here. Thanks for coming anyway.

Spencer.

>> SPENCER DAWKINS: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to say on the topic of scheduling, the side meetings seem to be -- the side meeting slots seem to be -- the registered side meeting slots seem to be pretty much back-to-back all week long with basically all the available space in use. And one of the -- again, that's cool.

I remember when the IESG started making it easier for people to find each other to schedule side meetings and providing spaces for them, so that's cool.

But I think it would be a reasonable question to ask -- I participate in two or three working groups that do a significant amount of their meeting time in interim meetings during the time between IETF meetings.

I wonder what -- I wonder what could be done to improve the ability of people to schedule interim side meetings in a more formal way than just me reaching out to people that I know without having to use up IETF meeting week time.

I was in a very important side meeting this week and ended up having to skip out of a somewhat less important working group meeting this week.

The other thing is that -- the thing with side meetings is kind of like for hot RFC talks where there's not really anybody in charge of being the gatekeeper for them.

And one of the things just for the community to be aware is it's pretty easy for people to schedule a side meeting because these things tend to be somewhat at the last meeting without realizing that someone else who's working in a similar topic area with a different name for the topic area, it's like these people should be talking to each other. Like I said, for the community to be aware of that.

I don't know if it's possible to open up the -- help me out here. We have just done -- we just changed the format of the wiki to be, like, there's a top and a bottom part. But perhaps there's a way to basically saying, I'm planning on a side meeting at this IETF and I don't know when it will be and I don't know what room it will be in and things like that.

>> LARS EGGERT: One thing we could do is certainly we could start a mailing list for side meeting conveners that they can use to talk to each other, because that I don't think we currently have.

But there is the tussle for the IETF as an organization, we were more involved in deconflicting side meetings because a while ago, you needed area director approval to

get a room for a side meeting.

>> SPENCER DAWKINS: Right.

>> LARS EGGERT: That was not working because people were reporting that an AD had approved the side meeting on this topic as if that was an endorsement other than just saying, Yeah, that room is empty, go take it. That caused a lot of problems because that was reported out as some sort of IETF endorsement. We really need to be careful to not do something that re-creates that problem.

One thing we could try is basically a mailing list for side meeting organizers to talk to each other.

>> SPENCER DAWKINS: That would be another really good suggestion. And one thing I'm thinking about is it's pretty easy for me to set up a side meeting on my own because I have got a Zoom account that would accommodate up to a hundred people, which is more than I would ever have in any meeting.

But I saw that the IETF is -- was providing Webex access for side meetings. Was this the first IETF when that's happened?

>> LARS EGGERT: No, we've done this for a while. And also the meeting -- we try to make things available and make it easier to have side meetings so it's not such a heavy lift to run it in the room. But we do try and do things that can't be construed as any sort of endorsement by the IETF.

We will try to make this -- I'm going to put it on the wiki for the next meeting. Thank you.

>> SPENCER DAWKINS: Cool. Thank you. And I'll stop talking.

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you.

Andrew.

>> ANDREW CAMPLING: Hi. Andrew Campling. Just on the side meetings, I have to say I think the kits in the side meeting rooms is a big improvement. So thank you to whoever arranged that. That was really good.

On a less serious note, I simply want to come to the mic to congratulate Warren for raising the sartorial bar of the IESG. Thank you.

(Applause)

>> WARREN KUMARI: Thank you to the secretariat.

>> What's different?

(Laughter)

>> LARS EGGERT: Corrine.

>> CORRINE CATH: Hi, Corrine Cath of the University of Delft. Just wanted to echo what was just brought up again, the difficulties of traveling here and coming here, not only if you are from certain sectors but also certain regions.

And I wanted to mention a little initiative that some of us have been running because we recognized this problem maybe two, three years ago, especially when it came to technologists that don't work for big corporations. And we've actually quite successfully been running a tiny travel fund for public interest technologists to not only come to the IETF but also W3C and other spaces.

And I'm saying this not because I think I can fund all of this room that's now staring at me; but because if a bunch of people working for civil society organizations, academia, can hack this, I think there are more creative ways that we can think about it as a community. I'm well aware of the fact that there's not as much money as there used to be.

It always doesn't take that much again. The fact that we can do that is a good example of that.

>> LARS EGGERT: Thanks for doing this. Thanks for sending us people.

And I will note that you're doing it for a particular reason, to bring in particular people. For the IETF to do something like that, it would put us into this awkward position that Jay outlined earlier where we would then need to somehow figure out who is deserving by some metric of one of these grants, which is, in my book, very hard because everybody makes contributions. And they are all valued. They all move us forward. We don't have unlimited resources.

It's easy if you have a purpose for a grant. It's much more difficult to hand it out from an organization unless you are an organization with very deep pockets.

>> CORRINE CATH: I fully understand that. At the same time, we also have difficulties because our funding is very limited, right? We also have a set of criteria, and we have to hash it out. Not everyone who applies to us can go.

But at the same time, I feel you are capable of doing this because you're doing it with

the fee waivers. It's not entirely impossible. And I understand it's difficult. But sometimes to bring in a diverse set of voices, we're going to have to do difficult things.

>> LARS EGGERT: Let's talk offline. Maybe there's some criteria that Colin and I can take a look at and see if that brings some more clarity. Thank you.

>> MARTIN DUKE: Regarding the visa difficulties, certainly I think many of us can sympathize with the trouble that causes. Unfortunately, we have little to no impact on immigration systems and immigration laws.

But I will say that Jay has been working on an effort to make it somewhat easier for us to meet in places we haven't met much in the past, countries we haven't much met in the past. That's going through the Gen Area. There's a document there.

I don't think we're going to stop meeting in the traditional countries we meet, but maybe at least sometimes we can get to places that are more accessible to more people.

>> LARS EGGERT: Zhenbin.

Be quick, Rahul.

>> RAHUL GUPTA: To the point that it's difficult, there are visa difficulties. If decisions are made timely and documentation, et cetera, is available timely, it simplifies the process a lot. So you can do that.

Also, destination matters. Like, Shenzhen is especially tough for some reason. It's not my first time. I have lived in Sweden for three years. Every time there is a problem. There's a pattern to this behavior, which also can be learnt about if you talk to enough people. Thank you.

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you.

>> ZHENBIN LI: Zhenbin from Huawei.

So, in fact, I have these comments under things that happened in the routing area and also the IPR's working group chair because the IPR's working group chair, Loa was forced to be replaced.

I thought the process and the reason in the mailing list -- I think the response to AD and the deliberation and the lack of documentation.

I think the only reason used to inject these new opinions are only the reason to replace the working group chair. So I think this needs to be explained more as to make this more apparent.

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you.

>> Zhenbin, as I said to you in a reply on the MPLS list regarding this, the decisions with regards to appointment and replacement working group chairs are things that are taken with very careful deliberation. They are done in order to ensure that working groups function in the most harmonious way, to find the consensus that we need to build open standards. Those decisions are very often very, very difficult to make, both on the replacement and the appointment. They require a lot of communication, a lot of which happens off list, which you're not going to go and divulge publicly because there are a lot of things that come in when those decisions are made. And they are made for very careful reasons.

And, yes, as you noticed, a working group chair was replaced. And I think that the mail that was sent in response to your mail gave a -- as much detail as -- is appropriate because of the communication. It was not done lightly.

And, yes, I think that the process does say that working group chairs serve at the pleasure of the ADs. I think that that's important because there has to be a trust relationship between the working group chairs and the ADs. And the decision was made. Yeah, I think that's pretty much all I can say about that.

>> ZHENBIN LI: So the question is that one, because you emphasize this deliberation and the consultation and also because this is a very exceptional case in the routing area.

So I think two options. The first option maybe you can explore -- explain what's the deliberation or the consultation?

Second option, emphasize the outcome. So what's the reasons? Because I see now this is the only -- the reason is that inject this new perspective. I don't think it's very reasonable reasons. That's my point.

>> LARS EGGERT: Thank you.

Abdussalam.

>> ABDUSSALAM BARYUN: As my comment for the IESG, I would like also to know the way the AD worked, how do they work with the chairs of the working group chairs.

Is there some kind of clear procedure as the way they replace or don't replace? That

needs to be clear to any participant. Usually we don't know or we don't care sometimes. But if some problem happens, we may need to know. Like, I'm not sure what happened before, who commented before me.

Actually, my question was regarding newcomers. Newcomers, they need -- my observation or my belief, they are decreasing. They are not increasing.

I work in some working groups, so I hope that there is a strategic plan, as I heard from the LLC. They already have a plan and are asking the community what's your feedback on the strategic plan.

Is there a strategic plan from the point of the ADs, IESG, for newcomers who are going or, let's say, leaving us? I'm not sure how many people are coming and going.

So we have to have at least a strategy. This is most important issue for IETF.

>> LARS EGGERT: So Jay is generating data for us. All IETF participants are surveyed to try to ask people -- reasons for joining and leaving the organization. We're analyzing this.

And the IESG is working together with the LLC on -- LLC owns a lot of the meeting-related aspects of making a newcomer experience a good one. And the IESG owns the technical content of that, right? So we do keep working together, and we do try to identify ways in which you can improve that.

And we're going to ask again after this meeting how did it go for the newcomers in the post-meeting survey and take actions. It's a process, right?

I think everybody in the organization, especially in leadership, is aligned that we want to have more newcomers, we want to be a welcoming environment for everybody. We want to make it as easy as possible to come here. Real-world considerations make that sometimes more difficult than we want to. But it's a process I think that everybody is committed to go down the road on.

>> ABDUSSALAM BARYUN: Is there a clear plan or something on the list we can work on together? But if it's only by IESG doing it, I don't think newcomers -- for me, I started in 2013. I started because the AD was supporting me. But if I didn't get support from AD, I would not even stay for one month with IETF. So I think it's important that we -- that the new ADs also, they put this into consideration.

>> LARS EGGERT: I wouldn't only put it on the ADs. We have a mentoring program

that has tried to formalize these more ad-hoc relationships that you benefited from and make them available more widely and also advertise them more widely. I think Mirjam wanted follow up.

>> MIRJAM KÜHNE: I just wanted to ensure in all leadership groups, this is very high on the agenda. It's a topic we talk very often. We talked about it last Sunday. And we have a bunch of activities. The EODIR (phonetic) is working with mentors and newcomers. But I think also outreach is important, like just going out and actually talking about the IETF so people know how it works and they're aware of it. There's a whole bunch of things.

I do agree to the point that we need to bring a little bit more strategy into that and actually make a plan and then execute it. It's also something that we are discussing.

>> MARTIN DUKE: I would just say also -- I'll make a general point about the comment about sort of transparency about chair assignments.

Without speaking about the merits of this case, which I'm not particularly familiar with, these are essentially personnel actions and there are reasons to remove a chair that should not be disclosed in public.

>> LARS EGGERT: We have got three minutes and three people in the queue. So if you are in the queue, please let be brief.

Vesna is next in queue.

Did you join the queue on the Meetecho? No? Okay. All right. Then let's hope we have time for you.

>> VESNA MANOJLOCIC: I'm a relative newcomer. And what I've heard about the IETF is that we make decisions by humming, and I haven't heard any humming until now.

(Applause)

>> LARS EGGERT: Okay. I'm going to fix this. Please hum for Vesna now.

(Humming)

All right. There you go. We digitized the hums with the Meetecho tool. Sorry for that.

All right, Rudiger.

>> RUDIGER VOLK: Looking at mailing lists when working group products are

pushed over to IESG, once in a while, I did see so many changes coming out of that, that I would like to ask, well, okay what is your feeling whoever -- well, okay, less rework should be required or is that something that is, in general, at an acceptable level?

>> Rudiger, clearly, during the IESG evaluation, when the content is technically changed, we typically run another IETF last call because we need to get a consensus on what they've changed. Whether it's been done all the times, I cannot guarantee. But normally there's a process. And I'm seeing my fellow ADs are doing the same as I do.

>> RUDIGER VOLK: So the follow-up there would be, I haven't done any statistics on this. Just remembered some observations. Is anybody running statistics so we see what percentage of last recall, recycling happens?

>> WARREN KUMARI: Let me quickly hop in as well. I don't think we have any stats like that because a large number of then changes happens when ADs are doing review. They're purely editorial, a huge number of grammar issues and things like that. So I don't think you can really just do a useful thing other than reading them all. Although, I would point out if people send better-reviewed documents to the IESG, there will probably be less changes when we do ours.

>> Let me add to that as well. I actually recently sent a document back a couple of weeks ago where I felt that the diff was too big and that I couldn't really determine anymore whether it still had working group consensus. So I actually sent it back to the working group for a short working group last call.

I think in general, that's what a responsible AD does after it goes through the process from when it's gone from publication requested through the pipeline. Just before sending it to the RFC editor, you have to check and see how are these changes -- are there actually any, like, "must" or "should" keyword changes because that could be a single line that could be enough to send it back to the working group. It's not just about the bulk of the text.

>> And the same thing happens in the (indiscernible) stage.

>> WARREN KUMARI: Which there is now a mailing list for.

>> LARS EGGERT: Tony Li.

>> TONY LI: Hi, Tony Li, Juniper. I would like to respond to Robin. The decision Andrew had to make was a difficult one, but I believe it was absolutely necessary. The relevant working group has been dysfunctional for a very, very long time. And without making a change, it was going to continue in that way and that's simply not acceptable.

The decision was regrettable. I wish that there had been a better way, but I definitely support it. Thank you.

>> One more from (saying name). One of the groups I belonged for many, many years, I still remember our chair, George (saying name). When George stepped down, the whole meeting room, people stand up with respect for many, many -- long time.

So this even happened many years ago, looks like it happened yesterday.

I think now is also -- I think for MPLS is even longer than George, right? I think now should also have this kind of respect from the people, at least MPLS group.

From the mailing list, I can see that we just kick off Loa without discussing with Loa.

This is not smooth. What I can see, it was not smooth.

And also, we don't give a chance for people to express respect for Loa who make huge contribution to MPLS and also to the community. That's all I'm going to say.

>> Thank you. I'll respond very briefly to that.

I'd like to repeat what -- I think it was Martin who said there are personnel matters that shouldn't be talked about on the stage.

And the other thing I'll say is that there was actually a wonderful outpouring of thanks to Loa on the MPLS mailing list after that action, which I thought was great. And I have nothing bad to say about that.

But I will disagree that there was no opportunity to express respect for Loa on the mailing list. Thank you.

>> LARS EGGERT: Thanks, all. I close the queue. We're a little bit over time, but thanks for sticking around. Hope we'll see all of you and your friends in Brisbane.

(Applause)