

IETF 121 Plenary

November 6, 2024

Dublin, Ireland

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: This is a good lighting. This is a good lighting for me. Good afternoon, everyone. We're going to get started. This is the -- there we go. This is sunrise now.

This is the IETF 121 Plenary here in Dublin, and welcome to all those that are online joining from around the world.

I want to say how excited I am to be back in Dublin and back in Ireland. There's a tremendous commitment here to Internet standards. And they are committed, not only to the work here we do, but they absolutely want conformance and compliance. And they have fielded a new workforce for us that provides the security patrol for our RFCs here.

So this was observed in the wild. Hopefully, if you have been out and about, you got a chance to see that.

Before we get started, a few administrative things to call out. The Note Well, of course, applies here, as it does to any of the other meetings here that we have. And this enumerates our mandatory responsibilities around intellectual property, anti-harassment, and associated processes for how we do standardization in this organization.

Best practices, we have a number of you online. So thank you, really, for joining us. So please keep your audio muted. Keep your video off. When you are in the queue and you are recognized to speak, feel free to turn on your video, and of course, unmute. And best practice from the experiences we've had with Meetecho is a headset really works best.

We have a very full agenda. We have the normal things we do where we walk through the various leadership bodies, but before we do that, we have a few special topics to talk about. So we'll hear from our host Cisco. And then, we'll hear from the Internet Society, giving service to critical service awards. And then we'll hear about an exciting development in supporting the free and open Internet from ARIN.

If you're looking to make commentary in the mic line, the batting order this time around is IESG, followed by IAB, and we'll be closing with the LLC.

We're all sitting here. It's a lot of logistics to really make this meeting the success it is, on a non-technical level, to give us the forum to talk about the standards and protocols. And that is directly because of the support of the different organizations that you see listed here. That's for the Secretariat. That's the Meetecho team. That's the NOC. It's the support from the professional staff in the LLC, the tools and the hackathon. There will be a lot of clapping throughout this evening, but I want to start here to really thank the team that made all of this really possible for us.

(Applause)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: And with that, I would like to turn the stage over to our host, Cisco, so Cullen, please come on up. A few words.

>> CULLEN JENNINGS: Thank you, Roman. I'm going to try to take those few words advice to heart here.

So I know that all kinds of people travel incredibly to get here. I know a huge amount of work that everyone puts in. And on behalf of Cisco, we just wanted to say thank you to everyone for the stuff we do here. It makes a huge impact to the world. Our stuff is used all over the place. The stuff that is developed out of this community has changed so many things over the past 20 years. And thank you all for this. So with that, have a great evening.

(Applause)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: So on behalf of the organization, we would very much like to thank you, Cullen, as the representative for Cisco for your support in making this possible here at this meeting. So there's that. And there's a photo for us.

I think there's a handshaking photo.

>> CULLEN JENNINGS: Perfect.

(Laughter)

>> CULLEN JENNINGS: I hope you can ship this for me.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: In fact, I can. Thank you so much, Cullen.

Next up, I welcome to the stage -- if Sally Wentworth could come up and please talk us through the two service awards.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Good afternoon, everyone. I am Sally Wentworth, and I'm delighted to be here today to honor some truly remarkable individuals.

For those of you who don't know me, I am the new Internet Society's CEO and President. And it is a true pleasure to be with you here today and to be part of this community.

It is my honor today to present two awards. First, the Itojun Service Award and the Jonathan B. Postel Service Award. First, I'll begin with the 2024 Itojun Service Award.

The Itojun Service Award is named after Dr. Jun-ichiro "Itojun" Hagino. The award recognizes and commemorates extraordinary dedication of Itojun to IPv6 development. Itojun worked as a senior researcher at the Internet Initiative Japan, IIJ, and was a member of the Board of the Widely Integrated Distributed Environment or WIDE Project. He served on the KAME Project as the IPv6 Samurai and was a member of the Internet Architecture Board.

After he passed away, far too soon, in 2007 at the young age of only 37, this service award was established by friends of Itojun and has been administered by the Internet Society. The award is focused on technical contributions related to the development or operation of IPv6 networking, keeping with the spirit of servicing the Internet.

The recipients are chosen by an award selection committee composed of former Itojun awardees and other members of the technical community, including people well-known here within the IETF such as Ole Jacobsen, Randy Bush, and Bob Hendon. The award was presented from 2009 to 2012. And this year the committee decided to conclude the award as IPv6 deployment has become increasingly driven by organizations rather than individuals.

And so, it is my great pleasure to announce that the final award is presented to Jen Linkova.

(Applause)

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Many of you --

(Applause)

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Many of you here will know very well of Jen's long-time advocacy for IPv6. The words of the committee were that she was selected "for her tireless and selfless efforts to make IPv6 more deployable in enterprise networks." So please join me again in congratulating Jen.

(Applause)

>> JEN LINKOVA: Well, what can I say? Thank you. Thank you, everyone who made this happen, for believing in me and my humble work. I just try to get some fun and look what happened. I'm still getting fun, yep.

So yeah, thank you, again. I never met Itojun, but it's a great honor to be somehow associated with his work. And the first -- I think it was the first thing I learned about the IPv6 Project. So it's -- as I say, it's a real honor.

And to be honest, I'm really glad to hear you concluded it because it's now not a personal-driven but organizational- and community-driven effort because it's not about me. It's not about what I've done. It's about everyone, you here, my colleagues, my coworkers, everyone else. So it's not me.

And I wish Itojun were here. And despite some people still not believing that we are going to get this done, I hope that we are going to continue to work on what he started and finally complete this eventually. I know it's job security, but I would really see IPv6 becoming first-class citizen and people start saying, Oh, who care about IPv4? Nobody using it. So let's continue working on it. Thank you very much, everyone, again.

(Applause)

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Turning now to an award with which many of you are familiar, the 2024 Jonathan B. Postel Service Award.

As many of you know well, John Postel played a critical role in the formation of the RFC series that we are all here this week to develop. He was IANA in those early days and was involved in the IAB and the IRTF and was the first actual individual member of the Internet Society in 1992. He was truly an Internet pioneer.

The Jonathan B. Postel Service Award is presented annually to an individual or organization that has made outstanding and sustained contributions in service of the Internet Community.

The selection criteria are focused on three aspects which reflect Postel's service to the Internet Community: Technical contributions, leadership, and service to the community.

The selection committee has made up of former Postel awardees, many of whom are well-known within the IETF. Because the committee did not select an awardee last year, they decided to give two awards this year.

The first recipient of the 2024 Jonathan B. Postel Service Award is Dr. Steven Crocker.

(Applause)

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Dr. Crocker has been involved in the Internet from its very

earliest days. Steve worked directly with John Postel and was the author of the very first RFC, RFC 1, along with many other documents of that time.

As we all know here, these document, the RFCs, are essential to the evolution of the Internet. He was nominated for his many contributions to the Internet and its predecessor, the ARPANET. Dr. Crocker was also inducted into the Internet Hall of Fame as part of the inaugural class in 2012 and continues to be actively involved in making the Internet better, particularly in the area of DNS and security.

Please join me again in congratulating Dr. Steve Crocker.

(Applause)

>> DR. STEVE CROCKER: This will be short. First of all, thank you all. 1968, John Postel, Vint Cerf, and I were among graduate students in the newly-formed computer science department at UCLA. We didn't arrive there intending to work on networking, I don't think. I don't know what the others had in mind as their own personal agendas, but I know what mine was, and it was off in a different direction. But UCLA was selected to be the first site on the ARPANET. Really four sites that were sort of selected all at once. And we were drawn in to this network project, sort of like a vortex. And it was inescapable, and we just got sucked in and kept going. I tried to escape some years later and got drawn back in again.

It was a technically interesting project. I think each of us had some different views as to where it was going to go. I had some very lofty ideas. To me, connecting the computers that look like it was obviously useful, would have a big impact, but wasn't really scientifically deep. So I used to sneer that it was -- only had socially-redeeming values.

We're now 50-plus years later. Lots and lots of adventures. Lots of interesting people. From different walks of life. Scientists, entrepreneurs, government bureaucrats. Made friends. Met my wife. And lawyers. Lots and lots of lawyers.

Endless opportunities and challenges. And a great deal of luck. So with that, thank you very much.

(Applause)

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Our second recipient of the 2024 Jonathan B. Postel Service Award is Dr. Xing Li.

Dr. Li was nominated for his contributions to Internet development in China, Asia Pacific, and globally. Professor Li is the Deputy Director of the China Education and Research Network Center and is one of the pioneers of the Internet deployment in China.

He was inducted into the Internet Hall of Fame in 2021. He served on the IAB, authored 11 RFCs, and is actively contributing right now to a number of IETF drafts on IPv6 and routing. Unfortunately, Dr. Li was unable to travel to the IETF this year, but he provided some remarks via video.

>> DR. XING LI: I am deeply honored to receive this award today. Firstly, I would like to express my gratitude to the nomination and the selection committee.

Today is the day that holds my personal significance. The year 2024 marks the 30th anniversary of the China journey in the global Internet Community. I feel incredibly fortunate to have been part of that journey. Exactly 16 years ago at 72nd IETF held here in Dublin, I presented our work on stateless IPv4-IPv6 translation technology.

This enabled IPv6-only CERNET2 to community with global IPv4 Internet. The standardization of this technologies now embedded in most modern operating systems, making it possible to make IPv6-only a reality.

In the above process, John's wisdom is guiding us for the success. I would like to quote my favorite two.

The first one in RFC 791. The Internet protocol implements two basic functions: Addressing and the fragmentation, which is the key for the above IPv4-IPv6 translation technology.

And the second one, Postel's law: Be liberal in what you accept and conservative in what you send.

I believe that today's award is not merely an individual recognition but a tribute to the entire Chinese Internet technical community.

Over the past three decades, they have all benefited greatly from the knowledge and the guidance of the Internet pioneers, the IETF, and other related technical groups.

As I stand here today, I'm keenly aware that I represent the older generation who has been fortunate enough to witness and to contribute to this remarkable journey.

However, we must not forget that our young colleagues now face new challenges such as Internet fragmentation, artificial intelligence, and the digital divide.

Regardless of what lies ahead, I still have my belief that we must continue to improve Internet technology and to, more importantly, preserve the connectivity and the singularity of the global Internet. Thank you, once again, for this tremendous honor.

(Applause)

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Once again, congratulations to both Dr. Crocker and Dr. Li for the Postel Service Award and to Jen Linkova for the Itojun Service Award.

I would also like to ask you to think about people who have provided service to our technical community who might be nominated for future awards. We will be calling for nominations for the 2025 Jonathan B. Postel Service Award in the spring of 2025. So please let us know if you have suggestions.

And thank you, all, again for all that you do for the Internet.

(Applause)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Thank you for that reset. So I welcome up to stage Mark Kosters, the CTO of the American Registry for Internet Numbers, ARIN, for some exciting news about support to the IETF.

>> MARK KOSTERS: So much like Steve Crocker, I don't have many words to say, but do I have three minutes of excitement, all right? So let's go ahead and get started.

So what I would like to talk to you today is about an endowment. But before I do that, I would like to tell you a little bit about myself.

So I've actually been a part of the IETF Community ever since IETF 25 that happened in Washington, D.C. in November 1992.

I've had the opportunity to work for three wonderful companies that all thought that IETF

is important. And that was Network Solutions, Verisign, and now ARIN. They all thought that the IETF was an important institution to support and participate in standards development and evolution.

To that end, I'm happy to have the honor of announcing today that ARIN has made a second \$1 million U.S. contribution to the IETF Endowment to reflect the strong commitment of our community to the Internet protocols and related work of the IETF.

(Applause)

>> MARK KOSTERS: In 2016, the ARIN Board of Trustees approved contributing up to \$2 million U.S. to Internet Society's IETF Endowment, created to provide the IETF with direct financial support, aimed at ensuring long-term, sustainable funding for the development evolution, and use of Internet protocols.

The initial contribution of \$1 million U.S. was made in July 2016 in coordination with the contributions from the other Regional Internet Registries and the Internet Society. In a demonstration of ARIN's continued support for the work of the IETF and thousands of volunteer contributors from around the world who work to develop and maintain open protocols that make the Internet possible, the ARIN Board of Trustees voted in October of 2023 to approve a gift of the remaining plush funds of \$1 million U.S. That's what we just had.

ARIN strongly encourages its fellow organizations in the Internet Community to make their own contributions to the IETF Endowment, helping support efforts that are critical to advancing the technical foundation for the global Internet today and for the future.

So thank you.

(Applause)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: So on behalf of the IETF Community, we thank you so much for your support and contribution for free and open Internet, and good things are ahead.

>> MARK KOSTERS: Absolutely.

(Applause)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Thanks so much.

Okay. So now we're going to switch over to the various reports from the various leadership bodies, and I'm up first for the IETF Chair Report.

I've prepared the usual participant statistics in various ways, and we're going to talk about the statements and some of the things that the IESG has been working on. And then other hot topics or topics that have previously come up that I would like to report on.

Some stats about how folks participated in the IETF 121 and how many came. Some raw numbers. You can see there on the left side, the one new figure that we have there that we don't often talk about is how many of the people that are participating in the meeting are absolutely brand new. I'm not going to embarrass some of those that are here in the room by pointing to them or making them raise their hands. But by the numbers, 16% of everyone that participated in this meeting, this is their first time here at the IETF, and all I can say is welcome. I hope it's been kind of a great experience for you, and I hope you come back.

(Applause)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: The other sets of things I wanted to briefly talk about here

because this comes up a lot at the mic line, and I've heard it come up a lot in some of the mailing lists in preparation for this meeting was around fee waivers. Now, we have a significant number of remote participants, and it's phenomenal they're able to participate like the on-site participants through the Meetecho tool, but there often is this question that comes up with the fact that remote participation has a fee associated with it. And that is exactly correct. There is, in fact, a fee to participate. But here in the IETF and with commitment from the IETF Administrative LLC, we do not want that fee to be a barrier to participation in the standards process. So I want to reiterate again that there's an unlimited fee waiver program that's running which means practically, if you want to participate remotely and you cannot afford the fee, with no questions asked, you can get a fee waiver, and you will be granted that fee waiver. To just give you a sense of that, on every given meeting, hundreds of people participate in this process. So roughly half of all those that participated remotely in this meeting used a fee waiver. So again, I want to reiterate, spread the word to colleagues, if they want to participate online and are unable to pay the fee, there is a fee waiver, and they can absolutely join us this technical community here having the conversations on the technical standards and advancing the Internet.

Some of the other things that are there are questions that come up about the on-site fee waiver process. That's a little bit of a smaller program that we run there. And you can see some of the stats there from the discretionary process that the Chair has and the Chair of the IRTF.

This is a slightly different presentation of the slide that we typically have. You're used to seeing a giant pie chart kind of with countries that participated highest. It's a bar chart now, and also the origin of the participants, as reported, is pinned on the map there. So we have participation from around 66 countries around the world there. And then on the right side, you can see the countries of origin where 10 or more participants came here to the IETF.

And then the other thing I wanted to highlight is contextualizing how many people are participating here in Dublin relative to some of the other meetings that happened in the past. And you can see kind of where we are. It's roughly akin to prior European meetings. The distribution of on-site versus remote is a little bit on the lower end in the sense that there's more on-site participation and a little bit less remote participation. And again, I want to reiterate, once again, if we do the look-back period for all the meetings you see on the screen, the spread has been around half of all participants that have been remote have made use of the fee waiver program. So I will repeat again, participating online does not cost money if you cannot afford it. That is not a friction. Please spread the word for your colleagues to join us, to join us in the meeting because we do have this fee waiver program.

All right. So that's about the on-site meeting in your Working Groups, but I always like to talk about future and one of the most important things we do here is really think about the future. And we do run the IETF childcare program where you can participate in the meeting and drop your child off, and they get high-quality care. And how very confident that they are to -- the future, I looked at the feedback. It looked like there was a lot of excitement, but I keyed on, if you look at the six quotes that we got, one of them was around cookies. So that's really on-brand and on-message for future participation in this organization because there are few things more important than the cookie selection.

(Applause)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: The IESG made a number of announcements and statements here.

I'm sure you saw them on the IETF announce list, but perhaps you did not notice that this morning we did release an additional statement on addressing comments and crediting contribution. This was largely a reiteration of the critical elements that are mandatory to follow in the standards process, which is that comments provided need to be adjudicated and evaluated relative to the Working Group consensus process that we have. And then the criticality of providing attribution and crediting those contributions in our standards process. So if you have not yet seen them because you have been busy with the Working Group meetings, please do take a look at that. The IESG believes that's critically important to the success of the standards process.

These are pointers to some stats. I will note that the appeal count there says zero. I was told right before I walked into this meeting that an appeal has been filed. So it is now an appeal of one. That has happened since IETF 120. And then here are some other pointers that get you to all the material that I'm about to talk about.

There's been questions in the community around what is the IESG kind of working on? What's the throughput of documents? So I want to bring up this chart that I introduced at the last Plenary.

So it's a little bit of a representation of what I would call the middle of the document pipeline process. So when you're working in the Working Groups, that's phase one. Then it gets sent to the IESG, and the IESG does things with it. And once community comments have been adjudicated, IESG comments have been adjudicated, it then gets sent to the RFC Editor.

This chart is really reflecting the in and the out of what goes into the IESG and gives you a sense of what is the workload during formal telechats that your IESG is working on.

And the one thing I wanted to point out, the last time I presented this chart -- so this is the second from the left, the IETF 119 and IETF 120 -- a comment was made, look, the blue bar is much higher than the orange bar, and the blue is the input to the IESG, and the orange is kind of the output. And I tried to explain that, listen, documents sometimes take a while to process. Sometimes that's IESG. Sometimes it's kind of not. So I just wanted to point out the opposite has happened coming into this meeting. Since the last time we met together, the orange bar is higher than the blue bar. So the throughput out of the IESG is higher than what happened -- than what got sent in. And again, that's not necessarily the IESG did more things. It's just that, perhaps, the community conversation took a little longer there, and things unwedged before the meeting. What we're largely looking for is not large variability between those two bars.

The other feedback I've heard over the past months that I started talking about last meeting and doing again was there was concern around documents sitting a long time in the publication request queue with the various Area Directors. Here's the re-rendering of the stats as of a couple days ago when that chart was made, which was that all the documents sitting in the publication request queue of your Area Directors was sent after the last meeting. And the vast majority of them actually were sent in the last month, sometimes on the order of a couple days.

So in a sense, one of the stats I reported last time was what is the balance of documents and pub req from the last meeting. This time, everything is new since the last meeting. And I really want to say thank you to the ADs about how hard they worked on that. Because the magic that made that possible is the load balancing which was Area Directors helped each other in area and out of area. So there was area one and area two and Area Directors not in the

area stepped in to help process documents that were taking a little longer on the pipeline. And this really reiterates all the great working relationships and how the IESG is working on a team for the common goal of getting standards through the process.

One other -- the last part of the pipeline that I wanted to talk about is things in the Working Group, things in the IESG, and the last one is it goes in the RFC Editor. This is an area where the IESG gets all sorts of questions because the IESG is done, so now do I get an RFC? No. There's a little bit more to do because it needs to be run through the RFC Editor to, frankly, make it sometimes much more readable and a whole lot of other processes. But the big question is: How long does it take to get to? So I wanted to flash up stats that you can already get and have been able to get for quite some time, but maybe you were not aware you have access to this.

If you go to the URL that's listed there in source, these stats are generated -- someone will correct me if I'm wrong -- twice a week to give you a real-time indication of how long things are taking to process in the pipeline. And I want to make two commentaries.

First, to set expectations, look at the blue bar. And what that means is that right now, the median wait time for documents in there is about seven weeks. If the IESG has done your document, it will pop out no faster to RFC than those kind of seven weeks. And that number goes down a little bit, that number kind of goes up.

But what I really want to draw your attention to is the things you in the Working Group have a lot of control over and that's what's in brown and in red. So these are the things where the participants with the authors, the editors, and the Working Groups need to get involved.

So you probably heard about this and its origin story of it was the final check with the authors, and roughly, let's turn it around in 48 hours. Well, that 48 hours, right now, the median time is about four weeks. If you're wanting to move your document faster, respond to the RFC Editor faster, and let's shrink that time.

The other place that actually introduces the most significant latency are those things in red. To decode what misref 1G and the others mean, it means missing reference. And 1G means your document is missing the normative reference. So that is the document that you're normative referencing has not yet been submitted. And 2G means it's one indirect, which is the document you're referencing is missing one. And in the 3 means the document you're referencing that you're referencing is missing kind of one.

So this is entirely in the control of Working Groups. So you submit the document, but it's going to wait there until the other documents are done. So this is a place where Working Groups can provide a little bit of energy because that, in fact, introduces significant delays, as you can see there, on the order of tens of weeks.

Okay. So the last thing I wanted to do before I get off the stage is to remind everyone, just like many of you, you have come here through the support of other people. And your Area Directors are sponsored by a whole array of different organizations. So I wanted to acknowledge the employers of all your Area Directors that make their effort possible in helping us advance this standards process. So thank you to those employers.

(Applause)

All right. I invite to mic, Tommy Pauly, Chair of the IAB.

>> TOMMY PAULY: Thank you. Thank you, Roman. All right. I'm Tommy Pauly, and I'm the

current IAB Chair. I'm going to give you a very quick update on what the IAB has been doing.

I'll try to be as fast as Cullen was earlier, but we probably won't get quite that well.

So you can find the full report that we've written up for the IAB, what we've been doing for the past couple months at our website, as well as in the proceedings for this meeting. Some of the highlights here and some of the actions that you can take.

First, we have a workshop that is coming up in December. This is the Next Era of Network Management Operations workshop or NEMOPS. And if you're interested in participating in that, the deadline for paper submission is November 17th. So please do that if you are interested.

We also held a workshop recently in September that was very successful on AI-control. And this is looking at how we have mechanisms to allow or prevent AI scraping, various information from sites, and other related issues. And we have an initial report from that workshop that has been published just this week. So please read that, check it out. It will go through some more revisions before being published, but we're excited to share that progress.

We also, on the IAB, we deal with many appointments, and so there are places where we rely on getting feedback from the community. So we have just sent out the Call for Feedback for the ICANN NomCom nominees. That is now open. Please do provide us feedback.

Also we have a feedback period that is closing just today for the IRTF Chair candidates. Colin, who is speaking after me, has been the IRTF Chair for a while and is going to be stepping down. We expect to be selecting the new IRTF Chair very shortly, and that announcement should be coming in the next couple weeks.

If you have any feedback around those appointments, you can email the IAB Chair and Execd@iab.org. And if you have general comments or thoughts that you would like to share with the IAB, you can email the whole IAB at IAB@IAB.org. And that's all for me. And next, I will hand over to Colin.

(Applause)

>> COLIN PERKINS: Thank you, Tommy. My name is Colin Perkins. I'm the IRTF Chair.

As many of all know, one of the things we organize in the IRTF is the Applied Networking Research Prize. The ANRP is awarded to recognize some of the best recent results in applied networking. It's awarded to recognize interesting, new research ideas that have potential relevance to the standards community. And it's awarded to recognize upcoming people that are likely to have an impact on Internet standards and technologies.

We are very pleased to make these awards. We are very pleased for the sponsorship and support of the Internet Society, Comcast, and of NBCUniversal to support these awards and to make them possible.

The nominations for the 2025 Applied Networking Research Prize are open now and will remain open until the 15th of November. So if you know any good applied networking research, if you know any good people who you think deserve one of the awards, please do nominate, either third-party nominations, or please nominate your own research, if you think it's of suitable quality.

I'm also very pleased to announce the award that we -- we made two ANRP awards earlier this week. Two absolutely fantastic papers, to Sawsan El-Zahr, who -- I can't see her, but she is here somewhere this week, in the back here -- had an absolutely fantastic paper on

reducing the carbon footprint of Internet routing. And to Mingshi Wu who unfortunately couldn't make to it this meeting but had a really great paper looking at understanding censorship of fully-encrypted Internet traffic.

As I say, two absolutely fantastic awards, two great papers. If you missed the talks on Monday, please do look at them. They're online, and the videos are on YouTube. And Sawsan, in the back there, please do talk to her if you're interested in reducing the carbon footprints.

(Applause)

>> COLIN PERKINS: In addition to the prize, we also organized the Applied Networking Research Workshop. I'm pleased to announce that the ANRW 2025, as usual, will co-locate with the July IETF meeting in Madrid in July 2025. The organizers this time will be Anna Brunström who is a long-time IETF participant in the Transport Area, who I'm sure many of you know, and Ryan Beckett from Microsoft Research.

The call for papers for the workshop we expect to release early in the new year, around January, February time. The deadline for submissions will be in April 2025. So if you have any papers to submit to the workshop, please do consider submitting to the ANRW next year.

We also run a Diversity Travel Grant program. We're very pleased to offer this to try to bring in early-career academics and PhD students from underrepresented groups, from underrepresented parts of the world, to attend the IETF and IRTF meetings.

We have some statistics on the slide -- I hope that is readable -- showing the break down by gender and by geographic location. And I'm very, very pleased that we can offer this, and thank you very much to the sponsors who are supporting this.

Travel grants for the coming meeting in Bangkok, the call for travel grants will open shortly after this meeting. So if you're interested in applying for a travel grant, please do look at the URL shared on the slide in the coming weeks and make sure to apply.

Finally for me, I spoke about the IRTF Code of Conduct at the last meeting. I was hoping to announce that we had approved that this time. We're not quite there. But hopefully, in the next week or so, we will have approved the Code of Conduct. This is in the final approval ballot from the IRSG. We're just sorting out the last details. So hopefully, we will see this approved in the coming days.

Thank you to the IRSG members. Thank you to everybody else who contributed and who commented on the Code of Conduct. I think this is a really important document, so thank you to everybody. And I look forward to putting this into place.

And that's all I have. Next up is Dean from the NomCom.

(Applause)

>> COLIN PERKINS: I'm supposed to tell jokes or sing or something, right?

>> DEAN BOGDANOVIC: Yeah. It's working. Good.

Hi. Good evening. And I'm Dean Bogdanovic, the official Chair for 2024. And as you know, this is the NomCom composition for the 2024- 2025. There are a few of us here who still have the energy after 12-hour interviewing multiple candidates and -- sorry, multiple nominees, as well as having initial deliberations among us on grading it.

So we usually have the ten voting members and the seven liaisons. The liaisons are

helpful, trying to, you know -- by explaining certain things for the bodies that we are looking for to fill in the positions. And we have to fill in quite a few positions, but for us to be able to do that, we also need a little bit more support from the community.

I said we have some really nice statistics on our private pages, and I wanted to share this with you.

So we received a lot of nominations. And there was quite a few of very well-qualified nominees that are, you know, being recognized by the community that they could be doing a good leadership work for the community. But it's a process that requires dedication. And at the end, we come out to a pretty small pool of the nominees that accept the nomination as well as go through the whole process.

The one thing which I would encourage you, if you're getting nominated but you don't feel that you have time this year, accept the nomination and provide a feedback. Because sometimes if you just provide the negative answer, then people might not be nominating you next year. And I receive some feedback: I couldn't do it this year, but I can do it next year; please keep me in mind. It's not for me to keep you in mind. It's for you to inform the community that you're working with -- that you will be willing to do it next year.

And even when we, as NomCom, say, Based on all the criteria that we were looking for, you're not a good nominee to become a candidate this year, please come back next year because it's a learning process. The same way how NomCom is trying to improve to make the whole process friendlier and easier for the nominees to become leaders, this is also a good thing that when you're interviewing for a job for a long time, having a couple interviews will help you get into the -- to learn how to interview and provide the answers. We are interviewing some really good nominees who can be candidates, but they don't have the experience in interviewing. They get a little bit -- I don't want to say afraid, but uncomfortable in a situation like this. Because it can be uncomfortable. You're answering in front of 10 people or 15 people. And it's like, you know, defending your PhD thesis or, you know, your master's degree. And it is not that.

So based on these stats, I would encourage you to accept the nomination. Try it out to go through the nomination process, and don't view the negative answer as a definite no. This is like an encouragement, for many of you, especially for the younger participants in the IETF to try to do this process again. And if any of you who will receive a negative answer, as many of my previous NomCom co-chairs, I'm very happy to provide you feedback and provide you some additional mentoring, how you can improve your experience in order to be in a leadership position.

We are looking to fill -- I forgot the exact -- 17 positions. We got one extra because Alissa Cooper is stepping down from the IAB. And that was an additional position that has to be filled in. But another than that, it's a pretty standard NomCom year with the exception of one extra IAB term.

I like this one year extra IAB term. We are asking all the nominees if they would prefer one-year or two-year terms. But sometimes the one-year term can be viewed, oh, it's an opportunity for me to show myself, my contribution, especially if I'm a more inexperienced participant where I can step into that role and be happy to accept it because you can show your energy and your good intentions that people will value, and especially in the next year interview, you will have an advantage. Could be very positive compared to the other nominees.

And lastly, NomCom here is to make decisions based on your feedback. We really need your feedback on the nominees to make the best decision for the IETF leadership. We are not the ones who are making the decisions. We are the ones who are evaluating the nominees' feedback with the community feedback and weigh in who is the best based on the both input.

You can say equally, both the community and the NomCom. And I encourage you to provide the feedback. Feedback is open until Friday. We still have interview on Friday morning. And we will start deliberation Friday midday, after -- like midmorning to midday.

After that, I will close the feedback but would appreciate -- because we have a slate of great candidates, and we have a hard job to make decisions. And the more feedback we get from you, it will be easier for us to provide that and make the right decision. Thank you.

And Glenn is right now.

(Applause)

>> GLENN DEEN: Hi, everybody. I'm Glenn Deen. I'm the Chair of the IETF Trust. And the President of the Intellectual Property Management Corporation which is what the Trust is becoming.

Before I get started, I want to call out not only is Steve Crocker an award recipient, you were on the first batch of the IETF Trust from 2005 to 2007. So thank you.

So IETF Trust, I've talked in the past about what we do. We manage the intellectual property, copyrights, trademarks, and things like that, but not patents, for the IETF. And we enable the IETF to do its work. Without being told, no, you can't do stuff because you don't hold the copyrights. We hold the coppery rights to RFCs, Internet-Drafts, and things like. And we hold the copyrights of the photographs being taken right now of me being up here.

There with five trustees. Three of them are appointed by the NomCom, one by the IESG, and one from ISOC. These are the five trustees.

So we would like to give a report out every time on what we've been up to. Since we last met at IETF 120, we've had two licensing requests come in. Out of the two licensing requests, we have given one which is a new trademark licensing request. That's actually part of the restructuring efforts. The existing IETF Trust got a license request back from the IPMC to manage the IANA marks. So that everything can keep going while we're doing the transition work. And one of the licensing requests was not granted.

We issued no direct RFC licenses. And we also did not get sued which is always awesome. Nor did we sue anybody.

So we are doing a restructuring. As I've talked to this group before about, we are converting from a Virginia trust to a different legal structure, Delaware not-for-profit corporation. We had really tried really hard to keep the name the same. We wanted to keep the name IETF Trust in the conversation. Because we all know the Trust. It's been around since 2005. Unfortunately, the word "trust" has a lot of very specific meanings legally and in other ways. We weren't able to do that. We tried. We spent a lot of time discussing various strategies, various approaches. In the end, somebody said, it's time, pull off the Band-Aid. So we did.

So we're rebranding the trust. The naming of it, within the community going forward, will be called the IETF Intellectual Property Management, IPM. We tried really hard, trust me. I can show you the email chain. And the -- so IPM is what we're going to be called short form

instead of trust. And the legal part of that backs that up is the IETF Intellectual Property Management Corporation.

So what does this mean? It means a couple things. One, can you see on the left, the old and the new. The old was called the IETF Trust. And the new is the IPM. One was a Virginia trust. One is a Delaware corporation. One is created in 2005. The other was in 2023.

The other big changes that are going to happen, the IETF trustees, website -- it's going to be maintained forever. Because the documents there actually pertain forever to the IDs and the RFCs that were published or submitted during those documents' lifetimes. So the documents you see, TLP 1 through 5, which are the rules for how you can use the documents, they're going to be maintained as legacy. And the RFC Contributor Rights, they started out in what 1992 and culminated with one we all know, RFC 5378. That's all going to get updated, as you can see on the other side.

So we're going to be sending out some emails. We're going to let everybody know what's going on. But I wanted to let you know that's the overall plan. We have the Trust legal provisions. We are cleverly going to rename that to the Technical Legal Provisions so we can still call at this time TLP. And we're going to start from version 6. So we have versions 1 through 5 and then version 6.

Before anybody says, My gosh, you can't do that, I'll point out, the original name for the Trust Legal Provisions used to be the Trust Legal Policies. So they haven't always been called legal provisions.

And we're also going to provide a revision and update to RFC 5378. So that will get a new number. And we're going to work with Roman who said he's willing to AD sponsor that to get that done and published. And I want to point out one last thing on that. We are not changing the IETF's Intellectual Property Rules as part of this things. Those are all staying exactly the same. We are only changing the corporate backer, the legal entity that owns the copyrights.

So practically, what you're really going see change is the boilerplate. This is the thing that appears at the top of IDs and RFCs. It's going to change from saying IETF Trust over to saying Intellectual Property Management Corporation. And the URL is going to change, and the name of the TLP is going to change. That seems pretty simple. It's a lot of work.

So if you are a tools developer, and we're already working with the IETF tools, but if you have your own templates, your own cheat sheets, your own tools for developing Internet-Drafts, one of these you're going to have to start planning for now is changing the boilerplate that goes at the top of your IDs when you prepare them for submission. Work with the Tools Team for that and IDs will take care of that stuff. But if you have your own tools, this is your notice to start working on it now.

We will set, in the future, a cut-over date. And that will depend on when we can publish the new updated RFC 5378 and the new TLP 6.0. We are working on those. When we know what the date for those will be, we will tell everybody so that you know what the cut-over date will be. And then, after that date, the new boilerplate will be in use.

After that, so that puts everything in place. It's been a long journey. We are getting really close to shutting the old trust down and being only the ITMC. To get there, we have the things on the one side here which are the IETF related, and it's the update in the boilerplate and the tools that support it.

The other part this is the IANA. When the IANA transition took place a few years ago, some things from the IANA were given over to the trustees to manage. Three trademarks and a few domain names. We are working with those parties to get approval for those transfers to the new entity and get the agreements in place and signed off so that we can give to it the new corporation.

So once those two big things are done, we're going to do the very final step which is any final tax filings, and then we're going to shut down the Virginia trust. And at that point, we're going to have champagne and say the restructuring is complete, and the Trust is going back to being very boring.

I hear them clapping. If you want to come and talk to a trustee to know more about this restructuring or what's going on, we are holding office hours tomorrow from 3:30 to 4:30 p.m. And we'll be up in Wicklow, a multipurpose room 2. And if you want to send us an email, that's our email address.

So Jay and Jason.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Before you go leave, do you want to take questions now? Or would you ask that folks come at your office hours?

>> GLENN DEEN: Oh, gosh. We've only had one question.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: I wanted to provide the opportunity. We've come to realize that.
So –

GLENN DEEN: Does anybody want to ask us a question? If you do come see us in office hours. We don't get a lot of visitors. We're not lawyers, but we do legal things. And they're important to the IETF. So if you want to learn more, come and talk to use. We really do like people socializing with us and asking questions about the trust.

(Applause)

>> JAY DALEY: It's only when you come up here you realize there are huge wings over to the left with screens and people sitting there and things.

Hi. I'm Jay Daley, I'm the IETF Executive Director. I'm going to start off by welcoming you all to Dublin and those of you online and a big thank you to Cisco, the host for this meeting. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

>> JAY DALEY: Particularly big thank you for such a short speech. That's excellent.

As you know, the IETF is only able to work because of the sponsors that -- well, it helps significantly though the sponsorship we see from a number of industry organizations, a number of companies. We have a set of sponsorships that are particularly around certain values.

We have diversity and inclusion, we have two gold sponsors there, Akamai and Huawei.

We have running code sponsor value, which is what supports of the hackathon. And we have Ericsson is a gold sponsor there, and Meta as a silver sponsor. So thank you very much for those companies that support those specific areas.

(Applause)

>> JAY DALEY: And, also, a big thank you to our bronze sponsors. I will note, especially,

that we have NTT that has signed up as a bronze accessibility sponsor.

And we have DENIC as our bronze Open Internet sponsor, who are both new to us. Thank you very much for these other sponsors. They help us continue.

(Applause)

>> JAY DALEY: In order to operate, we obviously use a lot of equipment and services, and we receive some very generous donations from a number of organizations.

We have EI For All and INEX who are helping us with connectivity for this meeting, and we have a number of other organizations who provide us equipment, services, and various other things. In some cases, millions of dollars' worth of equipment.

Thank you very much to all these sponsors who help us greatly.

(Applause)

>> JAY DALEY: So, as a reminder, we have an online store where you can order T-shirts. We are also interested in other things that we can potentially sell through this. Please let us know if you think there's something anyone would actually buy. That would be very helpful to us.

It does have worldwide delivery. We've had questions about that. As far as we know, we can get those everywhere.

Take a look at that.

I'm slightly concerned I missed a slide about the global hosts.

So assuming it's not there later.

I will do the people, and then we'll do the global hosts.

So, as Roman mentioned earlier, we have a number of volunteers that help us.

So we have a codesprint over the weekend where we have people who come and give their time to develop code for Datatracker, and then we have the NOC volunteers who come and run the network that we're all now using rather than listening to the conversations. So thank very much to all of them.

(Applause)

>> JAY DALEY: And then we have a team, as you know, a hardworking team. In the background, we have the Secretariat, who has been running the registration desk, sorting out the various issues that people have and other things. We have the Meetecho team who are running the remote participation, which Roman will tell is significantly better than that you might expect in many other forums you go to.

And then we have the NOC team, the professional NOC team that support the volunteers as well. So thank you very much to all of those people.

(Applause)

>> JAY DALEY: You don't need to clap for this one. I'm on there. It always feels a bit weird. But this is the NOC staff -- Sorry. This is the LLC staff of whom most are developers, and then there are Mirja and Greg who do the finances and the administration side of things. Thank you very much to all of them as well.

(Applause)

>> JAY DALEY: Oh, and there it is, the global hosts slide.

So we have these seven organizations that are our global hosts. They're the ones that give us a regular commitment of six to nine years and are sponsoring the meetings, as Cisco is sponsors this meeting.

And so it's a very long-term commitment. We know, from speaking to the global hosts, this is something that they really have to really fight within their organizations to be able to do, and it is a very strong measure of commitment.

So we are very pleased to be able to continue with our global hosts. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

>> JAY DALEY: So we have IETF 122 coming up in Bangkok in March. We do not yet have a host for that. If you're interested, please let us know, and we have sponsorship opportunities that are still available for that one, plenty of those.

Here are our future meeting locations and venues.

We have Bangkok coming up, Madrid in July of next year. We do largely have a host ready to sign for that one.

We then have Montréal in November of next year, and we have Comcast NBCUniversal will be the host of that.

IETF 125 in Asia, which we are currently negotiating with a venue in China or about.

IETF 126 in Vienna, which is back in the same place that we went to in Vienna a couple of years ago.

IETF 127 in San Francisco at Hilton in Union Square. The whole area around there has been cleaned up recently and quite changed. So we think that will be quite a different meeting.

And then IETF 128 in Asia. We haven't yet booked that one. Still looking at things.

We are going to put out some community feedback consultation shortly about some possible venues in India and possibly some other places in Asia coming up soon. And I know that plenty of people have been asking us to go to India for some time, so I expect people are looking forward to that.

So that's it for my bit.

(Applause)

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Thank you, everybody. I'm Jason Livingood from the board. Let's kick off here.

First up, I think you know all of us by now. The one thing that will be changing at the end of December is that Sean and Shauna will flip roles, and Mirjam and I will also flip roles, as part of our transition plan to make sure that we're passing off and having good continuity since Sean and my terms end in March.

So we're getting prepared there.

We have a bunch of upcoming board meetings. These are on our website. Feel free to join.

You know, we often have very few people join. So if you ever have questions or comments or when to ask things, whatever, please do dial in.

This is a quick snapshot of the financial situation. I really wish I could take credit for all of the investment income, you know, but, really, we're investing in the broad markets, and so we sort of rise and fall as the market changes.

Of course, it's down to our investment strategy and so on.

All of the rest of the things are coming in line as we approach the end of the year.

What we're going to be doing between now and the end of the year, you know probably late December, is putting out something about the 2025 budget.

So sort of a narrative, as we've done before, explaining what's happening in 2025, what the major costs and revenues are and these kinds of things.

I think we've also been discussing -- because, at the last meeting, we presented sort of the long-term history of the financial trends for the organization.

We've thought about doing something like that that sort of ties that back to what those long-term trends are.

But, obviously, one of the key things that is a part of that that we've been working on is fundraising.

So I want to pause once again to say a heartfelt thank you to ARIN. Please give them a lot of applause because that's a lot of money.

(Applause)

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: It's a really big deal, and these kind of things take a long time to develop, and we all wish that we've got some other deals in the pipeline, so to speak. We all wish those things would come to fruition maybe faster, but other organizations and individuals have worked hard to generate their money, and they want to make sure that we're going to be responsible with that money and use it in a way that meets our mission and aligns with what their interests are.

We hope to have more news there in the future, but, obviously, really, really appreciate the trust placed in us by organizations that decide to invest like that. So thank you.

We're also wrapping up the second IASA2 review. We actually meant to have that done by this meeting. I took the responsibility to do that but have been too busy in day-job things and haven't gotten to it.

If you were at the TSB working group and heard my update there, you know why I've been so busy. So apologies. We'll complete that by end of year, come hell or high water.

There's nothing really major in it. It's just a bunch of -- things that are all primarily administrative.

And lots of ways to contact us.

We have the website, as you might expect.

Feel free to reach out. Thank you.

So now we're on to the open mic sessions. Always exciting.

Thank you.

(Applause)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: I invite the IESG to the stage.

Why don't we start with introductions.

Jim, can you start?

>> JIM GUICHARD: Jim Guichard, Routing AD.

>> ERIK KLINE: Erik Kline, Internet AD.

>> GUNTER VAN DE VELDE: Gunter van de Velde, Routing AD.

>> MAHESH JETHANANDANI: Mahesh Jethanandani, Ops AD.

>> DEB COOLEY: Deb Cooley, SEC AD.

>> PAUL WOUTERS: Paul Wouters, SEC AD.

>> WARREN KUMARI: Warren Kumari, the real -- No. Hang on. The real Ops AD.

(Laughter)

>> ZAHEDUZZAMAN SARKER: Zaheduzzaman Sarker, WIT AD.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Roman Danyliw, GEN AD and IETF Chair.

>> TOMMY PAULY: Tommy Pauly, IAB Chair.

>> ERIC VYNCKE: Eric Vyncke, INT AD.

>> ORIE STEELE: Orie Steele, ART AD.

>> MURRAY KUCHERAWY: Murray Kucherawy, ART AD.

>> FRANCESCA PALOMBINI: Francesca Palombini, WIT AD.

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

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Okay. The mic line is open.

First up, I see Bron. I don't actually see Bron, but I --

(Overlapping speakers)

(Laughter)

>> I hear Bron.

>> There he is.

>> BRON GONDWANA: All right. This venue is not very conducive to getting to the mic quickly.

My question is about the old dispatch experiment, which has run for three IETFs now. I was in the unfortunate situation of knowing the timelines well in advance and preparing something that required getting quite a few people to sign off on it to bring it to ALLDISPATCH. I showed up with a draft, a set of slides, and a proposed charter for a working group to discover that it had been shortened in this third session. There wasn't time for my stuff to be discussed, even though many other proposals there came with their slides very late and wound

up with slides that the chairs said they hadn't had a chance to give them advice on how to bring things to ALLDISPATCH.

The experience has been different all the three times, which is very tricky for someone trying to use it.

So I guess my question for the group is: What is the plan for the experiment? Do you know whether you would call it succeeded now, and how will you test the success?

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Yeah. That's a great question. Got to thank you. You're exactly right. We've run the experiment three times. There's been certainly kind of some modulation. You did mention the other one was around how many conflicts we provided in the session. So that's another thing that we changed. The working plan now, after three sessions, is that we've got to make some decisions, of course, on the way ahead. We do not plan to run the experiment one more time, based on the early discussions.

The IESG is going to kind of gather amongst itself. The other thing we're going to do is we're going to ask for formal community input. We previously said, please, kind of send us input as you can through email. We're going to be including some questions in the post-meeting survey to get a solicitation from the community on the way ahead.

>> BRON GONDWANA: Thank you.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Jen, you're next.

>> JEN LINKOVA: Yeah. Jen Linkova. I remember that I think last time, or somewhere in Brisbane, there was a discussion about moving IETF primary SSID to more like advanced technology. I'm wondering if there are any updates on that, and, if there are, do we need any help?

>> Awesome. Thank you. Yep. Presented that in Brisbane. The general plan is to do an IPv6 -- network. We're actually running on new equipment at this meeting. And if people could, please, join the IETF-NAT64 sometime to test it. That would be awesome. We would like to get some load testing to make sure it all works.

As far as we know, everything should work perfectly fine. The only exception is it seems some people's corporate machines have issues reaching Slack. They've got some content filtering stuff installed, we think. And if you're using Linux machine, you might not be able to ping IPv4 addresses because you don't have IPv4 address. That works fine with Macs and iOS and Android and stuff because you use --.

We also turned up an IETF-NAT network. So for people who want a normal corporate NAT'd network, you can now use that.

If people can test it, hopefully, at the next meeting, we might be able to make that default, or if we don't get enough tests at all, possibly the next meeting. But we would like to have a default SSID that is IPv6 mostly.

Follow-up?

>> JEN: Yeah. I just feel that people who try that and if there's an issue, I guess it would be nice if they reported it.

>> Yeah. So, everybody, please try it on your phones. Try it on your laptops. Try it on anything else you have and let us know if you have any issues.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Great. Thank you.

Pete, you're up next.

>> PETE RESNICK: So yay that you are considering ALLDISPATCH, making it permanent. Please make it as long as possible, and please have it in its own session. I think that worked incredibly well, especially this time, even though it was too short.

What I got up for was I saw the post about the appeal. I know we have tended, in this community, to handle appeals sort of internally in the IESG or the IAB. I've been part of a couple of those, and I sort of regret it now, especially for technical ones. I have some weird memory of an appeal being handled in plenary. That might be a little wild and woolly, but I do think, as much as possible, for the technical appeal, if you all can sort of, in a very constrained way, have the technical discussion publicly, that might be interesting to the community. And I think if you read 6.5 of 2026, it kind of encourages open and transparent.

So if you can do that and can figure out a way to do that without complete mayhem, I'd encourage it.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Thanks for that feedback. Some of us only knew about the existence of the appeal and have not even had the opportunity to read the substance of it. There's going to be obviously ongoing discussion.

Thank you.

Tim, you're up next.

>> TIM CHOWN: Hi. Tim Chown. ALLDISPATCH, I enjoyed that session. I don't think the name conveys necessarily what it is to a newcomer, but it was very enjoyable. Thank you.

My question is about the full-Friday experiment. Couple of weeks ago, there was a two-page PDF posted to the -- list, saying that it's been declared a success. And, yet, if you look at the numbers that are on that two-pager, there's negative feedback for having the 5:00 p.m. Friday finish. There's 40 working groups that asked not to meet on a Friday. There's all of us, then, having an extra night in a hotel, being an extra day away from our families. I just wondered to what extent -- It doesn't seem a very convincing reason to declare it a success.

I wonder whether other things have been tried, like maybe starting 30 minutes earlier during the day, encouraging more interim meetings, having groups that want two sessions to get the Friday slot, just so that some of us can get back to our families sooner rather than having to travel an extra day.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Thanks for reviewing kind of the justification that we had there, and you're exactly right. There were a number of trade-offs to be made. I think the better language that I'm going to vent here on the fly, not that we considered it a success. It was we saw it as one of the only ways to satisfy the constraints that we were being kind of provided beyond fundamentally changing the venue dynamic kind of setup.

So, as you probably saw in the justification, there is a tremendous number and increase in the number of session requests, and based on kind of that rising trend, there was really no other way to service it. Certainly, we can discourage session events, but that is not something we were headed. Other things we also considered is could we add additional tracks to help. But that, it turns out, involved lots of different contracting things and could only be satisfied many out years. And out of the options presented to meeting the session request demand, we

thought that that was the way we needed to go, fully recognizing the feedback on the survey about using the Friday slot.

>> TIM CHOWN: But if you look at 115 and 116, there were like 115 sessions, and now there's 150. There's a big jump. What is causing that?

There's this thing that you always fill the available space, but it does seem like a big jump. What is actually causing that jump in sessions?

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: I wouldn't say we have a comprehensive understanding in the need of why people want more sessions beyond the fact that when the individual area directors that I welcome to come to the mic to say more, they do look at those requests, and there's rationale and basis for all of that. But I'm not really prepared here to talk about what are the trends that got us there.

The number of working groups has largely stayed kind of stagnant.

>> TIM CHOWN: And just finally, given there were 40 in Brisbane, working groups, that asked not to meet on a Friday. I think that was Friday, not just Friday afternoon. You could just opt not to do that. Were those all honored?

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: I'm sorry?

>> TIM CHOWN: Were those all honored, the 40 requests not to meet on a Friday?

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: I don't have that information. I don't know.

>> TIM CHOWN: All right. Thank you.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: You're welcome. Friday, in general, is not popular with a number of working groups, and we know that.

Cullen, you're up next.

>> CULLEN JENNINGS: Thank you. As an IAB member, we had a really hard time understanding the decision on IETF 125. I was wondering if you could help us understand why the IAB Liaison and the IAB Chair were excluded from that conversation.

Thank you.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Thank you for that question.

The IESG fully recognized that this was kind of a contentious decision, and we were very clear around processes or procedures. And we looked deep into the IESG charter, and I wrote down figuring there would be questions around this, around RFC 3710 and, really, in the spirit of the things discussed in section two about ensuring that the IESG could have a frank kind of discussion, the ADs could do that, we decided to convene in the smallest group possible to give comfort so we could have that free and open discussion. That's how we arrived at that approach.

Arnaud?

>> ARNAUD TADDEI: Hi. I want to come back on the GENDISPATCH. I understand it's an experiment, but frankly speaking, I could see good progress in the first one. As you know, I'm now a C17 Chair, and we had the problem in 2018. We went through exactly this path six years ago. We've been through a long journey here. We improved and we degraded because we tried to do too many things. We improved and then we started to get to a very optimal position now. It's really performing. We are really good.

My simple message here is I don't know what the outcomes are from the experiments but be patient with yourselves. You're on a good journey. It's a long journey. It's hard. It's not easy to get everything fixed in the first place. Just give yourself the time. That's the best feedback I can give you from my feelings on that.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Perfect. Thanks for that feedback.

As a reminder, everyone, we are going to have something in the post-meeting survey for IETF 121.

I see Bron next in the queue again.

>> BRON GONDWANA: Yeah. Sorry for coming up twice, but I did want to respond specifically to that question of the Friday sessions. I'm not specifically picking on OAuth, but I'm just going to mention them because I'm aware of them. They have three two-hour sessions at this meeting. That's six hours for one working group. The main benefit of us flying here and being together in person is to build the relationships, and those relationships can be used to do good work together.

I don't think six hours for a working group brings the benefit for the work. There's plenty of chance to do telechat and calls between IETFs, and I think we should restrict working groups to one session per IETF, and then if there's more work to do, do it outside that. Compress the things that need the face-to-face, that need the relationship-building into that. That would be my proposal to fix this issue, rather than extending into Friday.

>> Maybe if you need two or three meetings, one of them has to be on Friday.

(Laughter)

>> BRON GONDWANA: No -- I mean, yes, but I don't agree. I think six hours at the IETF for one working group is too much.

>> I'm not arguing your point. I think you're right. But I think if we have to find some kind of compromise -- you know, if you're going to take up six hours of the IETF's time, for whatever reason, there's -- maybe a bit of a penalty box is appropriate.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Okay.

Aijun?

>> AIJUN WANG: Yeah -- all of the AD come from the different companies. There is no two AD come from the same company. So I think can this principle apply to the -- chairs? You know, I can give you an example. In the -- working group, there are three chairs, but two of them came from the one company. I think it violates the diversity principle with IETF -- because if you held -- faced several times our proposal -- I want to improve the diversity of the -- working group.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Thank you for that feedback. If I understood correctly, you're emphasizing the need to have working group chairs that are sourced from different companies?

>> AIJUN WANG: Yeah. I think the most obvious principle of the IETF is diversity --

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Thank you for that feedback. I'm unaware of the specific working group we're talking about but thank you for that feedback.

Martin?

>> MARTIN THOMSON: Martin Thompson. I understand there's a lot of sort of controversy about IETF 125. And that decision, I respect that decision. That was one that was made by the IESG.

I want to talk about 127, and I think that we need to reopen the question of the venue for 127.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Someone quickly remind me. Where is 127?

>> GROUP: San Francisco.

>> MARTIN THOMSON: I want to put that on your agenda to consider.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Okay. Thank you.

Michael?

>> MICHAEL RICHARDSON: Hi. Michael Richardson. Martin's point is also mine.

I wanted to ask if we're going to have meetings on Friday afternoons, so what does that do to you guys? Because you normally have had IESG repeats. Is that Saturday? NomCom will be deliberating Friday afternoon. So that's often been an available thing, forcing people to travel an extra day. And so is it another day after that, or what's happening? What will happen to that?

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: So you're asking when does the IESG deliberate, do their post-meeting kind of wrap-up now that we run all day on Friday?

>> MICHAEL RICHARDSON: Yeah. And there's other groups that I think have used that afternoon and other things and the NOC taking the network apart and all sorts of stuff. How is the NOC affected? Is it effectively we're here until Saturday, in the end, or what does that mean, in general, I guess?

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: I think there's a lot of considerations. The one I can answer with a lot of certainty, the IESG and the IAB take the meeting that they used to have at the end of the day, now they do a lunch. And that's when we do our deliberation.

As to kind of the NOC team, I know they tear down the network at the end of the meeting. I don't have a lot of fidelity into what the after-action on that is and kind of the individual travel plans of --

>> MICHAEL RICHARDSON: I'm just trying to understand the overall expense. So you guys are not staying until Saturday? Okay. That's good. Lunch meeting, okay. I think that maybe we should just figure out what other things are coming up.

So that's all. I don't know what that was about but okay. Thanks.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Thank you for that feedback.

Sam?

And I will confess to everyone coming up to the mic who sees me confused. It's because I'm scanning all the different microphones, and the light is coming into my eye.

>> The echo doesn't help either.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: All right. We're going to -- Dhruv?

>> Actually, I could not register so Dhruv did it for my behalf.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: The floor is yours.

>> I would go back to the five-day meeting.

There is a problem with funding for the positions. Trying to extend the meeting times, it's not helpful with the leadership positions because one of the main thing that is coming is about funding. People are getting nominated, and they're saying, I have to get back and see if I can get funding for this.

>> I mean, I think all of us would like to be able to go home early.

>> No. This is people --

>> No, no. I get it. But on the whole Friday thing, I don't think any of us desperately want to meet on Friday, but, unfortunately, like, people keep coming up with working groups, and you all keep wanting to do work.

This is not directed at you. This is in general. Like, I go to my working groups like, Maybe you don't want to meet?

And they're like, We have so much work we have to get done. And can we charter another one?

And everybody is like, Oh, you should close a bunch of working groups but not mine.

Yep. I mean, I agree with -- We all agree it's an issue.

>> People are on tight budgets. That's the only thing I'm saying.

>> I think we all agree it's an issue. I just don't know what the solution is other than, you know, meet earlier, have less meetings, people get work done faster.

>> More tracks.

>> Yep, more tracks, more rooms.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: I mean, we welcome feedback on creative solutions to either constrain the number of slots, reduce the number of slots, or satisfy the existing growing number of slots that are being requested.

>> And, also, just to add a little bit, the amount of funding required for three half-days or three days a year for the AD position is quite minimal compared to the other efforts you need to get funding for.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Anyone else?

Okay. Sam, you're back?

>> SAM WEILER: I am. Sorry for that earlier issue with permissions.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: No worries.

>> SAM WEILER: Roman, I'd like some more clarity on your answer about the decision process for 125. In a quick glance at 3710, I'm curious as to which reasons the IESG used for excluding its liaisons from that process.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: So I want to replay your question because I was reading it in the chat. So you would like to have a more concrete reason why we chose to exclude the liaisons from the 125 process?

>> SAM: I'd like to know which of the reasons. There are a couple of reasons in that document, and I'd like to know which ones the IESG relied on.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: To read the quote from Section 3.2, "Vital to have a frank exchange of viewpoints, allowing people to speak freely on topics known to be controversial," was that reason. The ADs really wanted to be able to talk freely, and that would be why.

Okay. Thank you.

Jen?

>> JEN LINKOVA: Yeah. Jen Linkova. I'd like to quickly come back to Friday meetings. I think there is a positive impact of having meetings on Friday because before I saw a lot of people leaving on Thursday.

(Laughter)

>> JEN LINKOVA: Right? And now most of them stay at least half of the Friday. So we probably need to consider that.

(Laughter)

>> And, I mean, I will note that that was definitely a thing. Right? It was very common that people would say, please, don't put my working group meeting on Friday. And so Friday was, then, basically not an unusable day. And then we start leaving earlier on Thursdays, and soon we have no meetings, which not necessarily a bad thing.

>> That sounded like asking for a meeting on Saturday. Is that what I heard? No? No? Okay.

All right. Mike?

>> MIKE JONES: Mike Jones. On the Friday meeting topic, I'm going to support the Friday meetings. Going to IETF and meeting my colleagues face-to-face and working with them is one of the most productive parts of my year. And so the ability to have use of the whole week for conversations with people, I fully support.

I mean, there's a thing that we've done for OAuth, when we're requesting three meetings. I'm okay for the third meeting. We'll accept all conflicts, and we'll meet on Friday, if that's what the schedulers decide, but I appreciate that we've been using the whole week.

Thank you.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Thank you.

Rich?

>> RICH SALZ: Yeah. Hi. Rich Salz, Akamai. Just before Mike spoke, you said, Oh, we'd like some concrete suggestions on how we can reduce the pressure here.

I just want to emphasize that Bron made a very concrete suggestion that should be looked at, which is put a quota on how many hours a given working group can have. Maybe you expand it to how many hours a given area can have. But that's a concrete suggestion, and I hope the IESG looks at it in the future.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Understood. Thanks and we welcome additional feedback.

David?

>> DAVID LAMPARTER: David Lamparter. There's also fixed costs with just attending IETF, for flights or whatever to get here. And especially for people who are not as well off, that could be a significant factor.

To make things a little bit easier on them, I would rather have them be able to attend a little bit more than a little bit less. Just to consider.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Thank you.

Mark?

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: Good evening, IESG.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Good evening.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: I have little sympathy for those who want to optimize their travel home on Friday afternoon, so I support the other people who are saying, yes, let's meet a whole Friday. For me to get home often involves spending two days on a plane.

That's good, but, at the same time, as you referred to earlier, Roman, there's a discussion to be had about how do we optimize our work? How do we make sure that working groups are productive? And that we're closing working groups that are not productive?

And I've heard a lot of discussion about, oh, we can game it this way or we can force people to have quotas. At the end of the day, hard decisions need to be made, and that's what the community looks to you for. So I'd encourage you to make those hard decisions.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Thanks.

So that was the last question in the queue.

I want to pause if someone is looking for the button to put themselves in the queue.

Jan?

>> Oh, there is one.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Jan?

>> JAN-FREDERIK RIECKERS: Yeah. Hello. Jan-Frederik Rieckers speaking. To come back on the question of funding for the IETF, I have known that one of the problems that at least my travel office has is that the hotel options provided by IETF are mostly not options that my travel office would choose. So I'm not sure if that's the IESG or LLC, probably LLC, to provide some more cost-effective options for hotels additionally to the hotel options that we have right now.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: So I'm going to answer, and then if I get this wrong, that is primarily an LLC issue, so I would refer Jay to come to the mic to help answer.

So we've gotten the feed -- the LLC and the IESG has certainly gotten the feedback that there will be interest in alternative hotel options that are cheaper and commitment to potentially multiple hotel options.

I'm told that one of the complexities of that is that we plan so far ahead to be able to guarantee a room rate requires that contract. I mean, that is why we have the rates associated with this hotel. To be able to guarantee any other room rates, even fancier hotels or less fancier hotels, would require a whole lot of other contracts to be signed.

So it's not necessarily a matter of just kind of surveying and making recommendations. It would involve a significant new level of contract and a whole new level of vetting of those venues. And that is the reason that's not currently done right now.

>> Someone said you're right.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Always nice to hear. Thank you.

So if I got that wrong from Jay, please correct me.

All right. So one more time, the mic line is empty. Someone looking for the button? Going once? Twice? All right.

(Applause)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Oh, Sam's back.

>> SAM WEILER: As my taste for travel declines, I find myself thinking: Wouldn't it be nice to only have one or two of these that I needed to go to in a year? I know that we've considered it before, and I'd love for us to consider it again.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Noted. That was, I think, a large, facilitated kind of process. We would have to think through how to do that exactly. So if you have ideas on how we would open and think through that reasoning, I would welcome that. That would not be an IESG decision.

>> SAM WEILERS: Certainly.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Okay. That's it for the IESG. We're going to now flip it over to the IAB.

(Applause)

>> TOMMY PAULY: Okay. Hello, everyone. And we'll welcome up all the IAB members up to the stage.

Very good. Okay.

So we will start with our introductions.

Cullen, do you want to start us?

>> CULLEN JENNINGS: Cullen Jennings.

>> QIN WU: Qin Wu.

>> DAVID SCHINAZI: David Schinazi.

>> WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: Roman Danyliw.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Mirja Kühlewind.

>> TOMMY PAULY: Tommy Pauly.

>> COLIN PERKINS: Colin Perkins.

>> DHARUV DHODY: Dhruv Dhody.

>> SURESH KRISHNAN: Suresh Krishnan.

>> MATTHEW BOCCI: Matthew Bocci.

>> ALVARO RETANA: Alvaro Retana.

>> TOMMY PAULY: All right. Then, I don't know if we have Alissa online? Yes, we do.

>> ALISSA COOPER: Alissa Cooper.

>> TOMMY PAULY: Thanks, Alissa.

All right. Our queues are open, if there are any questions or comments for the IAB.

All right. Andrew?

>> ANDREW CAMPLING: Hi. Andrew Campling. Thank you for the IAB Open this week. It felt really good, as a participant. Whether it for you, you decide. I came away -- I'm not overly involved with any delays and stuff, but I came away thinking there is a lot more that could be done there.

I just want to know would you welcome some proposals from the community as to maybe how we could do more and be smarter in how we engage with the other SDOs? Do you have an appetite for doing that?

>> TOMMY PAULY: Yeah. I think we certainly love to hear feedback. This is a process where the liaison relationships that the IAB helps facilitate are meant to reflect the entire community.

So I think it's maybe a question of what is our venue for that? During the meetings, we have liaison coordinator office hours. That's a time to get directly involved. People are welcome to join the IAB calls or send email to the IAB. We can also use the architecture discuss list or potentially other lists for broader discussions. If it's a proposal where we want to have the whole community be able to see and engage with the IAB, architecture discuss may be a good starting point for that.

I also welcome if any of the coordinators have any comments they want to make to go first.

>> Thanks, Andrew.

So for sure like maybe the opening the liaisons and RFCs and the procedures for that. So, really, we do have the appetite for getting community feedback. That's why we're kind of opening it up for everybody. It's been 20 years since the last one, so we kind of had to see where the community stands now. But I think the only thing we need to be cautious about is how much effort it's going to take from the community. Like the IETF community itself, and how much work it's going to take from the others as well.

I think as long as we kind of find a good balance for that, we're open to any kind of suggestion. So, yeah, feel free to come and put in input. Thanks.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: To pile onto that, ultimately, that's going to have to go -- that document is going to have to go to IETF last call, but, of course, it would be more productive and helpful if you have some tangible ideas relative to that document that they provided earlier that was provided at last call.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: And I would also like to add that we are trying to constantly improve the liaison process, especially when we understand that there are some problems with pain points. In some cases, we know about pain points that we can't fix immediately. If you

actually have any problems that you think need addressing, please reach out to us. We care about it.

>> TOMMY PAULY: All right. Thank you.

All right.

Yes. I think we have a remote question. Please go ahead, Abdussalam.

>> ABDUSSALAM BARYUN: I have two questions. One is what is the communication channel that IAB uses for engaging with the community? Because I feel that there's still not -- it's not communicating directly. Let's say, for IETF, usually it's through the working group or through one list, which is IETF. But IAB, mostly it's more difficult to engage or maybe it's not reaching most of the community within IETF meeting.

Also, the second question is regarding any RFC published by IAB. Before publishing it, does it go through, let's say, advice or let's say it's submitted to some working group related to that issue that it's raising? Because I don't remember, within 10 years, I seen any IAB draft which is submitted to a working group asking something while I'm on the list.

Okay. Thank you.

>> TOMMY PAULY: All right. Thank you. Yeah.

So the way the IAB works is separate from the IETF working group process. However, we do really try to have openness and communication with the community and get feedback, but that's not going to be through a normal working group meeting.

At the meetings themselves, we do have the IAB open slot, and that is where the IAB shares what it's working on, information about workshops, documents, technical programs, other things like liaisons. And that's a good place to have dialogue.

Also, as I was alluding to earlier, with Andrew's question, there is an architecture discuss list, and this is an open list that anyone can join that is more specifically around topics that are within the scope of the IAB. For documents specifically, a document that becomes an IAB RFC is not something that gets full IETF consensus. The IAB RFCs are a different stream than the IETF stream as is the IRTF stream for research documents, and each of these streams have a different process.

But we do have several community review feedback periods for IAB stream RFCs generally at the time when we first adopt a document into the IAB stream and right before publishing. That is going out on the architecture discuss list.

What's happening right now, for example, for the workshop report, for the recent AI-CONTROL workshop, is that that will be reviewed, and we can have comments and discussion on that architecture discuss list, and you can engage with the IAB at the IAB Open meetings or just emailing us directly or if you want to join our calls as well.

Hopefully that helps.

Wes?

>> WES HARDAKER: If I could add one thing. One thing that I think that the IAB as always done, since before my time, is we participate in working group meetings, and we don't do it by standing up and saying, I'm an IAB member. We're going to give an opinion. No. We participate as active participants. We go to sessions all week long.

Before I was on the IAB, I honestly skipped sessions and went and walked around town. I haven't done that since I've been on the IAB. We're out there actually trying to engage and make sure we're participating in working group activities. A lot of it is silent. Our participation is just being part of the community.

>> TOMMY PAULY: That's a good point.

All right. Thank you.

All right. Is anyone else in queue? I just wanted to know if you were --

>> Yes. Just my comment. My comment on that is why separate? Discussions can be done. As we have the member or the liaison member liaison with outside of IETF, he's doing some -- with other SDO. So within the working groups, if we get some kind of, let's say, feedback from the IAB, if it's related to some work we are doing, it would be nice. Let's say some kind of engagement between the IAB with the working group chairs.

So I'm against separating. I heard you now to say separating as if it's a rule. My comment -- It's not a question, just a comment. We should think: Why are we separating? Why we need the separation? Is it needed?

So thank you.

>> TOMMY PAULY: Thank you. Thank you for the comment.

I think I will reiterate what Wes was saying, that all of the IAB members endeavor to be involved in the community, part of the community, and when working group chairs need help with liaisons, et cetera, we try to be involved.

If there are specific cases you're aware of where that should happen more, please do email us and reach out about that.

Martin?

>> MARTIN THOMSON: Yeah. Martin Thomson. I don't think people say this often enough, but I'd like to thank the members on the IAB for the work that they do and the sort of engagement that Wes was talking about, which is often silent, which was often behind the scenes, which is often steering difficult technical problems into BoFs and new work.

So, for me, at least, thank you to all of you for the work that you do. I don't think we say that often enough.

>> TOMMY PAULY: Thank you.

(Applause)

>> TOMMY PAULY: Carolina?

>> CAROLINA: Hi, Tommy. I had a quick question. I was wondering if you guys could provide a bit of context on how you decide when you sunset IAB programs. The reason for me asking it is we had a site meeting today for the creation of a research group on green standards and sustainability, and there were a number of questions about it not overlapping with the IAB impact group. And now that there's a potential research group being created, there's work that's formally started. I just wonder when you guys decide the IAB is good to sort of leave it off to the community to sort of continue the work?

>> TOMMY PAULY: Thank you.

So I will let Suresh come in. Just generally, we do try to hold regular reviews internally of IAB programs to make sure they are still doing something, if they're still needed. But for the specific point of the impact, please go ahead, Suresh.

>> SURESH KRISHNAN: Yeah. Thank you. I think, Tommy, you went into it. Really, the idea is if there's work to do, the program continues. If there's no work to do, the program goes away. That's kind of the high-level thing.

In this case, the green working group had its first meeting. The -- RG is still a proposal RG. It's not even an RG yet. So the idea is to kind of figure out the scoping for those and see if there's anything else left to do.

And I think, between me and -- we do have an idea there is other stuff out there that needs to get done. We did talk to -- and Allie to kind of talk about what's left. And that is kind of the architectural considerations for the trade-offs for sustainability.

So what do you trade-off for sustainability? Usability? Is it availability? Is it some kind of operational thing? What do you tradeoff for that? I think that's still some kind of IAB document that's missing there. I think until we suss that out, we keep that alive.

As Tommy said we will look at it. Bits don't take much space, right? But you're not going to do something with high bandwidth without knowing something will go through. If you see, a couple of months later, another section set up and we don't have anything to do, we will certainly close it up.

I think we had a really good, successful year spinning off these two things, but if there's nothing more to do, it will be done.

Thanks.

>> I would like to echo the point that the research group is still in the process of being formed, and we're still trying to figure out the scope of its charter. Assuming the research group is formed, once we know the scope of its transfer and we can see how things are actually working, then we'll be able to make a decision on what happens to the program.

>> TOMMY PAULY: Okay. I will give another moment in case anyone needs to find the button to join the queue. Otherwise, we will close up.

All right. Thank you very much, everyone. That's it for the IAB. On to the LLC.

(Applause)

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: While we're waiting for everybody to join, there was one question in the IESG session about hotels. I am just looking back --

>> FLOOR: Mic!

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Sorry. Let me start from the beginning since you probably just heard vague mumbling.

In the IESG session, I heard a question about San Francisco. In our October notes, we have a report here. It says Portland site report was shared with the board, and Jay Daley provided no review. The board will review and report and discuss further.

One of the questions was whether this might be an alternative to San Francisco and how the cost of travel differs between the two cities.

So it is an item that is in discussion and not quite resolved just yet.

Another question that came up previously, which I think is really optimally directed at the LLC, pertains to hotel rooms and finding alternative locations.

I think you probably, you know, yelled from the back, you know, saying something like, yes, Jay that's not something we're doing.

We've discussed this a number of times before. I think, ultimately, we're not really a travel agency. It's not our core competency. We try to find a core hotel and alternatives, but we have routinely lost a lot of money booking room blocks and then having people not use the room blocks, in part because sometimes, when that long date approaches, the room rates that you get on the web are lower than what the booked rate was that we had to book two years or three years or four years ahead of time.

It's just too much financial risk, and it doesn't make sense. There are lots of websites you can go to find cheap hotel rates or Airbnb rates and what have you.

I know many corporate travel portals want you to book through their portals as well instead of using a third party.

So that's that.

Looks like we have two people in queue.

Mark, somewhere. There he is.

>> MARK NOTTINGHAM: I'm here. Hi. Regarding San Francisco, I think we can have a discussion about costs, which that's an issue we have in many places today, especially. We can have a discussion about safety and make different judgments about that. It's interesting for me because I used to live in San Francisco. Now I really don't like going there.

The real issue that we need to discuss, though, is that because of very recent events, it's going to be very difficult for a large number of people to get there. The suggestion that I would make is that the LLC and IESG and however that all works, thinks very carefully about the weighing of how you can judge when enough people can't come to make the meeting worth one and how that affects our decision process.

While all of the geopolitical fun is going on, it might be good to consider not having meetings in either of the interesting countries and have them somewhere else.

I know that makes your job very hard, and I appreciate the work you do, but that might be where we're at.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yep. Good point and fodder for our next board meeting's discussion. I can assure you I've been practicing deep breathing all day.

(Laughter)

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Next up, Bron.

>> BRON GONDWANA: Hi. Just to speak on the hotel thing very briefly. There's plenty of sites in which you can go and look for hotels. I very much agree with you that the IETF should give zero to maybe two hotel options that you can vet and say, We stand by these ones.

Other than that, it's easy enough to find your own accommodations for a range outside of different things from the IETF hotels. It's fine.

The thing I came up to ask about or comment on, I run a service myself. I know we go down occasionally. This week, we've had some really -- with the Datatracker, and the communication has been, yes, there's a problem. Yes, we fixed it. It was down again during the working group chairs.

I would like to know what the plan is to make it more robust, given that it only gets tested at this degree three times a year. It's a real challenge, and it has interrupted our work quite a bit this time. I wanted to raise that topic and be the one to take the blame.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah. No doubt we take uptime seriously, especially during these meetings. It's one of the core things we have to deliver, the technical platform and tools. There's been a lot of discussion on the Slack channel about this.

I know, in particular, we've had a weird issue with one particular ASN originating a lot of odd traffic. Probably just automated and causing a lot of challenges.

I think we may have someone standing up at a mic that might want to add any additional detail?

>> Feel free to jump in the queue?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: You bet. Please. You're the expert here.

>> ROBERT SPARKS: Robert Sparks. Bron, direct answer to your question, what's being done, we are at the sharp part of the knee and a major change to the infrastructure we use to deliver the Datatracker service. It was only shortly before IETF 120 that we had the IETF running in a modern cloud environment. We are continuing to evolve the way that service is delivered to take advantage of scalability options, deeper resistance and reaction to unwanted cloud -- I'm sorry -- unwanted traffic pressure.

The kinds of issues that we've been facing this time, I don't think are issues that we could lab test. The meetings produce a combination of very unique real customer traffic and an attractive target for nuisance traffic or even malicious traffic. So the approaches that we are taking are continuing to evolve the shape of the architecture so that we can reactively scale when we need to scale, identifying the places where we actually have archaic code thinking and how we respond to requests so that we're vulnerable to, like, people who are just wanting to mess with something because the size of the body of people who just want to mess with something because it's fun is getting quite large.

Massively improving our visibility into how this system is behaving under the different kinds of traffic that it gets.

So it's not that we're sitting and waiting for it to break and fixing why it broke that time. We're just piling on. As I said, we're at the very beginning of the knee of the curve to moving rapidly to better behavior.

>> Thank you. I think the one thing that I would ask for and I think probably a lot of people would ask for is more detail about what's happened and what the state of things is because, at the moment, it is an unpredictable machine, as far as we're concerned, and we don't know when we walk into a session, whether we'll be able to get our work done.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: That's a fair point. I think most of our data we're used to root cause analysis reports and these kinds of things. I think we'll take that as an action item.

>> ROBERT SPARKS: Thank you.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Thanks.

And thank you, Robert.

Next in the queue is Jim Fenton. If you are in the queue, make sure you -- -- put yourself in the queue.

>> JIM FENTON: Hi. Jim Fenton. With respect to hotels, I understand the economics of, you know, getting a room block set aside and negotiating all of those things, and since I don't have any of the corporate constraints on where I can book my hotels, I like to book at IETF hotels both because of the IETF hotel network, which is, as usual, great, but also just kind of to make sure that IETF is not stuck with a bunch of rooms that they've committed.

In this particular case, the negotiated hotel is rather inconvenient. I'm definitely getting my steps in every day, which is great, but I'm also walking past a couple of fairly promising-looking hotels that are a whole lot closer.

I'm not sure there's a question here but just kind of feedback that I would really like it if it was a little easier to commute from the hotel to the meeting venue when they're in separate places.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yep. We hear you. Thank you.

Next up, Richard.

>> RICHARD BARNES: Hi. I sort of plus one what Bron was saying. It's just that maybe we've kind of had an ongoing sequence of performance issues with the Datatracker. Obviously, evolving and trying to address as we go.

What are the suggestions that this high-visibility incident we had this week or incidents, perhaps? It might be a good opportunity to do a little bit of post-mortem/architecture review. Maybe involve some of the folks in this community who are experts and get some free consulting out of them. That might be a good exercise for the teams and the IESG to organize.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: That makes sense.

Andrew?

>> ANDREW CAMPLING: Hi. Andrew Campling. Just two quick points. In terms of countries that we go to, I get that while rotating countries, the idea is that people don't struggle to get a visa from one country. Maybe next time, it's someone else's turn.

Judging from some of the comments in the chat here and in previous meetings, some people seem to suffer pretty much every time. I think we maybe need to do something for them just occasionally. I'm not in that category, but I know there are some people that want to contribute more, and it seems to be a struggle almost every meeting. You know, someone still has not had a response to their visa request to Vancouver.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Right.

>> ANDREW CAMPLING: That's pretty unacceptable, not that we can control it other than picking different countries occasionally.

The second question -- you can answer both, as you seek it -- we had some stats on some of the visitor stuff -- participant stuff on this meeting early on. I don't think there was anything yet on things like the diversity of the participation, just on the new. Is it too early yet

to have any feel for are we doing any better on bendovers, or are we still as poor as we were in Brisbane?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: I think it's one of the things that is captured in the post-meeting surveys a bit. But no. So maybe it's back down to the IESG data that you had on the meeting attendees and so on, brand diversity.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: I'm kind of unclear on what exactly we're talking about. I mean, we do have diversity data across a lot of dimensions. We do the community survey on an annual basis. And so to get the deep-dive, comprehensive data that you can't necessarily scrape from the registration information, that comes from the once-a-year survey.

>> ANDREW CAMPLING: Okay. I just remember -- I think it was in Brisbane -- we hit an all-time low, 7.6% female participation, which I think is shameful.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: That's from the community survey. We don't have that clean demographic information just based on the registration information.

And if you're kind of really interested in what we're doing -- or anyone is around the topic of gender diversity at Systers, there's going to be a presentation that's going to walk through our response and action plan related to all the things that came from the experience.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Fair point on the visas. I mean, I think historically, the biggest cluster of folks having difficulty getting visas have been from China --

>> And India, I think, as well.

>> JAY DALEY: India? Yeah. And, I think, as you heard, we're working on a China meeting location. And they mentioned the possibility of other Asian locations, including India, for future meetings. So presumably, in both of those cases, it makes it easier for those folks that live in those countries.

Now, of course, there may be the burden of other countries, but it shifts the burden around in a lot of ways.

Thanks.

Richard, another question? Popped back up.

>> RICHARD: Since I'm making suggestions and we're talking about geopolitics and visas and whatnot, one place that still doesn't require visas to get to is the Internet.

(Laughter)

>> RICHARD: So as we're trying to navigate all of this --

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Not yet.

>> RICHARD: I said still. As of this meeting. It may be something to consider as we continue to struggle with finding the right combination and consider whether three times a year is still the right cadence for this, in a world where we have a robust capabilities.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah. And that's definitely not an LLC question. I think that's an IESG for sure.

>> Some combination.

JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah. Yeah.

Jean Francois. Online? Yeah.

>> JEAN FRANCOIS: Yes, I'm here. So I'm not 100% sure that this is the proper section to add this question, so I apologize in advance if that was not the place.

Looking at the data from participation since the previous person at the mic was discussing about the diversity element, we actually did a bit of research on our participation numbers using the Datatracker for country, and we observed that there was discrepancy in the numbers between the information of the Datatracker versus what was published in the summary of the meetings. And some of those differences were quite substantive.

We did raise this concern, and we sent an email to the LLC, I believe to some of the staff, and we haven't heard yet so far as to -- we were told that it was being looked into. So I'm not saying that there has not been any movement upon it. It's just that I haven't heard anything. That has been a few months now. So I would like to know if there was an update of that.

Thank you.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah. Maybe it might have been lost. I'm not sure, but I would encourage you to send it to the board email address, and we will definitely take a look.

Thank you.

>> JEAN FRANCOIS: All right. Thank you.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yep.

Mike Bishop?

>> MIKE BISHOP: Yeah. I wanted to clarify something from Richard's question because the issue of changing the number of in-person meetings versus online meetings was raised during the IESG, and they said it was not an IESG issue. And then I think you just said it was an IESG issue.

So who actually owns that question, and how do we have that conversation?

>> It's the community.

>> MIKE BISHOP: Okay.

>> It's a community decision.

(Laughter)

>> So, clearly, by the way, we need a plenary question dispatch session, don't we?

(Laughter)

>> So the current consensus is for three meetings a year, and it's not something that either the IESG or the LLC can change because that's in a BCP. So it's the community. So through a process that I'm sure Roman can explain to you but that has to change that.

>> MIKE BISHOP: But then the expectation would be if that were to change, we would need a working group to write a document to modify that?

>> No idea. That is definitely a question for Roman, not me.

>> MIKE BISHOP: Okay.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: So is the question on deck as how would we change the BCP that says 111 exploratory?

>> Yes. Right. Yes. Yes.

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: We would need a draft for that and then all the usual intended processes with processing that draft. I wouldn't presuppose how we process that AD-sponsored, GEN AREA working group.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: It's going to have to get dispatched.

(Laughter)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: It does not necessarily need to get dispatched.

(Laughter)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: So while you're hearing a little bit of perhaps what sounds like confusing answers, there's a lot of conventions to --

>> There's a meeting slot available on Friday, if you need it.

(Applause)

(Laughter)

>> ROMAN DANYLIW: In all seriousness, why that topic sounds kind of confusing because there's the community part of it which provides the guidance on we're doing 111. Then there is the piece about who owns the venue selection and the properties of that venue. You know, the community delegates who that is, but then the LLC has specific operational processes relative to that.

And then there's something kind of in between all of that which speaks to the media experience part, and that's where the IESG gets involved. And some of that is in community process. Some of that is not.

A little bit, for example, about how you heard about the Friday meeting, that's in the area where the IESG kind of owns that without specific --

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: So I'm going to summarize what I think I heard. Somebody needs to write an Internet draft about it and then follow the normal process.

>> Thank you.

>> JAY DALEY: I don't see anyone else in queue.

Oh, Brian? There he is. Ugh, my stomach is grumbling.

>> Thank you, Brian. All input is good input.

>> BRIAN TRAMMELL: So I would have one question, I think, for the LLC board. I don't need an answer for this right now, but if that process were to happen, how much lead time would we need before we would drop from three to two? Like, how long in advance would decisions made here then affect the -- because, I mean, like, we've signed contracts. We've got committees. We have the things that are up that the actual meeting schedule -- would it be long after that?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: No. I mean, that's as far out as the headlights are shining at night.

>> BRIAN TRAMMELL: Okay.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: And, you know, if the community was like, oh, it needs to change faster than that. We'd be like, Well, here's the cost to do that. Is that really worth it?

>> Yeah. There's some ability to move the meetings, but as cost.

>> BRIAN TRAMMELL: Okay. Awesome. Thank you very much.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Sure.

All right. I don't see anyone else.

All right. Thank you. Have a good night.

(Applause)

Captioning Provided By:

Caption Pros

20701 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 107245

Scottsdale, Arizona 85255

www.captionpros.net