

Remote Participation Services (RPS) Requirements BoF

Paul Hoffman
IETF 83, Paris

Agenda

- Introduction to draft-ietf-genarea-rps-reqs
- Currently-open topics
- Comments I have heard this week
- Topics to be opened

Current work

- draft-ietf-genarea-rps-reqs
- -03 has been out for a few weeks
- Already have lots of input for -04
- Consensus calls are coming

Requirements instead of technologies

- Eventual result will be one or more RFPs for the actual services
- Thus, we are specifying requirements for capabilities, not specifying tools
- Covers remote participation for both regular IETF meeting and interim meetings
- Note that these are requirements for the next RPSs, not the current set of tools

Tiered requirements for capabilities

- Requirements are for the desired capabilities of the new RPS
- Some capabilities are tiered by priority, with soonest-delivered coming first
- The current draft has a few “functional specifications”, but those will probably disappear

Interactions with WG chairs

- Lots of the comments at the Wednesday plenary about remote participation were in fact about how WG chairs run meetings
- This project is only about RPS tools, not procedures and requirements for WG chairs
- Whatever changes we make to the RPS will have significant effects on WG chairs

Target audiences

- IETF community
 - People who always go to meetings
 - People who never go to meetings
 - People who go to some meetings
 - WG chairs who host meetings with remote participants
- Eventual bidders to provide the services
 - Some of whom won't know what an IETF meeting is like

Voice-to-room vs./and IM-to-mic

- Large split in opinions on this one
- Issues include:
 - Simplicity
 - Reliability
 - Timeliness of communication
 - Extra effort for chairs
 - Effect on local participants

Registration

- Having remote and local participants identified to each other to the same degree
- Not burdening remote participants more than joining a mailing list
- Transparency of the process and “blue sheet” issues
- Cost of the RPS will be addressed after we have a set of required capabilities

Face-to-face interims without remote participation

- It was surprising to some people that this is considered OK
- Getting reliability of RPS for venues not scheduled by the IETF is really difficult
- People think hard about whether they should travel to remote interims

Standards compliance

- Currently: “The specifications SHOULD rely upon IETF and other open standards for all communications and interactions wherever possible.”
- MUST?
- What if there is a gap?
 - Codecs
 - Things that are really formats, not protocols

Video

- Very helpful for remembering that there are humans around us vs. distracting
- Takes up screen real estate both locally and remotely
- Local participants can't hide themselves, but remote participants can

Comments I have heard this week (1)

- Reliability, reliability, reliability
 - Not ready at the beginning of a session
 - Not clear what the fallback is when failures happen
 - Assuming that remote presentation is possible caused problems when it wasn't
 - Large frustration for both chairs and the remote participants

Comments I have heard this week (2)

- Reliability, reliability, reliability
- “While your document focuses mostly on tools, most of the issues lie in successful execution”
- Inaudible audio
- Chairs should be paying more attention to remote participants
 - Watching Jabber
 - Asking if there are problems

Comments I have heard this week (3)

- “The audio didn’t work” / “WebEx didn’t work” / “Meetecho didn’t work”
- “No one local was in the Jabber room so our complaints were not heard”
- Some mics in a room worked but others didn’t, so problems weren’t found until the first presenter, or the first person to ask a question, talked
- “So far this meeting has been somewhat less remote-friendly than usual”

Comments I have heard this week (4)

- Many problems with Tools agenda
 - Tools agenda is not kept in synch with what shows up on the Meeting Materials page
 - “Best effort not good enough for those of us who rely on it”
- Having too many tools causes real problems with screen real estate for remote participants
 - Also causes attention problems
- Two agendas is one too many

Comments I have heard this week (5)

- Having the chair also channeling the Jabber room is a bad use of management
- “I kept forgetting there were remote participants in my WG”
- “I thought this all would work on my tablet, but it didn’t”
- Can we get the benefit of hallway conversations for remote participants?

Goals of this work

- Improve the effectiveness for the current set of remote participants
- Help people who are currently only mailing list participants become remote participants
- Reduce the perceived need for some people to attend some/all IETF meetings
- Probably other goals as well

