

IAOC  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Best Current Practice  
Expires: January 7, 2017

F. Baker, Ed.  
Cisco Systems  
July 6, 2016

IAOC Plenary Meeting Venue Selection Process  
draft-baker-mtgvenue-iaoc-venue-selection-process-03

Abstract

This documents the IAOC's IETF Meeting Venue Selection Process from the perspective of its goals and thought processes. It points to additional process documents on the IAOC Web Site that go into further detail and are subject to change with experience.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on January 7, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction . . . . .	2
1.1.	Requirements Language . . . . .	3
2.	Meeting Selection Participants and Responsibilities . . . . .	3
2.1.	The IETF Community . . . . .	3
2.2.	IESG and IETF Chair . . . . .	4
2.3.	The Internet Society . . . . .	4
2.4.	IETF Administrative Oversight Committee . . . . .	4
2.5.	IETF Administrative Support Activity . . . . .	4
2.6.	IETF Administrative Director . . . . .	4
2.7.	IAOC Meeting Committee . . . . .	5
3.	Venue Selection Process . . . . .	5
3.1.	Venue Selection Principles . . . . .	5
3.2.	Venue Selection Objectives . . . . .	6
3.3.	Venue Selection Criteria . . . . .	8
3.3.1.	Venue City Considerations . . . . .	8
3.3.2.	Basic Venue Criteria . . . . .	9
3.3.3.	Technical Services and Operations Criteria . . . . .	10
3.3.4.	Lodging . . . . .	10
3.3.5.	Food and Beverage . . . . .	11
3.4.	Non-criteria . . . . .	11
3.5.	Venue Selection Phases . . . . .	11
3.6.	Experience Notes . . . . .	13
4.	Transparency . . . . .	13
5.	IANA Considerations . . . . .	13
6.	Security Considerations . . . . .	13
7.	Privacy Considerations . . . . .	13
8.	Contributors . . . . .	14
9.	Acknowledgements . . . . .	14
10.	References . . . . .	14
10.1.	Normative References . . . . .	14
10.2.	Informative References . . . . .	15
Appendix A.	Change Log . . . . .	15
Author's Address	. . . . .	15

## 1. Introduction

This document describes the IETF Meeting Venue Selection Process from the perspective of goals and thought processes. Following IETF 94 and at IETF 95 there was a discussion on the IETF list of the selection process and criteria for IETF meetings. In response to that discussion, the IAOC and the IAOC Meetings Committee took it upon themselves to more publicly document its process and involve community input.

This document describes the objectives and principles behind the venue selection process. It also discusses the actual selection

process to one level of detail, and points to working documents used in execution.

### 1.1. Requirements Language

Requirements called out in this document are identified as either "mandatory" or "desired", and considerations are tagged as "Important" or "Would be nice". For clarity, the terms are defined here:

**Mandatory:** If this requirement cannot be met, a location under consideration is unacceptable. We walk away.

**Desired:** We would very much like to meet this requirement, but have frequently been unable to. The fact that we could not meet it is considered in comparison to other sites.

**Important:** Can be a make-or-break consideration, but can also be traded off against other considerations.

**Would be nice:** Not make-or-break, but warrants additional consideration if found to be true.

## 2. Meeting Selection Participants and Responsibilities

The formal structure of IETF administrative support functions is documented in BCP 101 [RFC4071][RFC4371][RFC7691]. The reader is expected to be familiar with the entities and roles defined by that document, in particular for the IASA, ISOC, IAOC and IAD. This section covers the meeting selection related roles of these and other parties that participate in the process. Note that roles beyond meeting selection, e.g., actually running and reporting on meetings, are outside the scope of this document.

### 2.1. The IETF Community

While somewhat obvious to most, it is important to note that IETF meetings serve all those who contribute to the development of IETF RFCs. This includes those who attend meetings, from newcomer to frequent attendee, to those who participate remotely, and to those who don't attend but contribute to new RFCs. Potential new contributors are also considered in the process.

IETF consensus with respect to the meeting venue selection process is judged via standard IETF process and not by any other means, e.g., surveys. Surveys are used to gather information related to meeting venues, but not to measure consensus.

## 2.2. IESG and IETF Chair

The Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG) is a group comprised of the IETF Area Directors and the IETF Chair. The IESG is responsible for the management, along with the IAB, of the IETF, and is the standards approval board for the IETF, as described in BCP9 [RFC2026]. This means that the IESG sets high level policies related to, among other things, meeting venues. The IETF Chair is a member of the IESG who, among other things, relays policies to the IAOC. The IETF Chair is also a member of the IAOC.

## 2.3. The Internet Society

The Internet Society (ISOC) executes all venue contracts on behalf of the IETF at the request of the IAOC; solicits meeting sponsorships; collects all meeting-related revenues, including registration fees, sponsorships, hotel commissions, and other miscellaneous revenues. ISOC also provides accounting services, such as invoicing and monthly financial statements. The meetings budget is managed by the IAD.

## 2.4. IETF Administrative Oversight Committee

The IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC) has the responsibility to oversee and select IETF meeting venues. It instructs the IAD to work with the Internet Society to write the relevant contracts. It approves the IETF meetings calendar.

## 2.5. IETF Administrative Support Activity

The IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA) supports the meeting selection process. This includes identifying, qualifying and reporting on potential meeting sites, as well as supporting meeting venue contract negotiation. The IETF Secretariat is part of the IASA under the management of the IAD.

## 2.6. IETF Administrative Director

The IETF Administrative Director (IAD) coordinates and supports the activities of the IETF Secretariat, the IAOC Meetings Committee and the IAOC to ensure the timely execution of the meeting process. This includes participating in the IAOC Meeting Subcommittee and ensuring its efforts are documented, leading venue contract negotiation, and coordinating contract execution with ISOC.

## 2.7. IAOC Meeting Committee

The IAOC Meeting Committee is generally referred to as the Meetings Committee.

The fundamental purpose of the committee is to participate in the venue selection process, and to formulate recommendations to the IAOC regarding meeting sites. It also tracks the meetings sponsorship program, recommends extraordinary meeting-related expenses, and recommends the IETF meetings calendar to the IAOC. The charter of the committee is located here: <https://iaoc.ietf.org/committees.html#meetings>.

Membership in the Meetings Committee is at the discretion of the IAOC; it includes an IAOC appointed chair, the IETF Administrative Director (IAD), IAOC members, representatives from the Secretariat, and interested members of the community.

## 3. Venue Selection Process

The process of selecting a venue is described below and is based on <https://iaoc.ietf.org/venue-selection.html>.

### 3.1. Venue Selection Principles

The IETF, and therefore the IAOC and its Meetings Committee, have some core values that pervade the selection process. These are not limited to the following, but at minimum include them.

Who are we?

We are computer scientists, engineers, network operators, academics, and other interested parties sharing the goal of making the Internet work better. At this time, the vast majority of attendees come from North America, Western and Central Europe, and Eastern Asia. We also have participants from other regions.

Why do we meet?

We meet to advance Internet standards development, to advance Internet Drafts and RFCs. We meet to facilitate attendee participation in multiple topics and to enable cross-pollination of ideas and technology.

Where do we meet?

We meet in different locations globally in order to spread the pain and cost of travel among active participants, balancing travel time and expense across the regions from where IETF participants are based. We also aim to enhance inclusiveness and new contributions.

**Inclusiveness:**

We would like to facilitate the onsite or remote participation of anyone who wants to be involved. Every country has limits on who it will permit within its borders. This principle of inclusiveness militates against the selection of venues within countries that impose visa regulations and/or laws that effectively exclude people on the basis of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or national origin, and to a lesser extent, reduces the likelihood of selecting countries that use such attributes to make entry difficult.

**Internet Access:**

As an organization, we write specifications for the Internet, and we use it heavily. Meeting attendees need unfiltered access to the general Internet and our corporate networks, which are usually reached using encrypted VPNs from the meeting venue and hotels, including overflow hotels. We also need open network access available at high enough data rates to support our work, including the support of remote participation.

**Focus:**

We meet to have focused technical discussions. These are not limited to breakout sessions, although of course those are important; they also happen over meals or drinks (including a specific type of non-session that we call a "Bar BOF"), or in side meetings. Environments that are noisy or distracting prevent that or reduce its effectiveness, and are therefore less desirable as a meeting venue.

**Economics:**

Meeting attendees participate as individuals. While many have their participation underwritten by employers or sponsors, there are many who do not. Locations that do not provide convenient budget alternatives for food and lodging, or which are multiple travel segments from major airports, are therefore exclusionary, and violate our value of "Inclusiveness". Within reason, budget should not be a barrier to accommodation.

**Political considerations:**

The IETF does not make political statements. We do not decide who is or is not a country, and we do not choose or not choose venues based on political criteria.

### 3.2. Venue Selection Objectives

Venues for meetings are selected to advance the objectives of the IETF, which are discussed in <https://www.ietf.org/about/mission.html>. The IAOC's supporting objectives include:

- o Advancing standards development
- o Facilitating participation by active contributors
- o Sharing the travel pain; balancing travel time and expense across the regions from where IETF participants are based.
- o Encouraging new contributors
- o Generating funds to support IETF operations in support of standards development, including the Secretariat, IASA, and the RFC Editor.

There is an explicit intent to rotate meeting locations equally among several places in accordance with IETF policy. However, a consistent balance is sometimes difficult to achieve. The IAOC has an objective of setting the Regions 4 years in advance, meeting in Europe, North America, and Asia, with a possibility of occasionally meeting outside those regions. This policy, known as the 1-1-1\* model, is set by the IESG, <https://iaoc.ietf.org/minutes/2010-11-10-iaoc-minutes.txt>, and is further discussed in [I-D.krishnan-ietf-meeting-policy]. The reason for the multi-year timeframe is maximization of opportunities; the smaller the time available to qualify and contract a conference venue, the more stress imposed on the qualification process, and the greater the risk of not finding a suitable venue or paying more for it.

There is no formal policy regarding rotation of regions, the time of year for a meeting in a specific region, or whether a meeting in a non-targeted region replaces a visit to one of the regions during that year.

The IETF chair drives selection of "\*" locations, i.e., venues outside the usual regions, and requires community input. These selections usually arise from evidence of growing interest and participation in the new region. Expressions of interest from possible hosts also factor into the meeting site selection process, for any meeting.

Increased participation in the IETF from those other regions, electronically or in person, could result in basic changes to the overall pattern, and we encourage those who would like for that to occur to encourage participation from those regions.

### 3.3. Venue Selection Criteria

A number of criteria are considered during the site selection process. The list following is not sorted in any particular order, but includes the committee's major considerations.

The selection of a venue always requires trade-offs. There are no perfect venues. For example, a site may not have a single hotel that can accommodate a significant number of the attendees of a typical IETF. That doesn't disqualify it, but it may reduce its desirability in the presence of an alternative that does.

Each identified criterion is labeled with the terms defined above in Section 1.1, i.e., "Mandatory", "Desired", "Important" or "Would be nice". These terms guide the trade-off analysis portion of the selection process. All "Mandatory" labeled criteria must be met for a venue to be selected. The remaining terms may be viewed as weighting factors.

There are times where the evaluation of the criteria will be subjective. This is even the case for criteria labeled as "Mandatory". For this reason, the Meetings Committee will specifically review, and affirm to its satisfaction, that all "Mandatory" labeled criteria are satisfied by a particular venue and main IETF hotel as part of the process defined below in Section 3.5.

#### 3.3.1. Venue City Considerations

- o Travel to the venue is reasonably acceptable based on cost, time, and burden for participants traveling from multiple regions. It is anticipated that the burden borne will be generally shared over the course of the year. [Important]
- o Travel barriers to entry, e.g., visa requirements that can limit participation, are researched, noted, and carefully considered. [Important]
- o Economic, safety, and health risks associated with this venue are researched, reviewed and carefully considered, at the time the selection is made, and thereafter as the time for the meeting approaches. [Important]
- o Review available travel information (such as <https://travel.state.gov/content/passports/en/country.html>) for issues that would be counter to our principles on inclusiveness etc. [Important]



- o The venue is assessed as favorable for obtaining a host and sponsors. That is, the Meeting is in a location and at a price that it is possible and probable to find a host and sponsors. [Important]
- o Prior successful IETF experience with the Venue and Venue city will be considered as a positive factor when deciding among multiple venues. [Would be nice]
- o Consideration will be given to whether it makes sense to enter into a multi-event contract with the venue to optimize meeting and attendee benefits, i.e., reduce administrative costs and reduce direct attendee costs. [Would be nice]

### 3.3.2. Basic Venue Criteria

- o The Meeting Space is adequate in size and layout to accommodate the meeting and foster participant interaction. [Mandatory]
- o The venue and hotels can be put under contract. The subsequent failure to put a selected venue under contract will result in a re-evaluation of the venues and selection for the meeting. [Mandatory]
- o The cost of guest rooms, meeting space, meeting food and beverage is affordable (within the norms of business travel). [Mandatory]
- o The economics of the venue allow the meeting to be net cash positive [Mandatory].
- o An Optimal Facility for an IETF meeting is held under "One Roof", that is, qualified meeting space and guest rooms are available in the same facility. [Desired]
- o An Optimal Facility for an IETF meeting is accessible by people with disabilities.
  - \* The selected facility conforms with local accessibility laws and regulations [Mandatory]
  - \* <http://www.sigaccess.org/welcome-to-sigaccess/resources/accessible-conference-guide/> provides a definition of related considerations that shall be used in evaluating this criterion. [Desired]

### 3.3.3. Technical Services and Operations Criteria

- o The Venue's support technologies and services -- network, audio-video, etc., are sufficient for the anticipated activities at the meeting, or the venue is willing to add such infrastructure at no or at an acceptable cost to the IETF. [Mandatory]
- o The meeting venue must permit and facilitate the delivery of a high performance, robust, unfiltered and unmodified IETF Network. [Mandatory]
- o The IETF hotel(s), which are one or more hotels in close proximity to the venue where the primary IETF room allocations are negotiated and the IETF SSIDs are in use, must provide, or permit and facilitate, the delivery of a high performance, robust, unfiltered and unmodified Internet service for the public areas and guest rooms. This service is typically included in the cost of the room. [Mandatory]
- o The overflow hotels should provide reasonable, reliable, unfiltered Internet service for the public areas and guest rooms. This service is typically included in the cost of the room. [Desired]

### 3.3.4. Lodging

- o The IETF hotel(s) are within close proximity to each other and the venue. [Mandatory]
- o The Guest Rooms at the IETF hotel(s) are sufficient in number to house 1/3 or more of projected meeting attendees. [Mandatory]
- o The Venue environs include budget hotels within convenient travel time, cost, and effort. [Mandatory]
- o Overflow Hotels that can be placed under contract. They typically must be within convenient travel time of the venue and have a variety of guest room rates. [Mandatory]
- o The IETF hotel(s) are accessible by people with disabilities.
  - \* The selected facility conforms with local accessibility laws and regulations [Mandatory]
  - \* <http://www.sigaccess.org/welcome-to-sigaccess/resources/accessible-conference-guide/> provides a definition of related considerations that shall be used in evaluating this criterion. [Desired]

### 3.3.5. Food and Beverage

- o The Venue environs, which includes onsite, and the areas within a reasonable walking distance, or conveniently accessible by a short taxi, bus, or subway ride, has convenient and inexpensive choices for meals that can accommodate a wide range of dietary requirements. [Mandatory]
- o The Venue environs include grocery shopping that will accommodate a wide range of dietary requirements, within a reasonable walking distance, or conveniently accessible by a short taxi, bus, or subway ride. [Desired]

### 3.4. Non-criteria

The following is specifically not among the selection criteria:

- o Visiting new locations for the sake of variety in meeting locations.

### 3.5. Venue Selection Phases

Commencing the process four years in advance of an event results in the following schedule as a guideline:

#### Phase 1: Identification and Preliminary Investigation

Four years out, a process identifies cities for meetings and initiates site selection.

- A. The IAOC selects regions for meetings.
- B. Meeting target cities per region are provided to the Secretariat based upon Meetings Committee input and, if known, host preferences.
- C. Potential venues in preferred cities identified and investigated, including reviews of Official Advisory Sources, consultation with specialty travel services, frequent travelers and local contacts to identify possible barriers to holding a successful meeting in the target cities.
- D. Investigated cities and findings are provided by the Secretariat to the Meetings Committee for review. Meetings Committee makes a recommendation to the IAOC of investigated/ target cities to consider further as well as issues identified and the results of research conducted.

#### Phase 2: Community Consultation

The IAOC asks the community whether there are any barriers to holding a successful meeting in the target cities. Community responses are reviewed and concerns investigated. IAOC provides a list of vetted cities to the Meetings Committee to pursue as potential meeting locations.

Phase 3: Vetted Venues Evaluated for Site Qualification Visit

- A. Secretariat Assesses "vetted" target cities to determine availability and conformance to criteria
- B. Meetings Committee approves potential cities for site qualification visit.
- C. Site qualification visits are arranged by Secretariat and preliminary negotiations are undertaken with selected potential sites
- D. Site qualification visit is conducted using the checklist from <https://iaoc.ietf.org/meetings-committee/venue-selection.html>; The site visit team prepares a site report and discusses it with the Meetings Committee.

Phase 4: Qualified Venues Evaluated for Contract

2.75 - 3 years out, initiate contract negotiations.

- A. The Meetings Committee reviews the venue options based on venue selection criteria and recommends a venue to the IAOC. Only options that meet all Mandatory labeled criteria may be recommended.
- B. IAOC selects a venue for contracting as well as a back-up contracting venue, if available.
- C. Secretariat negotiates with selected venue. IAD reviews contract and requests IAOC and ISOC approval of contract and authority for Secretariat to execute contract on ISOC's behalf.
- D. Contracts are executed.

Phase 5: Evaluation and Contingency Planning

3 Months Prior to the Meeting, the meeting site is checked for continued availability and conformance to expectations.

- A. Secretariat reviews current status of the contracted meeting location to confirm there is no change in the location status and to identify possible new barriers to holding a successful

meeting in the contracted city and provides findings to the IAOC.

- B. IAOC considers the information provided and evaluates the risk - if significant risk is identified, the Contingency Planning Flow Chart (<https://iaoc.ietf.org/meetings-committee/venue-selection.html>) is followed, if current risk is not significant, the situation is monitored through the meeting to ensure there is no significant change.

### 3.6. Experience Notes

- a. The foregoing process works with reasonable certainty in North America and Europe.
- b. Experience to date for Asia and Latin America is that contracts take longer and often will not be executed more than two years in advance of the meeting. While the IETF will have the first option for the dates, for reasons not completely understood contracts won't be executed.

## 4. Transparency

BCP 101 requires transparency in IASA process and contracts, and thereby of the meetings committee. BCP 101 also states that the IAOC approves what information is to remain confidential. Therefore any information produced by the meetings committee or related to meetings that individuals believe is confidential, e.g., venue contracts, must be confirmed to be confidential by the IAOC.

## 5. IANA Considerations

This memo asks the IANA for no new parameters.

## 6. Security Considerations

This note proposes no protocols, and therefore no new protocol insecurities.

## 7. Privacy Considerations

This note reveals no personally identifying information apart from its authorship.

## 8. Contributors

In addition to the editor, text was developed by

Ray Pelletier  
Internet Society  
Email: rpelletier@isoc.org

Laura Nugent  
Association Management Solutions  
+1 (510) 492-4008  
Email: lnugent@amsl.com

Dave Crocker  
Brandenburg InternetWorking  
+1.408.246.8253  
Email: dcrocker@bbiw.net

Lou Berger  
LabN Consulting, L.L.C.  
Email: lberger@labn.net

Ole Jacobsen  
The Internet Protocol Journal  
+1 415 550-9433  
Email: olejacobsen@me.com

Jim Martin  
INOC  
+1 608 807-0454  
Email: jim@inoc.com

## 9. Acknowledgements

Additional commentary came from Jari Arkko and Scott Bradner.

## 10. References

### 10.1. Normative References

- [I-D.krishnan-ietf-meeting-policy]  
Krishnan, S., "High level guidance for the meeting policy of the IETF", draft-krishnan-ietf-meeting-policy-00 (work in progress), June 2016.
- [RFC2026] Bradner, S., "The Internet Standards Process -- Revision 3", BCP 9, RFC 2026, DOI 10.17487/RFC2026, October 1996, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2026>>.

- [RFC4071] Austein, R., Ed. and B. Wijnen, Ed., "Structure of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)", BCP 101, RFC 4071, DOI 10.17487/RFC4071, April 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4071>>.
- [RFC4371] Carpenter, B., Ed. and L. Lynch, Ed., "BCP 101 Update for IPR Trust", BCP 101, RFC 4371, DOI 10.17487/RFC4371, January 2006, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4371>>.
- [RFC7691] Bradner, S., Ed., "Updating the Term Dates of IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC) Members", BCP 101, RFC 7691, DOI 10.17487/RFC7691, November 2015, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7691>>.

## 10.2. Informative References

- [I-D.barnes-healthy-food]  
Barnes, M., "Healthy Food and Special Dietary Requirements for IETF meetings", draft-barnes-healthy-food-07 (work in progress), July 2013.

## Appendix A. Change Log

- 2016-01-12: Initial version
- 2016-01-21: Update to reflect <https://iaoc.ietf.org/documents/VenueSelectionCriteriaJan2016.pdf> and <https://iaoc.ietf.org/documents/VenueSelectionProcess11Jan16.pdf>, accessed from <https://iaoc.ietf.org/private/privatemeetings.html>.
- 2016-02-23: Reorganize and capture IAOC Meetings Committee discussions.
- 2016-03-03: Final from Design Team.
- 2016-03-17: First update incorporating [mtgvenue@ietf.org](mailto:mtgvenue@ietf.org) comments
- 2016-05-20 Updated in accordance with editing by Laura Nugent, Dave Crocker, Lou Berger, Fred Baker, and others.

## Author's Address

Fred Baker (editor)  
Cisco Systems  
Santa Barbara, California 93117  
USA

Email: [fred@cisco.com](mailto:fred@cisco.com)

INTERNET-DRAFT

Intended Status: Best Current Practice  
Expires: May 3, 2017

N. Elkins  
Inside Products  
V. Hegde  
Consultant  
October 30, 2016

Definition of Participation Metrics for IETF Attendees  
draft-elkins-mtgvenue-participation-metrics-01

Abstract

IETF meetings are held physically in various geographic regions of the world. One of the criteria for choosing a location is the amount of participation by the people in that region. Additionally, questions arise as to whether holding a physical meeting in a location increases the amount of participation by local attendees. Participation in the IETF process may occur in a number of different ways: email lists, writing drafts, physical or remote attendance at a meeting, chairing Working Groups and so on. This document defines the metrics and terms which may be used to measure participation both before and after an IETF meeting.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at  
<http://www.ietf.org/lid-abstracts.html>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at  
<http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

Copyright and License Notice



Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction . . . . .	3
1.1	Geographic outreach . . . . .	3
1.2	Encouraging Participation from New Regions . . . . .	3
1.3	Motivation for New Geographic Regions to Participate . . . . .	3
2	Participation and its Nature . . . . .	4
2.1	What does Participation Mean? . . . . .	4
2.2	Ways to Participate . . . . .	4
2.2.1	Email Lists . . . . .	5
2.2.2	Authoring Drafts . . . . .	5
2.2.3	Authoring Seminal Drafts . . . . .	5
2.2.4	Starting a new Working Group or BOF . . . . .	6
2.2.5	Remote Participation . . . . .	6
2.2.6	Attending Physical Meetings . . . . .	6
2.2.7	Participating as a Leader . . . . .	6
2.2.8	Participation in standards implementation. . . . .	6
2.2.9	Participation in tools development . . . . .	6
3	Measuring Contributions following a Physical IETF Meeting . . . . .	6
4	Guidelines for tracking metrics . . . . .	7
4.1	Phase 1 - Non-binding metrics . . . . .	7
4.2	Phase 2 - How to measure them . . . . .	7
4.3	Phase 3 - Accept as input for meetings . . . . .	7
5	Security Considerations . . . . .	8
6	IANA Considerations . . . . .	8
7	References . . . . .	8
7.1	Informative References . . . . .	8
8	Acknowledgments . . . . .	8
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	8

## 1 Introduction

IETF meetings are held physically in various geographic regions of the world. One of the criteria for choosing a location is the amount of participation by the people in that region. Additionally, questions arise as to whether holding a physical meeting in a location increases the amount of participation by local attendees. Participation in the IETF process may occur in a number of different ways: email lists, writing drafts, physical or remote attendance at a meeting, chairing Working Groups and so on. This document defines the metrics and terms which may be used to measure participation both before and after an IETF meeting.

### 1.1 Geographic outreach

The document [I-D.sullivan-mtgvenue-decisions] "Prioritized Objectives for Making Decisions in Selecting a Meeting Venue" contains the following:

"The IETF moves its meetings around to ensure that those who can participate in person at the meetings share the difficulty and cost of travel. The point of such moving is emphatically not to find new or interesting places to visit, or to undertake outreach to new communities who would not otherwise participate in the IETF."

### 1.2 Encouraging Participation from New Regions

The document [I-D.baker-mtgvenue-iaoc-venue-selection-process] "IAOC Plenary Meeting Venue Selection Process" contains the following:

"The IETF chair drives selection of "\*" locations, i.e., venues outside the usual regions, and requires community input. These selections usually arise from evidence of growing interest and participation in the new region. Expressions of interest from possible hosts also factor into the meeting site selection process, for any meeting.

Increased participation in the IETF from those other regions, electronically or in person, could result in basic changes to the overall pattern, and we encourage those who would like for that to occur to encourage participation from those regions."

### 1.3 Motivation for New Geographic Regions to Participate

The very process of preparing for or asking for an IETF meeting to be held in a geographic region where it has not been held before can have a profound change on the nature of that region's relationship to Internet Standards. It can change the thinking from being

"consumers" of standards to "developers" of standards. It may help create a core group both within the region and from the diaspora to mentor and foster new work. This can have a long lasting impact on the network professionals of that geographic area. Planning for an IETF meeting to be held in a region can be a concrete rallying point to create such empowerment and change.

All the above factors speak to the need to define more clearly what "participation" means and how to measure it objectively.

## 2 Participation and its Nature

### 2.1 What does Participation Mean?

There are two ways to contribute to the IETF process: fundamental participation and process participation.

**Fundamental Participation:** fundamental participation means active contribution to substantive IETF work. The work of the IETF is to develop protocol standards, so a fundamental contribution is in protocol development. Having said that, the reason for a protocol standard or a Working Group is to solve a problem which exists on the Internet. A new standard is not developed in isolation in someone's head. It is a result of discussions both face to face and electronically, sometimes lasting for several years. Additionally, one Internet Draft or one conversation can lead to changing a view point or sparking ideas for other contributors.

**Process Participation:** the IETF organism needs support to maintain and improve itself. Groups such as mentoring, education, outreach, diversity, meeting venue and so on attempt to improve the functioning of the IETF organism. Involvement in such groups is necessary to the IETF but is of a different nature than a contribution to a protocol standard. Having said that, involvement in process groups may be a way to build a network of contacts which then may lead to conversations about protocol problems which then may lead to a new protocol standard. Involvement in process groups is very much needed by the IETF and it may be a way for new people to work their way towards fundamental participation.

### 2.2 Ways to Participate

Traditionally, work in the IETF consists of interactions and decision making on email lists as well as physical meetings which are held three times per year. New ways to participate include attending meetings electronically at a remote hub or from a single location.

One may also become involved in an Internet Draft Review team. Some methods have very little associated economic costs; others have a high cost.

One caveat in starting to keep metrics on participation - one hopes that people will not attempt to "game the system". That is, make comments without merit on email lists or at the microphone in a meeting merely to improve the statistics for the region. The social sanctions for making comments without merit are sufficiently high that the authors feel that baseless contributions will likely not persist.

### 2.2.1 Email Lists

Posting to a Working Group email list to discuss an Internet Draft is the way that is most open to most people. There is little barrier to entry in terms of economic cost. An Internet connection of some type and an access device is all that is needed.

However, there may be cultural barriers. Sometimes people (especially when new) are not comfortable with the process of posting to the Working Group email list or want to check with others about their understanding of an Internet Draft before asking a question or posting a suggestion. So, the IETF Mentoring program is starting Internet Draft Review Teams so that would-be participants can work with remote mentors to facilitate engagement. The desired output of such teams is posting to an email list.

Posting to a fundamental Working Group email list should be the only metric counted. Posting to an email list such as IETF discuss, 96attendees and so on, is not a worthy metric to gauge participation.

### 2.2.2 Authoring Drafts

Not all Internet Drafts become RFCs. Often, the statistic used is that one in ten Internet Drafts become an RFC. Still, authoring a draft shows active participation. The draft should however, spark active discussion on the email list. If it is chosen for live presentation at a Working Group session, then that is a high degree of participation.

### 2.2.3 Authoring Seminal Drafts

Some drafts change the thinking of others. These may be seminal ideas which are referred to by quite a few others. References to a particular piece of work can easily be found and should be regarded as a high degree of participation.

#### 2.2.4 Starting a new Working Group or BOF

A Working Group is started to address a specific problem. Leading a BOF or a Bar BOF which then leads to Working Group formation should be regarded as a high degree of participation.

#### 2.2.5 Remote Participation

One may participate electronically in Working Group sessions either alone or at a remote hub. Merely viewing a session should not be counted as participation. Making a comment should be counted. Comments are kept in the minutes of the WG meeting, hence can easily be used.

#### 2.2.6 Attending Physical Meetings

One may attend physically and yet not contribute to the process. Alternatively, a physical attendee may be actively engaged and have many conversations both in fundamental and process groups. In the end, an active physical participant will likely end up speaking at the microphone and commenting on a draft or a discussion that is underway in a Working Group meeting. Hence, the examination of WG minutes should be enough to count as a participation metric.

#### 2.2.7 Participating as a Leader

Serving in an IETF management position, Working Group chair, Area Director, and so on can easily be measured and should be regarded as a high degree of participation. Fundamental leadership positions (those of standards developing groups) should be weighted more heavily than process group leadership positions. Having said that, it takes time and a network of contacts to become a fundamental group leader. It also likely takes consistent physical attendance at IETF meetings.

#### 2.2.8 Participation in standards implementation

Standards are not useful in isolation. Implementations of standards are important to see what happens "when the rubber meets the road". Many times, once an idea in a draft is implemented in the real world there are problems found either in interoperability, security or some other areas. The IETF has recognized this with more emphasis on code through hackathons and interaction with open source implementers. Implementing an open source solution should also be considered as a contribution. Often implementation of standards goes hand-in-hand with the standard implementation.

#### 2.2.9 Participation in tools development

Several tools which the IETF uses (such as datatracker) are either completely or partially maintained by volunteers. Contribution to these tools also helps makes interaction and tracking of activities easier for other IETF volunteers. Additions to tools should also be considered as contributions. These can possibly be measured in terms on number of commits or lines of code (though admittedly these are crude metrics).

### 3 Measuring Contributions following a Physical IETF Meeting

Metrics should be kept and published for the above categories following each physical IETF meeting. Metrics may be kept by individual and also by geographic region. The geographic region should be country, continent and Internet Registry (APNIC, Afrinic, etc.) This way, one can readily assess the impact of a meeting in a particular area as well as the growth in contribution for a region. Aspiring regions who wish to increase their IETF presence will also have a way to show their increase in participation over time.

### 4 Guidelines for tracking metrics

#### 4.1 Phase 1 - Non-binding metrics

Define a broad set of non-binding metrics. Some of the metrics can be easily tracked such a number of drafts and meetings attended. Other are little fuzzy such as email contributions, comments in WG on the microphone. Make a list of these and start implementing them.

#### 4.2 Phase 2 - How to measure them

Metrics such as email contributions can be tracked partially by looking up email addresses of participants (and mapping them to country against known databases such as registration history and drafts/RFCs). Track and refine these metrics and get consensus on which ones to track and on the implementations as well. These can be separate drafts.

#### 4.3 Phase 3 - Accept an input for meetings

Once these metrics are acceptably robust, they can be checked for suitability for continued tracking. These can be used as inputs in decision making process for meeting locations.

## 5 Security Considerations

There are no security considerations.

## 6 IANA Considerations

There are no IANA considerations.

## 7 References

### 8.1 Informative References

[I-D.baker-mtgvenue-iaoc-venue-selection-process] Baker, F., "IAOC Plenary Meeting Venue Selection Process", draft-baker-mtgvenue-iaoc-venue-selection-process-03 (work in progress), July 2016.

[I-D.sullivan-mtgvenue-decisions] Sullivan, A., "Prioritized Objectives for Making Decisions in Selecting a Meeting Venue", draft-sullivan-mtgvenue-decisions-00(work in progress), July 2016.

## 9 Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Fred Baker, Yoav Nir, S. Moonesamy and Dave Crocker for their comments.

## Authors' Addresses

Nalini Elkins  
Inside Products, Inc.  
36A Upper Circle  
Carmel Valley, CA 93924  
United States  
Phone: +1 831 659 8360  
Email: [nalini.elkins@insidethestack.com](mailto:nalini.elkins@insidethestack.com)  
<http://www.insidethestack.com>

Vinayak Hegde  
Consultant  
F2, First Floor, Prabhu Kunj, 7th Cross,  
Eshwara Layout, Indiranagar 2nd Stage,  
Bangalore - 560038  
Phone: +91 9449834401  
Email: [vinayakh@gmail.com](mailto:vinayakh@gmail.com)  
URI: <http://www.vinayakhegde.com>

Internet Engineering Task Force  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Best Current Practice  
Expires: July 16, 2017

S. Krishnan  
Ericsson  
January 12, 2017

High level guidance for the meeting policy of the IETF  
draft-krishnan-ietf-meeting-policy-02

Abstract

This document describes a proposed meeting policy for the IETF and the various stakeholders for realizing such a policy.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on July 16, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.



## Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	2
2. The 1-1-1-* meeting policy . . . . .	2
3. Implementation of the policy . . . . .	3
4. Re-evaluation and changes to this policy . . . . .	4
5. Open items . . . . .	4
6. Acknowledgments . . . . .	4
7. References . . . . .	4
7.1. Normative References . . . . .	5
7.2. Informative References . . . . .	5
Author's Address . . . . .	5

## 1. Introduction

The work of the IETF is primarily conducted on the working group mailing lists, while face-to-face WG meetings mainly provide a high bandwidth mechanism for working out unresolved issues. The IETF currently strives to have a 1-1-1-\* meeting policy [IETFMEET] where the goal is to distribute the meetings equally between North America, Europe, and Asia that are the locations most of the IETF participants have come from in the recent past. This meeting rotation is mainly aimed at distributing the travel pain for the existing IETF participants who physically attend meetings and for distributing the timezone pain for those who participate remotely. This policy has neither been defined precisely nor documented in an IETF consensus document. The goal of this document is to provide an initial definition of the policy, and eventually to get a consensus-backed version published as a BCP.

## 2. The 1-1-1-\* meeting policy

Given that the majority of the current participants come from North America, Europe, and Asia [CONT-DIST], the IETF policy is that our meetings should primarily be in those regions. i.e., the meeting policy (let's call this the "1-1-1" policy) is that meetings should rotate between North America, Europe, and Asia. It is important to note that such rotation and any effects to distributing travel pain should be considered from a long-term perspective. While the typical cycle in an IETF year may be a meeting in North America in March, a meeting in Europe in July, and a meeting in Asia on November, the 1-1-1 policy does not mandate such a cycle, as long as the distribution to these regions over multiple years is roughly equal. There are many reasons why meetings might be distributed differently in a given year, and that is fine as long as the distribution in subsequent years balances out the disruptions.

BACKGROUND NOTE: The IETF recognizes that we have not always been successful in following this policy over the past few years. In fact, at the time of writing, going back 6 years the meeting locations resemble more the previous 3-2-1 policy (9 Americas, 6 Europe and 3 Asia). This is attributable to two reasons:

- o we plan meetings 3 years ahead (meaning meetings for 3 of the 6 years had already been planned when the new policy was set)
- o there were some logistical issues (venue availability, cost etc.).

While this meeting rotation caters to the current set of IETF participants, we need to recognize that due to the dynamic and evolving nature of participation, there may be significant changes to the regions that provide a major share of participants in the future. The 1-1-1-\* meeting policy is a slightly modified version of the aforementioned 1-1-1 meeting policy that allows for additional flexibility in the form of a wildcard meeting denoted as a "\*". This wildcard meeting can be used to experiment with exceptional meetings without extensively impacting the regular meetings. e.g. these wildcard meetings can include meetings in other geographical regions, virtual meetings and additional meetings past the three regular meetings in a calendar year.

The wildcard meeting proposals will be initiated based on community consent. After such a proposal is initiated the IESG will make a decision in consultation with the IAOC [RFC4071] to ensure that the proposal can be realistically implemented. The final decision will be communicated back to the community to ensure that there is adequate opportunity to comment.

NOTE: There have not been many such wildcard meetings in the past (with IETF95 in Buenos Aires and IETF47 in Adelaide being the exceptional instances). How often we intend to do such meetings in the future should also be an open topic for discussion within the community.

### 3. Implementation of the policy

Once this meeting policy has been agreed upon, the policy will be provided to the IAOC as high level guidance. Similarly, any wildcard meeting decisions will also be communicated to the IAOC to be implemented. The actual selection of the venue would be performed by the IAOC following the process described in [I-D.baker-mtgvenue-iaoc-venue-selection-process].

The IAOC will also be responsible

- o to assist the community in the development of detailed meeting criteria that are feasible and implementable, and
- o to provide sufficient transparency in a timely manner concerning planned meetings so that community feedback can be collected and acted upon.

#### 4. Re-evaluation and changes to this policy

Given the dynamic nature of participant distribution in the IETF, it is expected that this policy needs to be periodically evaluated and revised to ensure that the stated goals continue to be met. The criteria that are to be met to initiate a revision need to be agreed upon by the community prior to the publication of this document. (e.g. try to mirror draft author distribution over the preceding five years).

#### 5. Open items

There has been some discussion on whether attracting new participants is one of the stated goals of this policy. This should be one of the things to be discussed and agreed upon with the community as the draft progresses.

This draft uses the terms North America, Europe and Asia without a precise definition of the geographical regions. This might lead to some ambiguities. Is this ambiguity something that is desirable or not? Or should we redefine the regions based on other criteria such as the distribution of RIRs (e.g. ARIN/RIPE/APNIC), the UN statistical department's classification of macro geographical regions?

Do we need to predefine success criteria for the wildcard meetings?

#### 6. Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Jari Arkko, Alissa Cooper, Spencer Dawkins, Stephen Farrell, Bob Hinden, Ray Pelletier, Tobias Gondrom, Eric Gray, Melinda Shore, Dave Crocker, Brian Carpenter, Eliot Lear, Andrew Malis, Olaf Kolkman, Ole Jacobsen and Yoav Nir for their ideas and comments to improve this document.

#### 7. References

## 7.1. Normative References

- [RFC4071] Austein, R., Ed. and B. Wijnen, Ed., "Structure of the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA)", BCP 101, RFC 4071, DOI 10.17487/RFC4071, April 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4071>>.

## 7.2. Informative References

- [CONT-DIST] arkko.com, "Distribution of authors by continent", 2016, <<http://www.arkko.com/tools/allstats/contdistr.html>>.
- [I-D.baker-mtgvenue-iaoc-venue-selection-process] Baker, F., "IAOC Plenary Meeting Venue Selection Process", draft-baker-mtgvenue-iaoc-venue-selection-process-03 (work in progress), July 2016.
- [IETFMEET] IAOC Plenary Presentation, "IETF 1-1-1 Meeting Policy", 2010, <<https://www.ietf.org/proceedings/79/slides/plenaryw-3.pdf>>.

## Author's Address

Suresh Krishnan  
Ericsson

Email: [suresh.krishnan@ericsson.com](mailto:suresh.krishnan@ericsson.com)

MTGVENUE  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: January 9, 2017

A. Sullivan  
Dyn, Inc.  
A. Cooper  
Cisco Systems  
July 8, 2016

Prioritized Objectives for Making Decisions in Selecting a Meeting Venue  
draft-sullivan-mtgvenue-decisions-00

Abstract

Selecting a site for an IETF meeting necessarily involves balancing various factors about the site and the goals of the IETF meeting. Those who are faced with choosing a site need guidance on how to prioritize objectives in making such decisions, since no algorithm is possible. This memo provides a set of such objectives in order of importance.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on January 9, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of

the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction . . . . . 2
- 2. Objectives . . . . . 2
  - 2.1. Inclusiveness . . . . . 3
  - 2.2. Co-location of attendees . . . . . 3
  - 2.3. Network access . . . . . 4
  - 2.4. Safety and security . . . . . 4
  - 2.5. Affordability . . . . . 4
- 3. Non-Objectives . . . . . 4
  - 3.1. One roof . . . . . 4
  - 3.2. Maximal attendance . . . . . 4
  - 3.3. Geographic outreach . . . . . 5
- 4. Informative References . . . . . 5
- Appendix A. Discussion Venue . . . . . 5
- Appendix B. Change History . . . . . 5
- Authors' Addresses . . . . . 5

1. Introduction

As [I-D.baker-mtgvenue-iaoc-venue-selection-process] makes clear, there are myriad factors to balance in choosing an IETF meeting venue. While that document outlines some important principles at work in considering the factors, it offers only guidance about how to decide among competing considerations.

This memo offers a list of objectives, in descending order of importance, in an attempt to guide decision-makers. These are objectives, not rules, and are intended to guide decisions in a way that encourages the productivity and comity of the IETF community.

It is expected that the list will be initially controversial. It is offered as a proposal in order to determine whether the community has collective preferences. Expression of such collective preferences can help those who are making venue selections be confident that they understand what the community is likely to want. If it becomes clear that the community cannot really come to a conclusion about how to order these sorts of objectives, that too is information for those undertaking venue selection.

2. Objectives

## 2.1. Inclusiveness

The purpose of an IETF meeting is above all to support the standards-development work that is undertaken by IETF participants. Therefore, when selecting venues, maximal inclusiveness is paramount, and must trump other considerations. Maximizing inclusiveness carries a number of implications:

**Legal exclusions:** Formal legal exclusions or differential treatment by authorities in a candidate destination, on the basis of age, gender or gender identity, sexuality, marital status, political views, racial background, nationality, countries previously visited, or any other category of irrelevant discrimination, in general ought to disqualify a site from candidacy. Informal but widely-experienced (or widely-announced) persistent discrimination of the same sort, particularly at the point of immigration, should also be treated as an extremely negative consideration, but is not the same as formal legal sanction against an identifiable group.

**Accessibility:** IETF contributors have different physical abilities. An acceptable venue must accommodate the ranges of physical ability found across the community. This means that attendance at every session and accommodation in meeting hotels must be a practical possibility for those using a variety of assistive devices.

**Distribution of travel difficulty and cost:** The composition of IETF contributors changes over time, and the difficulty and cost of travel ought to be shared throughout the community. This includes difficulties relating to long journeys, different customs in modes of travel, and cultural adjustment to local norms of visitor behaviour.

**Predictions are hard, especially about the future:** Legal, political, and economic realities sometimes change after an agreement is signed, and nobody expects infallible predictions. The goal is still maximal inclusiveness, even if that goal can be only imperfectly realised.

## 2.2. Co-location of attendees

The IETF does not meet to make decisions: those are made on mailing lists. The reason for the in-person meetings is twofold. First, it is to address issues that can be better solved in person because of the way in-person communication can often dissolve misunderstanding more quickly than written communication can. Second, it is to encourage the development of social bonds and informal understanding so that later written communication can be easier.

Accordingly, sites to be selected must provide the necessary support for informal interaction and random group work. In practice, this means that:

- o Venues need to be in urban areas in order to accommodate a wide range of opportunities for these kinds of interaction.
- o Meeting hotels need to be in close proximity to each other and the venue.

### 2.3. Network access

Unfettered high-bandwidth access to the entire Internet, from all the hotels associated with the meeting, is a necessary criterion for a successful meeting. It should be treated as an extremely negative consideration were mobile networks outside the hotels to be subject to significant filtering or interference.

### 2.4. Safety and security

In keeping with the objective of inclusiveness noted in Section 2.1, an acceptable venue will be in general safe for individuals. Health risks and issues of safety from violence or personal crime are to be regarded as worse than issues of crimes against property.

### 2.5. Affordability

Many IETF participants fund their own way to meetings, and many others have limited employer support for travel. With the understanding that the facilities necessary to achieve the goals of meeting in person at all cannot be sacrificed, the cost to meeting attendees for accommodation should be minimized.

## 3. Non-Objectives

### 3.1. One roof

While it can be convenient to hold a meeting in a venue under "one roof" (e.g. a conference centre with an attached hotel, or a large hotel with many meeting rooms), it is a secondary goal and may be sacrificed whenever it is in tension with goals in Section 2.

### 3.2. Maximal attendance

Because the IETF garners a significant portion of its revenue from IETF meeting fees, there is considerable incentive for decision-makers to prefer a venue that will attract more attendees. It is important to resist this temptation: a larger meeting in which key



contributors could not make it is not a better meeting; neither is one with a lot of "tourists".

### 3.3. Geographic outreach

The IETF moves its meetings around to ensure that those who can participate in person at the meetings share the difficulty and cost of travel. The point of such moving is emphatically not to find new or interesting places to visit, or to undertake outreach to new communities who would not otherwise participate in the IETF.

## 4. Informative References

[I-D.baker-mtgvenue-iaoc-venue-selection-process]  
Baker, F., "IAOC Plenary Meeting Venue Selection Process",  
draft-baker-mtgvenue-iaoc-venue-selection-process-03 (work  
in progress), July 2016.

### Appendix A. Discussion Venue

This Internet-Draft is offered for discussion in the IETF MTGVENUE working group, and on its mailing list <mtgvenue@ietf.org>

### Appendix B. Change History

00:

\* Initial version

### Authors' Addresses

Andrew Sullivan  
Dyn, Inc.  
150 Dow St  
Manchester, NH 03101  
U.S.A.

Email: [asullivan@dyn.com](mailto:asullivan@dyn.com)

Alissa Cooper  
Cisco Systems  
707 Tasman Drive  
Milpitas, CA 95305  
U.S.A.

Email: [alcoop@cisco.com](mailto:alcoop@cisco.com)