**IETF 96 - WG Chairs Lunch**

around 50 people in the room

Agenda:

1. Ombudsteam Processes Update

2. Revisiting the IETF Newcomer Experience

(next steps in EDU and Mentoring and beyond)

3. New IETF website update and feedback

4. Techniques for keeping work moving in a WG

5. Open Forum - Advice and Feedback

(ask your fellow WG chairs questions, provide feedback)

---

**1. Ombudsteam Processes Update (Pete Resnick)**

slides: http://wiki.tools.ietf.org/group/edu/attachment/wiki/IETF96/96-Ombudsteam.pptx?format=raw

Pete Resnick introduced the Ombudsteam and talked about cultural assumptions and the responsibility of WG chairs to make everyone feel welcome and heard.

Daniel Kahn Gillmore said that we need to work to make the IETF a more representative place. He was also wondering if there is also advice and guidance when we as a WG chair make mistakes ourselves. It may be useful to have a safe way to point something like this out. He also mentioned that face-to-face time is essential to get work done, but it is expensive and that remote participation needs to be made easier.

Bernand Aboba talked about the huge efforts made in the area of remote participation efforts and that they are increasingly successful. At this meeting hundreds of people participated remotely. Bernard himself has been participating remotely over the last years and it's working well.

Allison Mankin said that there are many things WGs can do to encourage the right things and to be inclusive (for instance by choosing editors who haven't done this before etc.)

Pete said that the ombudsteam is personally happy to talk about tricky issues with WG chairs. He added that his personal reaction would always be to admit your mistake and recognise it and be honest about it without being defensive.

Barry Leiba said that one thing WG chairs can do to be more inclusive is to appoint people as document editors. Often the authors also become editors. He suggested to identify additional editors to give more people the opportunity to contribute.

Pete added that this is related to the unconscious bias we all make: We tend to pick our friends or people we know rather than finding a new person.

Michael Richardson thought that we pick friends and acquaintances, because we can twist their arms. Because there are not enough volunteers. He also asked for some more details about what the ombudsteam actually does - maybe in contrast to other ombudspersons.

Pete explained that traditionally ombudspeople act as a go-between between leadership and members. This is not how the role is defined in the IETF. It's more about dealing with reports of harassment and different kinds of bad interactions. The team gives confidential advice and council if people have issues. They can possibly investigate and help resolve serious issues.

Linda Dunbar said that she believed WG chairs selecting designated people as editors is a convenient way to discriminate people who are new or have a different opinion. In order to create a fair opportunity for everybody, she suggested to involve those people more.

Collin Jennings noted that only on very few occasions he saw WG chairs asking for volunteers. But each time he has seen it, he was very surprised by who and how many people actually volunteered.

Pete added that even when asked it that way, you might not get all people who might actually volunteer. He suggested to approach people who you see a lot, but maybe aren't interacting as much as others, and ask them directly to do a favour to you - this might work better for various cultures and people.

Rick Taylor said that there are some incredibly smart people, who are painfully shy. We also need to reach out to these people.

Sue Hares said she is really interested in having remote participation by lots of people in her WG. She also said that she would like to talk some more about increasing remote participation.

Karen responded that there are a lot of activities ongoing in that area right now. But maybe this could be a good topic for the next WG chairs session.

**2. New IETF website update and feedback (Greg Wood)**

slides: http://wiki.tools.ietf.org/group/edu/attachment/wiki/IETF96/96-ietf-website-revamp.pdf.zip?format=raw

Alia said it looks nice :-)

**3. Revisiting the IETF Newcomer Experience (Karen O'Donoghue)**

(next steps in EDU and Mentoring and beyond)

slides: http://wiki.tools.ietf.org/group/edu/attachment/wiki/IETF96/96-WG-Chairs-Discussion.pptx?format=raw

The Edu Team is looking for input from WG chairs on how to better reach out to new communities, such as the open source community, researchers etc.

Yaron Sheffer talked about priorities in the area of outreach. Experience shows that we don't get many people from the research community and if we do they don't usually stay very long. He was wondering how much efforts we want to spend to get students to the IETF meeting. He also said that we might be missing some countries. He personally comes from Israel and there aren't many people from Israel at the IETF.

Karen responded that getting researchers to the IETF is indeed challenging. Maybe we also need to think about how we can be more efficient so that researchers don't time out. But maybe we're also not looking for long-term attendance by researchers, but instead on a short-term project/problem-solving basis?

Alia Atlas added that outreach is increasing, but that we should also encourage low-volume participation. She believes it should be easier to participate for people to just work on a few number of things. We shouldn't have a large learning curve and the expectation of full-time involvement. She also mentioned the idea of remote hubs to pull people together from time to time in areas where there are people who are interested in IETF work. The key-point is that we need to keep experimenting and try new things.

Tim Chown commented that one of the problems is that an RFC doesn't count as academic publication. Whether we can fix that, is a different questions. We could produce material that explains what the IETF is about and how it can be relevant to your research. How to engage with the IETF as a researchers. Maybe do presentations on hot topics at the IETF.

Kenny (?) responded that it is not true that students don't get credit for work in the IETF. He said it depends on country and environment and mentioned an example in the UK.

Nalini said that a lot of work is already done by people in Latin America and India. We shouldn't duplicate efforts, but coordinate them better.

Mat Ford mentioned the Applied Networking Research Workshop (ANRW) that took place for the first time in conjunction with this IETF meeting (on Saturday prior to IETF 96). Peer-reviewed academic papers were being presented. This will be organised once a year from now on.

Tim Chown agreed that this is a fantastic initiative and suggested to produce a generic slide deck that teachers and professors can grab from the web site and present it to their students.

Karen said that on the other hand some of the WGs and RGs met in conjunction with other external events.

Michael asked (the Ombudsteam) how one can deal with people who are very vocal, loud and often wrong. They've got passed the newcomers phase and it's a big struggle to contain the enthusiasm from people who don't get where we are going.

Robert Sparks noted that at this venue there are a lot of open break-out places and people are taking strong advantage of that. He asked WG chairs to consider to make their WG session shorter or don't meet at all and to leave time to take advantage of working sessions outside the official WG slot.

Barry Leiba asked the WG chairs to re-evaluate the conflict list, lengths of the time needed and size of room needed each time (rather than just copying the information provided last time).

Karen agreed and added that a number of sessions had been canceled. She was wondering if people schedule sessions just in case and then cancel them later?

Alia urged people to think about what discussions people don't want to have and actually make them happen. She suggested to have a conversation about what issues are actually blocking things. Maybe experiment with other formats: Pick issues and break into smaller groups and then report back to each other at the end.

Collin mentioned some reasons why people cancel WG session: some drafts and changes to existing drafts were not delivered even though they were promised.

Karen suggested to keep the work moving throughout the year.

Barry added that we have a general draft submission deadline, but we can also set our own deadlines.