

mtgvenue
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Best Current Practice
Expires: May 4, 2017

R. Pelletier
Internet Society
L. Nugent
Association Management Solutions
D. Crocker, Ed.
Brandenburg InternetWorking
L. Berger
LabN Consulting, L.L.C.
O. Jacobsen
The Internet Protocol Journal
J. Martin
INOC
F. Baker, Ed.
October 31, 2016

IETF Plenary Meeting Venue Selection Process
draft-ietf-mtgvenue-iaoc-venue-selection-process-02

Abstract

This documents the IETF's Meeting Venue Selection Process from the perspective of its goals, criteria 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 May 4, 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	3
1.1. Background	3
1.2. Requirements Language	3
2. Venue Selection Objectives	3
2.1. Core Values	4
2.2. Venue Selection Non-Objectives	5
3. Venue Selection Criteria	5
3.1. Venue City Criteria	6
3.2. Basic Venue Criteria	7
3.3. Technical Services and Operations Criteria	7
3.4. Lodging Criteria	8
3.5. Food and Beverage Criteria	8
4. Venue Selection Process	9
4.1. The IETF Community	9
4.2. IESG and IETF Chair	9
4.3. The Internet Society	10
4.4. IETF Administrative Oversight Committee	10
4.5. IETF Administrative Support Activity	10
4.6. IETF Administrative Director	10
4.7. IAOC Meeting Committee	10
4.8. Venue Selection Phases	11
5. Text carried forward	13
5.1. Venue Selection Process	13
5.2. Transparency	15
6. IANA Considerations	15
7. Security Considerations	15
8. Privacy Considerations	16
9. Acknowledgements	16
10. References	16
10.1. Normative References	16
10.2. Informative References	16
Appendix A. Change Log	17
Authors' Addresses	17

1. Introduction

This document describes the IETF Meeting Venue Selection Process from the perspective of goals, criteria and thought processes. It 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. Background

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.

1.2. 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. Venue Selection Objectives

Alissa's comment: "Why do we meet?," "Inclusiveness," and perhaps reformulated versions of some other items listed, per draft-sullivan-mtgvenue-decisions; 3.2)

Editor comment: This section is believed to be complete. /d

2.1. Core Values

The IETF has some core values that to pervade the selection process. The values are not limited to the following, but at minimum include them.

Why do we meet?

We meet to advance development of Internet Drafts and RFCs. We also seek to facilitate attendee participation in multiple topics and to enable cross-pollination of ideas and technologies.

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. However the IETF seeks to:

1. Minimize situations in which onerous entry regulations prevent participants from attending meetings, or failing that to distribute meeting locations such that onerous entry regulations are not always experienced by the same attendees; and
2. Avoid meeting in countries with laws that effectively exclude people on the basis of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, or gender identity.

Where do we meet?

We meet in different locations globally in order to spread the difficulty and cost of travel among active participants, balancing travel time and expense across the regions in which IETF participants are based.

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.[MeetingNet]

Focus:

We meet to have focused technical discussions. These are not limited to scheduled 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 are underwritten by employers or sponsors, many are self-funded. In order to reduce participations costs and travel effort, we therefore seek locations that provide convenient budget alternatives for food and lodging, and which are minimize travel segments from major airports. Within reason, budget should not be a barrier to accommodation.

? There may be other points from Section 5.1.1 to move here.

Editor comment: This section is believed to be complete. /d

2.2. Venue Selection Non-Objectives

Alissa's comment: (3.1 "Political considerations," 3.4)

Editor comment: This section is believed to be complete. /d

IETF meeting venues are not selected or declined with the explicit purposes of:

- o Endorsing or condemning particular countries, political paradigms, laws, regulations, or policies.
- o Variety in site-seeing experiences.

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 1.2, 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 IAOC and Meetings Committee will specifically review, and affirm to their 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 4.8.

3.1. Venue City Criteria

Alissa's comment: 3.3.1 bullets 1, 5, 6, plus other bullets from Section 5.1.3.1 if reformulated as criteria)

Note that these considerations are not "make or break" but flexible enough to allow for trade-offs and judgement on the part of the IAOC. Ideally, a city will meet all criteria. If all criteria cannot be met, the IETF community needs to consider the trade-off acceptable.

- 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]

Editor query: Resolve Important vs. Mandatory. d/

- 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]

Editor query: Resolve Important vs. Mandatory. d/

- o It is possible 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, will be considered a positive factor. [Would be nice]
- o Travel barriers to entry, e.g., visa requirements that can limit participation, are acceptable to the IETF community. [Important]

Editor query: Resolve Important vs. Mandatory. d/

- o Economic, safety, and health risks associated with this venue are acceptable to the IETF community. [Important]

Editor query: Resolve Important vs. Mandatory. d/

- o Available travel issue assessments (such as <https://travel.state.gov/content/passports/en/country.html>) have been pointed out the IETF community. [Important]

Editor query: Resolve Important vs. Mandatory. d/

3.2. Basic Venue Criteria

Alissa's comment: (3.3.2 bullets 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)

- o The Meeting Space is adequate in size and layout to accommodate the meeting and foster participant interaction. [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. Technical Services and Operations Criteria

Alissa's comment: (3.3.3)

- 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]

3.4. Lodging Criteria

Alissa's comment: (3.3.4)

- 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]

3.5. Food and Beverage Criteria

Alissa's comment: (3.3.5)

- 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]

4. Venue Selection Process

Alissa's comment: (2)

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.

4.1. 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.

4.2. 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.

4.3. 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.

4.4. 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.

4.5. 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.

4.6. 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.

4.7. 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.

4.8. Venue Selection Phases

Alissa's comment: (3.5, perhaps with additional detail currently in 3.3.1 bullets 2, 3, 4)

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. The IAOC shall maintain a public web page that lists all target cities, when community input was solicited, and summarized review results. Once review results are published the 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.

5. Text carried forward

This document is being reorganized along an outline proposed by Alissa Cooper. In preceding sections, her comment is made explicit. That is intended to be removed when the reorganization is complete. Text in this section is left over and will potentially be moved to preceding sections.

5.1. Venue Selection Process

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

5.1.1. Venue Selection Principles

heading paragraph moved to Section 2.

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? Moved to Section 2.

Where do we meet? moved to Section 2.1

Inclusiveness: Moved to Section 2.1.

Internet Access: Moved to Section 2.1.

Focus: Moved to Section 2.1.

Economics: Moved to Section 2.1.

Political considerations: moved to Section 2.2 and reworded per Alissa's suggested text.

5.1.2. 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.

5.1.3. Venue Selection Criteria

Heading text moved to Section 3.

5.1.3.1. Venue City Considerations

- 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]

5.1.3.2. Basic Venue Criteria

- o moved to Section 3.2
- 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]

5.1.4. Venue Selection Phases

5.1.5. 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.

5.2. 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.

6. IANA Considerations

This memo asks the IANA for no new parameters.

7. Security Considerations

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

8. Privacy Considerations

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

9. Acknowledgements

This document was originally assembled and edited by Fred Baker. Additional commentary came from Jari Arkko, Scott Bradner, and Alissa Cooper. It was discussed on mtgvenue@ietf.org.

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-01 (work in progress), July 2016.
- [MeetingNet]
O'Donoghue, K., Martin, J., Elliott, C., and J. Jaeggli, "IETF Meeting Network Requirements", WEB
<https://iaoc.ietf.org/ietf-network-requirements.html>.
- [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 comments

2016-05-20 Updated in accordance with editing by Laura Nugent, Dave Crocker, Lou Berger, Fred Baker, and others.

posting as working group draft August 2, 2016

Reorganized per Alissa Cooper outline Work in progress. In addition, contributors were re-organized to be authors.

2016-10-28 Editor changeover. Further alignment with guidance by Alissa Cooper, Andrew Sullivan and the mgtvenue working group. Many various changes.

Authors' Addresses

Ray Pelletier
Internet Society

Email: rpelletier@isoc.org

Laura Nugent
Association Management Solutions

Email: lnugent@amsl.com

Dave Crocker (editor)
Brandenburg InternetWorking

Email: dcrocker@bbiw.net

Lou Berger
LabN Consulting, L.L.C.

Email: lberger@labn.net

Ole Jacobsen
The Internet Protocol Journal

Email: olejacobsen@me.com

Jim Martin
INOC

Email: jim@inoc.com

Fred Baker (editor)
Santa Barbara, California 93117
USA

Email: FredBaker.IETF@gmail.com

Internet Engineering Task Force
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Best Current Practice
Expires: January 9, 2017

S. Krishnan
Ericsson
July 8, 2016

High level guidance for the meeting policy of the IETF
draft-krishnan-ietf-meeting-policy-01

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 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. 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