IAOC Meeting 2014-25-09 10:00 AM EDT

Jari Arkko [PRESENT]
Scott Bradner [PRESENT]
Kathy Brown [PRESENT]
Randy Bush [PRESENT]
Tobias Gondrom [PRESENT]
Chris Griffiths, Chair [PRESENT]
Bob Hinden [PRESENT]
Russ Housley [PRESENT]
Ray Pelletier [PRESENT, IAD]

Greg Kapfer, ISOC CFO, Guest

Michele Gehrke [SCRIBE]

IAOC Meeting Agenda

====================

1. Operations - 10 Min
 a. Minutes
   2014-07-10
   2014-07-23
   2014-09-11

 b. RSE Position
 c. RPC Selection Committee

2. Finance - 20 min
 a. Attendance History & Projections
 b. 2015 - 2016 Draft Budget

3. Meetings - 15 min
 a. Honolulu Update
 b. Asia Site Visit Update
 c. Guest Room Contracting Practice Review
 d. Meeting Audio Experience Experiment

4. Tools - 10 Min

a.  Liaison Statement Tool Award
b.  IETF Website Revamp Award

5.  Legal - 5 min
 a.  Glassey, et al v. Microsemi Inc., et al

6.  RPS - N/A

7.  AOB

Chris called the meeting called to order at 10:02 AM EDT.

1. Operations
 a.  Minutes
   2014-07-10
   2014-07-23
   2014-09-11

The July 10th and July 23rd minutes were adopted without objection. The minutes from the September 11th meeting are pending review by Ray.

 b.  RSE Position

Ray reported that discussions are beginning with the incumbent about new contract language and project funding.

 c.  RPC Selection Committee

Ray reported that in 2015 there will be a RFP for the RFC Production Center as all of the extensions have been used

We need 2 IAOC members to serve on selection committee; First meeting of Selection Committee will be in Honolulu (RFC 6635). Randy volunteered to serve on selection committee. The IAOC needs one more volunteer prior to Honolulu.

The process governed by RFC 6635.  This will be its first implementation of this process.
 The RSE owns and develops the work definition (the SOW) and

participates in the IASA vendor selection process.  The IAOC establishes the contract process, including the steps necessary to issue an RFP when necessary, the timing, and the contracting procedures.

The IAOC establishes the Selection Committee, which will consist of the RSE, the IAD, and other members selected by the RSOC and the IAOC. The Committee shall be chaired by the RSE.  The Selection Committee selects the vendor, subject to the successful negotiation of a contract approved by the IAOC. In the event that a contract cannot be reached, the matter shall be referred to the Selection Committee for further action.

The draft timeline:
    Nov 2014 RPC Selection Committee Meets @ IETF 91
    May 2015 SOW completed
    Jun 2015 RFP Issued
    Nov 2015 Award and Transition Begins

2. Finance

a. Attendance History & Projections

Ray reported on the Attendance History & Projections.

1. Paid Attendance History

A comparison of the average Budget estimates and the average actual number of paid attendees by Early Bird and Late registration for IETF meetings from IETF 70 to IETF 90.

|       | Budget | Actual | Var % | Var $ |
|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| Early | 916    | 924    | .9%   | $5K   |
| Late  | 122    | 126    | 3%    | $3K   |

The average for the period IETF 83 to IETF 90.

|       | Budget | Actual | Var % | Var $ |
|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| Early | 915    | 962    | 5%    | $31K  |
| Late  | 118    | 129    | 9%    | $9K   |

2. Projections 2015 – 2016

Ray went over the assumptions for attendance for IETF 92 – IETF 97, Dallas, Prague, Yokohama, Buneos Aires, Berlin, and Asia.

b.  2015 - 2016 Draft Budget

Ray reviewed the assumptions for the draft Budget including registration fee increases in 2015 and 2016, an increase in the contracts for the RFC Production Center and Secretariat and VATs added to, not deducted from the registration fees where VAT is required.

Ray then reviewed the Revenues, Expenses and ISOC's contribution with these assumptions and the projections.  He noted in particular that 2016 is an unusual year.  A year in which meetings are held in Europe, North America and Asia there are meeting space costs for two of the meetings; in 2016 the North America meeting is being substituted for with a meeting in Latin America, where there is typically a charge for meeting space.  So, in 2016 there are three meetings with meeting space costs, which typically run from $100,000 USD to over $300,000 USD.

2.  Meetings - 15 min

a.  Honolulu Update
    Ray reported that paid registrations trending with Toronto; Toronto Paid: 1,196, $757K in registration revenues; Honolulu Budget: 1,200 paid and $754K in registration revenues.

    Ray said we are awaiting a final contract for an Overflow Hotel

    Site Prep Trip is scheduled for early October.

    Ray will send note out to community regarding room blocks.

b.  Asia Site Visit Update

Ray said the Site Qualification team of Laura, Marcia and Jim made an 11 day site visit trip to two cities, six possible venues, and numerous overflow hotels in two countries in Asia to qualify venues for IETF 97 in November 2017.

c. Guest Room Contracting Practice Review

Ray provided an outline of the current contracting practice for Guest Rooms and a proposal based upon a review of guest room activist for the last 3 years:

In summary, currently we contract for ("book") 3,459 room nights, 600 on a peak night; essentially half of expected attendance. The proposal is contracting for 4,720 room nights, 780 on a peak night; about 65% of anticipated attendance. Both of those targets are subject to a lot of variables.

Ray said that as a matter of practice he likes to book 600 on a peak night, about 50% of the expected attendance. Often we can get that at the HQ hotel, but not always. Sometimes it's only 400, Yokohama is about 330, Buenos Aires is much less than 600 also. Under those circumstances he will then do Overflow Hotels to get us up to the 600, and beyond if there is no Attrition clause in the contracts AND if we can get a better deal for the community than they can get for themselves. No Attrition clause in the contract means we are not financially liable for any shortfalls in the number of room nights that we have contracted for.  This is an art not a science. In Anaheim we were surrounded by lots of hotels at different price points, providing all kinds of competition for the HQ hotel. We typically don't do overflows in that scenario and our HQ room block may be lower. In Paris we did a headquarters hotel and the hotel across the street. We were negotiating with others, but they wanted $300 a night. We didn't contract with them.

The proposal is contracting for 4,720 room nights, 780 on a peak night; about 65% of anticipated attendance.  The number of rooms booked at the headquarters hotel will depend upon the maximum peak rooms available,

together with the rate. If we can get far better rates at plentiful nearby hotels, we recommend booking a smaller number of rooms at the headquarters hotel and more rooms at the overflows.  It's a balancing act.

Room blocks at meetings where we anticipate attendees arriving early and/or departing late due to scheduled events, time change, flight schedules and the appeal of the location as a vacation destination will be adjusted to add more rooms on the shoulders when possible.

These recommendations come from analysis of our past meeting block size and how well we did filling the rooms, referred to as "pick-up". A number of factors influence the data, which can result in skewed information, including:
a. Popularity of the destinations
b. Events scheduled outside of regular times
c. Prices at the headquarters and overflow hotels
d. Availability of rooms at headquarters and overflow hotels and the ability of the hotels to add rooms to the block as pick-up demands

The impact of this change is that we are looking to increase overflow hotels where venues already booked, such as Dallas and there should be an increase in hotel commissions about 20%+.

However, every venue will be different depending on:
   a. Rooms available at HQ hotel and their cost
   b. Availability of competitive hotels
   c. Risk

Note: These are contracts between hotels and ISOC.

d.  Meeting Audio Experience Experiment

Ray reported that the IETF is going to experiment at IETF 91 with:
1. Getting handheld microphones for the speakers, replacing lavalier mics,
2. Increasing the number of sound speakers in the largest rooms, and
3. Installing transmitters and making assisted listening devices.

These changes are in response to feedback in Toronto about the adequacy of microphones in the WG sessions, meeting surveys that had complaints regarding audio quality in the room, and individuals indicating they have difficulty hearing, the estimated cost for which is less than $1,500.

3. Tools

a. Liaison Statement Tool Award

Ray reported that on 23 May 2014 the IAOC approved an award to Yaco to develop the Liaison Statement Management Tool.  While some progress had been made the primary developer left the company and Yaco is not in a position to complete the project.  The TMC requested AMS as the only other bidder among the IDIQ contractors to update their proposal.  The TMC is recommending that AMS be awarded the contract to develop the tool - AMS uses the tool; their updated proposal demonstrates they have learned from their other work in the interim; and there is confidence in their abilities.

The proposal cost is for <confidential>  <confidential>.  Funding is available in the 2014 and 2015 Budgets.

Russ suggested the amount to be changed to

Resolution:
The IAOC approves the award to AMS for the development of the Liaison Statement Management Tool at a cost not-to-exceed <confidential> <confidential> and requests the Internet Society to execute such agreements to effect this award.

Scott made the motion to award the development to AMS at the changed amount of and Russ seconded.

The vote results are as follows:

Bob Hinden [YES]
Chris Griffiths [YES]
Jari Arkko [YES]
Kathy Brown [YES]

Randy Bush [YES]
Russ Housley [YES]
Scott Bradner [YES]
Tobias Gondrom [YES]

The resolution passes with a unanimous Yes vote.

   b. IETF Website Revamp Award

Ray reported that the TMC has a vendor in mind but is withholding a recommendation pending identification of a PM for the project.

Kathy would like to have off-line conversation regarding this subject. Ray to send out doodle poll.

   c. RFPs

Three Statements of Work for RFC Editor work underwent community review.
   a. Digital Object Identifiers
   b. RFC Editor Automated Stats and Reports
   c. RFC Editor Website Revamp
The RFPs will be issued next week for all 3.

5. Legal
Glassey v Microsemi Inc., et al

A motion to dismiss was filed today, September 25, 2014, on behalf of the Internet Society and the IETF.

6. RPS – N/A

7. AOB - N/A

Chris adjourned the Meeting at 10:55 AM.