Meeting: **IAOC Meeting**

Date: **The meeting was called to order at 12:00 PM EST by Tobias Gondrom 2016-01-28. Quorum was established.**

Attendees Present:
Jari Arkko
Lou Berger
Scott Bradner
Kathy Brown
Leslie Daigle
Tobias Gondrom (Chair)
Ray Pelletier (IAD)
Benson Schliesser
Andrew Sullivan

Guests: Ole Jacobsen, Russ Housley
Scribe: Michele Gehrke

1. Operations
a. Minutes
2015-10-01
2015-12-17

Scott made the motion to adopt both the October 1st minutes and the December 17th minutes, which was seconded by Andrew. Without objection, the minutes were adopted.

b. IANA Transition Update

Jari gave an update on the current state of the IANA transition

<Confidential>

</Confidential>

c. E-Vote IAOC Admin Procedures

Ray included the record of the e-vote to send proposed changes to IAOC Administrative Procedures to the community for the minutes, as required by the IAOC Administrative Procedures.

On 19 January the IAOC decided by e-vote to send proposed changes dated 8 December 2015 to the IAOC Administrative Procedures to the community for review.

With all members of the IAOC voting the e-vote closed on Tuesday 19 January 2016 at 07:15 AM ET.

The vote results:
Jari Arkko [YES]
Lou Berger [YES]
Scott Bradner [YES]
Kathy Brown [YES]
Leslie Daigle [YES]
Tobias Gondrom [YES]
Benson Schliesser
[YES] Andrew Sullivan
[YES]

Passing the vote required both a quorum (5) and a majority of the voting members in office (5). With all members voting YES the motion to approve sending the proposed modifications to the Draft IAOC Administrative Procedures dated 8 December 2015 to the community passed.

The matter was referred to the community for their input during the period 20 January through 4 February.

Background

RFC 7691 updates RFC 4071 to update the term dates of IETF Administrative Oversight Committee (IAOC) members. The changes to these procedures are to provide the implementing details necessitated by RFC 7691.

The proposed amendments add a new Section 2 entitled IAOC Member Terms with the following language:

2. IAOC Member Terms

2.1 RFC 7691 removed the following sentence from RFC 4017: IAOC terms normally end at the end of the first IETF meeting of a year. And added the following requirements:

1. The IAOC and the IETF Trust each hold a regular meeting close to the time of, or during, the first IETF meeting of the year.

A regular meeting has proper notice, minutes that are posted, and may be held face-to-face, via teleconference, or as a combination of the two.

In furtherance of this requirement the IAOC shall hold a regular meeting during each of

the three annual IETF face-to-face meetings. Proper notice shall be provided for these meetings and minutes shall be recorded for them. In person participation of the meetings is preferred but participation via teleconference shall be supported when requested by an IAOC member. The IAOC meeting held during the first IETF meeting of each year fulfills
the requirement of RFC 7691 section 2.1.

2. The IAOC and the Trust select their chairs as the first order of business in their individual meetings in a manner of their choosing.

In furtherance of this requirement one of the regular or ex officio IAOC members not eligible to be elected as the IAOC Chair under BCP 101 or under adopted IAOC policies shall open the IAOC meeting held during the first IETF meeting of the year and act as a temporary Chair. The temporary chair shall, as the first order of business in the meeting, call for nominations for IAOC chair from among the members of the IAOC defined as eligible for the role under BCP 101 or under adopted IAOC policies. After whatever discussion the temporary chair feels is needed, the IAOC elects a chair by a majority vote via a secret ballot. Voting is repeated, if needed, until a chair is elected. Once elected, the chair assumes management of the meeting.

3. The IAOC determines the beginning and end of the normal terms of its members relative to the above mentioned IAOC meeting; such terms must start and end close to the time of this meeting, unless those determinations are made by the appointing bodies.

In furtherance of this requirement the date and time of the terms of individual regular IAOC members begin or end at the start of the IAOC meeting held during the first IETF meeting the year in which each term was designated by the appointing body to begin or end unless the appointing body determines a different start or end date and time.

Subsequent sections were renumbered to accommodate the new Section 2.

The Legal Committee has reviewed the changes and recommends them to the IAOC.

Resolution:
The IAOC approves sending the proposed modifications to the IAOC Administrative Procedures as in the Draft IAOC Administrative Procedures dated 8 December 2015 for the purpose of obtaining community comment thereon. The community comment period will run from 20 January to 4 February 2016.

The vote will close Tuesday 19 January at 11:59 PM ET, or earlier if all votes have been cast.

Please let me know your vote by Reply All to this message.

You may vote Yes, No (opposed), or you may formally Abstain. Passing the vote requires both a quorum (5) and a majority of the voting members in office (5).

Jari Arkko [YES]
Lou Berger [YES]
Scott Bradner [YES]
Kathy Brown [YES]
Leslie Daigle [YES]
Tobias Gondrom [YES]
Benson Schliesser [YES]
Andrew Sullivan [YES]

The motion passed.

2. Finance

a. Sustainability

Jari advised that more work is necessary and he would be attending to it.

b. IETF Endowment

Kathy gave an update on the status of the endowment.

<Confidential>
</Confidential>

c. November Financials

Ray advised the group that the numbers still needed some minor tweaking and that we will see the December figures in February.

In summary through November revenues have exceeded budget by $300,000 and expenses are under budget by $200,000.

Income	November	YTD Actual	YTD Budget	YTD Variance	Annual Budget	Notes
Total Income	$ 1,479,819	$ 4,362,738	$ 4,061,426	$ 301,312	$ 4,068,500	
Expenses	November	YTD Actual	YTD Budget	YTD Variance	Annual Budget	
Meeting Expenses						
Total Meeting Expenses	$ 910,953	$ 2,544,154	$ 2,652,368	$ 108,214	$ 2,673,008	
Operating Expenses						
Total Operating Expenses	247,092	2,941,815	3,035,213	93,398	3,338,558	
Total Expenses	1,158,045	5,485,969	5,687,581	201,612	6,011,566	
Internet Society	November	YTD Actual	YTD Budget	YTD Variance	Annual Budget	
ISOC Direct Contribution	$ 321,774	$ (1,123,231)	$ (1,626,155)	$ 502,924	$ (1,943,066)	27
Capital Development	14,250	137,200	190,300	53,100	215,000	28
ISOC Contribution plus Capital Development	$ 307,524	$ (1,260,431)	$ (1,816,455)	$ 556,024	$ (2,158,066)	29

d. 2016 Sponsorships Update

Ray reported that sponsorships were under Budget for Buenos Aires by about $300,000; that Berlin was in good shape because it is hosted; and that we are still in discussions with a couple of companies to co-host Seoul.

Buenos Aires	Budget	To Date
Sponsorships	$440K	$120K
Note: includes 2 BnB 1 BnB Awaiting Execution		
Berlin		
Sponsorships	$455K	$350K
Note: 2 BnB awaiting execution		
Seoul		
Sponsorships	$455K	$20K
Note: includes 2 BnB		

3. Meetings

a. Meetings Process, Criteria and Contracts
Ray said there has been much discussion on the IETF lists regarding the hotel situation, venue selection and process, hotel room blocks and transparency.

Under the Meetings Committee leadership Fred Baker has begun an Internet Draft on the Meeting Venue Selection Process, to include the objectives, process, and criteria. There is also discussion about holding a BOF on the topic.

Ray said that also among the discussion has been whether to publish hotel contracts online or not. Ray said hotels don't want to except for guest-related matters because they don't want to reveal their positions to other groups with whom they negotiate,

or their competitors.

Ray said that he and Laura likewise don't want to reveal our negotiating positions or what has been accepted. Trade-offs are different at every venue. Ray said he and Laura were looking at whether they could support publishing a summary of the standard contract provisions that the Internet Society uses for over 90% of its venue contracts.

Lou is concerned with being compliant with BCP 101, which says we have to publish all contracts. However, the qualifier is except for confidential information. What do we deem as confidential?

Leslie stated that reviewing BCP 101 at the Retreat would be a good idea. We need to classify it according to our comfort level and ensuring we're in sync with the community.

b. Bits-N-Bites Sponsor Requirements
Ray has taken this topic up with the Meetings Committee to put language in the BnB sponsor MoUs. This is the language being used for Buenos Aires.

Bits-N-Bites Prague Language:
Sponsors must ensure that all aspects of their activities and appearance are appropriate to a professional discussion among a diverse community of attendees. This includes ensuring that displays, marketing collateral, staff attire and demeanor at the event is appropriate for this event and the IETF. We reserve the right to request that inappropriate material, dress and behavior be removed from the event.

Benson suggested the following language should be added: At the request of the IETF, in the event this occurs, fees will not be reimbursed.

Leslie suggested we use "We reserve the right to require the removal". Strengthens the language.

Lou asked if we have obligations to the community regarding this change (based on BNB in Prague)?

Jari noted that the IESG is supportive of adding this language to the contract relating to this effect.

c. 30th Anniversary
Ray pointed to the upper left hand corner of the Sponsorship opportunities page, the logo for the 30th anniversary being used. Hope to use this logo on t-shirts, etc. for the remainder of the year. Ray said that we have a specific assignment of this mark.

d. Meeting Space, Equipment and Service Fees Review
Ray described the Fees for for-profit entities requesting meeting space, equipment and services:

1. Current paid meeting room, equipment, and service fees at IETF meetings are low:
    - The current fee structure is:
    - ½ day room usage $250
    - Full day room usage: $500
    - Projector: $150
    - Speakerphone: $50

2. In other locations if room and equipment were being obtained directly from the hotel:
    - Rental of a room that can accommodate at 40-U, per day:
    - Asia: $1,998
    - Europe: $805
    - North America: $0, based on F&B minimum spend

Rental of a projector per day:
    - Asia: $300
    - Europe: $425
    - North America: $440
    -

3. Starting with IETF 95, the Finance Committee recommends increasing the fees as follows:
    - ½ day room usage: $750
    - Full day room usage: $1,250
    - Projector: $350
    - Speakerphone: $150
    - Food and beverage coordination: $200 per service
      (Note: food and beverage costs are separately invoiced with no markups)

The above fees are expected to fully cover, on an annual basis, room, equipment, and AMS expenses.

Resolution
The IAOC adopts the following room, equipment and service charges effective January 1, 2016:
    - ½ day room usage: $750
    - Full day room usage: $1,250
    - Projector: $350
    - Speakerphone: $150
    - Food and beverage coordination: $200 per service

Scott made the motion to pass this resolution and Lou seconded the motion.

Without objection, the resolution passes with a unanimous Yes vote.

4. Tools
Ray reported that the Tools Budget for 2016 is$200K, and that awarded and under consideration today totaled $80,539.

a. Contract Awards

Ray said that this is a list of the work for 2016.
1. Repair the "broken" messages in the email archive Award: <Confidential> </Confidential>
2. Improvements to mail archive tool: SOW under development <Confidential> </Confidential>
3. Interim Meeting Management: <Confidential> </Confidential>
4. Tracking Manual I-D Post Requests: <Confidential> </Confidential>
5. Review Tracking: <Confidential> </Confidential>
6. RFC Editor Statistics and Metrics: <Confidential> </Confidential>
7. RFC Format-related Tools: RFP; Six SOW's
8. Author Statistics: RFB
9. Meeting Materials Management: RFB SOW being drafted; mid-year
10. IETF Website Update: SOW to be developed

Lou asked if Item #7 is a higher priority than item #5?
It was discussed by all that the biggest unknown price tag is for the RFC format tools. Russ guestimates the cost in the $100K range. Russ also suggested that we could put a hold on item #5 and move forward with item #7. Since #7 contains 6 separate sub-items, we could hold on 1 or 2 of them.

It was decided that we will not proceed with items #8, #9 and #10 until we receive pricing on #7.
1. Ray presented the background materials for the Interim Meeting Management, Tracking Manual ID Posts, RFC Editor Reports and Stats, and the IETF Review Tracker Tool awards:

2. Interim Meeting Management Award

1. A Request for Bids was sent out on 15 Dec 2015 for the development of the Interim Meeting Management tool.
2. Bids were received from AMS and Spherical Cow Group on 18 Jan 2016.

3. This project will result in improved support for management

of interim meetings. This includes requesting, approving, and
viewing interim meeting details, and sending email notifications.

4. TMC recommends award to AMS, not to exceed <confidential> <confidential>.
  a. This number includes 10% above the bid for the TMC to handle any minor surprises
during the development effort,

  b. AMS is familiar with the code, likely to be more efficient.

5. There are funds in the 2016 budget for this project.

Resolution
The IAOC awards the development of Interim Meeting Management tool to AMS at a
cost not-to-exceed <confidential> </confidential> and requests the Internet Society to
enter into such agreements to effect this award.

3.   Tracking Manual ID Posts Award
Tracking Manual I-D Post Requests
1. A Request for Bids was sent out on 15 Dec 2015 for the development of the Tracking
Manual I-D Post tool.
2. Bids were received from AMS, IOLA, and Spherical Cow Group on 18 Jan 2016
3. This project will result in improved support for Tracking Manual I-D Post Requests in
the IETF Datatracker.
4. TMC recommends award to SCG, not to exceed <confidential> </confidential>.
    a. This number includes 10% above the bid for the TMC to handle any minor surprises
    during the development effort.
    b. SCG recently was awarded an IDIQ contract to do development work for the IETF.
    Their bid is competitive with other proposals. This would be their first effort.
5. There are funds in the 2016 budget for this project.

Resolution
The IAOC awards the development of Tracking Manual I-D Post tool to SCG at a cost not-
to-exceed <confidential> </confidential> and requests the Internet Society to enter into
such agreements to effect this award.

4.   RFC Editor Reports and Stats Award
1. A Request for Proposals was sent out on 29 Dec 2015 for the development of the RFC
Editor Automated Reports & Statistics project.
2. Bids were received from IOLA and Standcore on 18 Jan 2016. The TMC sought
clarification from Standcore on its proposal, which was received on 22 Jan 2016.
3. This project will create a web-based tool that retrieves data from the RFC Editor
database and creates reports and graphs using a high quality web graphics package
4. TMC recommends award to Standcore, not to exceed <confidential> </confidential>.
    a. This number includes 10% above the bid for the TMC to handle any minor surprises

    during the development effort.
    b. The Standcore proposal reflected a better understanding of the RFC Editor
    database and is a better cost value.
5. There are funds in the 2016 budget for this project.

Resolution
The IAOC awards the development of RFC Editor Automated Reports & Statistics project
to Standcore at a cost not-to-exceed
and requests the Internet Society to enter into such agreements to effect this award.

5.   <u>IETF Review Tracker Tool Award</u>
1. A Request for Proposals was sent out on 28 Dec 2015 for the development of the
Document Review Tracking system.
2. Bids were received from IOLA on 18 Jan 2016. The TMC sought clarification from IOLA
on its proposal, which was received on 21 Jan 2016.
3. This project will add tracking of document reviews to the IETF Datatracker.
4. TMC recommends award to IOLA, not to exceed <confidential> </confidential>.
    a. This number includes 10% above the bid for the TMC to handle any minor
    surprises during the development effort.
    b. While the IOLA proposal was the only proposal received for this project, it
    reflected an understanding of the work and a cost considered reasonable. IOLA has
    undertaken more than 10 development projects for the IETF under the IDIQ
    contract.
5. There are funds in the 2016 budget for this project.

Resolution
The IAOC awards the development of Document Review Tracking project to IOLA at a
cost not-to-exceed <confidential> </confidential> and requests the Internet Society to
enter into such agreements to effect this award.

It was agreed that one vote will be taken for all 4 resolutions mentioned above.

Benson made the motion to pass all four of the above resolutions as drafted and Scott
seconded the motion.

The vote results are as follows:
Jari Arkko [YES]
Scott Bradner [YES]
Kathy Brown [YES]
Lou Berger [YES]
Leslie Daigle [YES]
Tobias Gondrom [YES]
Benson Schliesser [YES]
Andrew Sullivan [YES]

All 4 resolutions passed with a unanimous Yes vote.

5. Legal
a. Website Privacy Policy
Scott stated that outside counsel have proposed revisions to the draft policy.

b. IAOC Terms
Scott stated the draft Administrative Procedures are awaiting IAOC comments before sending to the community very soon. He asked the IAOC members to review and send any comments.

c. Records Retention Policy
Scott and Ray working on an update.

Scott informed the group that there is a Legal Committee call today and everyone here is invited to attend at 2pm to review Jorge's list of issues.

6. AOB
N/A