

IAOC Meeting 2014-07-23 / 07:30 EST / 11:34 UTC

Attending:

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

Bernard Aboba [GUEST]
Linda Klieforth [GUEST]
Olaf Kolkman [GUEST]
Lynn McNair [GUEST]
Alexa Morris [SCRIBE]

IAOC Agenda

1. Operations
 - a. Minutes
 - b. Admin support
 - c. RSE Position - Linda Klieforth
2. Finance
 - a. Bits-N-Bites Program
 - b. 2015 - 2016 Forecast Update
 - c. Asia v. North America Venue Impact
 - d. Prague VAT
3. Meetings
 - a. Toronto Numbers
 - b. Asia Sponsorship Workplan
 - c. Hilton Multi-Event Agreement
4. Tools
 - a. IETF Website Revamp
 - b. IMAP Server
 - c. iCal Server
5. Legal - N/A
6. RPS
 - a. Productizing RPS

7. AOB

=====

Chris called the meeting to order at 07:34 local Toronto time, 11:34 UTC.

1. Operations

a. Minutes

There are no minutes ready for approval at this time; the IAOC still needs to review minutes from the last meeting, held on July 7, 2014.

b. Administrative support

Ray reported that he needs part-time administrative assistance. The assistant would assist with tasks such as preparation of IAOC and IAOC subcommittee meeting minutes, posting of contracts, tracking of invoices, etc. Ray estimates this as 8-10 hours per week and would like to request the IAOC's assistance in obtaining allocation in the budget.

Chris stated that he'd asked Ray to prepare and present this request, as it's important that Ray's time is properly and effectively utilized. Through meeting with Ray regularly, it's clear that he needs assistance. So, at this point it's just raising it as a continued item for the IAOC to discuss.

Kathy asked if the assistant would be needed for eight hours a week.

Russ noted that if the assistant will attend and minute all subcommittee calls, ten hours will not be sufficient.

Ray noted that subcommittee calls are only once a month, so that particular week would be a high volume week. He understood that his action coming out of the meeting is to prepare something for the budget to address this support.

Chris stated that he wants to make sure that the IAOC estimates appropriately for that administrative support.

Olaf said that, while he was not yet sure about his role in the IAOC, he wanted to note that this went back to a discussion years ago -- a fundamental discussion about when the IETF draws upon volunteers. How much is the IETF staff-driven versus volunteer-driven?

Ray replied that some time ago the IAB and IESG shifted from the volunteer model to the staff model because of the volatility of those volunteer appointments. Jari clarified that the IESG still relies on volunteers for certain roles.

Kathy stated that, except for the minutes, she believes that ISOC could be helpful with these items. ISOC can absorb eight hours a week, but not four days a week.

Russ noted that he had the opposite reaction regarding ISOC's role as minute taker: since the IAOC makes contracting decisions, there are some times that an AMS minute taker would have to leave the room, while ISOC is a neutral party.

c. RSE Position

The IAOC discussed the request by the IAB to increase the scope of the RSE projects, however the IAOC decided it could not act without more information from ISOC about the character of the contract with the RSE.

2. Finance

a. Bits-N-Bites (BnB)

Revenue History (Non-ISOC)

- Vancouver \$47.5K
- Atlanta \$42.5K
- Orlando \$45K
- Berlin \$47.5K
- Vancouver \$42.5K
- Toronto \$77.5K

Total Revenue: \$302.5K with an average of \$50.5K per meeting

Food & Beverage Cost History

- Vancouver \$41K, for a net of \$6.5K
- Atlanta \$41K, net of \$1.5K
- Orlando \$31K, net of \$14K
- Berlin \$39K, net of \$8.5K
- Vancouver \$47K, net of \$13K
- Toronto \$45K, net of \$32.5K

Totals: \$244K, with a total net of \$66K

Average: \$41K per meeting, with an average net of \$11K

Ray reported that the IETF has organized six Bits-N-Bites events, including the one taking place tomorrow night. Average revenue is 50,000 USD. For this meeting, the expenses are 45K and there are other costs (e.g. obtaining time spent soliciting sponsorships). He asked: what is the Return On Investment (ROI)? Even under the most optimistic scenario, it's really much less than \$50,000 USD. Ray asked for the IAOC's view on whether or not the program should continue, and expressed his own view that it should not, because of the

low ROI.

Olaf noted that there are benefits to the program that are not shown in the figures, such as touching base with vendors.

Jari said that he and Chris spoke about it the previous night, discussing the optimal view. Chris felt that BnB does not need to take place at every IETF. With a little more preparation time we will be able to promote more, have a relevant theme. For example, V6 transition is one possible theme, also SDN. So, Jari continued, by focusing on a particular topic and leaving more time between events, it may be possible to do this more productively.

Ray said that what he was hearing in the room is that we should skip BnB at IETF 91 in Honolulu. Tobias agreed.

Russ noted that in looking at the numbers, IETF 90 Toronto has the highest numbers and pointed out that it was when AMS became more involved. He said that he thought that the IETF hadn't yet explored the ways to make the event more successful. Ray stated that what he was hearing is that the IETF should skip IETF 91 and prepare for BnB at IETF 92 (Dallas) and IETF 94 (Yokohama). That is the guidance he needed in order to prepare the budget for 2015.

b. 2015 - 2016 Forecast June Update

On the revenue side, there has been no change from March forecast. For 2015 we are forecasting \$4.1 million USD. For 2016 the forecast is \$4.2M. On the expense side we are forecasting \$6.1M in 2015, which is restating the G&A to reflect \$230K less to account for the deletion of the tools development depreciation. In 2016, the forecast is for \$6.8M, with the G&A restated minus a \$200K depreciation.

ISOC Investment:

2014: \$1.9M

2015: \$2M, -\$230K G&A

2016: \$2.6M, -200K G&A

Tobias noted that the IAOC had these discussions in Helsinki at the retreat and took out those numbers because they were clouding the discussion. Kathy stated that cash flow also needed to be removed. Randy said that they should be doing accrual accounting; hiding the depreciation under ISOC doesn't work. Kathy said she didn't care either way. Chris noted that they were preparing it in accordance with the ISOC CFO's, Greg's Kapfer, recommendation.

Ray stated that the Finance Committee recommended that the depreciation be removed. Chris said that, realistically, the IAOC does need to be aware of it and reflect it somehow: we need to be able to reflect the actual costs. And we have a very complex relationship with ISOC so there is no single way to get it right.

c. Asia v. North America Venue Impact

Ray discussed the budgetary impact of holding an IETF meeting in Asia versus one in North America in 2016. A meeting in Asia would be \$200,000 more expensive than one in North America. The goal is to have one meeting in Asia every year and that is what we are working towards. 2016 is a year with three meetings with meeting space costs, and without hosts and sponsors for each of the meetings, a year of higher risk than usual.

d. Prague VAT

Ray has been in contact with Czech accounting firms that advised us that we would need to apply VAT to Prague registration fees. He's asked them to submit an application to the tax authority to get a definitive answer about whether or not the VAT is so applicable. The tax authority however is not required to respond to the inquiry.

3. Meetings

a. Toronto Numbers

Registration

Registered: 1,509

Paid: 1,185

Budget: 1,070; Variance: +115

Revenue: \$751K; Budget: \$683; Variance: +\$68K

Sponsors

Total: \$498K; Budget: \$450K; Variance: +\$48K

Bits-N-Bites

Total: \$77.5K; Budget: \$75K

We are ahead of budget by more than 100 paid attendees. Sponsorship is almost \$50,000 USD ahead of the budget. It's too early to know what the expenses will be.

Kathy noted that there were some visa problems: some people from Egypt were denied visas. This is not good and she thinks they should talk to the embassy.

Randy noted that there are very few places that we will not have some visa

issues, but that North America is worse than most.

Kathy asked if others agreed that, on behalf of the technical community, we should raise our concern with the Canadian visa authority. She said that she found it to be a serious issue and thought that we should raise it to make the point. Russ noted that the IETF has moved meetings away from the US in the past because of visa issues. Kathy said that the IETF wants to be global, and does not want to exclude people. She further stated that she wants to be sure that the organization is clear on this point, and on the record. She will willingly take on the battle, as it's an appropriate role for ISOC.

b. Asia Sponsorship Workplan - Lynn McNair

Ray explained that the IETF has had difficulties selecting a venue in Asia. Some of the issues are related to cost; some are related to availability. The IETF needs sponsorship for a meeting in Seoul and Lynn is going to speak to this. Kathy said that, after the IAOC retreat in Helsinki, ISOC held some internal meetings to get these plans together and execute them. She further stated that Drew has stepped up and ISOC is focusing now on what needs to get done.

c. Hilton Multi-Event Agreement

The agreement is still being reviewed by Hilton attorneys so there is nothing to report.

4. Tools

a. IETF Website Revamp

Nothing new to report

b. IMAP Server

The IMAP server RFP was issued on 17 June and two proposals were received on 7 July. The Technology Management Committee (TMC) recommended the work be awarded to one of the bidders.

The TMC recommended that Isode be awarded the contract to develop the IMAP server. Isode has a product that IMAP already and will be extending it to meet the IETF's special needs. The TMC believed the level of work proposed by Isode was reasonable; that the technology risk appeared lower significantly than the second bidder; and that there was concern that the deliverable by the second bidder would not scale the way we needed.

Resolution:

The IAOC awards the IMAP Server development project to Isode at a cost of <confidential> </confidential> and requests the Internet Society to execute such

agreements to effect this award.

Russ moved and Scott seconded the motion.

Jari Arkko [YES]
Kathy Brown [YES]
Scott Bradner [YES]
Randy Bush [YES]
Tobias Gondrom [YES]
Chris Griffiths [YES]
Russ Housley [YES]

The motion passes.

c. iCal Server

Russ shared that he participated in meetings the previous day about the iCal server, during which they determined that the original plan was too complicated. Matt Larson, AMS, believes that he will have a solution up for testing later today. Removing the requirement for a web interface makes this a lot less complicated; in addition, controlling the account from your own client simplifies things greatly as well. Russ reported that he'd tested out a quick prototype yesterday and it seems to meet our needs. If it works as expected, the IAOC will be the first group to use it.

5. Legal - N/A

6. RPS

Bernard reported that the IETF is spending \$130,000 USD annually on streaming audio and Meetecho, this translates into roughly \$130 a year on each IETF attendee. There are many ways to spend that money and the IETF should consider alternatives.

Currently there are two audio services working simultaneously: Meetecho and audio streaming. The expenses are high largely because of manpower (e.g. the need for production assistants). Until recently, WebRTC audio quality wasn't strong enough to consider retiring the audio stream, but that's changing.

Bernard further stated that he believes in the importance of cutting costs. By cutting the budget, it will help us to focus on what we can buy for that price. He recommended that in 2015 the IETF focus on decreasing the need for manpower and increasing audio quality. Make them contractual requirements. In Bernard's opinion, by 2016 the budget for all of this should be about what the IETF is currently paying for just audio streaming – about \$95,000 USD a year. This is feasible because WebRTC is now being used to deliver large scale, low-

cost Web conferencing services. Both Chrome and Mozilla are turning off plugins soon. As the IAOC goes forward to negotiate with potential vendors, it's also important to realize that the IETF is a prize reference account, and the IAOC should exploit that.

Bernard moved on to discuss the Jitsi Meet Experiment, which went live in April 2014. The goal for November of 2014 is to scale for larger meetings, like working groups.

In general when it comes to remote participation it's important to get the costs down and obtain in-kind donations first, so that fees to attendees can be as low as possible. As a start, Bernard recommended cutting the budget in 2015, and again in 2016.

Russ said it sounds like the IAOC needs to do some work.

7. AOB

a. Welcome Reception

Ray reported that the Welcome Reception proved disappointing to the sponsor. Food ran out and/or was sporadically delivered. Ray suggested they talk about what the Welcome Reception is, and what it's not. To start, it's not dinner.

Russ suggested that one model would be that when the Welcome Reception is sponsored, there are free drinks. When there is no sponsorship, there are no free drinks. Ray said he would discuss this with the Meetings Committee.

b. Kathy reminded the group that the Postel award is taking place this evening. This year's award is going to a person from the developing world. There is a reception right after the Plenary: all are invited.

Chris adjourned the meeting at 13:00 UTC.