IAOC Meeting
July 22, 2015

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

Guests:
Bernard Aboba
Russ Housley
Ole Jacobsen
Olaf Kolkman
Alexa Morris (Scribe)

Tobias called the meeting to order at 7:15 AM.

Agenda

1. Operations
   a. **Minutes from 2015-06-25**

Scott moved to adopt the June 25, 2015 IAOC minutes and Lou seconded. There were no abstentions, and no objections so the minutes were adopted.

   b. **RFC Production Center RFP Update**

Ray stated that Heather Flanagan as RFC Series Editor is chairing the RPC Selection Committee in accordance with RFC 6635. There was a Bidders Conference planned for 10 July, however it was cancelled as no one requested to attend. The planned presentation was posted.

   c. **IANA Transition Update**

Andrew said the ICG is working through three proposals it has received. The cross committee on stewardship continues to meet. The ICG says they will send something out for public comment sometime during August. The goal is to have it ready to present at the November ICANN meeting in Dublin.

d. W3C Attendee Accommodation

Jari said the W3C is having a meeting in Japan the week before us, and they are considering making a special offer to IETF meeting participants to attend their meeting. The IESG discussed this topic and would like to suggest that to increase cross-pollination, we should make similar arrangements. The arrangements should only be available for people who have not been in the IETF for some number of meetings or years. The request is to offer half price registration fee to W3C attendees who want to attend IETF 94. The idea is to attract new participants with this one-time arrangement and to increase cross-pollination. There must be conditions or otherwise everyone will use it.

Leslie noted that practically speaking, the number of IETF folk who could take advantage of the W3C offer is probably close to zero, because participation in the TPAC requires organizational membership in W3C. However, RTCWEB may be an exception.

Jari said he hoped is that this would not negatively impact revenue. The goal is to attract some new participants.

Ray said from an implementation standpoint we can check our database to determine if these people have participated in the last two years. From what I'm hearing, it sounds like as long as there is no negative impact, there will be no objection since it might improve cross collaboration, etc.

Scott: I have no objection as long as it covers the basic meeting expenses.

Ray said that the short answer to that is "yes" and asked is two years a reasonable period of inactivity? So, if a W3C attendee hasn't attended an IETF meeting since November of 2013 they will be eligible for the discount? Any objections? There were no objections to offering a half-priced registration fee for W3C attendees who had not participated in the IETF since November 2013.

2. Finance

a. 2016 Budget Schedule

Ray said that he was working with Dana at ISOC and others to put together the 2016 budget and it will be ready in the next 2 weeks. At this point we don't think there will be registration fee increase; of course this is still to be determined and all of you are the ones who will make that decision. Ray said the goal is to have the budget

ready by 25 of September for adoption by the IAOC.

b. Sustainability

The IAOC discussed the long-term sustainability of the IETF and the process that might be undertaken to develop a plan to ensure its sustainability.

c. IETF Endowment

Kathy gave an update on the status of the IETF Endowment.

<Confidential>

</confidential>

3. Meetings

a. Prague

Ray reported on the numbers for the Prague meeting to date.

Numbers	Budget	Actual
Registration Revenue	$829K	$875K
Paid Attendees	1,225	1,307

1st Timers: 200
Letters of Invitations: 243
Hackathon: 130
Code Sprint Participants: 15

Country Attendance:
United States 513
Germany 95
China 89
France 68
United Kingdom 62
Japan 53
Czech Republic 35
Sweden 35
Canada 34
Netherlands 33

Gender:
Declined: 86

Female: 129
Male: 1083

Tutorial Attendance:
Routing Area Overview: 166
Introduction to Performance Measurements and Monitoring: 163
Newcomer's Tutorial: 138
Document Editing and Shepherding: 104
YANG Advice and Editing: 95

b. Yokohama

Ray reported that the IETF will hold the Hackathon in Yokohama and are expecting 150-200 participants. In addition, Bits-N-Bites is open to all participants, as it normally is.

Hackathon:

Jari said the Hackathon is growing nicely and doing well; there are many interesting ideas and discussions. Some of the ideas include inviting students and even paying for their meeting registrations. Also discussed is the idea of taking the Hackahon outside of the IETF meeting and going to HackZurick, 2-4 October 2015. This is a new discussion. One thing to think about is to make sure that we brand as IETF.

Leslie said that one big question is how we get people to do more than stick around for the week, but also to get involved and contribute.

Lou stated it would be great to leverage the ideas of IRTF, and get their input on how to get researchers to participate. Perhaps one component is that they get sponsored attendance to the IETF.

Jari said for the 2016 Hackathons, we are in discussions with another vendor to be host for the entire year. This company is also interested in hosting an IETF meeting; this funding would come out of a different budget, so there is the possibility that they could do both.   Of course, it's possible we will have a different sponsor for each Hackathon.

Ray said that Charles Eckel may stay on as Hackthon Project Manager, which will lesson the burden on a potential host. Selling Hackathon sponsorship as an annual sponsorship is a good way to package it.

Having certainty that the event is sponsored is good, but it feels like ownership when the sponsorship is over a long period of time Benson said.

Lou said there is also risk in that approach: one company can do well at hosting the Hackathon, another may not do as well.

Ray said we intend for hosting the Hackathon to be a turnkey approach -- we will handle the logistics.

Lou stated we should just be careful about the financial impact.

Future Meetings

Ray gave an update on venue selection and contract negotiations.

<Confidential>
</confidential>

c. Child-Care Support: Yes/No, Way Forward?

Ray said the question raised was should the IETF provide or facilitate childcare support for IETF attendees at IETF meetings? The use cases are:
a. The IETF hires someone (Attendee Spouse(s) or a local firm
b. The Hotel provides or recommends the service
c. The IETF recommends a service
d. Do nothing

Ray said that we've asked about liability insurance for the use cases, this is under investigation. The current cancellation insurance costs $6K - $12K per meeting.

There are childcare services available for the next four meetings (IETF 94 in Yokohama through IETF 997 in Seoul). Hotels usually have established procedures, and typically they work through a service, which costs between $17-34/hour. Our role could be that we just pass attendees along to a normal service that hotels provide. If that is the case, there should be no liability there.

Benson asked should we ask a question on the survey?

4. Tools

a. IETF Website Revamp Update

Russ said that the website revamp is underway. The new site will cater to three types of visitors:
1) A potential participant – someone who may come to a meeting someday,
2) Those who will never participate in the organization, but who might want to know something about it, and
3) Those who already do participate in the organization.

 We are trying to develop a website that meets the needs of these three groups. Joe Hildebrand is the project manager.

b. RFC Editor Website Revamp Update

Russ said this his project is being done in-house, by the RFC Editor, and is estimated to be completed in September.

Lou said we may get more comments about infrastructure. We are seeing some problems with tools and the CDN.

Russ said we are trying to move things that are static to CDN, the dynamic stuff we want served by the Datatracker.

5. Legal

a. Last Call comments on the IAOC terms Internet Draft

Scott said that Dave Crocker and John Klensin suggested the I-D be less specific about transition terms and instead that the document just state that the transition of terms occurs during the meeting and is subject to decision by IAOC. The document's phrasing needs to be simpler, for clarity and to avoid redundancies that invite divergence (e.g. during the first -> around the time of the first). We will see a new revision and the specifics will be published as IAOC Administrative Procedures after community review.

6. Remote Participation Services

Bernard reported out as the RPS Chair. The RTCWEB WG hasn't published all drafts, but the work is already deployed worldwide. Support for IETF RTCWEB protocols continues to climb. More than 600 mobile applications are now incorporating support for WebRTC.

In terms of the IETF standardization progress, the initial set of IETF RTCWEB drafts is nearing completion. Work is now transitioning from initial drafts to operational support (e.g. XRBLOCK) and enhancements (e.g. robustness technology (FEC), faster call setup (ICE enhancements), and next generation video codecs, etc.

Vendors are either feeling a lot of pressure to roll this out, or they aren't listening. The next step is additional browsers. Multiple browser support is very important. There was a Chrome 43 outage – bugs in mainstream release knocked out Chrome support on jitsi.tools.ietf.org site. Service was unavailable for a couple of weeks because of issue, and it was a sobering experience. This did not affect Meetecho.

It's important to measure both usage and availability, in order to expand availability across the globe. Bandwidth usage is important, particularly for developing world where it's not quite low enough. Support on mobile platforms is also important, particularly on low-end devices (~$100 or less).

7. **Any Other Business (AOB)**

a. Plenary Slides
Review of slides was skipped due to time constraints.

b. Anti-Harassment Policy

Ray said we need to develop wording on IAD & Secretariat activity surrounding enforcement of the anti-harassment policy. The IESG is not planning to discuss the anti-harassment policy at this meeting.

Lou said once we have the words drafted, let's schedule a call rather than discuss this by email.

Andrew moved to adjourn to IAOC meeting and Leslie seconded. Meeting adjourned at 08:51.