

Meeting: LLC Board

Date: September 9, 2021

Attendees

LLC Board:

Maja Andjelkovic
Lars Eggert
Jason Livingood
Sean Turner
Peter Van Roste (attended Part I and Part II)

Staff/Secretariat:

Jay Daley
Alexa Morris
Laura Nugent
Lee-Berkeley Shaw
Lisa Winkler
Greg Wood

Observers/Guests:

Sean Croghan
John Hahn, Goldman Sachs (Board + ED section)
Robert Sparks

Scribe:

Liz Flynn

Conflicts of Interest Declared:

None.

Part I: Open to the Public

1. Record e-vote results

Two e-votes have been completed since the previous Board meeting.

a. The August board meeting minutes were approved with the board e-voting as follows:

Maja Andjelkovic: YES
Lars Eggert: YES
Jason Livingood: YES
Sean Turner: YES
Peter Van Roste: YES

b. The June 2021 financial statement was approved with the board e-voting as follows:

Maja Andjelkovic: YES
Lars Eggert: YES
Jason Livingood: YES
Sean Turner: YES
Peter Van Roste: YES

2. Update on IETF technical work

Lars reported that publishing the HTTP core specification revisions which will require some bis documents to change the status of some related documents.

The IESG is also considering an experiment to move the IETF 112 plenary to the week prior to the meeting to free up agenda time for sessions. No decision has been made yet.

Lastly, the IESG is proposing to extend the RFC 8989 experiment which extends NomCom eligibility as a result of the continuing effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

3. Next steps on IASA2 retrospective

According to the timeline published previously, revisions based on community input are being done throughout September. There has not been a lot of community feedback lately and Jason expects to have a draft of the final report by the next Board meeting on 14 October. Jason

volunteered to send one further & final call for comments out to the admin-discuss@ietf.org mailing list.

4. Executive Director report - Public

Public Executive Director Report

For the IETF Administration LLC Board meeting on 9 September 2021

This report is provided by the IETF Executive Director and is taken as read at the meeting allowing more time for questions or follow ups. This report is public and there is no separate confidential report.

1. Strategic Matters

Nothing to report.

2. Policies

Nothing to report.

3. Finance

Budget

The Secretariat has provided draft meeting budgets for 2022. Work on the full budget for 2022 will start soon.

Pitching the IETF Endowment

We have now had a number of potential sponsors of the IETF Endowment ask the same questions: “Is there a plan for the IETF to become fully independent of ISOC?” and “How big does the IETF Endowment need to be for the IETF to become fully independent of ISOC?”.

In some cases this is linked to a concern that a change in ISOC strategy could have an adverse effect on the IETF and potentially put their donation at risk. We have explained that the [Endowment Policy](#) legally ensures that the money can only be used on IETF activities, but some are looking for a greater assurance of ongoing independence on how that is determined.

Advice is sought from the board on how to address these questions. In doing so, the board may wish to consider developing a roadmap to full independence for consultation as part of the IASA2 review.

The Board discussed this and noted there is a chicken-or-egg problem here, in that the IETF cannot attain greater financial independence without such new financial support. In order for the endowment to generate sufficient income to cover the projected ISOC contribution 10 years in the future, the endowment would need to have over \$100M invested. But greater financial independence may not just mean replacing the ISOC income stream but being able to change the IETF cost/revenue model - such as by having sufficient other income that meeting registration could be free.

As an action item, the Board asked Jay and Lee-Berkeley to draft a list of recent questions from potential donors and the responses given so far. The Board will then review the responses and this process may highlight any gaps where further Board discussion or other work is needed.

4. RFPs and contracts

Brand values RFP

By the time of the board meeting, we will have issued an RFP for some work on brand values to support our fundraising activities.

5. Meetings

IETF 112

Planning for a fully online IETF 112 is underway.

IETF 113 Bangkok

We anticipate it will not be possible to meet in-person in Bangkok in March 2022, in part because we have been advised by the local host that it is extremely unlikely we will be able to hold an in-person meeting in Bangkok at that time.

Based on IETF discussion and the current consultation, it is more likely this could be our first hybrid meeting with up to 500 on-site attendees and others participating online. Thus, we have started to look for alternative venues with a capacity of around 500 people. It is possible that this will not be in Asia as required by the rotation strategy in RFC 8719; we are currently evaluating locations in Asia and Europe.

The Board discussed this further and encouraged the ED and Secretariat to work quickly to identify a candidate location. The ED agreed to firm up dates of key milestones and share with the board.

COVID-impacted venues

A further [consultation](#) has now been initiated focusing on the financial aspects of a COVID-impacted meeting. The initial feedback has been positive and asking for the IESG to look more at the longer term strategy for IETF meetings.

Booking of future venues

The current environment is complicating our normal meeting booking process, in three ways. The first is the increased issues experienced when interacting with venues:

- Venues who are difficult to communicate with due to reduced staff numbers.
- Venues claiming that they have such strong demand they will not reserve space and require a firm booking.
- Venues imposing last minute price rises during the negotiation process.

The second is the difficulty with site visits, which we have not yet restarted. For example, the EU is now [considering](#) advising member states to ban non-essential travel from the US.

The third is the general level of uncertainty and the difficulty in booking a venue when we cannot accurately predict the numbers and risk a significant problem through both over- and under-estimation.

No specific assistance is sought at this time, this is just a heads up as to the difficulties being faced.

6. Tools/RPC/RSOC/RSE

Meetecho

We have commissioned the development of a special version of Meetecho to be used by those onsite at an in-person meeting, across a range of devices. This was explained in our recent consultation on COVID-impacted meetings.

authors.ietf.org

Work is well underway on a new one-stop-shop resource site for Internet-Draft authors that will be the new home of the tools information and guide material currently on tools.ietf.org. A joint IESG/Tools/LLC group has been established to work through the content and launch the site.

Wiki migration

We have commissioned Meetecho, who have extensive experience of connecting to identity services with Javascript, to produce the necessary patches to our chosen wiki product (Wiki.js) for it to integrate with the Datatracker.

Tools migration to GitHub

One of the remaining major components of the migration of tools.ietf.org is the migration of the code repositories for xml2rfc, Datatracker and related tools. Our new contractor, Ribose, won an RFP for this work and is well underway and making daily progress.

Zulip implementation

Zulip is the instant messaging system chosen by the community to replace Jabber. A [Service Plan](#) is now out to consultation, and will be finalised prior to launch.

Website content streamlining

After much planning and consultation, the Internet Standards section of the website will be revamped to be clearer and talk to people at all levels of expertise.

Security reviews

By the time of the board meeting it is expected that the security review of RPC code will have been published. Scoping work has started on an in-depth security review of Datatracker.

7. IESG/IAB/IRTF/Trust

Nothing to report.

8. Communications/Outreach/Engagement

WG Chairs training

By the time of the board meeting, the first WG chairs training session will have gone ahead with over 50 attendees.

9. Miscellaneous

Nothing to report.

5. Unexpected IPR update

Someone attempted to make an update to a previous Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) declaration which was identical to the first (original) declaration. We believe this to be a mistake because no information changed. The original submitter is automatically informed of such updates, and in this case the original submitter has asked for metadata to help determine who made this incorrect update attempt. So far we have refused to share this identifying metadata.

The Board discussed this with Jay and agreed that the IETF should not turn over potentially confidential or personal information to any party absent a legal order, particularly when it seems clear this arises from an inadvertent incorrect use of a web form. Jay also described potential improvements to how the form works. Should additional requests come up in the future, Jay will consider proposing a policy for how to handle this in the future. Jay will also advise the Board of any further inquiries regarding this specific request/issue.

6. AOB

a. Website responsiveness monitors

Several people noticed that some of the IETF websites have been slow, which seems to be the case for some time. Jason gave a recent example of a datatracker page taking more than 30 seconds to load, and Jay noted he is aware of datatracker performance issues that are potentially related to how the backend database is configured and how the queries are structured. Other Board members noted very slow performance for non-datatracker sites that should simply have static HTML and presumably be much faster.

Robert Sparks shared a view of the extensive monitoring tools he has in place for the websites and response times are generally fast with a few blips, though in some cases he may be monitoring the backend origin servers rather than the Cloudflare service in front of them that the end users hit. Robert was thanked for being proactive and having developed good longitudinal data to zero in on performance issues for a wide range of URLs.

Jay will give some thought to how to improve website performance. The Board suggested investigating URL monitors that would measure the end user to site and include the Cloudflare layer, as perhaps there is optimization to be done in the Cloudflare settings. The Board suggested Jay consider asking Cloudflare for assistance or engaging their professional services. If a CDN change was going to be made, as some in the community have suggested, it seems good to have data on our current performance so we can measure any potential change.

Part II: Board + Staff

1. Update on candidate locations for a hybrid IETF-113 meeting

Jay and Laura Nugent shared some of the cities they are working with as potential IETF 113 venues and hope to advance to the contracting phase soon. There are negotiations going on

with several venues and as those develop, site visits will be needed. One person has been identified to visit one site, and other sites will also need assignments.

The Board asked that negotiations and site visits proceed with haste and that a venue finalist be ready for approval by the October Board meeting if possible and by the end of October at the latest, given all of the preparation that must go into the first hybrid meeting.

2. Insurance question

Jay raised a question about a historical ISOC insurance policy and will talk with the IETF's insurance broker to understand more. The question was whether liability insurance covered IESG and IAB members. Initially it is thought that these were considered "covered individuals" under our policies but Jay will double check.

Part III: Board + ED Only

1. Goldman Sachs Q2 update

A Goldman Sachs (GS) representative provided an update on second quarter financials.

GS also suggested that the IETF consider changing our asset mix and eligible investment vehicles in an updated Investment Policy. One suggestion was to increase the percent of the portfolio allocated in equities, reducing bonds, as a reflection of what they believe the next 10+ years will look like for returns. Another suggestion was to consider investing in private equity (PE) assets in the shift to greater equity investments. GS has just sent a long report with more information on these suggestions, which the Board will consider.

Part IV: Board Only

The Board briefly returned to a discussion of IETF-113 venue negotiations and selection to reiterate a desire to move quickly in order to provide as much time as possible for various groups to prepare for a first hybrid meeting.

The Board also briefly discusses the GS proposal. A concern was raised that the PE returns related anecdotally were the positive ones and that the reality may be different. As well, a concern was that the IETF's investment costs will be greater for PE compared to index mutual funds for example, with the note that it seems unlikely we will find a way to beat average market returns but that by minimizing investment costs we can have better net returns. There was also

discussion of what university endowments are doing, which appeared to be moving to lower cost investment vehicles and more liquid investments that have more certain valuations, which might run counter to considering PE investments. On the other hand, GS has a lot of experience with other non-profit organizations. The Board closed with the decision to more fully review and subsequently discuss these potential changes.