


IETF 119 Meeting Survey

IETF 119 Meeting Survey

April 15, 2024 2:56 PM PDT

Q1 - Where do you live? (this question cannot be skipped)



- Africa
- Asia
- New Zealand, Oceania
- Europe
- Latin America (Mexico, Central America, South America, Caribbean)
- Middle East
- US, Canada
- Brisbane
- Elsewhere in Queensland
- Elsewhere in Australia

Field	Choice Count
US, Canada	40.71% 103
New Zealand, Oceania	1.58% 4
Middle East	0.00% 0
Latin America (Mexico, Central America, South America, Caribbean)	1.58% 4
Europe	27.27% 69
Elsewhere in Australia	5.53% 14
Elsewhere in Queensland	1.58% 4
Brisbane	4.74% 12
Asia	16.60% 42

▲
Field

Choice Count


Africa

0.40% 1

253

Showing rows 1 - 11 of 11


Q1a - What is your gender? (check all that apply)



Field	Choice Count
Man	86.97% 207
Woman	12.61% 30
Transgender	1.26% 3
Non-binary	0.42% 1
Other (please specify)	0.00% 0
	238

Showing rows 1 - 6 of 6


Q2 - Which of the following applies to you? (check all that apply)



Field	Choice Count
Spoke in the mic line during the meeting	59.09% 143
Author of an active Internet-Draft	54.13% 131
Presented at a session	40.50% 98
Current WG Chair, Area Director, IAB member	28.51% 69
None of the above	24.79% 60
	242

Showing rows 1 - 6 of 6


Q2a - How old are you?



Field	Choice Count
Under 18	0.00% 0
18-24	0.81% 2
25-34	13.36% 33
35-44	21.05% 52
45-54	27.94% 69
55-64	26.72% 66
65-74	8.50% 21
75 or over	1.62% 4

247

Q2b - What is your employment status (check all that apply)



Field	Choice Count
Employee	78.23% 194
Independent contractor	9.68% 24
Business owner	8.87% 22
Retired	5.24% 13
Student	3.23% 8
Unemployed	3.23% 8
Other (please specify)	1.61% 4
	248

Showing rows 1 - 8 of 8

Q2b_7_TEXT - Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)


Consultant

I'm employed, but I was self-funded and didn't come as a representative of my employer

Humanitarian ICT - i've been focused on building, 'human centric' ecosystems (requiring standards, etc.) its been complicated.

Self-employed

Q2c - What sectors do you work in? (check all that apply)



Field	Choice Count
Business	63.24% 160
Academia	17.00% 43
Civil society / Not for profit	15.81% 40
Government	10.67% 27
Other (please specify)	6.32% 16
	253

Showing rows 1 - 6 of 6

Q2c_6_TEXT - Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

International organization

Information Technology

RIR

Other (please specify)

Standard Organisation

Software Engineering

Network Operator

Free/Libre/Open Source Software community

We As hacked

Technology

For Purpose

Telecommunication

pre-retirement: Government


Publishing

Open Source

RIR

Telecommunications


Q3 - How did you participate in the IETF 119 meeting that has just finished? (this question c...



Field	Choice Count
Onsite	74.51% 190
Remote	25.10% 64
I did not participate in IETF 119 Brisbane	0.39% 1
	255

Showing rows 1 - 4 of 4


Q4 - How many IETF Meetings have you participated in? (including this meeting)



Field	Choice Count
This is my first IETF meeting	10.24% 26
2-5	15.75% 40
More than 5	74.02% 188
	254

Showing rows 1 - 4 of 4

Q5 - Why did you participate remotely in the IETF 119 meeting? (check all that apply)



Field	Choice Count
It was too expensive to travel to the meeting	75.00% 48
I could not take a week away from home/work	39.06% 25
It is my preferred way to participate	15.63% 10
Other (please specify)	15.63% 10
I did not want to participate in the whole meeting	10.94% 7
I had childcare responsibilities	9.38% 6

Field	Choice Count
I did not want to go to this location	4.69% 3
I could not get a visa or getting a visa is too difficult	4.69% 3
The COVID policy (mask wearing, etc) was too loose	3.13% 2
	64

Showing rows 1 - 10 of 10

Other (please specify)

Collision with holidays

On-site ticket is too expensive for me.

Too far away

personal problem

Additional time to travel (+ 3/4 days back and forth)

The time to travel to this location is too long


i think calling it remote is a mistake and prejudices how people thing of it. I participated online.

Feels too far to travel

The travel time was far too long, 24 hours of travel for a week of meeting is far too long

I did not want to wreck the planet


Q5a - If you could have participated onsite at IETF 117 then would you have done so?



Field	Choice	Count
Yes	73.44%	47
Unsure	15.63%	10
No	10.94%	7
		64


Showing rows 1 - 4 of 4

Q8 - How well prepared were you for participating in this meeting?



Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
How well prepared were you for participating in this meeting?	3.13	0.78	245	20.41%	79.59%

Q8a - Internet-Drafts cannot be submitted or updated in the two weeks before the meeting (...)



Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
This rule is helpful for my preparation	3.89	1.01	225	9.78%	70.22%

Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
This rule should stay as it is	3.81	1.06	222	10.36%	67.57%
This rule should be extended to other methods for updating I-Ds, such as GitHub merges	2.89	1.22	202	37.13%	30.69%
This rule should stay but for a shorter period than two weeks	2.50	1.03	220	51.82%	17.27%
This rule should stay but WG chairs should also be allowed to approve exceptions	3.33	1.13	221	21.72%	51.13%
This rule should be removed entirely	2.01	1.12	213	70.42%	8.92%

Field	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strong agree	Total
This rule is helpful for my preparation	2.67% 6	7.11% 16	20.00% 45	39.11% 88	31.11% 70	225
This rule should stay as it is	4.95% 11	5.41% 12	22.07% 49	39.19% 87	28.38% 63	222
This rule should be extended to other methods for updating I-Ds, such as GitHub merges	15.84% 32	21.29% 43	32.18% 65	19.31% 39	11.39% 23	202
This rule should stay but for a shorter period than two weeks	18.18% 40	33.64% 74	30.91% 68	14.55% 32	2.73% 6	220
This rule should stay but WG chairs should also be allowed to approve exceptions	9.05% 20	12.67% 28	27.15% 60	38.46% 85	12.67% 28	221
This rule should be removed entirely	42.72% 91	27.70% 59	20.66% 44	3.76% 8	5.16% 11	213

Showing rows 1 - 6 of 6

Q9 - What more could the IETF do to help you prepare?

What more could the IETF do to help you prepare?

I have a minor problem with the Android app, which would help me if fixed. But really, that's up to me. It's open source.

nothing to add

Ensure all meetings have agendas posted well before the meeting

I don't know of anything right now.

Improve the agenda calendar so when my selected sessions are rescheduled or cancelled, I see it automatically.

I don't need additional help to prepare

Allow preparatory interim meetings

Give me guidance on submission of any new document and standard

lock time is necessary for scheduling and commitment. But 2week->1week might be ok

2 weeks for new I-Ds, 1 week (or 10 days) for updating I-Ds?

As a non technical person it would be good if there opportunities to read the drafts before the meeting. Although this was the case for the first time, future meetings would be different,

Extending the rule so that it covers the two weeks before the meeting through to the last day of the meeting would be beneficial.

Schedule and publish the agenda sooner.

The freeze on IDs is super-helpful for preparation. It's hard enough to read all the drafts, but nearly impossible when they are shifting close to the meeting.

Keeping an ID cutoff is a good chance to focus on review of existing specs and prepare for the meeting.

What more could the IETF do to help you prepare?

N/A

I don't really think this is something the IETF can help me with.

nothing comes to mind

N/A

Provide a description of the typical process for getting to an internet draft, and what level of preparation is needed at each stage. It was not obvious how beneficial having well developed concrete proposals would be. The focus on detail (specific protocols) rather than framework standardization was a little surprising.

Publish the working group agendas earlier

Provide a tool to download the presentations as a tar or zipped file. Currently the meeting materials only includes the associated I-Ds.

Get the agenda out much, much earlier. My participation depends on my ability to convince management that the agenda makes the sessions worth attending in person, and for what days.

I lost track of the last time I heard a WG chair ask the group "who here has read the document?"

Every session should list all I-Ds that are discussed in it. That way participants can easily find out which drafts to read, and, as a bonus, in the history of a specific draft it is clear in which sessions it was discussed, so you can look at these specific recordings to review the full discussions.

I don't feel comfortable providing advice about IETF process, as it appeared to be well developed and understood as part of the culture of IETF, which is important & useful. In my report, i have several notes; that is probably better shared with you in that format, rather than this... moreover, as i'm trying to do a - fresh-eyes, lay-persons review & provide considerations; that i think, are somewhat comprehensive... also, just my thoughts.

chairs could be encouraged to remind people of active drafts to read prior to arrival.

Make slides available as early as practical. Many appear minutes before the session.

Working Groups should be required to post their agendas earlier so attendees can have more time to familiarize themselves with the drafts on the agenda

What more could the IETF do to help you prepare?

Publish the agenda much earlier

more hours in the day. LOL

I don't have an opinion

Nothing to suggest.

Fewer conflicts == more hallway time to resolve issues.

It would be helpful if the overall meeting agenda could be announced more in advance.

Strongly require WG chairs to post agendas in good time. AD's to manage their chairs better. Strongly require presentation materials to be posted at least 3 days before the session.

even with the drafts frozen before a meeting, good understanding of the details require following mail list discussions for some time prior ... i don't think there's an easy way around this :) ... but thanks for asking

Require agendas and meetings materials to be posted, at least as good-faith preliminary versions, at least a few days before the first weekend of IETF, early enough for people to examine and work with them before they start traveling.

Start to make an agenda a but earlier

I am a procrastinator, so i love the fact i need to finish drafts at deadline to start having time to prepare slides in the two weeks before IETF. Some chair also like to see slides way in advance. That stresses me out. I do accept slides in my WG as late as necessary.

Don't use github for anything!

The earlier WG agendas are published the better, but of course everyone is under pressure in the lead up to the meeting so the current best-effort situation is entirely understandable.

A draft freeze is helpful, but it should be possible to make suggestions for changes either on the mailing list or on a repository. This enables faster progress on drafts by enabling relevant meeting discussion.


Q10 - Overall, how satisfied were you with this IETF meeting?




■ Very dissatisfied (0%, 0)
 ■ Dissatisfied (2%, 5)
 ■ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (9%, 22)

■ Satisfied (52%, 126)
 ■ Very satisfied (37%, 90)

Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
Overall, how satisfied were you with this IETF meeting?	4.24	0.70	243	2.06%	88.89%



Q71 - How satisfied were you with each of the following elements of side meetings? (Skippin...



Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
The number of side meetings	3.33	0.84	124	15.32%	44.35%
The scheduling of side meetings	3.33	0.89	123	19.51%	48.78%
The length of side meetings	3.60	0.77	120	8.33%	61.67%
The remote participation technology in side meetings	3.12	1.22	107	30.84%	38.32%

Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
The content of side meetings	3.50	0.89	119	13.45%	55.46%


Q12 - How satisfied were you with the overall agenda of the meeting?



■ Very Dissatisfied (0%, 0)
 ■ Dissatisfied (6%, 14)
 ■ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (11%, 27)

■ Satisfied (55%, 131)
 ■ Very satisfied (28%, 66)

Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
How satisfied were you with the overall agenda of the meeting?	4.05	0.79	238	5.88%	82.77%




Q14 - How satisfied were you with the overall structure of the meeting? (start time, number o...



■ Very dissatisfied (0%, 1)
 ■ Dissatisfied (4%, 10)
 ■ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (11%, 26)

■ Satisfied (48%, 114)
 ■ Very satisfied (36%, 85)

Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
How satisfied were you with the overall structure of the meeting? (start time, number of tracks, etc)	4.15	0.81	236	4.66%	84.32%



Q16 - Is there anything else you would like to say about the meeting agenda or str...

Is there anything else you would like to say about the meeting agenda or st...

I didn't know about the side meetings. Would be nice to advertise them more promptly.

I conducted a side meeting but the remote didn't work.

We should force side meeting conveners to provide an iCal link for their meetings. Oh, and have better descriptions for them.

Please do not continue the extended Friday schedule. This make return travel difficult for long-haul travelers. We already eat into the previous weekend these days. Eating into both weekends is too much.

It is very hard to find side meeting information. I mostly get emails notifying me of when and where. Maybe it's just me, then ignore this comment.

This IETF there were an unusual number of conflicts in the security area. For example, lamps, keypass, and privacy pass all in the same slot. Perhaps the chairs need more help filling out the conflicts or there should be an implied conflict when neither AD can attend one session in the area.

Loved the unopposed dispatch slot.

It's too hard to keep track of when side meetings are. It is stupid these do not appear in an agenda form

no

What part of "we have people that participate in the eastern US and need a morning meeting (Brisbane time)", didn't you understand?

side meeting video is a disaster. No recording, admitting people from waitroom is cubuersome. Why no meetecho support??

The side meetings conflicted with the sessions. And some of the sessions conflicted the tracks in the sessions.

The Monday morning Dispatch session was far too long and mostly wasted time. Of all the items listed on its agenda, only maybe 4 items had ambiguity about where the work belonged. Those few actually ambiguous items easily could have been resolved in 60-90 minutes, leaving the rest of the morning for other WG meetings.

Is there anything else you would like to say about the meeting agenda or st...

An additional side meeting room would be useful, as would Meetecho support for remote access. Some side meetings appeared to be working group meetings in all but name.

Too many side meetings, many are conflicted with the IETF sessions

I was hoping for an NTP working group meeting, but there weren't enough participants to justify one. I met up with as many meeting participants as I could in the hallway track instead.

Really liked the consolidated Dispatch on Monday.

WGs should not use side meetings to augment their sessions (ivy and ccamp this time - oauth had their wrist slapped for this in the past). It would be nice to have an agenda view that overlays the side meetings into the main agenda (although I understand why they are not integrated into the agenda). I wonder if it might be a good idea to require drafts to be posted (in the absence of another mechanism) for side meetings, that say what they are about - less formal perhaps than BOF drafts, but enough to figure out whether the side meeting is worth skipping a wg session for.

Less conflict between side meetings and formal meetings, less conflict between related WGs in different areas.

Side meetings are a bit problematic. It can be hard to find out about them and understand what they are for. Sometimes it seems they are for marketing, however they are often useful. In general, I'm not a big fan of side meetings.

N/A

Kill the side meetings. Too many sessions either didn't meet, or had very few attendees, due to the location.

I was very surprised by the early start on Monday. Like, in the sense that I wound up skipping the first session because I'd been planning on a 9:30 start and wasn't ready, and just gave it up as a bad job. If it had started at 9:30, I probably would have come.

Our meeting ran a bit off-schedule as one participant took longer than anticipated. It may be handy to have a countdown clock available via Meetecho that the WG chair can control, so that specific amounts of time can be given to each topic being discussed.

No

no

Is there anything else you would like to say about the meeting agenda or st...

Let's use MeetEcho for side meetings, too.

The meeting room should be managed well. Because we need to learn how to use the system. We hope we can go there, join the meeting, and begin, without doing any further adjustment. But we should do something more now.

The side meeting conference systems is not friendly for participants, especially remote participants. In addition, sometimes the time conflict with other sessions exists. It is better to have the side meeting recorded for later watching and improve the conference system. It is not a good excuse that side meeting is not officially part of IETF meeting.

Too many side meetings these days.

There was too much open space. I would rather a shorter day with less time between meetings. I didn't stay in the hotel next door, so long breaks were mostly wasted time.

There should be a separate overview of the session timings, esp. if they are different each day. (not listing the specific sessions, but only the session slots and common sessions like Hackathon presentation, IETF plenary) This way the time planning is much more easy, because you just need a glance on the timetable to get a feeling how much time you have until the next session starts without having to look for the written times in the session header and calculating it. Especially for people who are more comfortable with a steady routine (like in direction of ASD), it would help to have a visual aid that clearly and easily shows the differences in the session timings on different days.

Timezone was tough on this one. I changed my personal timezone substantially, starting a week in advance.

I think maybe IETF could consider checking some side meetings, some side meeting is hard to get its real intention, because the description is too vague, and a lot of people participate in but then realized this is not something they are really interested. It is a waste of time.

Monday morning was under utilised. I would prefer that Fridays be limited to a morning session.

I couldn't quite figure out how to do a 'side meeting', as a newbie... but also, I sought to learn as much as possible rather than prioritising other considerations, that I still feel are important. I think there needs to be a 'humanitarian ICT' track, but I think the onus is on me to figure out how to communicate the notion better; which, needed me to first engage in listening... as noted, the report will end-up with more information in it.

I thought Monday morning as an IETF-wide dispatch was a complete waste of time, and then we went until Friday evening! Sorry, that's lame. Friday morning should be the hard stop and quit wasting valuable meeting time for another dispatch. Also, there were overlaps that were avoidable. IPsecme and EMU at the same time? Come on, man!

Is there anything else you would like to say about the meeting agenda or st...

More opportunities for side meetings and hallway discussions. The IESG should be stricter about giving WGs time.

There were too many SEC Area conflicts, but I recognize this is difficult to resolve,

It was impractical to attend the side meetings remotely from North America.

It was an extremely inconvenient time zone difference for my remote participation, alas.

I suggest to set a bar on side meeting permissions.

I didn't attend any side meetings.

I was happy with the agenda overall, but surprised by some of the non-appearances at this edition of the meeting. That's not on the IETF as an organization, of course, as the working groups (and research areas) are on their own to schedule.

I attended just one side meeting this time, so no real comment. I had four conflicts Monday session 2, a new record.

ALLDISPATCH was great. Continue as is, in the same time slot.

long days, especially later in the week are hard. Perhaps consider making the early days - Monday/Tuesday be the early start-work later days but by Thursday/Friday and even Wednesday shift to a slightly later start/slightly earlier end.

Planning for participating in side meetings is not easy: some pop up very late, some overlap with meeting slots and thus create conflicts beyond the official agenda. No great idea how to manage as side meetings are supposed to be flexible but it may be worthwhile watching carefully how they evolve. I personally like the idea of late meeting starts in the morning to allow for early side meetings.

I'm not sure that ALLDISPATCH was worth the time block.

Too many conflicts in sec.

Either we support side meetings with full A/V, or we just don't. If the schedule wasn't so full/conflicted, then we could have more non-WG forming BOFs. With full A/V support. Either we have BarBOFs, or we have BOFs. I disapprove of the side-meeting trend.

Is there anything else you would like to say about the meeting agenda or st...

We're way overcommitted. It would be nice to imagine we could chose to do less and so have less parallelism risks

It is ok to use Webex instead of meetecho; however, the A/V needs to be setup in tested in advance if remote participation is to be possible.

Please don't cancel side meetings

Meetecho for side meetings please

The DispatchAll scheduling sucked. Regardless of the experiment, taking a half day out of the whole IETF for what was effectively an ART/GEN/SEC conflation was a waste. At the least we should have allowed the other rooms to be used for side meetings. We should also have made this scheduling very clear before people booked travel/accommodation. Great to have important technical presentation from a visitor during IABOpen, but scheduling what was effectively a technical plenary against the regular tracks meant that most people could not attend.

The lunch break was very early by my lunch time standards. It felt innatural every day.

Overlapping has happen few times, also starting time was too early for the Europe region, but I understand that it cannot be fine for the all world time zones, so no complains about time difference.

Seemed like too many side meetings.

What the All Dispatch was about? I believe the time could have been used more productively by avoiding conflicts or allotting a two-hour slot instead of an hour-and-a-half.


I did again have agenda conflicts, DetNet/BIER. Sad. Please shuffle WG conflicts so it does not hit same combinations over and over.

The agenda and structure for IETF119 was excellent. Please don't change it. The mega dispatch session needs some tweaking and tighter time management. Please keep this for future meetings though. It's far more productive than having discrete dispatch slots which clutter the meeting agenda and struggle to fill their allotted time.

Might have just been good luck, but didn't feel like there were any major WG clashes on the agenda (this is of course going to be different for everyone, but it was good for me).

The meeting timings were really bad for remote participation from the United Kingdom.

Q18 - How many times did you have a conflict between two sessions that were scheduled in...



Field	Choice Count
None	37.66% 90
1	20.08% 48
2-5	38.49% 92
6-10	3.35% 8
11+	0.42% 1
	239

Showing rows 1 - 6 of 6

Q19 - Please list any sessions that you wanted to participate in that were schedul...

Please list any sessions that you wanted to participate in that were schedu...

maprg/moq iccr/mops/sconepr

6MAN,LSR,BMWG

jmap, spice

NFS & SAAG

IAB Open Meeting - Quantum Internet Research Group

Monday Session II: DMM - MoQ Thursday Session I: sconepr (BoF), ICCRG, MOPS

Post-Quantum Use In Protocols and moq Media Over QUIC

Wimse

I don't remember anymore, but because of MeetEcho, I was able to attend both, and due to the fact that the interesting presentations were at different times, I was able to easily switch between them.

CFRG and moq Keypass and lamps and privacy pass Mimi and pquip Dult and vcon

Too much work for now, sorry

NETCONF-TEAS

One conflict was resolved by ADs.

spring - oauth

Human rights, privacy sessions

MAPRG, WIMSE BoF, NMOP DNSOPs, OPSAWG DELEG BoF, TLS Mimi, Madinas RASPRG, Privacy Pass Scone Pro

Please list any sessions that you wanted to participate in that were schedu...

BoF, Mimi DINRG, DULT BoF

rats, tls emu, ipsecme ivy, v6ops

SCONEPRO, ICCRG

SML and HTTPAPI

sml + httpapi

ipsecme > emu lamps > rasprg oauth > sconepr It was pretty mild this time (i.e. not hard to prioritize). There were some conflicts with side meetings that I was only able to resolve because I had a colleague covering the conflicting session. Only so many hours in a day - scheduling is hard.

ICCRG and SCONPRO BoF 6man and ccwg

sml, httpapi

6MAN and LSR

WIMSE - CFRG LAMPS - JOSE

SIDR Operations, Path Computation Element IPv6 Operations, Source Packet Routing in Networking IPv6 Maintenance, Link State Routing

regext, v6ops add, bess, mimi, oauth

iabopen - calext

none

Am happy that recording was done so I review missed sessions

vcon dult

radext iotops oauth uta

Please list any sessions that you wanted to participate in that were schedu...

v6ops and spring srv6ops and nmrg

I sat on the couches and dialed in remotely. I'd have to go through it again to figure it out; fwiw, the android app not working, was a disappointment; and, i had broader considerations than being there focused on a particular thing as a subject matter expert (sme) of that particular thing; which, i think is different to many others... overall, i think scheduling is hard...

IPsecme and emu ace and madinas keytrans and lamps saag on Friday? Let's get back to tradition: Thursday afternoon for saag.

Lamps, jose COSE, ipsecme Oauth, openpgp Oauth, sconeopro labopen, qirg, radext

scim - System for Cross-domain Identity Management / tswwg - Transport and Services Working Group

CFRG and COSE (however COSE got rescheduled); LAMPS and JOSE; OHAI and STIR and SCIM (three way conflict); TLS and RATS; SIDRops and COSE and EMU (three way conflict); OAuth and OpenPGP; RADEXT and GNAP; LAMPS and KEYTRANS and PRIVACYPASS (three way conflict); OAuth and SUIT; MLS and SCITT; CBOR and OAuth and UTA (three way conflict)

lamps, jose; cose, emu, ipsecme; madinas, pquip; rasprg, lamps, keytrans

IAB Open, ICNRG

one advantage of being online was the ability to participate in one while monitoring another.

lamps, jose keytrans, lamps oauth, suit

IABOPEN & ICNRG

Unwanted trackers and 6MAN

GAIA always seems to be at odds with another Internet Freedom-related activity.

cfrg, maprg, wimse, moq irtfopen, ohai keytrans, lamps tls, deleg

iotops, oauth

Please list any sessions that you wanted to participate in that were schedu...

maprg/moq

MAPRG and IDR

Thursday SCONE bof clashed with a number of other sessions and created a conflict for many participants.

MAPRG vs QUIC TCMP vs WebTransport OHTTP vs TSVWG eBPF vs IPPM vs AVTCORE GAIA vs TSVWG DINRG vs CCWG ICCRG vs SCONEPRO vs MOPS

CoRE and QUIC.

SML and HTTPAPI

QUIC WG

LSR vs 6MAN RTGWG vs IPPM

hot rfc lightning talks (with the welcome reception) maprg - nmop v6ops - spring srv6ops - nmrg

14. I don't feel like listing them all.

cfrg, wimse spice, tswwg mimi, pquip qirg,iotops, icnrg, iabopen mimi, sconepr,iccr, ccwg, dult srv6ops, dtn, mls

nmrg, ccamp

teas and tswwg v6ops and quic

mops-iccr,sconepr

DTN, Network Management, Multicast Information Centric Networking, IoT operations Web Authorization Protocol, Network Inventory YANG

Operational forum and Yang modeling work directly conflicting with routing area work.

lamps, privacy, keytrans saag, 6lo

Please list any sessions that you wanted to participate in that were schedu...

Mimi, HTTPBIS, and MoQ were all in a single session

NMOP IDR RTGArea IRTFOpen RTGWG IPPM TEAS GAIA IVY SPRING IABOpen TVR BESS SCONEPRO 6MAN
LSR CCAMP SRv6Ops CATS IDR

mimi;add jmap;spice

DINRG 6MAN

maprg and IDR, bier and detnet, rtgarea and tswg, ippm and rtwg, v6ops and spring, icnrg and tv, bess and detnet,
6man - bmwg-netmod-lsr, cats - idr

CBOR, OAUTH, MEDIAMAN

calext, iabopen saag, sml

idr - saag idr - cfg manet - pquip

mimi - add

OPSAWG vs. BIER vs. DetNet BESS vs. DetNet


Oauth uta Lamps dult

DetNet/BIER (my primary concern) <https://pim> (did not expect that and i could run back and forth) two WG with side-meeting conflicts.

TLS, RATS COSE, EMU ACE, MIMI CORE, OAUTH IOTOPS, GNAP KEYTRANS, PRIVACYPASS SUIT, OAUTH, MIMI LAKE, WITAREA MLS, HTTPBIS CBOR, OAUTH, UTA

saag and cats dnsop and detnet

Q20 - How satisfied are you with the scheduling of sessions to avoid conflicts?




■ Very dissatisfied (0%, 1)
 ■ Dissatisfied (6%, 14)
 ■ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (16%, 37)

■ Satisfied (60%, 137)
 ■ Very satisfied (18%, 41)

Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
How satisfied are you with the scheduling of sessions to avoid conflicts?	3.88	0.78	230	6.52%	77.39%

Q22 - How satisfied were you with each of the following participation mechanisms provided f...



Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
Meetecho	4.50	0.66	223	1.35%	93.72%
Zulip	3.86	0.89	117	9.40%	71.79%
Audio streams	4.27	0.74	79	1.27%	84.81%
YouTube streams	4.24	0.81	96	2.08%	86.46%

Q24 - How can we improve the meeting participation mechanisms?

How can we improve the meeting participation mechanisms?

Connect local slide advance clicker to the dedicated laptop, allowing chairs to do other things (e.g., take notes) on theirs.

Provide a way for session chairs to mute (audio and video) a participant.

We can open a new window with the taking notes and continue following the meeting automatically when we click on the notes icon.

The clicker device for advancing slides didn't work in the session that I chaired.

Add side meetings to MeetEcho and record them as well. This would allow to revisit them when a conflict occurs.

Allow WG chairs to force mute/disable video a disruptive participant both adhoc and for the duration of a session

Easier access for AD to get delegate powers to help out last minute

Avoid virtual jet-lag for remote participation by reducing the current obsession with the nominal work hours at the on-site location.

meetecho is great. Side Meeting should also adopt!

Meetecho requires that I disable all of the privacy settings in my web browser before it will work. This seems wholly unreasonable for a tool which is mandatory-to-use -- NomCom has said that one MUST register attendance via Meetecho for at least 1 WG to qualify as attending an IETF meeting. Meetecho should be modified to not use "cookies" and to not "store data inside my web browser" so that it works well even with ALL web browser privacy settings enabled.

Add Meetecho support to side meetings

Continue to support development of Meetecho. The tool is not perfect, but it improves from meeting to meeting, so encourage them to keep at it! Video/audio processing of remote participants is much better now than 2-3 meetings ago.

The wi-fi was unusually slow at times during the meeting. I know that there were situations where there were high-powered hot-spots that seemed to be drowning the signal at certain times, but I encountered poor performance for

How can we improve the meeting participation mechanisms?

some periods of time at least every other day. For several sessions, I couldn't sustain a MeetEcho connection in the room.

As a WG chair, it might be useful to be able to increase/decrease a remote participant's mic volume.

Meeting room 6/7 (side meetings) had very troubled meeting setup for some reason, in several meetings

N/A

Having the only archive of the video files on YouTube, which is inaccessible without letting Google track you, is not appropriate.

Stop using youtube. This is a really bad idea. Downloadable audio streams are way more useful than youtube videos that you can only watch.

For Meetecho, it might be handy to have: 1. A countdown clock controlled by the WG chair 2. Reactions (thumbs-up, thumbs-down, etc.) separate from chat, so that audience members can provide brief feedback without having to be recognized

Make it more obvious how to report problems during a session. (I've been using @meetecho in the Zulip chat successfully, but that's not obvious.) Find a technology that makes it easy for remote people to interact with in-person people during breaks. (It probably comes with a pony.)

nothing comes to mind

for me the problem was the time zone, it was impossible for me to attend almost any sessions, plenary, etc.

Meetecho on mobile: make meeting login more friendly to those who only use the private browser setting (reentering your details can be tedious).

improve the conference system for sidemeeting

Often the audio in the room was too quiet and made it hard to hear speakers in the back.

Side meetings are horrible remotely, but still important to progress IETF work. Meetecho works very well. Why not offer meetecho for side meetings as well?

How can we improve the meeting participation mechanisms?

It seems no printer can access by internet as meeting before

raising hands is not quite humming. perhaps a star rating would offer some flexibility in indicating the level of preference.

Personally, i think the best answer is that you could develop a solid pod / app solution, that could be a very interesting project... BUT, i think there's also simpler methods. i've got several considerations that i'm putting into a report to forward to you.

Kill zulip

I like the idea of one badge for the codesprint, hackathon, and meeting, but the badge was not sturdy enough to last the whole week. The plastic cover was useful; bring it back.

I can't be on two devices - I wanted to view slides, but was already on my phone,

Australia is far away for a lot of people. This does not help interaction.

I strongly prefer slack for real time messaging over meetecho.

add the qrcode to register users participation to wg sessions on their badge

Meetecho in side meetings

Do believe that IETF should evaluate the use of a tool providing an online transcription of the speeches. This would allow hearing-impaired and, in general, non-native English speaking attendees to fully understand the discussions. That has been a common practice in many conferences for a very long time. Really it would be a measure to increase inclusivity.

no opinion

No suggestions.

The Meetecho lite client has a tendency to throw an error any time my phone goes to sleep. When I want to enter the queue, I have to click through and refresh.

How can we improve the meeting participation mechanisms?

Meetecho still seems to have random changes for each IETF meeting meaning that it can sometimes take a while to figure whether an option still exists and if so where the option has migrated to. It keeps attendees on their toes I guess ;-)

Better hotel, Rydges had almost nothing open all week except for the lobby (CBD).

volume in rooms for remote participants was bad in multiple sessions, testing that before meetings would be good.

I occasionally attend while in the hotel room. I noticed that quite a few speakers were unaware of the microphone's strong directivity, which often made it difficult to hear them because they were speaking from the side of the microphone. It would make sense to tell WG chairs about the strong directionality.

After I use my iPhone to open browser-based onsite tool (Meetecho), it's found the connection needs to be recovered each time I reopen the Meetecho after some time of silence, could the reconnection be avoided?

Clearly we need to figure out the disruption problem, without impacting the freeform style which smaller WGs easily enjoy. Fewer changes to meetecho --- it's good enough, we just need to learn it better (as a group)

better linkage to the meetecho/zulip head page over all active events. remind people the web URL can be installed as a webapp on homescreen on android.

1. Try to avoid scheduling conflicts between WG meetings and side meetings. 2. As far as possible, adjust WG session times to minimize odd hours for remote participants. For example, for the Vancouver meeting sessions will run from 6:30 PM to 3:30 AM in Europe. Perhaps the Vancouver sessions could start one to two hours earlier.

Wi-Fi dead spots Plenary interruption

The suppress audio/video button in Meetecho has already been discussed. Interference with the radio mics was uncomfortable. Video feed of speakers/chairs was patchy as it had to be adjusted manually often leading to remote participants being unaware who was speaking. This probably needs to be fixed so that a static shot is used to cover chairs and speaker, or an additional camera needs to be introduced. The balance of audio feed for the remote stream was often very varied between different mics in the room. This was exacerbated by using mics that were very sensitive to proximity so that people who did not kiss the mics were inaudible. The Zulip chat was poorly integrated with Meetecho such that if a participant is present in two sessions at once, outgoing individual chats do not appear in both sessions (and sometimes in neither) even though you can still send messages. We need to fix remote access to office hours (especially for ADs).

The new Meetecho interface on mobile behaved weirdly. I entered the onsite tool by clicking on the link in the agenda in my browser, then selected the chat, which occupied the entire screen. But if I pressed back from the chat, rather than getting to the entry screen, my browser exited altogether and went back to the agenda. Also, if I let the

How can we improve the meeting participation mechanisms?

mobile turn off the screen, then I would find myself back to the entry screen rather than in the chat. It should be possible to switch back and forth between the chat and the rest of the options in Meetecho on a mobile.

Chairs should have a button to mute interrupters. Fix the problem of late slides not being available to chairs immediately. That happened at several sessions that I intended.

Make it explicit that there are two types of side-meetings. One type has a direct connection to the work or administration of the IETF, IRTF, IAB, etc. These meetings are open, subject to the Note Well, and are set up for remote participation (via Meetecho unless there is reason to do something different). They may be "observe only" with, e.g., no mic line, if there is a good reason for that. In both "reason for exception" cases, the reasons should be public and announced in advance. If needed, the LLC and IESG may work out broader exception procedures but, to the extent possible, those procedures and the rationale for them should be public. The LLC may, with the advice and consent of the IESG, require meeting registration as a condition for organizing or participating in such meetings. The second kind -- everything else-- should be on their own. Arrangements for facilities should be made directly with the meeting facilities or other facilities or hotels in the area. If the LLC wants to help with those arrangements, it should do so for a fee, the fee structure should be public, and there should be no evaluation of the relative appropriateness of different meetings or groups. A fee waiver structure may be appropriate, but because such waivers impose costs on the IETF, applicants (or applicant organizations) should be public.

Meetecho progresses very fast and becomes more and more useful. May be some chat extensions like make it easier the citation etc.

Safari browser - chat did not let me enter my answers. have to change to Firefox

The close caption of my IETF side meeting wiki was much better than the close caption in working groups (where it was not manual, but automatic). Maybe the meetecho service can try to upgrade to the webex quality close caption service. The audio in P6-7 was bad, very echo'ie. The screen/table setup was bad. Normal WG room setup would be preferable for the large side meeting room (screen was too far away).

The meetecho GUI could be improved. Too many remote participants seemed unaware they were (un)muted or had video on and off.

Q23 - Did you report a problem with any of these participation mechanisms or your registrati...




Q25 - How satisfied were you with the response you received to your problem report(s)?



■ Very dissatisfied (0%, 0)
 ■ Dissatisfied (7%, 1)
 ■ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (0%, 0)
 ■ Satisfied (64%, 9)
 ■ Very satisfied (29%, 4)

Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
How satisfied were you with the response you received to your problem report(s)?	4.14	0.74	14	7.14%	92.86%



Q26 - How can we improve our problem reporting process and our response?

How can we improve our problem reporting process and our response?


Being able to contact Meetecho on Zulip and their responsiveness was pretty darned good.


Provide a separate "Meetecho chat" tab, so the chair doesn't have to type Meetecho in the chat, and so we can keep participation tool discussions separate from technical discussions

Provide an obvious way to report during meetings in the chat. (I've been using @meetecho successfully, but that's not obvious.)

Typing "@meetecho" in the chat is probably very effective, but doing so feels: - whiny - like a call into the dark which might or might not get a response


Q69 - How satisfied were you with each of the following aspects of the onsite experience? (...)





Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
Badge collection process	4.71	0.61	172	1.16%	97.67%
WiFi	4.09	1.07	179	11.73%	80.45%
QR Code process for recording session participation	4.31	0.88	160	4.38%	84.38%
Food and drinks provided at breaks	3.75	1.02	177	12.43%	63.84%
Hallway seating / breakout spaces	3.93	1.02	176	13.07%	75.57%
Signage	3.96	0.89	164	7.93%	73.78%
Barista prepared coffee	4.08	1.05	141	12.06%	79.43%
Childcare	3.76	0.87	21	0.00%	47.62%
Welcome Reception	3.97	0.93	131	8.40%	76.34%
Farewell Reception	4.15	0.89	100	7.00%	81.00%

Q70 - How satisfied were you with the onsite experience overall?




■ Very dissatisfied (0%, 0)
 ■ Dissatisfied (3%, 6)
 ■ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3%, 5)

■ Satisfied (48%, 86)
 ■ Very satisfied (46%, 83)

Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
How satisfied were you with the onsite experience overall?	4.37	0.70	180	3.33%	93.89%

Q62 - Where did you stay in Brisbane?



Field	Choice Count
Rydges South Bank	40.22% 72
Other hotel (please specify)	26.26% 47
AirBnB or other rented accommodation	8.94% 16
At home	5.03% 9
With friends	0.56% 1
Other (please specify)	1.68% 3

Field	Choice Count
Novotel Brisbane South Bank	3.35% 6
Ibis Styles Brisbane	7.82% 14
Mantra South Bank	0.56% 1
W Brisbane	2.79% 5
Hyatt Regency Brisbane	2.79% 5
	179

Showing rows 1 - 12 of 12

Other hotel (please specify)

royal on the park

Hilton

One Department

Capri By Fraser

Mantra South Bank across the street

Brisbane One Apartments

Hilton

Emporium Hotel South Bank

Liverside Hotel, 15min on foot from the venue

Indigo

Riverside Hotel

Brisbane One Apartments by Cllix

Other hotel (please specify)

LLIC/Casino Towers

Hilton Brisbane

Ivy & Eve

Four Points

Brisbane One

Mercure

VINE Apartment

hilton

Courtyard Marriott South Bank

Holiday Inn Express Brisbane Spring Hill

mercurit

Hilton Brisbane

Atlas Apt.

voco

Arena Apartments by CLLIX

voco Brisbane

Brisbane One by clix

Ivy and Eve by CLLIX

Mercure

Courtyard by Marriott

Other hotel (please specify)

Hilton Brisbane

4 points by sheraton

Ivy & Eve Apartments

Indigo

Other

Hilton

Hilton

Royal on the Park

Voco Brisbane City Centre


Other (please specify)

Atlas Apartments by CLLIX


Ivy and Eve Apartments by CLLIX

With family

Q79 - How many people travelled with you who did not participate in the IETF meeting?



Q80 - How many nights in total are you staying in the following regions:




Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
In Brisbane	11.37	1.94	3.77	172
Elsewhere in Australia outside of Queensland	5.65	3.69	13.64	95
Elsewhere In Queensland outside of Brisbane	5.20	2.41	5.80	93


Q63 - How satisfied were you with the options for accommodation in Brisbane?



■ Very dissatisfied (0%)
 ■ Dissatisfied (4%)
 ■ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (14%)
 ■ Satisfied (49%)
 ■ Very satisfied (32%)

Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
How satisfied were you with the options for accommodation in Brisbane?	4.10	0.79	167	4.19%	81.44%






Field	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
AirBnB or other rented accommodation	43.75% 7	43.75% 7	12.50% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	16
At home	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	2
Hyatt Regency Brisbane	60.00% 3	20.00% 1	20.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5
Ibis Styles Brisbane	7.14% 1	78.57% 11	14.29% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	14
Mantra South Bank	0.00% 0	100.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	1
Novotel Brisbane South Bank	33.33% 2	33.33% 2	16.67% 1	16.67% 1	0.00% 0	6
Other hotel (please specify)	31.91% 15	44.68% 21	14.89% 7	8.51% 4	0.00% 0	47
Other (please specify)	0.00% 0	50.00% 1	50.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	2
Rydges South Bank	33.82% 23	51.47% 35	11.76% 8	2.94% 2	0.00% 0	68
W Brisbane	40.00% 2	40.00% 2	20.00% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	5
With friends	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0


Showing rows 1 - 11 of 11

Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
Rydges South Bank	4.16	0.74	68	2.94%	85.29%
Novotel Brisbane South Bank	3.83	1.07	6	16.67%	66.67%
Ibis Styles Brisbane	3.93	0.46	14	0.00%	85.71%
Mantra South Bank	4.00	0.00	1	0.00%	100.00%
W Brisbane	4.20	0.75	5	0.00%	80.00%
Hyatt Regency Brisbane	4.40	0.80	5	0.00%	80.00%
Other hotel (please specify)	4.00	0.90	47	8.51%	76.60%
AirBnB or other rented accommodation	4.31	0.68	16	0.00%	87.50%
At home	4.00	1.00	2	0.00%	50.00%
With friends	0.00	0.00	0	0.00%	0.00%
Other (please specify)	3.50	0.50	2	0.00%	50.00%


Q81 - How likely would you be to recommend visiting Brisbane to a friend, family ...



■ Detractor ■ Passive ■ Promoter



Q83 - What was the primary source of funding for your onsite participation?



Field	Choice	Count
My employer	75.14%	133
A grant or bursary	9.04%	16
My own business	5.65%	10
My personal funds	5.08%	9
One or more clients	5.08%	9
Other (please specify)	0.00%	0


177

Showing rows 1 - 7 of 7

Q83_5_TEXT - Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

Q50 - (Only asked of new participants) What were your goals for participating in IETF 117? (...)



Field	Choice Count
To understand more about a particular technical topic(s)	73.77% 45
To meet people working in the same field	67.21% 41
To learn more about the IETF	55.74% 34
To initiate a new work item	22.95% 14
To contribute to work already in progress	50.82% 31
Other (please specify)	3.28% 2

61

Showing rows 1 - 7 of 7


Q50_7_TEXT - Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

To meet face-to-face people I work with online in the IETF.

To learn about how IETF works, how it fits into the existing ecosystems; and, form a view about advancements needed, that could be done via IETF, to support 'human centric internet' <https://www.intgovforum.org/en/content/the-internet-we-want> noting, the many complexities... There's a question below about how successful i was, i think, there's alot to learn... too much to grasp in a first / single, IETF - even in the best possible circumstances, which i think great effort was provided for me to get; So, as much as could be done, i think was successful, but overall, more work is needed; so, only partially successful...


Q51 - (Only asked of new participants) How successful were you in achieving your goals for ...



Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
How successful were you in achieving your goals for participation?	3.47	0.59	60	5.00%	95.00%


Field	Choice Count
Unsuccessful	0.00% 0
Neither successful nor unsuccessful	5.00% 3
Partially successful	43.33% 26
Successful	51.67% 31

Q52 - (Only asked of new participants) How satisfied were you with the following elements o...



Field	Mean	Std Deviation	Count	Bottom 2 Box	Top 2 Box
New participant overview videos	4.12	0.98	33	6.06%	87.88%
Blog post on sessions for new participants	4.07	1.03	30	6.67%	83.33%
Onsite new participants overview	4.25	1.09	24	8.33%	91.67%
Onsite new participant quick connections	4.00	1.25	18	11.11%	77.78%
Onsite new participant dinner	3.74	1.42	23	21.74%	65.22%
Onsite new participant happy hour	3.89	1.24	18	11.11%	72.22%
Email communications with new participants	4.23	1.11	44	9.09%	86.36%


Q72 - (Only asked of new participants) Did you have the assistance of an IETF Guide?



Field	Choice Count
Yes	15.25% 9
No, I requested a Guide but one was not available	0.00% 0
No, I did not want a Guide	49.15% 29
No, I did not know about the Guide Program	35.59% 21
	59

Showing rows 1 - 5 of 5

Q53 - (Only asked of new participants) Do you plan to participate in another IETF meeting?



Field	Choice	Count
Yes	80.33%	49
No	3.28%	2
Maybe	16.39%	10
		61

Showing rows 1 - 4 of 4

Q54 - (Only asked of new participants) How can we improve the new participant p...

How can we improve the new participant program?

Please reduce the on-site ticket price.

Allow us to give introduction of us in any of the plenary or working group sessions and how our work will be benefited from it

idk its pretty great

I thought the options for new participants were pretty well-thought out and publicised.

More outreach and request anyone colocating events (like the ISOC policymakers) to join as a requirement to get the support

N/A

New Participant Dinner: at least guide expectations that it gives no guidance, but preferably add a short IETF guided discussion. That said, the emphasis placed on new participant guidance is very encouraging.

It was well done

I live poorly, so, my ability to attend physically is difficult. I will likely attend remotely, but, there was alot that could be done when attending in person that isn't feasible otherwise. I am writing a report and will forward it to you, but i think overall, there's a funding problem generally; so, i think IETF is a remarkable group of people, doing an extrodinary job, with the resources it has available to it... should more resources become available, i believe IETF Could put it to good use... I hope to help, and am thankful for your help throughout IETF119.

Tutorials and basic introduction for writing drafts and how to find correct working group to propose new standards

I'd probably need to consider that question as immediately I cannot provide more insight of improvement. I found the way of introducing new member and the professionalism outstanding and a great contrast to some other forums I've attended. Experience overall has been very good and left me with the thoughts of needing to participate with the mailing lists in the topics I am interested in.

the MeetEcho platform is very intuitive, the intro/test sessions make it easy to quickly get up to speed. the Agenda page was also excellent AFTER i got the hang of it. you may want to consider a short video (or PPT) that points out its main features and how to easily find a particular time slot / session / topic

How can we improve the new participant program?

More of the big picture of how ietf operates including the why as well as the life stages of a draft RFC.

Q27 - Is there anything else you would like to say?

Is there anything else you would like to say?

Thank you for a great conference. I hope to visit Brisbane again!

I thought Brisbane was an excellent venue for an IETF meeting. I wish we could get more attendance to justify returning.

The food should be improved

It would have been nice to have signs outside the meeting rooms saying what was happening in the room instead of having to go into the room and/or scan the QR code to figure it out.

For those travelling long distances (e.g. this time for me, from Scotland to Brisbane), I needed to arrive on the Thursday before the Hackathon (Saturday) to participate in the Hackathon, having spent approximately 29 hours travelling (door-to-door). However, none of the IETF hotel block bookings started on the Thursday. Additional flexibility on days for the IETF hotel block bookings *before* the Hackathon would be appreciated for those travelling from afar.

The Technology Deep Dives session was one of the highlights of the meeting for me. It was interesting, informative and useful. Proposed topic: TCP / QUIC congestion control.

Reception, thank you for helping me out for trying admin mode for the meetecho for the co-char who was the first time.

Having a cash bar at the welcome reception was an inconvenience. The open bar at the farewell session was more conducive to participation.

Nope

Having many conference hotels across the river and the ridges selling out almost as soon as registration opened resulted in fewer spontaneous meetings. In warm climates and seasons, the secrétariat should ask for a warmer temperature inside to reduce energy consumption and body shock. Note how popular the outdoor tables were on the terrace

Love the idea of collecting badges for recycling. The implementation, however, meant that the collection was closed before the meeting was actually finished — I nearly didn't get to recycle my badge, and many others didn't.

Is there anything else you would like to say?

Too much open space, people scattered so hallway track wasn't there in practise.

Thanks for the organisation of the IETF meeting

I thought the meeting went well overall. I liked the new paper badges. I thought they held up well and would recommend using them at future meetings.

No.

The meeting venue was so dispersed that it was difficult to have the usual hallway conversations. Now that people are, understandably, staying at a range of hotels, the hallway meet-ups are even more important and I found those difficult this time.

I want to be connected with IETF community and will like to participate actively

food is too sweet and sugary. more healthy food is recommended. More salad, more fruit, more veggies, less muffins and chocolate cakes, more plain breads. If ietf hotel can be 10% cheaper then my company budget can completely cover. more hallway seating is recommended.

The venue was wonderful as a lot of seating area sometimes with power outlets were very helpful for day-job on-line meetings.

Go back to Australia soon !

A good meeting overall with no visible problems for participants (although the barista coffee could have been better). Thank you to the LLC team for all of your hard work in delivering the event.

The seating areas in the hallways were often insufficiently equipped with power and on the lower levels, the wifi quality was pretty bad.

Hope IETF can be held in mainland China to increase the diversity of the whole IETF

Waving to Stephanie and Jay, but you all do a great job! /Liman

Thanks for coming to Australia again. I wish I could participate more often, but being self funded this will probably be my last one until you come back. One thing that really struck me was how little presence of enterprise/SME/SOHO

Is there anything else you would like to say?

IT there was at the IETF, and how little knowledge of that space there was among many of the most vocal participants. It would be nice to have a broader base of contributors participating.

The location within Brisbane (on the South Bank) was really nice. While I would have preferred a 'branded' hotel (e.g. Hilton), having all those restaurants and the great walking area just outside the front door was fantastic. And the convention center handled the meeting with ease. Would welcome IETF returning to Brisbane!

I appreciated the Land Acknowledgment and I wish we did those in the US and Canada, too.

It was a long trip from home (London), but probably one of the best IETF venues I've been in the last 20 years.

It is recommended that break provide healthy foods such as yogurt and fruits.

I want to be sure I can attend as a chair, reviewer and author, but the cost is sometimes beyond my finance reach. Having one meeting in a much cheaper venue with cheaper hotel might help long-term (as prices generally increase not just IETF costs), but there's the issue that we are a global community, and I appreciate that. The meeting tooling worked well - the new style queue was good. [It might be useful for a chair to be able to remote mute a specific participant for a session, or a period.]

It would be better if more healthy food (less sugar) could be provided during the breakfast and meeting breaks

A HUGE thank you!!!

Thanks, it was an overall good experience for me. I hope to attend future IETF meeting either onsite or online.

I had a lot of "not satisfied" responses. I'm not sure I can remember all of them, but... There were a lot of problems with the WiFi, even on Thursday, when I would have expected all the bugs to be ironed out. This is the first IETF I can remember where I wound up using my phone as a mobile hotspot when the IETF SSID was reachable. They had some really good not-too-sweet cookies on Monday, and then never again. Instead they served those insanely sweet chocolate cakes. I know, first world problems. The public seating wasn't very good for collaborating. Probably nothing you could have done about that, but if we have a venue like this again in the future, putting table seating out in the public spaces rather than in the terminal room might be better.

Hopefully they'll be a social event in Vancouver!

No

no

Is there anything else you would like to say?

As conferences go, I am extremely impressed by the organizers of IETF meetings. There is clearly a long history of learning and improving, and the human values that the organizers strive for are excellent.

Brisbane was a good meeting.

I know Australia is far away but I like that the IETF went there for a change. Similarly I liked it when the IETF was in Buenos Aires (or at least South America). I am not saying that the regular Asia/Europe/North America needs to be abandoned, but it's nice to go to the southern hemisphere from time to time as well and hopefully make it easier for people from those areas to participate.

Do not use Novotel again as one of the IETF recommendations for lodging

Please go to CHINA!!!, like Shenzhen(near to Hongkong). Very cheap hotel and food, excellent service, fancy cities, amazing culture, Pandas!!(I hate to spend so much money for terrible hotels in EU, CAN, USA, AU, they just don't worth) Perfect distance to Asia, EU, America. Since China has the largest Carrier networks, it may be great that we go to China more. IETF will be more successful if more Asian people join, diversities matter. Also, they have new requirements that other networks do not have, since they are so large. We need new info(culture, venue, etc.) to help IETF get more participants, become more popular.

null

(See food discussion on admin-discuss) An IETF meeting in Africa would be nice.

Thank you. Let's not go back to Australia for a while.

If it is possible, maybe try to serve more fresh fruits during the session breakout;-)

Please consider moving the farewell reception to Thursday night. Please make the beverages and foods during session break more attractive

thankyou.

I got the distinct impression that the IETF was going through the motions this time. Do better!

It was too expensive to travel to Australia, please don't make this a regular location.

The lack of a hotel lobby bar had an impact (despite the attempt to nominate one as an alternative). That was made

Is there anything else you would like to say?

worse by the early closing times. Overall though, fine town and venue and would have no objection to returning.

Thank you for a great first experience at IETF, Brisbane was a great location.

Meetecho needs to let a Chair put the session in lecture mode so that people cannot interrupt a presentation, especially a plenary presentation.

move HotRFC meeting to 6:30PM or 7PM, to leave enough time for reception.

Rydges hotel ripped me off by adding extra fraudulent minibar charges and with a horrible unauthorized currency conversion on the credit card charge. Worst IETF hotel experience for me

The new badges were good. The lanyards are too jangly though - they were distracting in meetings when people move about in their chairs or walk.

Good meeting. Long and expensive travel. I had to get special approval to attend due to the cost of airline fare.

Thanks!

Overall, high marks for this meeting. The venue and hotel were fine facilities. Brisbane was a good choice for host city because there are many sights and activities nearby for meeting attendees to enjoy, and in an environment that feels comfortable and safe. It felt like the venue was part of the fabric of the city rather than part of a sterile industrial wasteland (Philly and Yokohama being recent negative examples for me). I felt the planning for food and drink was excellent and the quality very good. For US participants, this location was very good value for money as well (except for the longer, more expensive flight). For future IETF meeting locations in Asia, I'd love to see Seoul, South Korea and a repeat of recent host Singapore.

I'm involved with the tools and comms meetings, so it's not surprising I don't have suggestions as they're already taken in via other forums. --rich salz :)

I was disappointed with low speed and quality wifi in meeting venue and hotel. BECELINK is better than IETF ones.

Participating at this location is very difficult due to the time/date difference between North America and Australia...

Brisbane seems like a really nice city. I would be happy to go back except that numbers were down and it is long way to go for everyone, except the Aussies ... Thanks for all the organisation and effort that goes into setting up the meetings and trying to make them as pleasant and efficient as possible.

Is there anything else you would like to say?

It is a pity that attendance in person to Brisbane was relatively low. Some meeting rooms were really empty. Probably, the current plane ticket prices along with the duration of the trip represent a barrier to many. However, I understand that it may be acceptable to have a lower attendance on occasion to help promote IETF activities in not so typical world regions (e.g. Oceania).

I am not a coffee drinker and I would appreciate a larger volume of juice for the morning (pre-sessions) break. Juice wasn't available every morning as far as I could tell, and even when it was there were only a few bottles.

Note this survey didn't ask, but I used a day pass because I was only involved on one day.

Thanks

It's all great.

Overall, I was satisfied. One note: the Friday afternoon slot works well. Still, since it substantially directly impacts the itinerary, it would be helpful to know whether the WGs I am interested in are clustered in the first half of the week or the second half. I was disappointed that I could not attend some of the meetings I wanted to attend because I had to return to my country on Saturday, so I have to leave on Friday afternoon.

It was a really really long hike through that convention center.... wow. Room P6/7 was awful. Why, oh why Brisbane would you close one pedestrian bridge before you have opened the other one? It was clearly ready. I liked the Ibis.

Seriously consider a discussion to do less work: look at draft dynamics and encourage more WG to not meet, or meet alternate IETF. Friday afternoon is .. ok I understand this is a deliberate decision but I think it has problems. Saturday to Friday give hackathon. That's too much. Unlike many others I think DISPATCH is a good idea. Put a plenary on early so Pecha Kucha can feed off meme ideas.

I felt included and met some nice people who I had only read and heard about.

Thanks for experimenting with Australia/Brisbane as a meeting location.

I saw the newly elected IAB and IESG members. It seems like usual suspects passing the roles to each other. This is getting frustrated that only a handful of people seem to be in charge all the time.

The "ietf-hotel" WiFi network was not as reliable as usual. The food/snacks during breaks were outstanding - setting a new standard for IETF meetings. I liked the self-service espresso machines in the convention centre

Great Job very well done obviously lots of preparation and congratulations on it being so well done.

Is there anything else you would like to say?

alldispatch is a good idea to centralize the effort and widen the audience (given there's no conflicts), but it needs to be more tightly gated by the chairs to ensure presentations are "dispatch-able" and not marketing pitches we cannot act on. Would be nice to encourage/centralize WG and other protocol laptop stickers, they're even more fun to collect than badge ribbons

The Friday lunch period seemed to have become full length despite the day not being a full day. Was this necessary, or could we get the day complete and out the way sooner. I very thoroughly cannot recommend remote participation with a large time difference. I would not do this again and would prefer to miss the meeting and catch up on YouTube than suffer this again. The handling of Alper Demir may have felt necessary, but was heavy-handed and went further than necessary (possibly because the tooling was not there to get the balance right). Disruption is the price we pay for being open, and being open is more important. Just like we have rules for how people can be ejected from making contributions on mailing lists, we must have rules for audio and video contributions. These must be community consensus rules, not rules made by the IESG or the IED.

Everybody got excited for the IABOPEN talk on hashing content, but I found it just a repetition of the same things that were said 1000 times before, without any discussion on "where do we go from here" that was not "we are right, everybody else should just go away". Somehow, people at the IETF seem to like to be confirmed in their very opinionated opinions and only host talks that support their view of the world. The venue was nice but dispersive, a lot of walking especially for side meetings. Also those ribbon separations compressed the P-level chillout/beverage area a bit too much. The barista coffee was terrible, but that may be a matter of local taste for scorching hot darkish broth as coffee. And, more importantly, I really missed the social event. An hour of finger food and chat at the venue is not a replacement.

why oh why was Monday morning a dead zone agenda-wise? Populating Friday afternoon in place of Monday am sessions was a rewally poor decision imho. Please can we allow an attendee to arrive on Sunday and depart Friday lunchtime as we've been doing for the past 35 years or so? So No, no closing reception, no Friday pm sessions, just restore Monday morning sessions and close the wg agenda at lunchtime Friday to allow travel home without blasting away a second weekend. Please?

As always besides some issues which i mentioned it was very useful and helpful event, I love the discussions there especially the one on SRv6 Ops BoF.

Barista coffee was, contrary to usual, not very good and little to no benefit over the machines. Farewell reception food was inferior to most of the other food, including the Friday afternoon break food, which was excellent.

From europe, time zone was extremely inconvenient for remote participation. And location was hard to reach for onsite participation.

Remote participant Day pass should have been lesser .. at least 150 USD

Please do not waste our working time on discussions that do not require everyone's participation. Mailing list

Is there anything else you would like to say?

discussions seem more appropriate for resolving regular, non-urgent issues.

Thank you so much folks for all the hard work. luckily i did do some great vacation days on the beach (gold coast). i feel bad for all those folks who flew > 24 hours and didn't plan any extra vacation time but instead spent it all only in the venue or hotel. We should almost shame participants into attaching vacations to logically reduce environmental impacts of travel (two trips for one).

Lack of breakfast, morning tea and lunch was disappointing

Hold more IETFs in Brisbane!

Brisbane was a great host city for IETF. I look forward to IETF returning to Australia in the future.

End of Report