Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: February 6, 2011

Y. Nir
Check Point
August 5, 2010

Giving Non-Working Group Presentations in IETF Meetings
draft-nir-non-wg-presentations-00

Abstract

This document proposes a new avenue for IETF meetings participants to present ideas, results, or other information to the IETF community. The proposal does not replace the work done in IETF working groups, or the presentations given in area gatherings and the plenary sessions. Instead, it allows a different track for delivering information, gathering comments, and rallying support.

Status of this Memo

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

For the past few years, we have witnessed an unusual proliferation of so called "bar BoFs". The traditional definition of a Bar BoF has been an informal gathering of people interested in a particular subject, discussing what, if anything, should be done in the IETF about this subject.

The traditional bar BoF has three major weaknesses:

- o It is often difficult, especially for those who are not IETF regulars, to find these "birds of feather" among the 1200+ participants in a particular meeting.
- o Hundreds of drafts are published every day. It is often futile to expect that even those who might be interested in the subject will have read a draft on the subject, and be knowledgeable enough to have a meaningful discussion on the topic without a prior presentation.
- o Not all subjects benefit from the open, free-form discussion that is characteristic of a bar BoF. For example, presenting the results of an experiment, or the results of measurements taken over inter-domain traffic, is best done in presentation style with slides and a microphone, rather than over a meal of a drink.

This document suggests an alternative avenue for presenting new ideas or gathered data. Such things can still be presented in working groups or in gatherings. For this version of the docuemnt, this new avenue will be called the ´Berlin´ track, after a room in IETF78 that seems to me to be about the right size.

1.1. Conventions Used in This Document

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

2. The ´Berlin´ Track

The new track will be held in one of the regular conference rooms. Any meeting participant may give a 30 minute presentation on any technical issue, and the precise requirements are specified in Section 3. The requirements for the meeting room are specified in Section 2.2.

2.1. Scheduling

Four weeks prior to the meeting, the secreteriat will publish the schedule for the meeting, including rooms and times for the ´Berlin´

track. While a ´Berlin´ track session is as long as a regular session (for example, 2.5 hours), Each such session is divided into 30-minute slots. The secreteriat is encouraged to schedule these sessions in the early days of an IETF meeting, such as Monday or Tuesday, so that follow-up discussions can take place in the rest of the week.

A separate schedule will be published for each of the ´Berlin´-track sessions, consisting of 30-minute slots. Any participant can request a slot, provided that he meets the criteria in Section 3. With the approval of an AD, the participant may request two adjacent slots, if his presentation requires a full hour.

For each of the ´Berlin´-track sessions, the General Area AD will appoint a chaperone, who will perform a similar function as a WG chair in a regular session. The chaperone will introduce the presenters, make sure that presentations end on time, and advise the presentors and the audience about IETF procedure. To be able to do this, it is RECOMMENDED that the chaperone will be a current of former WG chair or IESG member, who has sufficient experience with the IETF to be able to advise the presentors about the appropriate next steps.

Requests can be made as long as slots are available. Having reserved a slot, the presentor still needs to comply with the requirements in Section 3. If the chaperone feels that the requirements are not met, she can remove the presentation from the schedule, freeing up the slot.

2.2. Room Requirements

The Berlin track meetings may attract varying sizes of an audience. Therefore, the room MUST be able to hold 50 people, and SHOULD be able to hold 70.

Like all meeting rooms, there MUST be a projector, and the chaperone should have a computer attached, to show presentations in PDF or PPT formats.

3. Requirements for the Presentation

General Requirements. These requirements should serve as guidance to the chaperones and ADs when they consider if a certain presentation is appropriate:

- o The presentations MUST be related to the issues the IETF works with. "Why we all need to be driving hybrid cars" is not appropriate, as is "Getting a universally-standard power-plug shape, so that we don´t have to carry stupid adapters to every IETF meeting."

- o Economics or social impacts or the Internet are appropriate subjects, but social commentary and politics in general are not. "Re-elect Obama in 2012 because he gets the Internet" has plenty of venues to present, none of which is the IETF.
- o Subjects need to have enough substance to warrant a half-hour time slot and hopefully some follow-up discussion. For this reason, adding yet another ciphersuite involving some government´s favorite algorithm to TLS is not appropriate.
- o Subjects SHOULD NOT have a natural home in another working group. A new TLS ciphersuite SHOULD be presented at the TLS working group meeting, not at the Berlin track. If, however, the working group chairs have passed on allowing this presentation, or if the working group does not have a scheduled meeting in this IETF gathering,then it is appropriate to present it at the Berlin track.

Presentations are scheduled for 30 minutes. With a nod from an AD, the presentations MAY be extended to 60 minutes.

A draft MUST exist for each presentation, providing further details about the problem, the proposed solution, or the information conveyed in the presentation. An AD can waive this requirement. It is also RECOMMENDED that a mailing list be set up for the issue.

The presentor requesting a session MUST be attending the IETF session, at least on a one-day pass. An AD may waive this requirement, if they believe the presentation to be particularly interesting to the IETF, but the requirement SHOULD NOT be waived for presentations proposing work items or work groups.

The slides for the presentation MUST be sent to the chaperone, who will upload them to the IETF website, similar to the slides for working group presentations.

About half the time should be spent on presentation, with the remainder left for questions and answers, and for finding a number of people who would like to participate in a future working group. It is up to the presentor to decide the proper mix, but the present-and- run style is considered bad form in the IETF, which is founded on open discussion.

It is highly recommended to use this presentation as an opportunity to get a list of people who are interested in the subject and get them to sign up for the mailing list. It is also RECOMMENDED to find a small group of people, who may have good ideas on the subject, and schedule a proper bar BoF or hallway meeting with them. They can later be the beginning of a working group.

To summarize, this is an approximation of how a presentation should go:

- Chaperone presents the subject (0.5 minutes)
- Presentation, including the problem and what can be done (15 minutes)
- Questions and Answers (10 minutes)
- Polling the room, how many are interested in this (1 minute)
- Show a slide with the mailing list address, and invite people to sign up (0.5 minutes)
- Ask who would like to meet for a bar BoF (0.5 minutes, find 4-6 people)
- Find a good time for the bar BoF (2 minutes)
- With 1 minute to spare, the next presentor walks up to the front of the room

4. Examples

This section is not meant to be normative. It holds listings for some hypothetical presentations, with a short explanation about why they are the way they are.

- Title: A multi-homed variant of FTP
- Time: Monday, 10:30 (30 minutes)
- Presentor: J. Doe
- Draft: http://www.ietf.org/id/draft-doe-ftp-mh-01.txt
- Slides: http://www.example.com/slides/mhftp.pdf
- Mailing List: http://www.example.com/ml/mhftp.html
- Abstract: Today many computers have multiple connections to the Internet, such as wireless LAN and 3G. We leverage this to allow multiple connections to be used simultaneously, so that file trasfers get the cumulative bandwidth.

This is classic IETF presentation. It can probably be presented in a few slides, it is technical in nature, and there are both a draft and a mailing list. The presentor will undoubtedly be grilled during the Q&A session, but might be able to find 4-5 people who will think this is worthy enough to join him in the hotel lobby later to talk about this. No AD involvement is required.

- Title: SNA Primer for TCP/IP Folks
- Time: Tuesday, 10:00 (60 minutes)
- Presentor: J. Smith
- Slides: http://www.example.com/slides/sna.pdf

- o Abstract: SNA is a network architecture quite different from TCP/IP. In this session we will learn the fundamentals of SNA, and compare the two architectures.

SNA is a big subject. Without getting into the messy subject of whether it is open or proprietary, the IETF is not the standards body that deals with it. That is why some AD has waived the requirements for draft and mailing list, and allowed the presentation to take a full hour.

- o Title: The Writing is on the Wall: World Peace through Facebook Interaction
- o Time: Canceled by chaperone
- o Presentor: J. Jones
- o Slides: http://www.example.com/slides/pax_facebook.pdf
- o Abstract: Today, when everyone has a facebook profile, and can ´friend´ anyone in the world, universal peace is finally at hand. What diplomats in the United Nations have never been able to achieve in closed session meetings, will very soon be done in a bottom- up fasion. In this presentation, we will explain how.

Whatever the merits of this idea, it is not technical, and it is not really about the Internet. While ´J. Jones´ deserves a soap box just as much as anybody else, an IETF meeting is not the right venue for this.

- o Title: Using the Camelia cipher in GDOI
- o Time: Canceled by chaperone
- o Presentor: J. Kwan
- o Draft: http://www.ietf.org/id/draft-kwan-camelia-gdoi-00.txt
- o Slides: http://www.example.com/slides/camelia-gdoi.png
- o Abstract: This draft adds the camelia cipher as a possible encryption algorithm for GDOI keys, both KEKs and TEKs.

This draft certainly has merit, but there are two reasons why it should not be in the ´Berlin´ track. First, it is very narrow in scope - it´s just like adding ciphersuites to TLS, and does not have enough substance for a presentation, and even less for discussion. In fact, it is very likely that the only reason for submitting this draft, was to get an IANA number assignment when it´s published. The other reason that this is not appropriate, is that this subject has a natural home in the MSEC working group. It can be a 5-minute presentation there. Given all of this, it does not make sense to waste a 30-minute slot of the ´Berlin´ track on this presentation.

5. Security Considerations

There are no security considerations for this draft.

6. Changes from Previous Versions

First version

7. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

Author´s Address

Yoav Nir
Check Point Software Technologies Ltd.
5 Hasolelim st.
Tel Aviv 67897
Israel

Email: ynir@checkpoint.com