

Mixed Mode Ad Hoc Agenda & Notes

G. Zimmerman 8/10/2021

ec-21-0198-01-00EC

Review – from 7/27: Issues to resolve

- What are we trying to achieve
 - Why try to have f2f, mm, or online meetings
 - What are we trying to achieve
 - Enable effective standards development to occur
 - To enable access to standards development when we resume f2f meetings (for the first time)
- Near-term solution – shoot for November, make sure we get done by March. (first meeting back)
- GZ to get information on IETF from Rick

Attendance (from Webex)

Meeting Goals

- Consensus on goal
- Identify possible near-term models for presentation
- Identify questions to be answered to come back with some proposed models. (I'm currently thinking not each meeting session is the same...)
- Identify next meeting date and deliverables for that.

Homework: Why are we here?

- Underlying assumptions: need to return short-term to face to face due to contractual obligations, rules structure, and familiarity with face to face processes (among other things)
- Propose near-term (next 1 year) meeting features which allow:
 - Promote effective standards development
 - May differ based on phase of project (e.g., baseline vs. comment resolution) & type of meeting (e.g., EC vs. WG vs. TF vs. SG) & group of people
 - Enable near-term return to face-to-face meeting content with fair participation for those who cannot travel due to governmental or health issues
 - Perhaps include choice of whether to travel as well... - need to discuss
 - Enable meeting planning/treasury to propose a fiscally responsible and operational model
- If we have more than one, that's OK.
- We expect this to evolve, but need to get started

- We are NOT here to choose the long-term meeting format

Rosdahl presentation

(from last time – update on various IEEE efforts)

Homework: Meetecho (IETF hybrid provider)

- Met with Linespeed, and later with Meetecho (held meeting over their tool)
- Provide hybrid meetings to IETF – described 20 room/802-style meeting to them
- Attendee management, Chair controlled muting, Chair controlled video feed, voting tools
 - Recommend using floor mic & room audio, remote video of presenter / chair, and queue, with remote queue managed by volunteer, support by on-site staff

PROS

- Experience with IETF, Computer Society, supporting similar meetings
 - Familiar to Linespeed (802's network provider)
- Proprietary Platform
 - Tuned for chair-run meetings
 - Voting, queue mgmt., etc
- On-site support
 - Responsibility for room setup and operations
- Manageable bandwidth
 - Should be single video stream per room
- Budgetable cost (similar to network provider)

CONS

- Lack of 802 user/chair experience
- Proprietary platform
 - New to learn for chairs & attendees
 - Proprietary, not quite same as mainstream which has developed quickly
- Low bit rate video (not the greatest quality)
- On-site support
 - Significant cost – would require extra fee

Best practices: things to consider

- Consider 3 classes of attendees:
 - Onsite
 - Remote – cannot attend (health/government) [TBD]
 - Full voting/attendance rights
 - Potentially with extra fee over and above onsite
 - Because 802 incurs contractual penalties & extra support costs
 - Remote – observer status
 - Reduced fee
 - No voting rights or attendance credits
 - Chair’s discretion on participation
- Consider small breakout rooms for problem solving
 - Value of face-to-face sessions is in working meetings
 - 802 to consider providing for small group (6-10) breakouts

Potential Models for Meeting Rooms (not breakouts)

‘Televised in-person’

- Description:
 - Video of presenter/chair & queue
 - Includes remote presenter
 - Room speakers / mic audio
 - No headsets
 - Use event tool managed by chair/volunteer
 - E.g., Meetecho, Webex Events, Zoom equivalent
 - Homework to do
 - Try to minimize on-site support
- Concerns:
 - Cost, On-site support, setup, new model

‘Co-located virtual meeting’

- Description:
 - Video only of presenter/chair
 - Attendee use local headsets
 - Relies on users
 - No room speakers, user mics
 - Minimal setup
 - Conventional web-meeting tools
 - Webex, Zoom
 - Only network onsite support
 - Potentially low cost
- Concerns:
 - Bandwidth, confusion of in-room sound vs. headset sound

Review — <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/21/ec-21-0157-00-00EC-best-practices-for-mixed-mode-ieee-802-lmsc-sessions.docx>

Next meeting?

- August 17, same time
- August 24, same time

Notes/issues from prior meetings

7/27: Attendance (from Webex)

[V] Benjamin Rolfe Blind Creek Associates

[V] Dorothy Stanley, HP Enterprise

[V] Steve Shellhammer Qualcomm

Andrew Myles, Cisco Systems

Dawn Slykhouse, Face to Face Events

Geoff Thompson - GraCaSI S.A.

George Zimmerman (CME Consulting/ADI, APL Group, Cisco, Commsco

Glenn Parsons, Ericsson

James Gilb, General Atomics Aeronautical Systems, Inc. Univ of San Diego

jay holcomb[Itron]

Jessy Rouyer [Nokia]

Jodi Haasz, IEEE-SA

John D'Ambrosia, Futurewei, US Subsidiary of Huawei

Joseph Levy InterDigital

Lisa Ronmark - Face to Face Events

Paul Nikolich, Self, HPE, Huawei, Wyebot, UNH BCoE, YAS BBV, Origin Wireless

RICK ALFVIN Linespeed

Stephanie Williams, Face to Face Events

Steve Carlson HSD. Bosch, Ethernovia

Stuart Kerry, OK-Brit; Self

7/27: Meeting Goals

- Identify key assumptions to be met that we can get consensus on. What don't we have consensus on...
- Identify questions to be answered to come back with some proposed models. (I'm currently thinking not each meeting session is the same...)
- Identify next meeting date and deliverables for that.

7/27: Possible Assumptions/Consensus Points

- Good audio is perhaps the MOST important aspect
 - Desk mics & room speakers are problematic
- If using dedicated conferencing equipment, need a trained operator
- Live-stream video of everyone or just of a room is distracting
 - If necessary, use video strategically – controlled by chair or other coordinator
- Recognize that a ‘mixed mode meeting’ isn’t a plenary – a plenary is multiple mixed mode meetings of various types...
 - Ongoing challenge of adapting to different facilities as well.
- Some key questions:
 - Can we agree processes from good virtual meetings are the starting basis for a good mixed-mode meeting, and then add on
 - Or: Do we start with processes from a face-to-face meeting and add on to that for a mixed-mode?

7/27: Things to consider

- Maximum length of time for a session?
- Different practices for different types of sessions?
 - Small, medium size working meetings vs. larger procedural meetings
- Require headset mics for everyone?
 - Logistical simplicity – pushback from some

7/27: Best practices – ESTA

(Carlson/Zimmerman w/ Karl Ruling)

- Meetings of different sizes get different treatment
 - ≤ 20 people might be table with a conference phone
 - 20-100 people requires interaction and care
 - 100+ people might be more like a conference presentation
 - Plenary, process-oriented, and problem-solving meetings are different
- Get support done by volunteers
 - Chair, watcher of online activity, video manager
- Generally, use headsets – table mics for small meetings only
 - Live audio is hard
- Provide your own network equipment
 - Knowledge in the room of any necessary equipment is important