Future meetings observations

13 Oct 2021

Authors:

Name	Company	Phone	email
George Zimmerman (as an individual participant)	CME Consulting/ADI, APL Group, Cisco, CommScope, Marvell, SenTekSe	1 310-920-3860	george@cmephyconsulting.com

The 'starter deck' raised some fundamental questions about remote only ops

- What aspects of remote operation have worked during COVID?
  - Highlight real examples
  - Identify why remote operation was successful in these cases
- What aspects of remote operation have NOT worked during COVID?
  - Highlight real examples
  - Identify why remote operation was NOT successful in these cases
- What could be done to turn these failures into successes?
  - Describe some real turnaround examples (if any)
  - … or hypothesis about how this could be done

This contribution attempts to provide some input, both from personal experience as a meeting Chair and participant, and from comments made in the "near-term mixed-mode adhoc".

What has worked for remote meetings:

WELL	NOT SO WELL
Increased frequency of meetings • Better than by using reflector-only or private conversations between participants	**Increased meeting time/frequency improved time to consensus** • Lack of interpersonal time and visual feedback has made building agreements harder in many cases
Better controlled discussion with fewer interruptions • Some meeting tools give Chair control of mute	**Silence ≠ Consent** • Lack of visual feedback makes it hard to tell if people are tuned out, tired of arguing, or really agree
Involvement of people who might not be able to attend otherwise	**Many individuals 'hanging on' but not participating**
Enables standards work to interlace with the 'day job'	**Only about 4 hour 'sweet spot' per day for multi-timezone access**
Preset agendas/topics guide decisions	**Getting things posted on time can be harder**

What has worked for remote meetings (cont'd):

WELL	NOT SO WELL
Online voting is well controlled and accepted	**Generally, requires pre-setup** • May give preference to 'unanimous consent' which is a false sense of support
Additional leadership person • Watching the queue, chat, and tool functions works well	**Chairs need support** • Usually not a one-person job
Few tech issues • Most participants work out their own • Minimal support	**When they happen, tech issues are disruptive!** • Participants jump into troubleshooting
Diversity of tools / donated access • Companies willing to supply WebEx/Zoom/Teams time • Chair gets choice & familiarity	**Many tools lead to inconsistent user interfaces and features** • Inconsistent user experience
Expense is low	**Collecting can be hard** • People expect free

Some observations from the 'mixed mode' adhoc *(personal opinions from discussion, not consensus)*

Presetting agendas and discussion times is important even in remote-only (not mixed mode) meetings

But it is also hard, requires discipline to stick to deadlines, judgement & flexibility to address topics which 'come up'

Trust in the Chair and flexibility for the group is key

Many have learned well, but training for new chairs & sharing will help

Different Chairs & different groups/stages require different styles

DON'T CODIFY TOO MUCH

People are used to not having video of speaker/audience

Makes setups easier, but *maybe that's not a good thing?*

Everyone has an opinion about every aspect, and everyone is sure they're right!

DISCUSSION? MORE POINTS?

THANK YOU!