Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Experimental
Expires: 27 July 2026

H. Godoy
State University of Campinas (UNICAMP)
D. Fischer

23 January 2026

# Microphone Access Fairness Protocol (MAFP)
## draft-godoy-fischer-mafp-00

Abstract

This document specifies the Microphone Access Fairness Protocol (MAFP), an Experimental protocol intended to improve fairness in access to microphones during technical events, forums, panels, and other interactive sessions. The protocol documents commonly observed behaviors, informal control mechanisms, and failure modes associated with microphone access in both in-person and remote participation environments.

Table of Contents



## 1. Introduction

In technical meetings, the microphone represents a shared and finite resource. Access to this resource is typically governed by informal human-driven procedures that lack formal specification, predictability, and reproducibility.

Despite advances in networking, distributed systems, and resource allocation, microphone access control continues to rely on ad-hoc moderation techniques. These techniques frequently result in unfair allocation, participant frustration, and inefficient use of limited session time.

This document does not attempt to fully resolve these challenges. Instead, it provides a structured description of commonly observed behaviors and proposes a lightweight protocol framework to improve perceived fairness.

## 2. Terminology

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 RFC 2119, except when such interpretation is overridden by real-time moderation decisions.

A Microphone Holder (MH) is the participant currently in possession of the microphone. A Waiting Speaker (WS) is a participant who has indicated a desire to speak but has not yet been granted access. The Moderator (MOD) is the entity responsible for microphone arbitration.

A Question That Is Actually a Comment (QTAC) refers to an utterance that presents itself as a question while containing no interrogative intent. A Last Question Promise (LQP) is a statement indicating that no further microphone access will be granted, without a guarantee of enforcement.

## 3. Problem Statement

Operational experience shows that microphone access frequently exhibits disproportionate usage by a small subset of participants, starvation of participants with concise or well-formed questions, non-deterministic moderation decisions, and inconsistent enforcement of time constraints.

In the absence of explicit policy, microphone access effectively operates under a best-effort emotional fairness model, which does not scale well with audience size or remote participation.

## 4. Design Goals

The MAFP is designed to improve perceived fairness in microphone access, limit prolonged monopolization of shared audio resources, provide minimal access guarantees, and allow graceful degradation under time pressure.

The protocol assumes deployment in environments where consensus is imperfect, time is finite, and human behavior remains unpredictable.

## 5. Architecture Overview

The protocol assumes the existence of a Microphone Resource, a Human Queue that may or may not be ordered, a Moderator Control Plane, and an Audience Data Plane. The system is inherently stateful, although state transitions are rarely documented and often only observable after microphone allocation has occurred.

## 6. Microphone Access Policies

Speakers should be allocated time proportional to estimated question length, prior speaking history, and observable audience reaction. Implementations may also consider queue position, remote participation latency, and the likelihood that a request is a QTAC.

Speech that exceeds a reasonable duration without a clear interrogative structure may be reclassified as a QTAC and subject to early termination. Detection mechanisms should be conservative to avoid misclassifying novel interrogative forms.

## 7. Moderator Behavior Considerations

Moderators must appear neutral and should make a reasonable attempt to honor request order. Moderators may forget all previous state at any time.

Decisions made by the moderator are considered non-reproducible events and should not be appealed during the same session. A moderator declaring a Last Question Promise should either enforce it or clearly label it as aspirational.

## 8. Failure Scenarios

Common failure scenarios include deferred handling via offline discussion, declaration of a final question followed by additional allocations, microphone failure during transitions, queue reordering based on physical proximity, and starvation of remote participants due to unmodeled latency.

In such cases, fallback mechanisms such as chat submission or hallway discussion may be invoked.

## 9. Operational Considerations

A speaker MUST NOT monopolize the microphone under the assumption that silence implies consent.

## 10. Security Considerations

The MAFP does not protect against intentional or accidental misuse of the microphone. Attack vectors include excessive verbosity, conversational hijacking, comment injection, and social engineering techniques such as appeals to urgency or authority.

## 11. IANA Considerations

This document makes no request of IANA.

## 12. Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge moderators operating under severe time constraints, participants who consistently fail to obtain microphone access, and audio hardware that fails at critical moments.

## 13. Call for Contributions

This document is open for community contribution. Contributors are encouraged to submit text that is both technically plausible and operationally recognizable.