IETF Venue Assessment Report: [LOCATION]

This is a recommendation made by the IETF Executive Director with respect to the appropriateness of [LOCATION] as a viable location for an IETF meeting, based on the assessment made by the IETF Secretariat of mandatory and important criteria taken from the requirements documented in RFC 8718[1].

Recommendation

This is a [**preliminary report** prior to community feedback/**final report** incorporating community feedback] made on [DATE].

[Only if final report] Based on the assessment below of the conditions for hosting an IETF meeting in [LOCATION], the recommendation is that [LOCATION] be [**approved/rejected**] as a potential location for an IETF meeting.

This section has one set of text for the preliminary report and one set of text for the final report. In the preliminary report, only partial information can be provided and so there is no recommendation. The additional information between the preliminary and final report is expected to be community feedback and any subsequent research triggered by this.

Classification system

This assessment uses the following classification system for each criterion:

Assessment	Indicator	Methodology
Met		Each test is applied on a <u>country</u>, <u>city</u> or <u>venue</u> basis. For some, local level exceptions may be considered. Some tests use an external source with no IETF LLC assessment, some require the IETF LLC to assess multiple sources and make an assessment and some require community feedback to assess. To be approved, a venue must not have any Not Met criteria.
Uncertain but possible		
Not met		

---

[1] https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc8718

Unable to assess / not assessed

Assessment of individual criteria

CRITERION: City includes one or more venues able to accommodate an IETF meeting.

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
1.1	Venue: Possible venues evaluated for size and general location acceptable to hold an IETF meeting	*This will contain the names of venues considered and whether or not they are potentially appropriate or, if required (e.g. for commercial reasons), no specific statement, just a list of possible venues.* *If no appropriate venues can be identified then this will be stated.*	

CRITERION: Open Internet access to venue and IETF Hotels.

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
2.1	Venue and IETF Hotels: Open and unfiltered Internet access can be provided at the venue and IETF Hotels *May require community feedback to assess*	The Internet access in [CITY] is suitable [or] There is a process to obtain suitable Internet access for the venue and IETF hotels. [or] Community feedback is required to complete this assessment *If this is answered by the statement that there is a process for obtaining suitable Internet access, then details of that process are not included here.* *The final option is for the possible, but unlikely case that no statement can be made without community feedback.*	

CRITERION: An overwhelming majority of participants who wish to do so can attend.

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
3.1	Country: Visa requirements are such that 80% of IETF attendees will be able to obtain a visa without excessive effort or cost	80% of attendees, by country, [can/cannot] enter [COUNTRY] without a visa or through a standard application process at reasonable cost.	
3.2	Country: Visa rules are not discriminatory on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation or gender identity (note: this intentionally does not include nationality)	The visa rules for [COUNTRY] [are/are not] discriminatory on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation or gender identity.	

CRITERION: Travel risks associated with holding an IETF meeting are acceptable.

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
4.1	Country: US State Dept travel advisory[2] is not at level 4 (*Do Not Travel*) *Region/City exceptions may override*	US State Dept travel advisory is at level [LEVEL] which is [acceptable/not acceptable]. *As an example of an exception: Egypt is level 3, but the Sinai Peninsula, with the exception of Sharm El-Sheik is level 4. So we could go to Egypt, but not the Sinai Peninsula, except Sharm El-Sheik, which we could go to.*	

CRITERION: Health risks associated with holding an IETF meeting are acceptable.

---

[2] https://travel.state.gov/content/travel/en/international-travel/International-Travel-Country-Information-Pages.html

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
5.1	<u>Country</u>: No epidemic or local disease outbreak of concern; or vaccination requirements[3][4][5], for serious diseases other than those we reasonably expect that all participants vaccinated against (*Currently: Chickenpox, COVID, Diphtheria, Hepatitis A, Measles, Mumps, Pertussis, Polio, Rabies, Rubella,Tetanus and Typhoid*) *Region/City exceptions may override*	There are no disease outbreaks of concern or unreasonable vaccination requirements. [or] *Standard text is not provided here because there are too many different possibilities. If there is something of concern then details of that will be provided.* *If there are any vaccination requirements, where proof of vaccination is required to enter the country, then that will be noted even if it is for one/some of the listed diseases.*	
5.2	<u>City</u>: Air Quality Index[6] in March, July or November is below 50 (*Good*), or below 100 (*Moderate*) or below 150 (*Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups*) for at least 16 days of the month for the last three years. *May require community feedback to assess*	**[March/July/November]** AQI (PM2.5) is **[acceptable/not acceptable]** **[or]** is not available but is believed to be acceptable based on our research. **[or]** Community feedback is required to complete this assessment.	
5.3	<u>City</u>: No war, violent demonstrations, or political unrest that would make the city unsafe for IETF participants. *May require community feedback to assess*	**[CITY]** is **[safe/unsafe]** for IETF participants in respect of war, violent demonstrations, or political unrest. **[or]** Community feedback is required to complete this assessment.	

---

[3]
https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/vaccination-requirements-and-recommendations-for-international-travelers-and-malaria-situation-per-country-2020-edition
[4] https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/travel/destinations/list
[5] https://www.who.int/travel-advice/vaccines
[6] https://aqicn.org/map/world/

CRITERION: Human rights risks associated with holding an IETF meeting are acceptable.

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
6.1	City: City is not unsafe for IETF participants due to discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation or gender identity, based on the lived experience of IETF participants *May require community feedback to assess*	[CITY] is [**safe/unsafe**] for IETF participants in respect of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation or gender identity. [or] Community feedback is required to complete this assessment.	

Additional sources including community feedback

- *Any additional sources consulted will be listed here.*
- Community feedback announcement: [_]
- Community discussions: [_]
- Summary of community feedback: [_]

IESG confirmation of meeting viability

Community feedback [**has/has not**] indicated a need for the IESG to assess the viability of a meeting in this city.

If a need for IESG assessment has been indicated then a short summary of the reasons why, should be included here.

Summary

[_] criteria have been assessed as Met; [_] criteria have been assessed as Uncertain but Possible; [_] criteria have been assessed as Not Met; and [_] criteria have not been assessed.