

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 8718¹.





Recommendation

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

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.

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 judgement. Others require the IETF LLC to assess multiple sources and make a judgement, as does community feedback. A venue must meet all mandatory criteria to be approved.
Uncertain but possible		
Not met		
Unable to assess / not assessed		

¹ <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc8718>

Assessment of individual criteria

CRITERION: City includes one or more venues able to accommodate an IETF meeting (*mandatory*²).

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
1.1	<u>Venue</u> : Possible venues evaluated for size and general location acceptable to hold an IETF meeting	[names of venues considered and whether or not they are appropriate or a statement that no appropriate venue identified]	

CRITERION: The level of Internet freedom is acceptable (*mandatory*).

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
2.1	<u>Country</u> : VPNs can be freely used <i>Region/City exceptions may override</i>	The free use of VPNs is [acceptable/not acceptable]	

CRITERION: An overwhelming majority of participants who wish to do so can attend (*important*³).

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
3.1	<u>Country</u> : 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 _____ without a visa or through a standard application process at reasonable cost.	

CRITERION: Travel risks associated with holding an IETF meeting are acceptable (*important*).

² Corresponds to RFC 8718, section 3.1 Mandatory Criteria

³ Corresponds to RFC 8718, section 3.2.1 important Criteria

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
4.1	<p><u>Country</u>: US State Dept travel advisory⁴ is at level 1 (<i>Exercise Normal Precautions</i>) or level 2 (<i>Exercise Increased Caution</i>) and not at level 3 (<i>Reconsider Travel</i>) or level 4 (<i>Do Not Travel</i>)</p> <p><i>Region/City exceptions may override</i></p>	<p>US State Dept travel advisory is at level ____ which is [acceptable/not acceptable].</p>	

CRITERION: Health risks associated with holding an IETF meeting are acceptable (*important*).

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
5.1	<p><u>Country</u>: No local disease outbreak or epidemic or regular vaccination requirements^{5 6} for serious diseases other than those we expect all attendees to be vaccinated against (<i>Currently: Chickenpox, Diphtheria, Hepatitis A, Measles, Mumps, Pertussis, Polio, Rabies, Rubella, Tetanus and Typhoid</i>)</p> <p><i>Region/City exceptions may override</i></p>	<p>[relevant diseases, epidemics or vaccine requirements and associated risks to visitors]</p>	
5.2	<p><u>City</u>: Air Quality Index⁷ in March, July or November is below 50 (<i>Good</i>), or below 100 (<i>Moderate</i>) or below 150 (<i>Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups</i>) for at least 16 days of the month for 2016-2020.</p>	<p>March AQI (PM2.5) is [acceptable/not acceptable]. July AQI (PM2.5) is [acceptable/not acceptable]. November AQI (PM2.5) is [acceptable/not acceptable].</p>	

⁴ <https://travel.state.gov/content/travel/en/international-travel/International-Travel-Country-Information-Pages.html>

⁵ <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/vaccination-requirements-and-recommendations-for-international-travelers-and-malaria-situation-per-country-2020-edition>

⁶ <https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/travel/destinations/list>

⁷ <https://aqicn.org/map/world/>

CRITERION: Human rights risks associated with holding an IETF meeting are acceptable (*important*).

#	Test	Assessment	Indicator
6.1	<p><u>Country:</u> Women Peace and Security Index⁸ score from the Georgetown Institute of Women, Peace and Security is in the top two quintiles (0.71 or above on a scale of 0 to 1)</p> <p><i>Region/City exceptions may override</i></p>	<p>WPS Index score of ____ is [acceptable/not acceptable]</p>	
6.2	<p><u>Country:</u> Safe for LGBT people, researched on an individual basis using multiple sources including Global LGBT Acceptance Index⁹, Asher and Lyric Fergusson LGBTQ+ Danger Index¹⁰ and others found at the time of assessment.</p> <p><i>Region/City exceptions may override</i></p>	<p>Level of LGBT acceptance and safety is [acceptable/not acceptable]</p>	
6.3	<p><u>Country:</u> No significant discrimination or persecution of religious freedoms, researched on an individual basis using multiple sources including World Bank¹¹, Religious Freedom Report¹² and others found at the time of assessment.</p> <p><i>Region/City exceptions may override</i></p>	<p>Level of religious freedom is [acceptable/not acceptable].</p>	

⁸ <https://giwps.georgetown.edu/the-index/>

⁹ <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Global-Acceptance-Index-LGBT-Oct-2019.pdf>

¹⁰ <https://www.asherfergusson.com/lgbtq-travel-safety/>

¹¹ https://govdata360.worldbank.org/indicators/hd6a18526?indicator=41930&viz=line_chart&years=1975,2018

¹² <https://religious-freedom-report.org/#map>

Additional sources including community feedback

- [replace with additional sources , if any].
- Community feedback announcement:
- Community discussions:
- Summary of community feedback:

Summary

have been assessed as meeting the requirements; have been assessed as not meeting the requirements and have been assessed as uncertain but possible. criteria have not been assessed because an earlier evaluated criterion has not met the requirements.

Date of assessment and recommendation: