Brief Background

At IETF 116 Yokohama, IETF LLC presented concerns with RFC 8718 at Gendispatch. Pitched as “we would like the community to review RFC 8718”

Dispatched: Create a separate mailing list … Collect the feedback from the community … present back to the gendispatch list or group as needed … decide again where to go in future … AD-sponsorship or unstable enough to need a WG.

Published 01 version based on feedback in the gendispatch session:

- Removed all the parts LLC can just action, and parts not well formed
- Reframed this as a BCP to clarify RFC 8718, update RFC 8178 and replace RFC 8179 (more on that later)
Recommendations - Meeting (Rotation) Policy

The I-D recommends a new policy to replace RFC 8719. This is new since the gendispatch meeting. Added to address concerns expressed by community members that the current policy does not “distribute the pain” enough and makes exploratory meetings too hard to include.

Feedback is that the proposed rotation policy is too strict and not workable and so this will be withdrawn.

Proposal would also have removed requirement for IETF consensus (as judged by IETF Chair) for an exploratory meeting and made this an LLC decision (controlled by the new rotation policy). New text will be provided to address just this point.
Recommendations - Hotels and Facility

Clarify “close proximity” requirement of RFC 8718 to mean “that the time it takes to walk from the IETF Hotels to the meeting space should be no longer than ten minutes, and a safe walk, including early in the morning and late at night.”

Replace the requirement for the total room block from “one-third of the projected attendees” to a more flexible “sufficient rooms to meet the expected demand”.

Interpret any reference to Overflow Hotels as an entirely optional feature that the IASA can choose to provide at its own discretion.

Update bullets on ad-hoc space and the lounge to now read:

- There are sufficient, easily accessible places within the Facility for people to hold ad-hoc conversations and group discussions.
- There are sufficient places within the Facility suitable for people to work online on their own devices.
Recommendation - Unfiltered Internet Access

New text from a community participant: Neither the Facility network, the IETF Hotels network, nor any upstream providers may impose technical constraints that affect the ability of meeting attendees (whether remote or onsite) to participate in the meeting or development of Internet protocols. That means that some filtering (e.g. for DoS protection, or locally mandated blocking of access to known CSAM sites) may be acceptable, but that broad, non-transparent filtering (e.g. port blocking or extensive government censorship of VPNs, web sites or email providers) are not acceptable. Where any filtering is unavoidable, or recommended by the IETF meeting NOC, the mechanisms used should be openly described as soon as is practical (e.g. before the meeting if local mandates are imposed, or during a meeting if in response to some attack/events).