

Public Executive Director Report

For the IETF Administration LLC Board meeting on 3 November 2026

This report is provided by the IETF Executive Director and is taken as read. This report is public.

1. Strategic Matters

2026-2029 Draft Strategic Plan (Board retreat)

A revised version has been provided to the board for review with a view to this being approved at this meeting in the Board/ED section of the agenda..

2. Policies

Investment Policy

A revised version has been provided to the board for review with a view to this being approved at this meeting in the public section of the agenda.

The key changes since the last revision are:

- Significant rewrite to address the Board comments and reflect the discussion with GS. Using tracked changes made it unreadable so all the substantive changes are noted in the document.
- There are no longer any exhibits as these are better in a separate confidential document (before now we have published with those redacted).
- Those exhibits contained the key information of investment objective and risk tolerance for each fund (except the two without a risk tolerance) which are now in a table in the body. A risk tolerance is proposed for the two missing.
- Added a specific bullet point in the Board responsibilities section relating to tranches.
- Added a specific bullet point in the Board responsibilities section relating to cash movement between deposits and the various assets in the Working Capital Fund (e.g. the money market accounts).
- Added a brief liquidity requirements section based on the worst of the Board wind down scenario as any other discussed scenario would also be covered by that.

- Noted the separate IMA and the Board Meeting Recurring Agenda Schedule.

Staff Policy

A revised version of the Staff Policy is presented to the board for approval in the Board/Senior Staff section of the agenda. This adds a travel section to the policy with the following parts:

- A requirement for staff to prioritise value for money when booking flights, which includes booking 6-3 months before the expected travel rather than last minute.
- Rules on flight refunds and credits.
- Rules about personal travel as a part of IETF funded travel.

This is an Operational Policy, not a Governance Policy, and these also require Board approval. The ED would be open to a conversation around Operational Policies being approved by the ED not the Board.

3. Finance

Draft Budget 2027

A revised draft budget is being presented in the Board/ED section of the meeting and the Board will be asked to approve the budget going to the community for consultation.

Authorised users for financial services

The changes to authorised users for our bank and investment advisers are still being processed.

4. RFPs and contracts

RFP for IETF New Participants Online Training

Negotiations are still underway.

5. Meetings

Remote rooms consultation

The report on the consultation on remote rooms is not ready for this meeting but as there have been no requests for a remote room and it is now past the deadline to request one, this has no practical impact. The report will be presented at the December Board meeting.

Meeting fee consultation

The report on the consultation on the meeting fee is not ready for this meeting. The report will be presented at the December Board meeting.

IETF 127 San Francisco

Preparations for IETF 127 San Francisco continue without issue.

Future Meetings

The current status is:

- IETF 127 San Francisco – Meeting registration is open.
- IETF 128 Kuala Lumpur – Negotiations with hotels are in the final stages and once those are completed, registrations will be opened. Huawei announced as host.
- IETF 129 Berlin – Booked and announced. Nokia announced as host.
- IETF 130 Vancouver – Booked and announced. Host signed and due to be announced.
- IETF 131 (Asia) – Due to the originally reserved slot being given away, we are speaking to previous venues in Asia.
- IETF 132 (Europe) – A site visit has been completed and options are being examined.
- IETF 133 (possible exploratory) – This is waiting for local supporters to work with the hotel to help them understand the IETF network and how that works, before they will commit to making the changes necessary to support it.
- IETF 134 (Asia) – In negotiations with the venue originally reserved for IETF 131.

6. Tools/RPC/RSWG/RSCE

Monthly reports

The November [monthly Tools report](#) and [monthly RPC report](#) have been posted. Both contain important information on the work being undertaken by the teams.

RPC SLA

The community [consultation on a proposed RPC SLA](#) has closed after an extension. This saw ~15 responses, which is a fair number of responses by historic standards. The key feedback was:

- General support for an SLA and, other than a few questions asking for clarification on some of the details of the calculations, no concern with the metrics proposed.
- LLMs/AI should be used extensively for RFC editing and should be the primary vector for achieving a major increase in performance.
- The backlog should be reduced to zero and invest as necessary to achieve that. This is urgent and more important than supporting GitHub or Markdown. Some suggested this should be done before an SLA was introduced.
- Very little of the existing work can be dropped to reduce workload.
- Quality metrics are not needed as this is the responsibility of the authors/WG.
- There is going to be an explosion of I-Ds due to AI and if this makes it a large increase in RFCs then this needs planning.
- Streams should all have the same SLA

Taking this feedback into consideration, the SLA will be introduced as proposed (with some clarifications) from 1 January 2026. This will be reviewed after 3 and 6 months and possibly adjusted as a result.

Separately, the ED will work on options for a short term investment to bring the backlog down to zero.

Tools consultations

The community [consultation on Tools SLA](#) and community [consultation on Tools Experience](#) have closed after an extension.

These consultations saw only a handful of responses, a relatively small response and so the key feedback should be considered in that context as unlikely to be representative of the community views:

- SLA
 - Better to measure and publish without targets for a period and then check in with the community to see where expectations are and then set targets.
- Experience
 - General concern that using professional designers will result in user interfaces not suited to a technical community.

- Designs and features should be targeted at the needs of active participants only with features such as accessibility deprioritised.

Taking this feedback into consideration, the SLA will be introduced as proposed as that is required to meet the key ED Goal around tools. On the experience side, user interfaces will continue to be improved to meet accessibility requirements and will continue to use professional designers when appropriate.

New RFC Editor website feature launch

The new set of features went live on time, meeting the requirements of our ICANN grant. There has been no mailing list discussion, but the new embedded survey has had ~1,600 non-spam responses that are being worked through. So far, much of the feedback has been about tweaking how the screens work.

The new site is attracting a lot of spam in the naming of user-defined sets and work is underway to stop that.

7. IESG/IAB/IRTF/Trust

IANA IPR transition

The IANA CCWG has finally approved the transfer of IANA IPR from the IETF Trust to the IETF IPMC. Consultation on the new TLP closed on 18 October so it should soon be possible to make changes to the tools to support the revised TLP and IETF IPMC.

8. Communications/Outreach

Nothing to report.

9. Fundraising

Nothing to report.

10. Miscellaneous

Nothing to report