IETF Trust Call at 10:00 AM EDT, Thursday, July 17, 2008

Participants:

Lynn St. Amour   [Present]
Fred Baker   [Present]
Bob Hinden   [Not Present]
Russ Housley   [Present]
Ole Jacobsen   [Not Present]
Ed Juskevicius   [Present; Chair]
Olaf Kolkman   [Not Present]
Ray Pelletier   [Present]
Jonne Soininen   [Present]

Jorge Contreras   [Guest, Counsel to the Trust]
Marshall Eubanks   [Secretary]

IETF Trust Agenda

Action

0. Minutes

   15 April 2008

   26 June 2008

1. Trust License Policy Implementing RFC

2. New and Simplified BSD License

Updates

1. ISSN

Roll was called and Ed called the IETF Trust meeting to order.

0. Minutes

A motion to approve the 15 April and 26 June minutes was made by Ray. The motion was seconded by Fred. The minutes were unanimously approved.

There were no further discussions regarding the minutes.

1. Trust License Policy Implementing RFC

The Trustees received Community feedback and Trust Counsel has incorporated some changes into the document which the Trustees should consider approving today.

Trust Counsel noted that there are a couple of cross references. The first one is as a result of comments wanting to make it clear that the code license in Section 3 wasn't trumped by section 2. So, in section 2.c.iii we added text, also in 2.i.

Next were comments around what percentage of the text was necessary before requiring all IETF legends, legal notices and indications of authorship. We had proposed one half, we got good discussion, and I think where we ended up was at any event no more than one fifth. That is in Section 3.c.iii.y. [Reads text]

 iii.   to copy, publish, display and distribute unmodified portions of IETF Contributions and IETF Documents and translations thereof, provided that:

                            (x)   each such portion is clearly attributed to IETF and identifies the RFC or other IETF Document or IETF Contribution from which it is taken,

                            (y)   all IETF legends, legal notices and indications of authorship contained in the original IETF RFC must also be included where any substantial portion of the text of an IETF RFC, and in any event where more than one-fifth of such text, is reproduced in a single document or series of related documents.

Next is Section 3.f, Termination. There was concern that the license to the code shouldn't be terminated, ever, and it was thought that that would conflict with the BSD license, as you can't terminate that license. Counsel suggested saying no right to terminate, and it was agreed that sounds clear.

Trust Counsel proposed different language inside the brackets of the copyright notice section 3.b say "the author's identified as such" in the RFC. And "The persons identified as authors in the associated RFC." It was agreed that sounds clear. Counsel further explained that in the section above that, we still have the code label in brackets. We didn't get much consensus in the RFC. We could leave as a label designated by the authors. We could let the RFC Editor look into choosing one.

Russ commented that the points are going to be defined by the Trustees; that was a task the RFC gave to us. Ed noted it could be subcontracted out.

There was a discussion concerning the formal means of starting and ending code, section 4.b. Trust Counsel said there was a suggestion of using: <Code Begin> and <Code End>. Marshall suggested that <CODE BEGIN> and <CODE END> would be better.

Trust Counsel noted that the language currently says "MAY be clearly identified." Should it be a MAY or a SHOULD? In previous discussions it should be a MAY; although, there's nothing wrong with SHOULD. There needs to be clarity. SHOULD is more directive. And maybe it should be MUST as it isn't helpful unless it is always there. Couldn't we say, MUST be clearly identified. It should also apply to stuff in the RFC Editor queue right now. ASN1 modules, MIBs have huge amounts of code.

It was asked if the Trust could make an exception for Appendices clearly labeled as code. Brian suggested <CODE BEGIN> and <CODE END> and Simon commented on it. It must begin with <CODE BEGIN> unless they are in an Appendix.

Russ said that he prefers to mandate that it be clearly identified and this is one way of doing it. Clearly, the Trust hadn't been doing this for the first 5000 RFCs. Ray agreed by saying that it MUST be clearly identified as code and one technique for clearly identifying it is <CODE BEGINS>. Ideally the Trust would not include an example, but if you must give an example, use <CODE BEGINS> and <CODE ENDS> but don't give lots of examples.

Trust Counsel's next topic for discussion was Supersedure, section 5.b. This is where if the IETF wants to enter into a large scale agreement with the IEEE for MIBs, this is where they'd want a special license. There was concern that the rights might be limited; although can't think of a reason why we would do that.

A motion to accept Trust Counsel's proposed different language inside the brackets of the copyright notice section 5.b was made by Russ. The motion was seconded by Ed. Not hearing any further discussion, the motion was put to a roll call vote.

Lynn St. Amour   [Aye]

Fred Baker   [Aye]

Russ Housley   [Aye]

Ed Juskevicius   [Aye]

Ray Pelletier   [Aye]

Jonne Soininen   [Aye]

The motion carried.

Ray mentioned that he would post this in text, Word and PDF format and it will say 'draft'.

2. New and Simplified BSD License

The Tools Committee had a call over this, recommended this, and also suggested that no form is required by developers participating in the code sprint. This was supported by Henrik, Cullen, and a bunch of others.

A motion to adopt the policy that code contributed to the IETF should be under the new and simplified BSD license, as published by OpenSource.org, was made by Jonne. The motion was seconded by Russ.

Discussion ensued wherein it was asked if the Trust needs wider Community input for this policy. It is people on the tools team who contribute code so their voice gets more weight.

The motion was put to a roll call vote.

Lynn St. Amour   [Aye]

Fred Baker   [Aye]

Russ Housley   [Aye]

Ed Juskevicius   [Aye]

Ray Pelletier   [Aye]

Jonne Soininen   [Aye]

The motion carried.

Updates

1. ISSN

The ISSN application has been completed and the Trust expects to hear back in a couple of weeks. The mail will go to ISOC.

A motion to adjourn the IETF Trust meeting was made by Ed. The motion was seconded by Russ. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 10:51 AM.