

IETF Trust Call at 10:00 AM EST, Thursday, 3 September, 2009

Participants:

Lynn St. Amour	[Present]
Fred Baker	[Not Present]
Marshall Eubanks	[Present, Chair]
Bob Hinden	[Not Present]
Russ Housley	[Present]
Ole Jacobsen	[Present]
Olaf Kolkman	[Present]
Ray Pelletier	[Present]
Henk Uijterwaal	[Not Present]
Jorge Contreras:	Guest, Legal Counsel
Karen O'Donoghue:	Guest, Scribe

Trust Agenda

1. Minutes - 08-11-06
2. 5378 requirements for Identification of Contributors.
3. Klensin Reply
4. TLP 3.0
5. Appeals Page

6. Possible Legal Responses to a Copyright Issue

Trust Agenda

The meeting was called to order by Marshall at 10:00 am.

1. Minutes - 08-11-06

A motion to adopt the 6 November, 2008, minutes was made by Marshall and was seconded by Russ. There were no discussions regarding these minutes and hearing no objections, the motion was passed by unanimous consent.

2. 5378 requirements for Identification of Contributors.

The Trustees discussed that last week an unnamed person asked to not be noted as a contributor on a document. The question was whether or not a contributor could go unnamed. It was noted that once a document goes through the process as an RFC then it's no longer a contribution so the rule didn't apply in this case. It seems that there is flexibility for someone to make a policy around who gets listed in the contributor section of an RFC; although, whether the Trust has the policy making decision or should take action regarding this is another matter (the action wasn't contrary to the directions of the Trust). It is possible that the policy making body in this instance is the IESG; an IESG statement would be the most appropriate way.

Marshall noted that there was no action to take on this item.

3. John Klensin Reply

After extensive work, the Trustees created a draft reply to John Klensin with comments from Marshall, Olaf, and Ray. It was noted that the TLP 3.0 is being held up by this issue. They discussed sending the reply to the announce list and the TLP discussion list. There's also an appeals page.

A motion to adopt the draft reply to John Klensin and send the reply to the announce list and TLP discussion list was made by Marshall and was seconded by Russ.

Roll call vote

Lynn St. Amour [YES]

Marshall Eubanks [YES]

Russ Housley [YES]

Ole Jacobsen [YES]

Olaf Kolkman [YES]

Ray Pelletier [YES]

A discussion ensued in which Lynn asked for clarification regarding the process if someone wants to appeal: does it go from here to the IAB? Olaf noted that even after an appeal the Trustees cannot take steps that would make them liable.

4. TLP 3.0

It was noted that the only change since IETF 75 in Stockholm is the effective date of TLP 3.0, which is Saturday, 5 September. A precondition to TLP 3.0 being published was to get the Klensin response out, which will be accomplished as of the release of these minutes. This issue has not been dealt with in the TLP discussion list.

Olaf asked if the effective date is 5 September, or does the motion include that Marshall can move the effective date around provided that the implementation is complete? He felt this is an important option.

Marshall noted that 5 December will be the end of the deadline.

A motion to approve the effective date of TLP 3.0 as 5 September with a 5 December implementation deadline, with the option to change the effective

date as necessary to accommodate tools implementation was made by Marshall. The motion was seconded by Russ. Hearing no objections the motion was passed by unanimous consent.

5. Appeals Page

A Trust appeals page has been established on the Trust website at <http://trustee.ietf.org/trustappeals.html>

Lynn quickly scanned RFC 4071 and noted that if someone wants to appeal, it may go to the body being appealed first for a formal review and can also be escalated to the IAB following RFC 2026. If further escalated, it would go to the ISOC Board of Trustees, again per RFC 2026.

6. Possible Legal Responses to a Copyright Issue

The Trustees discussed possible legal responses to a copyright issue involving Trust intellectual property.

After discussions, no action was taken on this issue.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Marshall and was seconded by Ray. The meeting was adjourned at 10:47 am by unanimous consent.