

IETF Trust Call at 10:00 AM EST, Thursday, 17 September, 2009

Participants:

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

IETF Trust Agenda

1. Minutes
 2. Independent Submissions Process
 3. Klensin Appeal Response: Next Steps?
 4. TLP 4.0 Timeline
-

IETF Trust Agenda

1. Minutes

There were no minutes to approve at this time.

2. Independent Submissions Process

Alternate Streams and TLP 4.0 Revisions & Timeline

- * TLP will require revisions to accommodate Alternate Streams (IRSG and Independent) (IAB covered by RFC 5378?)
- * Independent Stream Draft Last Call (LC) 14 Sept (Braden and Halpern)
- * Jorge requested to provide TLP language for Alternate Streams
- * Trust approve 4.0 for 30 day Community review 1 Oct
- * Need IRSG I-D
- * 15 Oct LC ends for Independent Stream
- * 4.0 may need revisions based on Community feedback to 4.0 or to Independent Stream LC
- * If no 30 day reset to 4.0, possible adoption 11 Nov in Hiroshima
- * If a 30 day reset, then possible adoption of 4.0 on 3 Dec

Bob Braden has a draft out. Trust Counsel went on to explain that Bob's draft takes IP language from RFC 3978. RFC 5378 excludes the RFC Editor Stream but has pretty broad rights in RFC 3978 - Bob is referring back to that and asking the Trust to implement procedures that should be simple amendments to TLP to add in an independent stream for independent stream documents.

Is the Trust considering the independent stream to be outside the IETF stream? Absolutely; although, permission would have to be obtained from the author(s) or the Trust. The only ones in doubt are pre-RFC 2026; anything

pre-RFC 5378 needs to have permission, and although the Trust has all the rights, the authors still have to get permission.

The question was asked: does the Trust want to prepare a modification of the TLP now? And if so, then it should be posted by 1 October. There is some risk that the Braden draft might be modified. While there is that risk, the TLP could be modified during its 30 day community review as well.

The question was asked: does it make sense to do a different policy / document / TLP for each different stream; and by reference or by full document? Think of all the boilerplates we have; if it's just one paragraph it should be kept together. When the Trust was working on the TLP it really was just one paragraph - it was a long paragraph but it had to be generic enough to apply to all three streams. This will be the easiest and shortest change to make. The Independent Streams will require permission to quote IETF stream documents (pre-RFC 5378). But we need to see how significant the change is before we make this decision.

It was requested that Trust Counsel either add to TLP 3.0 or create a TLP 4.0 to address Braden's document. If it's too much to add to 3.0, then Counsel should create a separate document. The new TLP draft should be posted for approval during the 1 October IETF Trust call.

3. Klensin Appeal/Request for Review Response: Next Steps?

* Klensin Appeal/Request for Review 18 July

* Response posted 3 September at <http://trustee.ietf.org/trustappeals.html>

There has been some feedback from the community regarding the wrong list, should be ietf.org for discussion - not TLP-interest; and an inadequate response: failed to respond to each allegation. However, it was noted that Klensin had not responded at all to the Trusts reply.

Marshall inquired if he should take his response and upgrade it to cover any subsequent emails. Olaf asked that the Trustees look at the draft response he sent as well. Ray asked if the Trust can't just say our first response wasn't clear enough, and in response to that we're now providing a clearer response.

Marshall said that the person to judge the quality of the response is John, and if he said "I wish you had responded to these points..." then I would

feel that was a reasonable request coming from him, is that procedurally followed? Or is there a notion that the Community can take up the appeal on its own? Russ said that's never happened in his tenure. The Trust has always waited for a proper appeal. Had John said, "I don't feel you answered the following points in my appeal," then the Trust would have something to reply to.

Olaf asked if the Trust is confident that it's communicating in a good way with the Community. If they don't get our messages, is that something that is our problem or the Community's problem? Marshall said that's something the Trust has to address, but he's not sure that's done by a second response to John's appeal. Henk feels the same. The Trust believes it has answered John's appeal, but the Community is saying that the communication wasn't clear; but if John's happy with our response then why should we take follow up action?

The first thing to be done is to ask John if he's happy with the response. Lynn asked if Marshall, in his Trust Chair role, could reach out to John and clarify if he's happy with the first response. Marshall said he'd be glad to take that as an action item. Action Item - Trust Chair to contact John and see if he is expecting anything further than the formal response already sent and if so what.

4. TLP 4.0 Timeline

This topic was not discussed during the meeting.

The IETF Trust meeting was adjourned at 10:34 am.