

IETF Trust Call, 10:31 am EDT, Thursday, 27 May 2010

Participants:

Lynn St. Amour [NOT PRESENT]
Eric Burger [PRESENT]
Marshall Eubanks [PRESENT, Chair]
Bob Hinden [PRESENT]
Russ Housley [PRESENT]
Ole Jacobsen [PRESENT]
Olaf Kolkman [NOT PRESENT]
Ray Pelletier [PRESENT]
Henk Uijterwaal [PRESENT]

Jorge Contreras [GUEST]
Karen O'Donoghue [SCRIBE]

Draft IETF Trust Agenda

1. Copyright FAQ

Marshall Eubanks called the IETF Trust Meeting to order at 10:31 am EDT. There were two additional updates for the agenda:

2. the IETF Trust @ 5, and
 3. the ISI response to the RFC collection initiative.
- The two new items were addressed first in the meeting.

2. IETF Trust @ 5

=====

An event recognizing the 5 year IETF Trust was considered for the Maastricht meeting. However, Bob Kahn was not available, and the Trustees decided not to have a special event in Maastricht. We should do some sort of recognition later. Marshall plans to mention at the plenary that the Trust has reached legal maturity.

3. ISI Response to RFC Collection initiative

=====

Bob Hinden sent an email summary to the mailing list yesterday regarding the status of this effort. There has been some confusion at ISI about what we were talking about. Bob Braden is going to follow-up with ISI after conversations with Bob Hinden. There are three distinct periods: UCLA period, ISI pre ISOC period, and the ISOC Trust period. The next step is to hear back from Bob Braden. Bob Hinden indicated that this is more complicated than originally anticipated, and we should wait until Bob Braden has a chance to follow up before going any further.

1. Copyright FAQ

=====

Ray Pelletier provided an update on the progress for the Copyright FAQ. He distributed the current marked up version

of the FAQ along with a document highlighting significant changes.

With respect to the definition of an IETF Contribution, the question about invited presentations at the plenary came up. Russ Housley indicated that the IESG has already discussed this and come to consensus on how they want to go forward. For these invited talks, we would file a third party disclosure on their behalf, we'll have the statement on file, and it is treated like any other contribution. Eric Burger was concerned that this doesn't sound like a valid IPR disclosure. Marshall asked if we could just suspend the IETF meeting for the duration of the talk? Eric indicated that this would be waiving the rules in certain circumstances. Russ pointed out that the IESG is uncomfortable with doing this. Given the lack of clarify on this topic, Russ indicated that we shouldn't publish the fact that we know the answer when we aren't sure yet. Ray indicated that the section will be taken out of the document.

There were additional concerns raised related to questions 4.4 and 4.10 and the pre-5378 problem. There could potentially be a lot of administrative work with very little benefit. We should have a process in place before posting this. Jorge suggested that we could eliminate the question until we come up with an adequate response.

The next series of changes related to the Alternate Stream Documents. There wasn't much consensus on this topic yet. It was discussed that the FAQ was a living document and the questions with consensus on the answers could be released, and others could be added as they gain consensus. Bob Hinden indicated this was a good approach.

Ray Pelletier moved, and Bob Hinden seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 11:13 am EDT.