

Attendees:

- \* Alexey Melnikov
- \* Fred Baker
- \* Joel Halpern
- \* John Klensin
- \* Nevil Brownlee
- \* Olaf Kolkman
- \* Ole Jacobsen
- \* Heather Flanagan

0. Agenda Bash

\*\* No items added

1. RSE Transition Update

a. first subpoena request

Question regarding whether Marshal Eubanks has seen the subpoena? (HF determined after the call that yes, he is on the legal@ietf.org mailing list and has explicitly acknowledged seeing this come in)

b. addition to the RSAG

Adrian Farrel has been added

c. extension request for PT editor

(FB) we should remember to add to the budget request funds for adding PT editors as needed; (JK) also consider adding consultant money for things like external review of Style Guide (honorariums, for instance)

2. RSE Reports

a. RFC Publication

(HF) queue lengths that are under the control of the RFC Ed are in good shape; AUTH48 is, as always, a bit on the long side

(FB) what is going on with AUTH48?

(JH) Russ is sending email to folks when things hang out in queue;

(JK) time for HF to have a discussion with the IESG and then the Production Center about pushing back on un-editable documents well before they get to AUTH48. If a document gets to AUTH48 and either isn't clear technically or isn't edited well because the Production Center was overwhelmed by it, that is just too late to find out -- everyone, including the WG or authors who produced it-- has moved on and any decision as to how to handle it is a problem.

this seems to be a problem with the streams, the authors, and the RPC (but more in the stream/author area); it is a problem if a doc gets to AUTH48 and isn't ready (disagreement between AD and authors and/or working group); understanding when a document should be pushed back as uneditable should happen well before AUTH48

(JH) IESG may be thinking they are doing what they can - is the community willing to change?

(FB) suggestion: the first time we expect to bounce something back, ping RSAG first just for a quick sanity check and to make sure this is a very clear example of something that should go back

b. RSE Priorities & Projects

i. Style Guide, parts 1 and 2

ii. Authors, Editors & Contributors

(HF) will be coming back to this now that my initial push to get the first rev of the "MUSTs" part of the Style Guide out for early review

iii. web/wiki space

(HF) new wiki made available to the RSE this week; will start populating it immediately and have at least somewhat ready for public review by Paris; RFC Editor website is also going through content updates as I find things that need to be brought up to date and can rewrite them

3. RSOC guidance

a. using ISSN issue as an object lesson

(JK) If you are absolutely confident that you understand the implication, then there shouldn't be a reason to ask the RSOC; the difficulty with ISSN is a combo of two things: 1) do something and apologize later model does not work because changing the information frequently negatively impacts the series, so we can't just go change this at whim 2) JK and the IAB have a separate problem with regards to ISSN which has nothing to do with RFC particularly; if we go back to the ISSN TC46 committee and don't appear to know what we are and what we're doing, that's an embarrassment; this all falls in the principle of "surprises are bad"

(NB) this kind of thing is going to depend a lot on what the RSOC members know; if its anything unusual, its worth bouncing off the RSOC

General summary: When in any doubt, bring the issue to RSOC for discussion

4. RSOC retreat

a. topics

i. relationship between production and publication functions

ii. independence (was "neutrality") of the series

iii. project priority list and roadmap exercise

iv. initial budget planning

\* ACTION ITEM: HF to find out whether or not remote participation will be possible and which room the meeting will be in

\*\* We have asked for a VOIP phone and network in the room, and the room will be Room 251

\*\* Coffee/tea has been requested and food is being sorted out

5. Approval of future call times

a. second Wednesdays at this time?

YES

b. hold 4th Wednesday at this time as needed?

NO; will do ad hoc calls as necessary, with 1 weeks' advance notice

6. AOB

Some discussion of HF's education on the tensions between different standards' bodies.

Next meeting: Paris!

Next telecom: 11 April (unless you're in New Zealand)