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1. Introduction

Standards development frequently requires collaboration between competitors. Cooperation among competitors can spark concerns about antitrust law or competition law violations (antitrust law and competition law are used here synonymously). Certain actions taken by a company that holds a dominant market position can similarly spark concerns about competition law violations. This document provides guidance for IETF participants about how to reduce antitrust risks in connection with IETF activities.

2. Terminology

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

3. Legal Compliance

The IETF does not provide legal advice to participants, and instead encourages participants to obtain independent legal advice as needed. This document does not contain legal advice.

All IETF participants must behave lawfully when engaged in IETF activities, including by following applicable antitrust laws.
4. Existing BCPs

Compliance with the BCPs that document the established rules and norms of the IETF facilitates compliance with antitrust law, as the IETF structure and processes are intended to mitigate antitrust risks. As a reminder, participants are already required to comply with the following policies documented in the BCPs:

* The Internet Standards Process as described in BCP 9 [BCP9], which is designed to "provide a fair, open, and objective basis for developing, evaluating, and adopting Internet Standards," and provides robust procedural rules, including an appeals process.

* The Working Group Guidelines and Procedures described in BCP 25 [BCP25], which emphasize requirements for "open and fair participation and for thorough consideration of technical alternatives," and describe IETF’s consensus-based decision-making processes.

* The IETF framework that participants engage in their individual capacity, not as company representatives, and "use their best engineering judgment to find the best solution for the whole Internet, not just the best solution for any particular network, technology, vendor, or user," as described in BCP 54 [BCP54].

* The IETF’s intellectual property rights policies as set forth in BCP 78 [BCP78] and BCP 79 [BCP79]; these policies are carefully designed to "benefit the Internet community and the public at large, while respecting the legitimate rights of others."

* The established conflict of interest policies, such as the IESG Conflict of Interest Policy, the IAB Conflict of Interest Policy or the IETF LLC Conflict of Interest Policy, if and when applicable.

5. Additional Guidelines

As the IETF is a standards development environment where representatives from competitors are highly likely to be present, the following additional guidelines are recommended to avoid the possibility of participants violating antitrust laws.

5.1. Adoption and implementation of standards

Participation in the IETF should not be conditioned upon the agreement of the participant to use any output of the IETF.
There should be no agreement among participants to implement or to adhere to IETF standards, or any discussions as to when participants will begin to offer products conforming to IETF standards.

IETF participants should not condition or discuss conditioning the implementation of an IETF standard on the implementer’s use of products or services from a particular supplier.

IETF participants should not use IETF standards to exclude suppliers or competitors from the marketplace.

It is acceptable for IETF participants to discuss the likelihood that adoption of a particular standard would subject implementers to a greater or lesser risk of patent litigation, but such discussions should be conducted with caution and only after consultation with the participants’ respective legal counsel.

5.2. Exchange of competitive information

IETF participants should avoid the exchange of any proprietary business information that is not necessary to the activities of the IETF. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, IETF participants should not discuss:

1. any restriction on any company’s independence in setting prices or establishing production and sales levels

2. prices, discounts, or other terms or conditions of sale, at which products or services implementing an IETF standard should be sold

3. bidding, terms of bidding, or refraining from bidding to sell any product or service

4. individual companies’ market shares or sales territories, except where already public

5. the allocation or restriction of customers, markets, or territories in which a company may sell or resell products

6. profits or profit margins

7. the actual cost of the inputs necessary to create a compliant implementation. However, to the extent that such a discussion would be directly relevant and beneficial to the technical purpose of the session, a sensible comparison of relative cost differentials is acceptable
8. the status or substance of ongoing or threatened litigation, except as it is directly relevant to IETF

9. agreements to refuse (or conditionally refuse) to do business with a particular supplier

5.3. Market Requirements

No IETF participants should engage in, direct, or encourage other IETF participants to engage in, the use of IETF facilities for surveys of customers or gathering of statistical data about market requirements. However IETF participants may make presentations about broad market potential or market requirements for informational purposes.

5.4. Dominant market position

IETF participants who are employed by or otherwise represent a company that may be considered to be in a dominant market position should not improperly use the authority of an IETF leadership position to suppress permissible discussions or proposals from a competitor.

6. Escalation of antitrust-related concerns

Participants should report potential antitrust concerns in the context of IETF activities to through the following channels: IETF Chair (chair@ietf.org), the IETF LLC executive director (exec-director@ietf.org), the IETF legal counsel (legal@ietf.org), or via the IETF LLC whistleblower service.

7. IANA Considerations

No values are assigned in this document, no registries are created, and there is no action assigned to the IANA by this document.

8. Security Considerations

This document may be considered to document means to avoid risks to the IETF and IETF participants related to antitrust. One may consider those to be security considerations. Other than that, this document introduces no known security aspects to the IETF or IETF participants.
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1. Introduction

Context and Note in Draft: This Internet-Draft is a small update of a version with the same name that was last posted and discussed in 2006. The problems it identified still exist in 2021 and the proposed solution still seems relevant. However, the original was written more as a discussion piece than as a formal proposal and this revision continues in that form. Should the idea get traction, much of the style will need to be modified and it will need to be adapted to formally update RFC 8713.

A consensus is emerging in the IETF that very long tenure in leadership roles is not in the best interests of the community. While, in theory, that advice could simply be given to the Nomcom, there is reason to believe that a different model for consideration of renewal or replacement for members of the leadership would be more efficient for the Nomcom and would impose less hardship on incumbents and the community. This document outlines that alternate method.
1.1. Mailing List

This proposal is under discussion on the gendispatch@ietf.org list.

2. The Review and Clean Nomination Model

The current nomination process pits incumbents, incumbent performance, and questions of stability in the IESG against potential other candidates. It also gives incumbents and the nomcom no explicit guidance about how many terms someone should serve. This is undesirable for a number of reasons. It creates the notion of incumbents being "fired" rather than honorably retired to the citizenry after a brief period of contributing to the community by assuming a leadership role. And, while there is significant value in treating stability as a goal, it can also create distortions about the degree of support various ideas have in the community and the impression of in-groups.

This specification changes the current model by reintroducing some principles that the authors believe are widely held in the community and optimizing the selection process to support those principles. The principles include:

- Service in the IETF’s leadership bodies is a short-term contribution to the community, not a career. Indeed, assuming those positions may be considered a responsibility to the community.

- It takes long enough to learn the job of being an effective AD that, in general, having someone retire after a single two-year term is uneconomic for the community.

- Just as retirement of an AD after one term should be considered a major step because of the inefficiencies of the learning period, the six-month or more period in which an incumbent is uncertain about whether work should be planned that spans the "first meeting of the next year" introduces inefficiencies that should be minimized to the degree possible.

- A demonstrated shortage of people willing to do work in the IETF should be taken as an indication that there is insufficient real community interest in the work to reach a meaningful consensus about high-quality results. While that position appears to be reasonably well-understood with regard to the number of active IETF participants interested in putting a working group together, and in finding leadership for working groups, the same principle probably should be applied to ADs and areas: if there are only one or two people willing and qualified to do the AD job, that may be
an indication that the IETF should review the appropriateness of
that area's existence or definition.

To deal effectively with these problems, the Nomcom consideration and
evaluation process is divided into two phases.

2.1. Phase 1: Review of Incumbents

Incumbent performance should be evaluated, not compared to potential
other candidates or replacements. The incumbent will always have
more experience. An AD who has done his or her job well, will have
accumulated strong proponents and probably strong detractors. Other
candidates are always risks, and direct comparison is inevitably
difficult.

In Phase 1, the Nomcom will evaluate the performance of incumbents,
collecting information from the community as needed to do that. The
Nomcom is instructed that an incumbent should be returned once (i.e.,
permitted/encouraged to serve two terms) unless there is strong
evidence of problems (e.g., incompetence, inability to work with WGs,
inability to work with other ADs, non-feasance, or malfeasance).
Conversely, the Nomcom should assume that it is better to return an
incumbent who has served two terms to the community and active WG
work unless some special circumstances apply.

While this process allows flexibility, the Nomcom is instructed that
"special circumstances" should be a rare occurrence, based on what is
best for the affected area, the IESG, and the IETF as a whole.
Simply doing an outstanding job as an AD should not constitute
"special circumstances" that would justify a third term.

The level of special circumstances required for a fourth, or
subsequent, term should be required to be much higher than that for a
third: the intent is to make more than three terms a rare and nearly
impossible event without formally prohibiting that through a term
limit: it is important that the Nomcom retain flexibility and the
opportunity to judge special circumstances.

Discussions between the Nomcom and a candidate as to whether that
candidate is willing to serve again should be covered by the Nomcom’s
normal privacy rules except as mutually agreed. If the Nomcom
chooses to not return a candidate who is willing to serve, the
expectation is that this will be indistinguishable to the community
from the candidate voluntarily stepping down. Under normal
circumstances, the Nomcom is expected to conduct informational
evaluations of even those candidates who have chosen to step down
(the evaluations may inform later choices), but such candidates may
negotiate with the Nomcom as appropriate, perhaps supplying in-depth
analysis of the relevant Area and its status and issues as an alternative.

At the end of this phase, the Nomcom submits the list of returning candidates to the IAB as usual. The IAB makes its decision and the choices are announced to the community. The list of (remaining) open slots is then announced to the community and nominations and recommendations sought. Any incumbent who is not returned in this phase is not eligible for the relevant position in the second phase.

2.2. Phase 2: Nomination and Selection of New Candidates

This procedure works exactly as described in [RFC8713], with the understanding that no incumbent will ever be a candidate for the same position under this process. As a side-effect, the process makes it more difficult than it has traditionally been to shift people around within the IESG: it is considered an explicit corollary to the principles above that an incumbent AD is one area should normally have working experience within one or more WGs in a new area before being considered as a candidate for AD in that area.

2.3. Revised schedule

[[to be supplied]]

The authors are aware of other proposals that would also affect the Nomcom timeline. Rather than trying to develop a revised schedule on a per-proposal basis, we suggest that one Nomcom schedule revision be considered, based on this and other proposals that would be accommodated.

3. Previous Discussion Points

In informal discussions before the initial version of this draft was completed and posted, there was considerable discussion on three points - whether this proposal should apply only to IESG appointments, or to all Nomcom appointments, whether "doing an outstanding job" is justification for third terms, and whether this proposal should contain a statement of guidance, or hard term limits.

Reasonable people disagreed on both of these points, but the proposal authors made choices.

The community will need to discuss, and decide upon, these issues.
3.1. IESG-only, or all Nomcom appointments?

This specification has been written to apply to the IESG only, since the IESG’s operational role and observed rates of AD burnout make it most obviously important there.

It is possible that consideration should be given as to whether a similar or identical model should be applied to the IAB and/or other appointments made by the Nomcom.

3.2. Justification for third terms?

This specification is written to allow Nomcom to return ADs for third terms, and beyond, due to "special circumstances". One question we’ve been asked is whether "doing an outstanding job" should be included in "special circumstances".

While our intention is to provide guidance to Nomcom, rather than rules, this specification proposes that this guidance be "no".

- The community is better served by having former ADs returning to technical work. A consistent criticism of the current working group process is that specifications often lack sufficient cross-area review when they are forwarded for publication. ADs provide this type of review, but currently-serving ADs don’t have time to provide reviews early in the development of a draft, where it is most useful and most likely to have a positive impact.

- Allowing "doing an outstanding job" to constitute "special circumstances" removes deterministic benefits of this model. The intention is that ADs return to the community after two terms. It is desired that all ADs "do an outstanding job" – this proposal would remove the ADs who do not, after their first term – but Only in Lake Wobegon are all the children above average, and Lake Wobegon is a fictitious place.

- We also note that former ADs are often asked to serve as working group chairs in difficult situations, to help with BOFs and WG charter discussions, and to carry out assignments that benefit from AD experience but do not require the assignee to be a serving AD.

3.3. Guidance, or hard limit on service length?

There was considerable discussion about whether it was better to offer the Nomcom the guidance above, discouraging terms beyond the second, or whether to flatly prohibit more than two terms. One group believed that giving the Nomcom a little extra flexibility was a good
idea; the other believed that any additional flexibility would likely lead to very long terms since there would always be a reason to make an exception.

The authors of this proposal prefer to offer Nomcom guidance, rather than rules. To take one example – if the Nomcom believes that returning a third-term AD is appropriate (due, perhaps, to serving area directors stepping down before the end of second terms), we prefer to allow Nomcom this flexibility, rather than restrict them to a course of action that seems ill-advised.

4. Internationalization Considerations

This specification is about IETF Procedures. It has no impact on internationalization issues.

5. IANA Considerations

This specification is about IETF Procedures. It has no impact on IANA issues and does not contemplate any IANA actions.

6. Security considerations

This specification is about IETF Procedures for leadership selection. It has no impact on Internet security issues.

7. Contributor

Spencer Dawson was co-author of the 2005-2006 versions of this draft and contributed very significantly to the thinking that went into them. It was not possible to contact him and get his review and assent before posting this version, so his is identified him as a Contributor but may be moved back to authorship in the future.
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1. Introduction

In order to encourage more turnover in the IETF management bodies, this document provides strong guidance to the IETF Nominating Committee (NomCom) [RFC8713] with regard to limiting the number of consecutive terms a given participant should be selected to serve in NomCom-appointed positions.

// The following paragraph is for draft discussion only and will be // changed or removed before publication.

For convenience, this document will refer to NomCom-appointed positions on the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG), the Internet Architecture Board (IAB), and the IETF Administration LLC Board of Directors (LLC) collectively as "leadership positions", or just "leadership". We can decide on final nomenclature for that after we've hashed out the other details in this proposal.

2. Background

The IETF community is best served when leadership changes at regular intervals, leading to greater diversity of thought, vision, and perspective, and avoiding "burnout" that can result from someone serving in time-consuming and stressful positions for an extended time. There have been occasional proposals for hard term limits, and many in the community support that approach, but there is concern about the effect of limiting NomComs too strictly. This document takes an alternative approach of using clear and strong guidance to NomComs, which they are expected to follow, while still giving them the flexibility to evaluate specific situations and to "do the right thing" when strict rules would be problematic.

This section lays out some principles that inform the guidance given here.
The IESG comprises the Area Directors (ADs) from each of the IETF technical areas, the IETF Chair (AD of the General Area), and the IAB Chair (ex-officio). It is widely considered that much of an AD’s first year is spent learning the role and finding one’s way. Because of that, ADs who are doing well in the second year of their first terms are generally re-appointed for a second term, taking advantage of their experience and allowing them to use what they have learned. Third terms are less common, and four terms or more are unusual, as the role of an Area Director is a busy and stressful one. Burnout is a danger, but even without that consideration the community thinks it important to bring new vision and perspective into the AD position regularly.

A complication often arises with respect to finding ADs: There are frequently few -- sometimes only one or two -- volunteers to stand for a particular AD position. Sometimes a NomCom has only an incumbent candidate, and no other volunteers to choose from. While some participants can serve -- and have served -- as ADs in more than one area, AD positions are not readily interchangeable, making the NomCom’s work more difficult when these situations arise.

The IAB comprises members across the IETF technical areas. Because its members are appointed "at large", rather than from specific areas, there tends to be a broader pool of IAB candidates, giving NomComs a greater abundance of choices than they have when selecting Area Directors.

A challenge in selecting the IAB is that ADs who step down often immediately vie for positions as IAB members. While the IAB is a different body, with different roles and needs, this situation nevertheless does not contribute to diversity in leadership, revitalization of a stressed AD, or fresh perspectives on the IAB. The community is particularly concerned with a pattern of ADs making immediate transitions to the IAB.

The IETF Chair role is the busiest and most stressful, and benefits strongly from recent experience on the IESG. "Recent", here, requires judgment, of course, and a good candidate for IETF Chair might be just finishing a term as a technical AD or might have held such a role within the last few years. It is not desirable for term limits to rule out IETF Chair candidates because they have been on the IESG "too recently".

(This document is not covering the LLC just yet...)

The community considers it important that participants who take on leadership positions return to the community (outside of leadership) periodically, to serve as working group participants, document...
editors, working group chairs, and directorate members. This allows the community to benefit from what those in leadership have learned and the experience they have developed. It also provides opportunities for others in the community to step into leadership, and benefits the individuals involved by allowing them to revitalize and regenerate, developing a new set of perspectives, before they consider additional terms in other leadership positions.

3. Specific Guidance to the NomCom

In general, an individual should be expected to serve no more than two terms in *any* collective NomCom-appointed positions before returning to the community for at least one year. As an example, if a participant is selected for the IAB in 2020 and becomes an AD in 2022, that participant would be expected to take a "gap year" in 2024. NomComs should consider a third consecutive term with no gap to be unusual, and should consider a fourth term to be exceptional, only to be used in exceptional circumstances. The IESG and IAB should consider such exceptional situations as needing analysis and possible action to see that they do not persist.

An exception to the general guidance above is for appointment to IETF Chair: It is expected that the individual selected as IETF Chair might be a sitting AD or IAB member, or one who is just stepping down from one of those roles, and that there might not be a gap year in this case.

NomComs are, given this guidance, tasked with doing the right thing and making the best choices for the IETF, with the understanding that situations arise where firm rules do not work well and judgment is critical. If a NomCom makes an appointment that this guidance considers unusual or exceptional, it is important that the situation be explained in the NomCom Chair’s report to the confirming body, as the confirmation process needs to consider the NomCom’s choice to deviate from this guidance, and needs to understand the situation that has arisen. The NomCom Chair should also include an explanation in the report to the community, to the extent possible within NomCom confidentiality rules.

4. IANA Considerations

This document makes no request of IANA.

5. Security Considerations

This document is purely procedural, and there are no related security considerations.
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1. Responsibility Change

In [I-D.iab-rfcedp-rfced-model], responsibility for the RFC series moved to the RFC Series Working Group and the RFC Series Approval Board. It no longer the responsibility of the RFC Editor and the role of the IAB in the RFC Series is altered. Accordingly, in [RFC2026] Section 2.6, the sentence "RFC publication is the direct responsibility of the RFC Editor, under the general direction of the IAB" is deleted.

2. IANA Considerations

This memo includes no request to IANA.

3. Security Considerations

This document presents no security considerations.
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Abstract

This document describes the individuals and organizations involved in the IETF standards process as described in IETF BCP 9. It includes brief descriptions of the entities involved, and the role they play in the standards process. This document obsoletes RFC 2028.

Discussion Venues

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

Discussion of this document takes place on the GENDISPATCH mailing list (gendispatch@ietf.org), which is archived at https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/browse/gendispatch/.

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at https://github.com/richsalz/draft-ietf-rfc2028bis.
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This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 7 April 2022.
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1. Introduction

The process used by the IETF community for the standardization of protocols and procedures is described in [IETFPROCS]. That document defines the stages in the standardization process, the requirements for moving a document between stages, and the types of documents used during this process. This document identifies some of the key individual and organizations and the roles they play in that process.

2. Terminology

In general, this document refers to individual roles as individuals, such as "a Document Editor." In reality, many roles are filled by more than one person at the same time. For clarity, this document does not use phrases like "Chair (or co-chair)," unless strictly necessary to do so.

3. Key Individuals in the Process

This section describes the individual roles involved in the process. It attempts to list the roles in the order in which they are involved in the process, but no meaning is otherwise attached.

3.1. The Document Editor or Author

Most Working Groups focus their efforts on one or more documents that capture the results of the group’s work. A Working Group generally designates a person to serve as the Editor for a particular document. The Document Editor is responsible for ensuring that the contents of the document accurately reflect the decisions that have been made by the Working Group.

When a document is composed and edited mainly by an individual, they may be referred to as the Document Author. The distinction is not significant. This document will use the term Document Editor.

When a Document Editor is a Chair of the same Working Group, a co-chair should manage the process around the document. If a co-chair is not available, the process must be monitored carefully to ensure that the resulting documents accurately reflect the consensus of the Working Group and that all processes are followed. This can be the collective obligation of all parties involved in the document.
3.2. The Working Group Chair

Each Working Group is headed by a chair with the responsibility for directing the group’s activities, presiding over the group’s meetings, and ensuring that the commitments of the group with respect to its role in the Internet standards process are met. In particular, the WG chair is the formal point of contact between the WG and the IESG, via the Area Director of the area to which the WG is assigned.

The details on the selection and responsibilities of a Working Group chair can be found in [WGPROCS].

3.3. The Area Director

The Area Director assigned as the "Responsible Area Director" for the Working Group will review the document after the Working Group has approved its last call, and when satisfied will request it to be put on the IESG agenda.

3.4. The Request for Comments Editor

The RFC publication series [IETFPROCS] is managed by an Editor responsible both for the mechanics of RFC publication and for upholding the technical and editorial standards of the RFC series.

4. Key Organizations in the Process

The following organizations and organizational roles are involved in the Internet standards process.

4.1. Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)

The IETF is an open international community of network designers, operators, vendors, researchers, and other interested parties who are concerned with the evolution of the Internet architecture and the smooth operation of the Internet. It is the principal body engaged in the development of new Internet Standard specifications.

4.2. Working Groups

The technical work of the IETF is done in its Working Groups, which are organized by topics into several Areas (https://www.ietf.org/topics/areas/), each one under the coordination of the Area Director. Working Groups typically have a narrow focus and a lifetime bounded by completion of specific tasks as defined in their charter and milestones.
For all purposes relevant to the Internet Standards development process, membership in the IETF and its Working Groups is defined to be established solely and entirely by individuals who participate in IETF and Working Group activities. These individuals do not formally represent their organizations, if any, although affiliations are often used for identification.

Anyone with the time and interest to do so is entitled and urged to participate actively in one or more Working Groups and to attend IETF meetings which are usually held three times a year [MEETINGS]. Active Working Group participation is possible without attending any in-person meeting.

Participants in the IETF and its Working Groups must disclose any relevant current or pending intellectual property rights that are reasonably and personally known to the participant if they participate in discussions about a specific technology. The full intellectual property policy is defined in [IPRRIGHTS1] and [IPRRIGHTS2].

New Working Groups are established by the IESG and almost always have a specific and explicit charter. The charter can be modified as the Working Group progresses. The guidelines and procedures for the formation and operation of Working Groups are described in detail in [WGPROCS].

A Working Group is managed by a Working Group chair, as described at Section 3.2. Documents produced by the group will have an Editor, as described at Section 3.1. Further details of Working Group operation can also be found in [WGPROCS].

Working Groups ideally display a spirit of cooperation as well as a high degree of technical maturity; IETF participants recognize that the greatest benefit for all members of the Internet community results from cooperative development of technically superior protocols and services.
4.3. Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG)

The IESG is responsible for the management of the IETF technical activities. It administers the Internet Standards process according to the rules and procedures defined in [IETFPROCS]. The IESG is responsible for the actions associated with the progression of technical specification along the "standards track" including the initial approval of new Working Groups and the final approval of specifications as Internet Standards. The IESG is composed of the IETF Area Directors and the IETF Chair, who also chairs the IESG and is the Area Director for the General Area. The IAB Chair is an ex-officio member of the IESG.

All members of the IESG are nominated by a nominations committee (colloquially, NomCom), and are confirmed by the IAB. See [NOMCOM] for a detailed description of the NomCom procedures. Other matters concerning its organization and operation, are described in the IESG charter [IESG].

4.4. Internet Architecture Board (IAB)

The IAB provides oversight of the architecture of the Internet and its protocols. The IAB must approve all IESG candidates put forward by the NomCom.

The IAB provides oversight of the process used to create Internet Standards and serves as an appeal board for complaints of improper execution of the standards process [IETFPROCS]. In general, it acts as source of advice to the IETF and other entities mentioned here about technical, architectural, procedural, and policy matters pertaining to the Internet and its enabling technologies.

The members of the IAB are nominated by NomCom, and are confirmed by the Internet Society Board. The IETF Chair is also a member of the IAB, and the IRTF Chair is an ex-officio member. See [NOMCOM] for a detailed description of the NomCom procedures. Other matters concerning its organization and operation, are described in the IAB charter [IAB].

4.5. Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA)

Many protocol specifications include parameters that must be uniquely assigned. Examples of this include port numbers, option identifiers within a protocol, and so on. The Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) is responsible for assigning the values of these protocol parameters for the Internet. These registries used to be published as RFCs entitled "Assigned Numbers," but are now maintained online (https://www.iana.org/protocols). Assignments are coordinated
by writing an "IANA Considerations" section in a draft, as documented in [IANADocs]. The IETF’s relationship with IANA is defined by formal agreements, including [IANAMOU].

IANA also is responsible for operating and maintaining several aspects of DNS (https://www.iana.org/domains) and coordination of IP address assignment (https://www.iana.org/numbers).

4.6. Internet Research Task Force (IRTF)

The IRTF focuses on longer-term research issues related to the Internet while the parallel organization, the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), focuses on the shorter term issues of engineering and standards making.

The products of IRTF research groups are typically research results that are published in scholarly conferences and journals. Research groups also sometimes develop experimental protocols or technologies, some of which may be suitable for possible standardisation in IETF. Similarly, IETF working groups sometimes ask research groups for advice or other input. Contributions from research groups, however, carry no more weight than other community input, and go through the same standards setting process as any other proposal.

The IRTF is managed by the IRTF Chair in consultation with the Internet Research Steering Group (IRSG). The IRSG membership includes the IRTF Chair, the chairs of the various Research Group and possibly other individuals ("members at large") from the community. Details of the organization and operation of the IRTF, the ISRG, and its Research Groups may be found in [IRTF], [IABIRTF], [IRTFPRIMER], and [IRTFCHAIR].

4.7. The IETF Trust

The IETF Trust is the legal owner of a number of intellectual properties for the IETF and others (such as IANA). This includes the IETF trademarks, the copyright licenses for IETF contributions including Internet Drafts. The principles for the copyright licenses are described in [IPRPRIVILEGIES] and [COPYRIGHT], and the licenses themselves are online in the Trust Legal Provisions (https://trustee.ietf.org/documents/trust-legal-provisions/).

The trustees that govern the Trust are selected from the IETF community as described in [TRUSTEES].
4.8. IETF Administration LLC (IETF LLC)

The IETF Administration Limited Liability Corporation (colloquially, the LLC) provides the corporate legal home for the IETF, the IAB, and the IRTF.

The IETF LLC is responsible for supporting the ongoing operations of the IETF, managing its finances and budget, and raising money. It regularly reports to the community. The LLC is the legal entity who signs contracts, including the Secretariat, meeting hotels, tools development contractors, and so on. The LLC also responds to legal requests; these are often subpoenas in patent suits.

Selection of the LLC Board of Directors is defined in [NOMCOM].

The IETF Executive Director handles the daily tasks and management, and is overseen by the LLC Board of Directors.

[ISOCIETF], Section 6 describes the legal relationship between the LLC and the Internet Society.

4.9. IETF Secretariat

The administrative functions necessary to support the activities of the IETF are performed by a Secretariat hired by the IETF LLC. The Secretariat handles much of the logistics of running the in-person meetings, and is responsible for maintaining the formal public record of the Internet standards process [IETFPROCS].

4.10. Internet Society

Internet standardization is an organized activity of the Internet Society, with the Board of Trustees being responsible for ratifying the procedures and rules of the Internet standards process [ISOCIETF].

The Internet Society also plays an important role in the standards process. It appoints the NomCom Chair, confirms IAB candidates, and acts as the last resort in the appeals process.

The way in which the members of the Internet Society Board of Trustees are selected, and other matters concerning the operation of the Internet Society, are described in their By-Laws [ISOC].

5. Security Considerations

This document introduces no new security considerations.
6. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA actions.
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Abstract

This document says that nobody can be picked by NomCom for a position more than two consecutive terms.

It obsoletes some other documents, which ones are TBD.

Discussion Venues

This note is to be removed before publishing as an RFC.

Source for this draft and an issue tracker can be found at https://github.com/richsalz/draft-rsalz-termlimits.
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1. Introduction

After a person has served two consecutive terms in any NomCom-chosen position, they are ineligible to directly serve for another term in any NomCom-chosen position; there must be a gap of at least one year. This rule goes into effect starting in March, 2023.

2. Conventions and Definitions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

3. Security Considerations

This document has no security considerations.

4. IANA Considerations

This document has no IANA actions.
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