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Chair Discussion
Third-Party Products

Trademarks

• RFC 5378 § 5.6.e — All trademarks, trade names, service marks, and other proprietary names used in the Contribution that are reasonably and personally known to the Contributor are clearly designated as such where reasonable.

• RFC 5378 § 5.8 — Contributors who claim trademark rights in terms used in their IETF Contributions are requested to state specifically what conditions apply to implementers of the technology relative to the use of such trademarks. Such statements should be submitted in the same way as is done for other intellectual property claims.
Third-Party Products (cont.)

• It appears to be permissible to use these trademarks.
  o Contributors must disclose their own trademarks in the product.
  o Contributors must properly mark the trademarks of others.

• But is this the correct forum for standardizing this?
Third-Party Products (cont.)

Down Reference

• RFC 2026 § 4.2.4 — Note: Standards track specifications normally must not depend on other standards track specifications which are at a lower maturity level or on non standards track specifications other than referenced specifications from other standards bodies.

• RFC 2026 § 7 — Other proprietary specifications that have come to be widely used in the Internet may be treated by the Internet community as if they were a "standards". Such a specification is not generally developed in an open fashion, is typically proprietary, and is controlled by the vendor, vendors, or organization that produced it.
Third-Party Products (cont.)

• It appears that this is a problem, because we must normatively reference the third-party documentation for readers to know how to implement the features in the document.

• RFC 3967 provides a mechanism by which to perform this down-reference:
  o For Standards Track or BCP documents requiring normative reference to documents of lower maturity, the normal IETF Last Call procedure will be issued, with the need for the downward reference explicitly documented in the Last Call itself. Any community comments on the appropriateness of downward references will be considered by the IESG as part of its deliberations.
Third-Party Products (cont.)

Solutions

• Remove them from the documents and...
  o Standardize them through another forum using the registry; or
  o Do nothing.

• Replace them with a suitable open standard if one exists.

• Note the downreference in the document and work with the IESG on approval.

Thoughts?
Synthetic Responses

• The charter says:
  o In particular, the WG will not define: [...] New protocols for delivering content from a CDN to an End User/User Agent.

• And:
  o A specification of the "CDNI Metadata interface". This interface will allow the CDNs to exchange content distribution metadata of inter-CDN scope. Content distribution metadata refers to the subset of content metadata that is relevant to the distribution of the content and therefore is to be processed by CDNs (for example, this may include information enabling: content acquisition, geo-blocking, enforcement of availability windows or access control).
Synthetic Responses (cont.)

• The charter does not appear to authorize the creation of a specification of metadata for the creation of content, only the distribution of content.

• This puts the Processing Stages Metadata draft out of charter scope.

• This also puts everything that depends on Processing Stages Metadata out of scope.

• We can:
  o Remove synthetic responses from Processing Stages.
  o Amend our charter.

Thoughts?
Shepherding the Internet Draft

• After the successful completion of WGLC (reaching consensus) and before the Internet-Draft is sent off to the IESG for review and approval
• A short summary about the draft is required, a sort of recommendation for publication as a standard
• Typically, any active participant within the WG would be the best person to take a pen and write this short summary
• Are you that person?