BRAD VERD:	While we're waiting for Fred, we'll get started and if he joins, he can take over. I'll call the meeting to order. Let's run through the rollcall. From Verisign I have myself.
MATT WEINBERG:	Matt is here.
BRAD VERD:	USC?
WES HARDAKER:	Wes Hardaker and Suzanne are both here.
BRAD VERD:	Good Morning to both of you. Cogent? Anybody from Cogent? I hear none, moving on. University of Maryland? Karl, I see you online, no? Somebody's got their mic open, just to let you know. We'll come back and try Karl in a bit. From NASA, anybody on the phone? I don't hear any. ISC?
JEFF OSBORNE:	Jeff is here.
BRAD VERD:	Hey, Jeff, how are you? Good morning. US DOD?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson and Kevin Right is here.

BRAD VERD: Good morning to both of you. ARL?

HOWARD KASH: Howard and Ken are.

BRAD VERD: Hey Ken, hey Howard. NETNOD?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here.

BRAD VERD: Hello Liman, good afternoon.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh is here.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Kaveh. ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt is here.

BRAD VERD: Good morning, Matt.

HIRO HOTTA: This is Hiro.

BRAD VERDE: Hi, Hiro. The IANA Functions Operators?

NAELA SARRAS: Good morning, Naela here.

BRAD VERD: Root Zone Maintainer?

DUANE WEASELS: Duane is here.

BRAD VERD: Hello, Duane. Liaison to the IAB? Danielle, are you on the line? I don't hear Danielle, moving on. Liaison to SSAC? I don't hear Russ, moving on. Liaison to the Board, Kaveh is on the line. Liaison to CSC, Liman, is on the line. Liaison to RSSAC, I am on the line. From Staff, we've got Andrew, Carlos and Mario.

Let's do a quick review of the agenda. We'll do our normal administration. We'll run through the minutes. We have some new documents that Mario will cover regarding on the Onboarding Process. We will go through the work items. We'll talk about a new work party that the document has been sent out. We'll cover the existing work parties. Carlos will talk through 000. Then we'll move on to ICANN 64 Planning, Workshop Planning, and then reports from the liaisons. Is there anything anybody would like to add to the agenda at this time?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'd like to mention a thing in any other business as a point of information only, regarding the conference in the Middle East.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you. I see no hands, I'm not seeing anything in the chat. It looks like Karl is here but his mic isn't working. Thank you, Karl. Running back to the administration, item number 4, Draft Minutes from our last meeting in December. I'm going to turn it over Mario.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Brad. Hi everyone. Happy 2019. You may have received the draft minutes from the 4th of December 2018. We have completed all of the action items from this teleconference. If you have any feedback regarding any of the agenda items, please let us know. There's only one action item pending from the previous conference, which is attend and discussion, regarding the RSO Identification Document. With this we actually have pretty much covered anything. Back over to you Brad.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Mario. The minutes have been sent out to everybody. Is there a motion on the floor to approve the minutes from the December 4th meeting?

RYAN STEPHENSON: I'll put a motion on the floor.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Ryan, is there a second?

JEFF OSBORN: Second.

BRAD VERD: Thanks Jeff. Great, minutes are approved. Moving on. Now, we're going to talk about some documents that were started a while back at the request of a number of different people. The RSSAC Onboarding and RSSAC Caucus Onboarding Document. Mario, I'm going to turn it back over to you to talk through these documents.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you Brad. As you mentioned, Carlos and myself have drafted two documents, one is the RSSAC Onboarding and the other one is the RSSAC Caucus Onboarding. Both of the documents are pretty much a review to give newcomer members and new appointment members

basically an inside about the Admin issues or Admin important things in the RSAC and these may cover mailing lists, teleconferences, work party, also some publications and our meetings basically which cover the ICANN meetings, IETF and our workshops. There are also some resources and some links at the bottom of both of the documents that might be useful for you just to check on different publications and acronyms that could be very important.

With this, we would like to please ask you for your review. The document, you can just basically get the access from the Google Doc and we appreciate if you have any feedback so that we can make it official, both of them. After that, we'll go ahead and just basically schedule a call to discuss further with some members that might be interested to join and the new appointed members. Back over to you Brad, to see if there are any questions.

BRAD VERD: Thanks Mario. The first issue, when I click on the link for the RSSAC Onboarding, I don't have permission to see it, maybe others do, I'm not sure. This is a document that with the help of Staff, we've drafted this. This is for new members, new people coming onboard, both for the caucus and for RSSAC and this came out with all the changes that happened at the end of last year. It was clear that having a How to Get Started course type of thing would be useful and this was the beginning of that.

Please, look at it through the eyes of a new person or somebody who's been here long enough, what would a new person want to know or

need to know? We think we've covered most everything but obviously extra sets of eyes are very helpful. Please, please, please provide input on that and get back to us. Any questions on those or comments? I see no hands and I don't hear anything. We will move on.

This is going to the Work Items. First items are a new draft statement of work and scope. Right now, for RSSAC 001 Version 2, has Fred joined us? I don't think so. This was sent out, people have provided input and some comments. I myself have added comments and we wanted to talk through this. Get people's thoughts, is this the right direction? Then hopefully, put a timeline on this, so that we could finish our feedback by the end of this week, it would give us a stable document for a week and then vote on it online so that we could begin work.

Let's start with the document, I hope everybody's read it. Sorry, I'm checking with Staff. Have people read the document? Are there comments? Thoughts? I can run through the questions that have been raised and my response. If you click on the Google Document, you'll open it up, again, this goes back to the background that there's still a number of things that could be worked on and should be worked on, while we are waiting for the implementation piece of 37 and 38.

These things usually are technical and should be able to just plug in to whatever happens with 37 and 38. This is the result of a number of discussions started in Barcelona. People were gelling around essentially redoing RSSAC 001 and the conversation started in Barcelona with, we'll let's just talk about what should be measured, let's not talk about what good looks like for that measurement, let's just talk about what the measurements are. This is just the progression of that. Duane, you had

EN

a comment here saying that you're struggling to see how the scope of items fit in to RSSAC 001 and it talks mostly about defining metrics. I added a comment for discussion, essentially, I'll just boil it down. I'm happy if we remove RSSAC 001 from this statement of work. I believe the scope is still valid and something that we should do.

DUANE WEASELS: I believe this scope of work is valid too. My comment was really that, the current 001, to me it feels a lot different than this work that's being proposed. That would either mean RSSAC 001 sort of changes a lot in nature from V1 to V2 or maybe we want to put it in a different document but I still think this work is important and should be done.

BRAD VERD: Okay. I agree with you. I think the work is important, needs to be done. I added my comment for discussion to your comment, that maybe when this is done, it replaces 001, I don't know. Do other people have thoughts and process on this? Liman, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's plus one, Duane. We need to make sure that when the document is ready, that we take a close look on which path we want to take. My comment there would be, probably want to make that part of this statement of work, that the decision isn't clear at this point, which path to take. I think it depends on the outcome of the document.

BRAD VERD: Wes, you're next.

WES HARDAKER: Thanks, Brad. I actually wasn't around with 001 was written but my understanding is that there were technical metrics in it because that was the responsibility of the IEFT vote, which is why there is corresponding RFC. I think there's a few choices going forward but I think it's work that we don't conflict with another document, so we have sort of two choices.

We take everything on on the ICANN side and find technical metrics and no longer refer to the RFC as the other source for metric or we could produce two documents and actually publish the other one through the RCF, with oversight from the [inaudible] and others that care over in the realm with respect to how they think that we ought to live up to. I don't know the right answer there but I'm mostly concerned about conflict, I'm ambivalent as to which is the right way to go, whether we do double document like last time or whether we move all the metrics to ICANN.

BRAD VERD: Okay, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I get the gut feeling that we have something here that will evolve to something. I think the work as it continues, will tell exactly Wes and the rest of us, whether we need an RFC document as well because I guess in the deliberations leading up the documents, that there will be discussions where people realize that, opps, this is on the other side of

the fence, we need to talk to the IDS and have an update of the RFC as well. I think that can be part of the process and we don't need to decide from the outset which way we want to go.

WES HARDAKER: I think that's fair should be update to reflect that they must fix it.

BRAD VERD: Yes, I think we should, can somebody volunteer to do that and go make those changes?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'd like to do that and I'm happy to work with Wes on that.

BRAD VERD: Liman and Wes will go an update that on the Statement of Work. Regarding the scope and the rest of the document, is there any discussion? Any feedback? Any thoughts? If not, my next question is, is everybody okay if I put a timeline on it to say, we'll get Wes's and Liman's updates and everybody else's feedback by the end of the week, so we can have a stable document for seven days and then we can do an online vote?

The reason, just so people understand the reason being, is that the goal here is that we do some of this work -- the goal here is to get a work party started as soon as possible because we want to do some of the work in Kobe and then we want to have something of substance walking

into the workshop and that would be an output item potentially from this group. We want to give them as much time as possible to produce something. That's what we'll do. We'll put a timeline on this for the end of this week for input. Please review it. Please, please, please review it and what I mean by that is, this document will have an impact on all of the root server operators so please take this back to your constituency and share it with them. I encourage all of you to be a part of the work party. These are going to be things that are affecting all of us. With that said, is there anything else on the draft statement of work? I don't see any hands, I don't see anything in the chat.

Moving on to updates from the existing one. Service Coverage of the Root Server System, work part update, Liman, do you have anything to share?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Actually, I don't, I've been totally offline for Christmas and New Year's holidays here. I need to get this back up and running again. Sorry.

BRAD VERD: Alright, great. No apologies, understood. Study Modern Resolver Behavior Work Party Update, Fred is not online. Is there anybody else that could give an update on this one? I will ask Fred to give an update via email to the list to everyone.

EN

WES HARDAKER:	I probably can Brad. The quick update is that we haven't done anything much in the last month. There's been good discussions in November and December but the holidays shut us done.
BRAD VERD:	Thanks, Wes. 000 Version 4, Carlos, do you want to update everyone?
CARLOS REYES:	Thanks, Brad. An update on RSSAC 000 Version 4. I went ahead and prompted all the changes based on the discussions in Barcelona. The document as you'll see it now, reflects the Chair and Vice Chair model, based on again, the conversations during the work sessions at ICANN 63. I went ahead and flagged the specific sentences that changed, just so that everyone is aware of those changes. What I think we'll do now is give everyone the next month or so to review it, ask questions and then I think Brad, I'll defer to you about having this on the agenda next month and potentially scheduling a vote, depending on the conversations on the mailing list.
BRAD VERD:	Thanks, Carlos. Again, please look at the Google Documents with OOO that Carlos has shared here in the agenda. The changes reflect moving from the Co-Chair model to a Chair Vice Chair model that we've all discussed. There are a number of logistics that need to be balanced and worked out should we go in this direction. I don't know if it's necessary to talk through them yet but just so you guys are aware, we're thinking it through and what has to be done. This is going to involve having bi-

law changes at the Board level. There's a lot of balls in the air. Any questions around 000? Again, I encourage everyone to review it, provide thoughts and feedback. I'm not sure we'll vote on this next time. We'll see what the progression is online, maybe we will. I see no hands, I see no comments.

Moving on. Item number six is ICANN Planning. Carlos, I think you have a draft schedule to cover.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. Just to quickly reiterate Brad's point, there are several steps that would have to take place with regards to bi-laws if the Operational Procedures are amended. I think at this point Brad and Fred are more interested in feedback about the document itself. Please take a look.

On to ICANN 64 planning. I put together a draft schedule. The meeting looks like a pretty standard RSSAC at ICANN meeting. We'll have work sessions on days one and two. We'll have the tutorials, Monday will be the opening ceremony and then the various cross community sessions and the public forum. Tuesday will be the public sessions and various joint meetings. Then Wednesday is the meeting with the Board, a work session and then RSSAC meeting in leu of a teleconference that month, we'll just have that meeting in Kobe.

Thursday there are no RSSAC commitments, it's the cross-community session and the public forums. Then in the evenings of course, there's the gala. We'll have an RSSAC dinner. We'll probably hear from the Board and OCTO about the reception, the technical community

reception and then the closing reception. Again, pretty standard schedule and as we approach the meeting, the Staff will work with the Co-Chairs on the various agendas and remote participation details. Again, as a reminder, everything is open now unless there's a request for a closed session, for example, with SSAC. That's how things are looking for Kobe.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you Carlos. Any questions or comments for Carlos? Moving on. Workshop Planning, Carlos back to you.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. Thank you everyone for participating in the surveys of dates. We definitely looked at the feedback that you all gave about the ICANN DNS symposium, the GDD Summit, DNS -OARC, the RIPE Meeting, etc., the May dates were problematic it seemed for pretty much everyone. Based on the results, it looks like we're going to go ahead and proceed with that week in April, the Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday in April, which was April 23rd, 24th and 25th. That's pretty much the format we've been using for workshops, allowing you to travel on Monday, workshop on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and then travel again on Friday. We'll keep that format and those dates.

What the Co-Chair discussed with Staff in December, is that we'll reach out to a few organizations that have expressed in hosting or have previously hosted, just to check on availability of space and we'll try and confirm a location soon. Brad and Fred will be reaching out to those

RSO's and hopefully by the February teleconference we can have a clearer understanding of where the workshop will take place.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Brad, just a quick point on the workshop. Do you want to mention the discussion about caucus participation and where we fell on that?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, absolutely.

CARLOS REYES: I'll defer to you, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Go ahead.

CARLOS REYES: So, basically, given some of the discussions we captured in Barcelona and that the group had, we've going to go ahead and extend invitations to four to give caucus members. We're going to take a look at the budget, see what's feasible. In the meantime, we were discussing how to prioritize who could attend and this is where the 001 V2 Work Party comes in. When the work party launches and once we have an idea of which caucus members are part of that work party, then any caucus

member that applies, who's also on the work party would be prioritized for attendance at the workshop. That's the general thinking for the April workshop. Brad, I'll defer to you if you want to add anything?

BRAD VERD: The only think I'd add is that we're not making that public, that piece of caucus members would be prioritized if they were members of the work party until after the work party is set. We don't want people to think that, I want to join the work party so I get a trip to wherever the workshop is type of thing. No, I have nothing else to add. Any questions, comments around the workshop discussion? Thanks for everybody participating in the survey or Doodle Poll.

Okay, let's go to the reports. It starts with me, the Co-Chair report. I met with Goran Marby the day after our December meeting, I was in DC, he was in DC, we sat down for a bit and we talked through a couple of things, most of which centered around RSSAC 37 and how to move forward with it. I won't steal Kaveh's thunder because I'm sure Kaveh will give us an update on what is happening there but there was definite discussion there. I also discussed -- for those of you who were in the Board and RSSAC meeting in Barcelona, it got a little stressed in that meeting and at one point, Goran made a comment that we don't trust him.

I wanted to have a discussion with him as Chairs of RSSAC and should say, Fred was scheduled to be at the meeting and then because of scheduling he ended up being on an airplane, so rather than cancel the meeting I was with Goran and Fred was on a plane, so he was not

present. In the room was Goran, David Olive, Carlos, Matt Larson from OCTO and myself. We talked through any trust issues and tried to build on that. Then we talked through communication between OCTO and RSSAC. Again, going back to those topics that were brought up in the Board Meeting of essentially who owns evolution of the root server system and everybody agreed that each individual root server operator owns the evolution of their own root server. Anything else I'm missing there Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: No, that was the extent of the meeting.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Second item here is RSSAC 37 38 Response Team. We as an Admin Team kind of talked a bit, given that we're getting questions from the Board from the BTC, which is the Board Technical Committee, from Goran, from Cherine, from different aspects of ICANN. We're getting questions around 37, we discussed the idea of creating a 37 38 Response Team and what we thought we'd try to model it after was the review work party.

Quite honestly, we kind of wanted to voluntell everybody or voluntold everybody, reassign the review work party to become the 37 38 Response Team and that is a team of people who would be tasked to responding to these questions as they come in because we feel that the questions are only going to increase in nature and we need to be diligent in our responses, so we're responding in a timely fashion and not having to spin up a work party and any number of things trying to

respond to questions as they come in. That was our discussion around that.

Any thoughts from people? When I say we wanted to use the same people on the review work party just because it was geographically diverse group and then obviously there were a couple of names, we were going to add to it but we're going to send out invitations I guess is the proper term to people to see if they'd be willing to do that. Obviously, if people are interested, the more the merrier. We just want to be responsive, I think that's the goal here, nothing more. Susanne, your hand just went up.

SUZANNE WOOLF: It sounds like Board experience too would be helpful here, if Kaveh conquers, I could work on it.

BRAD VERD: Okay, great.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I agree, thank you, Suzanne.

BRAD VERD: Alright, moving on. Organizational Review Update, we had a meeting with the OEC yesterday. This was more a formality meeting then really anything came of it. This was where Interisle, the independent examiner, presented their findings and RSSAC, which was Fred and

myself presented our feedback. I think we had two questions from the Board. Those questions were around RSSAC 42 and our feedback about the review and not about the content of the review, that was yesterday. Now, I believe Carlos help me here, we are in a waiting pattern to see if the Board has further questions and how they want to move forward, correct?

CARLOS REYES: Yes, that's correct. At this point the independent examiner and the RWP on behalf of RSSAC has given their presentations and the OEC is deliberating and making recommendations to the Board, that will take some time though.

BRAD VERD: But that's it with review. OEC is the Operational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board. It is made up of a handful of Board Members and a couple members from MSSI within ICANN. I hope that answers your questions Ryan. Anything else on the review?

Moving on, the IANA Functions Review. Carlos, I need help, I don't remember.

CARLOS REYES: Sure. As part of the IANA switch of transition there's now a review of the IANA Functions performance and that first review is kicking off soon. In August the RSSAC appointed Suzanne. Suzanne volunteered, completed the expression of interest and that was forwarded along. They're getting ready to start this work but I think on Monday, Brad and

Fred received a letter indicating that there's a seat for a non ccNSO member ccTLD and they've had trouble filling that spot. Brad, I'll stop there and I'll let you expand.

BRAD VERD: Thank you for refreshing my memory on it. Fred and I received a letter. Again, the specifics around this review for the IANA Function was written when the transition occurred, which was now four years ago, something like that. As it turns out, when they wrote those, the ccNSO had three seats, two seats coming from within the ccNSO, members of the ccNSO, one seat was for a ccTLD owner that was not a member of the ccNSO.

As it turns out, they're having a hard time filling that seat, they just have nobody, a lot of that is because things have changed and a lot of the CC's are now members of the ccNSO, so that pool to pull from has gotten very small and they can't find anybody. What they are suggesting in a letter is that the ccNSO would just appoint a third person from the ccNSO to fill that role. My feedback and obviously this is why I'm bringing it up here or why it was on the schedule to bring here, my thought process is, is that makes perfect sense and we should say, god speed but that is -- I'm here to tell them what your voice is.

If there are any thoughts or feedback that we should give them, now is the time to add it or share it here, if there's something else we want to tell or say if we have a challenge with their suggestion of changing the membership to that review panel. Liman, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just a word of support of your proposal. I think this sounds as the most appropriate way forward. I would also observe that if ccNSO actually turned to members -- sorry, if ccTLD operator turned to members of the ccNSO, that means two things, one is that they're actually showing interest which is good but it also means that the actual pool of people is being depleted as you noted and the pool, the people who are remaining in the pool are the ones that are actively uninterested in this, so it will be very hard to fill that seat. I think this is the right way forward. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thanks, Liman. Hiro, you have something to add? Probably you have a really good --

HIRO HOTTA: Thank you, Brad. I [inaudible] ccNSO council that I observe the creation and I think they know that we have done two thirds of the ccTLDs are in ccNSO, so naturally, among the three volunteers [inaudible] from ccNSO. It's very natural that the ccNSO members will be their three among the three candidates. I think it's very natural for ccNSO to appoint three persons on their three members appointees from the ccNSO. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thanks, Hiro. I definitely agree with those thoughts. Anything else? I see no hands, I see no comments. I'm sorry, Hiro, your hand is back up.

HIRO HOTTA: No.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Fred and I will move forward with responding to this letter by saying that we're fine, we have no objections to their suggestion of adding another member of the ccNSO to fill the seat on the IANA Review. Then, we will look to Suzanne for updates from the review as it starts.

SUZANNE WOOLF: As soon as I hear from people where we're going and what we're doing, I'm happy to share that.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you, Suzanne. Additional Budget Request Process. This was brought up in the past, we're bringing it up again. For Fiscal 20, which is again the fiscal year is June to July. If there are any needs for additional budgets requests, we have to get them in now. So far, we haven't had any, can't think of any but we're putting it out there for everybody to make sure everybody has an opportunity to share if there are anything we are missing. Thoughts? Comments?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Sorry for not having my hand raised. This is just for future planning for our budget. Will there be a workshop in fiscal year 20 planned?

BRAD VERD: Right now, in our budget, in the RSSAC budget are two workshops every fiscal year. Last year we didn't use both of them, we only used one of them. This year, we are using one of them because again, the fiscal year is -- so I guess last year we used both of them because fiscal year is June to July. This year we're only using one of them because we didn't do one in the fall. Right now, in our budget we have two, so that's already there, so we don't need to do a special request.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Alright, if something comes to mind, please get it to Fred, myself or somebody on the Admin Team and we'll do the request for you.

Moving on. There are a number of public comment opportunities that have just come open. I need to find out from the group here if we need to make a comment. Historically, we haven't done comments on some of this stuff but I just want to run through them. There's a draft fiscal year 20 operating plan and budget that's out there. If we need to make a comment or say something as an organization, this is where it would come from, we can talk about that.

There's another comment period, updated operating standards for specific reviews. I don't believe we need to do anything further than we've already done. We have two documents, I forget, I think it was 36 and 41, both regarding the reviews. I think we made it clear how we

feel about what went on and what needs to be fixed. I don't think adding to this is going to help.

There's the ICANN Strategic Plan for 21 and 25. I think Kaveh maybe will add to that in a bit, there are things we need to say there.

There's the two-year planning process. Historically, RSSAC has not commented on any of these but they've been sent to us and so we are sharing them with the group to see if there is a desire or a need to do any public comment. Any thoughts? Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Two comments. What are the due dates for these? Are we talking about a week or are we talking about a couple months?

BRAD VERD: I don't know that off the top of my head. I think they're all a little different. Some close in February, some close later, it's not a couple of months, it's probably, Carlos do you have a window there? Is it a month? Is it three months?

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. Yes, all of these close between February 8th and February 20th.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's good enough for me, that was the one thing. Another was, Brad, there is also the CSC related one, do you want me to talk about here or during my report?

BRAD VERD: When we get to your report, that's fine.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Alright, thank you.

BRAD VERD: There's a lot of public comments, please go and look at them. If you feel RSSAC should be adding values somewhere, please bring it back to the group and we will draft it up and then work it through.

Moving on, I don't see any further questions. Kaveh, do you have an update from the Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, before that let me quickly go through the strategy plan part. It's quite important, it's from 21 to 25 because basically that I did, that will match implementation of our work. I think it's important the foundation is right there. From my point of view, it is. If you read the document, basically the first strategic priority is the root server, so I'm unhappy with what's written there but I think it's good if you spend a bit of time, at least go through that part. I know it's for a bit further ahead but that's how the budget and the rest of the stuff will be, that's the

foundation that all the budget and everything will be built on it. I think it's important to make sure that we have set it properly, the ground properly for the future. With that, Carlos could you please upload that one slide?

CARLOS REYES: Yes, I'm uploading it. There's a question from Ryan.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Hi Kaveh, thank you very much for your update. I read through the strategic plan for fiscal year 2021 and 2025, forgive me for my very linear mind on this, it looks like from understanding it, that because there's only like a year and a half until the end of the fiscal year 2020 and when 2021 picks up, it doesn't look like the actual work, the program to actually, the project to actually start implementing or the creation of the implementation for RSSAC 37 and 38 will go ahead and begin in 2021 but forgive me for asking this but, I'm assuming ICANN will probably be working in preparation to begin to kick off that project in that year and a half timeframe before the 2021 fiscal year starts, am I correct in that or did I just garble that up?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, definitely. Basically, the idea is this is the [inaudible] plan. The idea is not basically already trying to guess and assign a budget for upcoming projects, it is having the foundation right to say, okay, this basically what we're going to invest in the high level, which is the direction with our mission. Obviously, the budget and all of that we will build on top

of that based on what's mentioned here, that's basically the high-level guideline.

At the moment, there is no specific project but that's not for any of the other projects that we know will come. It just mentions that the idea is for example opening up a new round of ccTLDs, it doesn't mention it as a project that needs funding. The budgets will be developed as usual, almost one and a half years beforehand, so when we get there obviously there will be projects and the budgets will be allocated.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Thank you for the update.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Let me quickly go through the BTC. Board Technical Committee had a meeting on Monday and there OCTO presented the progress on a few of the stuff they are working on, including RSSAC 37 and 38. The was a presentation, I already forwarded it early December, the proposal they had for the process on how to move forward, the [inaudible] study.

Now, Karen, who is basically following up our work, running a project on behalf of OCTO in the OCTO office, presented what they think at the moment of how to move forward. They thought the project in three phases, they envision it in three phases. Phase one will be design of a process to develop the final model, that's the final model we mentioned in 37. Then additional process to develop the final model will be the phase two and phase three will be the implementation of the final model.

Right now, we are focusing on phase one. Then they also presented on the way we can do that, again I repeat, phase one is design of process to develop the final mode. I won't go through all the details, I will share that later with the group. Basically, they talk about the forums, they presented on the possible forums for study group, committee, steering group and they said they are going propose a task force or working group, which their definition is working together for a specific object being delivered, that's what they want.

In how to appoint people to that group, again they went all possibilities, appointments, nominations, things like that and they suggested the best model would be stakeholder selection. Stakeholder groups designate members for the team. Then they went based on RSSAC 37, we have items by three main stakeholder groups, IEFT, IAB, ICANN Community and Root Server Operators, basically they suggest three primary stakeholders designate members to that team per subset committee and the criteria should have diversity, global representation, skill set of expertise and the weighing among stakeholders and interesting representatives.

That's the gist of the idea. They way they want to move that forward, is that you are to see a timeline. There's a Board workshop in the end of January and their idea is to propose this model at the Board workshop and discuss with the Board the idea for moving forward like this. Basically, having these three stakeholder group for delegating members to come up with a process. The idea is the Board agrees and based on the feedback back and forth, in Kobe the task force resolution which will direct or to publish a proposed process for public comment.

Then we go through the public comment. It will go through BTC and then again, hopefully by the second ICANN meeting of the year, the Board will publish a resolution basically, which is the process. That will conclude the phase one, which is figuring out the process for developing the final model. Then we will obviously enter the phase two. That's the current state, that's where we are.

As Brad said, as soon as we form that -- I forget what name he used but that group which basically from RSSAC supports the work of OCTO and Board, I will put them in direct contact. Basically, any further documents can be seen by that group so that they constantly provide feedback. We will have our formal points of providing feedback but I think it will be much more efficient if we also have that group working, which can immediately provide direction. That's a quick update. I also have another point to add but first I want to see if there's any questions at this point in time.

RYAN STEPHENSON: You can ignore my comment in the chat. This is all phase one, thank you.

BRAD VERD: Carlos, your hand is up.

CARLOS REYES: No, thanks. I think Kaveh covered it.

BRAD VERD: Any questions for Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Let me finish my report. There was one thing that came up, I won't go into details because it doesn't matter much but basically, there was a perception apparently from some Board members, including Cherine, that RSSAC is pushing for urgency on this. My comment, and Tripti was also on the BTC call, she's a member of BTC as a Board member now, also supported the position. For us, the most important thing is basically that we see progress towards completion in this work.

Obviously, we also think it's important but RSSAC is not thinking this is an urgent matter because I had an assessment [inaudible] to really do it quickly and if you don't, the whole system is under pressure and people might sell out, things like that, which I don't know where they come from. Me and Tripti had a chat afterwards, we said we'll start with Cherine, to make sure he's getting the right information. Just so you know, I took the very clear position that for us, at the moment, due process is paramount.

Obviously, we want progress and that's what we want but it's not that we say, you should do it tomorrow and sacrifice the process for sake of speed. Just so you and if people think different, that's something then I need to address. Right now, that's the position I'm taking and I'm also going to have a chat with Cherine, to basically just clarify just for him that, there might be other groups who feel urgency for that and that might be very valid but certainly it's not coming from RSSAC.

BRAD VERD: If I can just add to that then we'll jump to Ryan really quick because Ryan has his hand up. I think the way that I've kind of answered that question and that discussion with Kaveh around the urgency piece, is that we want this done right and we don't want to rush it just for arbitrary dates. We want to do it right because we all believe this is very important and so if that means being slow and steady, then that means being slow and steady. Ryan, you hand is up.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Thank you, Brad and thank you Kaveh for that great review. On the 27th of June 19 date, that Board discussion resolution at ICANN 65 and again, forgive me trying to understand some of the ICANN processes. Is this where the Board would actually give its feedback to yes, we're going to go ahead with this or we're going to go ahead with it in a different way? Is this where the Board's actually going to give it's official, official response back to 37 or 38 or have they really already done that?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No because I don't think we will get an official response in four months, that's not expected, that's also not what we asked them in 37, in the short document. Basically, what will happen by that time, hopefully by then, we will have a clear process for stakeholders to basically come up together, form a group and develop the final model. Develop the final model would be based on exactly what's written in 37 and 38, sorry I meant 38 the short one. Basically, looking back at those two, that group will develop a final model.

So, right now we're just trying to discover and the Board will basically finalize and so okay, this is for example three stakeholder groups. We'll designate members based on this model and that's how they will accountable, things like that and they should go ahead and form that group and start that work and that will conclude phase one. Is that clear enough for you?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yeah, thank you. Basically, when RSSAC produces the advice and everything and I can get with Carlos a little bit later about this, that when RSSAC produces the advice, the Board goes through the advice and absorbs it and they kind of look -- obviously they're going to look to the community to kind of then provide feedback on that advice and then Board will take and provide their resolution based upon the advice that we give them. Okay.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, that's generally the process. This was much more complex advice, this just didn't direct the Board to do one thing. Basically, what we asked them at 38 was to form this process, discover this and move forward. This is the path correct? That's why it's a bit different than just a straightforward resolution and an implement. That's why more steps are involved.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Understand, thank you very much.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, Ryan. Any other questions? Moving on. Can I get the agenda back up on the Adobe Connect please? I think next is Liman with the CSC. Liman, any updates from the CSC you'd like to share?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

As you yourself noted, I have reported over the past year or so that the contract under which the IANA operates, as it mentions in the contact, service level expectations but we've kind of turned that into the usual term service level agreement as of late. These are carved in stone in the actual contract, which is negotiated between the ccNSO, GNSO and the PTI. Changing these metrics and this service level expectation, it's a very cumbersome process that involves lots of lawyers and changing of contacts and signing and what have you.

There are lots and lots of measuring points for measuring the performance of the PTI. As with all paper products, it turns out that when the rubber hits reality, it turns out that some of these measurements don't have proper values that can rhyme well with what reality is like. Right now, the customer standing committee, more often than it would like to have to make a mark that says that PTI is not living the SLE's, that's not in anyway because the PTI is doing substandard work, because the SLE is ill designed and changing it is a nightmare.

There's been a proposal to change the contract and this is broad undertaking. The proposal is to do it once and for all and to remove the service level expectations from the actual contract and have them in a separate document with a different change in procedure. The bulk of the contact will still remain but the actual measurements and the

EN

service level expectations will be in a separate document. There will be two separate processes for changing that document, depending on the size of the change. If it's a minor change then there is light weight process to do that, it doesn't involve a full negotiation and then there is the major change if you want to do that, then that's more heavy weight process.

That proposal is now finally out there, it's out there for public comment. If you're really interested in this go and have a look. I don't really see a reason to comment. This is all done by people who have a very clear understanding of this and there is actually no controversy here. We don't have people yelling at each other, I don't know if it's the size of the table but everyone seems to agree that this is a very good idea, this is what we want to do and we should have done this from the start. If you want to have a look at that proposal please do. I don't see any reason for RSSAC to get involved or for RSSAC to make a comment on this other than to support it. If you want to do that but I don't think that's necessary either. From my stand point, this is just good and this is just what should be happening. Questions?

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Liman. Any questions?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I don't know if Naela wants to add anything to this?

NAELA SARRAS: No, thank you Liman, you said it very well. I support everything you said and it would just make the report just being a little easier in that we don't have to account for things that are completely outside of your control as Staff IANA naming changes.

BRAD VERD: Suzanne, your hand just went up.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah, just as a quick question.   Liman, this is about changing the mechanism for changing the SLE's, not about going to the substance of the SLE's, correct?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That is correct. Obviously, there's a reason for wanting to change the mechanism and that is we have a few we want to change but we first need to change the process.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I remember how that process came about because I was part of the working group and yeah, it was the best we could do at the time and I'm glad people are rectifying -- because you're right, the SLE's that were adopted weren't only driven by operational reality.   It sounds like a really good step. I'll take a look at it, thanks.

BRAD VERD: Nothing further for Liman, we will move on. RZERC, there's been no action on RZERC, no meetings, no calls, no email contact, so nothing to share.

SSAC, I don't think Russ is on the call. Danielle is not on the call. Naela.

NAELA SARRAS: Thanks, Brad. The only thing I want to add is, I think I reported in the last two calls that we're working on something called The Active Ticket Survey for poling each customer after we finish a request to see how we did. That finally opened around the middle of December and we're starting to get data back and we're actually getting a lot more response rate then we thought. We were guestimating in the three to four percent rate and we're actually getting a lot more, we're in the 30 to 40 percent rate. I don't know if that's just new and we'll go back to lower rate but so far, the response rate is great and the feedback is good for us to look into our processes and see where we can improve. That's new from my IANA in the last month or two.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Naela. Any questions for Naela? Alright, moving on to Any Other Business. Liman, you wanted to share something with the group?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, this is Liman [CROSSTALK].

DUANE WESSELS: Hey, Brad? This is Duane. I was wondering --

BRAD VERD: Sorry, you're not on the agenda, I'm sorry. We'll [inaudible] Liman with Any Other Business. Duane, anything from the Root Zone Maintainer?

DUANE WESSELS: I just want to let people know that today is January 9th and on January 11th, two days from today, the Root Zone will be published with KSK 2010, having its revoked bit set. We're not expecting any problems. There will be a packet size increase for DNS key quires but other than it should be good. I'll be sending out an email to the Root Server Operators as a reminder before this happens.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Duane. Sorry, I missed you, my bad. Any question for Duane? Again, please take that back to your operators and let them know. Alright, Liman, back to you, you were going to share something.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I just wanted to mention that there will be a conference in Dubai in February sometime, where the APTLD, the Asian Pacific TLD Organization holds a conference. They will be having a panel discussion about evolution of the root server system and I think it's in a wider context than just the RSSAC 37 proposal. They have invited people from various places, including the [inaudible] Project and the Russian TLD,

and also me as being a root server operator. I have accepted to be on the panel.

I just wanted to make you aware of A, that's its going on and B, that I'm going to be there. If you have any messages that you want to bring forward from RSSAC I could do that. If you have any questions or any worries, let me know. I wanted you to be aware that I will be there so it doesn't come as surprise for you. I will not be wearing my RSSAC hat but I expect questions about RSSAC and RSSAC 37, the document.

BRAD VERD: Thank you for sharing that. If there's any interest from others going, is there a link or something or a name of a conference that they can look for?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sure, I can make that available on the mailing list.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you. Hiro, your hand is up.

HIRO HOTTA: Thank you, Liman. I will be as well. The background of the proposal for the RSSAC for our Root Server System Evolution Panel, the [inaudible] did ask me whether we should have RSSAC or our Root Server Evolution Panel at the APTLD next meeting. I will be there, I will be part of the panel or I will be a part of the audience. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Hiro. Any other questions?

No? Okay, I don't see any hands up. I don't see any comments on the chat. Is there any other other business that somebody's thought of and needs to bring up now?

Not seeing any, and if that is the case, I will wish everybody a Happy New Year and conclude this meeting. Thank you. We are adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]