

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Fred, this is Liman. I think you just have to say let's roll it so that I can hear stuff, and then you just continue with the roll call, because we'll be stalled here.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, okay. So, Cogent? Has anyone joined? ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, ISC, I'm here. Jeff, are you here? I'm sure he'll be joining. NASA?

TOM MEGLIN: This is Tom Meglin, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Netnod, Lars, I heard you a moment ago.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I'm still here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, RIPE?

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh is here.

FRED BAKER: University of Maryland? I know Wes is on the call and I think Suzanne.

WES HARDAKER: You said Maryland, not USC.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry, it's too early in the morning. Okay, University of Maryland I'm looking for Karl and Gerry. USC?

WES HARDAKER: Hi, this is Wes, I am here.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Suzanne is here also.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Army Research lab?

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard is here.

---

FRED BAKER: DOD?

KEVIN WRIGHT: This is Kevin Wright.

RYAN STEPHENSON: And Ryan.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

MATT WEINBERG: This is Matt Weinberg. Brad's on vacation this week.

FRED BAKER: Okay. WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

FRED BAKER: Now our various Liaisons, the IANA Functions Operator?

NAELA SARRAS: Naela is here.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay, Root Zone?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: IAB? SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Russ is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Kaveh, you're here from the Board. CSC, Liman. And RZERC, Brad isn't. Okay, Carlos is typing. Okay, so you're looking at the agenda, what we have this morning. We've got at least one unusual thing, which is that Ken is going to talk a little bit about the statement on RSO Independence. We have a selection timeline for the RSSAC Liaison to the ICANN Board, otherwise it's pretty much as usual. Any changes to the agenda? Ozan, you want to talk about the draft letter?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. This is Ozan for the record, hello everyone. I circulated the draft minutes from 13th of March RSSAC Teleconference and RSSAC Meeting last week, so I hope you had a chance to review it. All the action items have been completed on the draft minutes. If you have any questions, please let us know. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Carlos, do you want to talk about the Liaison to the Board?

CARLOS REYES: Sure, Fred. Perhaps you can call for motion to approve the minutes?

FRED BAKER: Yes, I'm sorry, do we have a motion to approve the minutes?

WES HARDAKER: This is Wes, I make motion.

RYAN STEPHENSON: This is Ryan, I'll go ahead and second, please.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is anyone opposed? Do we have any abstentions? Failing that, we'll consider them approved. So there, Carlos. Let's move to the Board issue.

CARLOS REYES: Thank you, Fred. Hi everyone, this is Carlos for the record. As you probably know, we have a liaison obviously to the ICANN Board, Kaveh has been in that role since 2016. So his first three-year term is coming to an end at the annual general meeting later this year, which will be

---

ICANN66 in Montreal. And as such, we have to go through an election process with the RSSAC for that. Kaveh is eligible for reelection.

I am going to go ahead and post the timeline in the Adobe Chat, also on the agenda if you're looking at it. But essentially the nomination period would open in about two weeks, April 21st. It will run for 30 days and it will close on May 21st. We will then send the final slate to the RSSAC on May 28th, that would be one week before the next teleconference, which would be June 4th, and the election will happen on that teleconference.

I copied the relevant sections of the Operational Procedures, basically describing the role of the Liaison and the selection process. So, if you have any questions, please let me know, otherwise it's a standard selection process with a 30-day nomination period and then an election. Fred, back to you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you. Let's go into Work Items. Liman? Who has their hand up?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I just wanted to make a quick note. Before the nomination period opens on the 21st, I will try either before or just a few days after, I will try to send an email to the RSSAC explaining my experience and what I think, at least from my point of view, would be expectations for the possible nominee.

---

That said, I had a chat with my employer, because I feel that I need more time to be able to do this job properly and I've got more time, so I'm going to run again, but still, I will do my best to inform from what I've experienced, so if there are other people who want to run, at least they have my view on what it entails to be the Board Liaison. Just wanted to inform you.

FRED BAKER:

That will be very helpful, thank you. Did I miss any other hands? No, okay. Liman, you want to talk about the Service Coverage Work Party?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Only very briefly. As you all know, we've had problems to find people who want to step up as well as work party leaders for this. We talked about it during the Caucus meeting in Prague a couple weeks ago. We came to the agreement in the room, that it was probably a good idea to suspend the work party, partly because there is no obvious interest in doing it, but more so because the Service Coverage Work Party will have to rely on parts of metrics that aren't quite defined yet, because there is the Metrics Work Party in parallel, and they should be in serial.

So, our current proposal is to suspend the work party at least until the Metrics Work Party has reached some kind of conclusion and possibly even beyond that, on how to use the metrics. So, I will actually suggest that we suspend the work party and that we take full action on that.

---

FRED BAKER: Questions for Liman? Is there anything procedural we have to do with that, or just agree that it's suspended? Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Hi Fred, we will have a couple comments about the interactions between Metrics and this work party in our report, so more may come up later as part of discussion on RSSAC.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so Carlos, do we have to take a vote or something? Or do we just call it suspended?

CARLOS REYES: Fred, this is Carlos. No, there's no vote. This has happened I think two other times, so what we'll do is we'll work with Andrew and Ozan and I can change the status of the work party on the webpage and later if it's taken up again, we can do another call for volunteers or whatever the decision is at that point. But there is no step for RSSAC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is Liman, may I?

FRED BAKER: Certainly.



---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can I suggest that at least the minutes from this meeting reflect the fact that we arrived at this conclusion? And then someone, that could fall to me, but someone needs to inform the Caucus that this has happened.

FRED BAKER: Okay, who would you recommend having informed the Caucus? Should that be me? You? Carlos?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm happy to do it, as long as no one is opposed to that. I am the shepherd so it's kind of natural that I do it, and I don't mind. But I would like to be able to use the minutes or the upcoming minutes as the basis for delivering the message. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Well, and Carlos, you're going to do that, right?

CARLOS REYES: Yes.

FRED BAKER: Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah, this is Suzanne. This topic is difficult partly because we don't know how to answer the question the way it's usually formed, but it's actually the outside world pays attention to; you know, what are you

---

guys doing to improve service to underserved regions of the world. So I think it should be clear that we're not indifferent to the question or giving up on answering it, but there is a dependency on the other metrics work.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I keep hearing that, but on the other side, no one seems to be willing to work on this. What we're trying to do is formulate the task for them, and we're trying to engage them into this, and nothing happened. So, it can't be that important. If it was then we'd have 10 people standing at our door yelling at us, but we don't.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Can I respond to that?

FRED BAKER: Certainly, go ahead.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure, just that I didn't mean for this to turn into a large digression but it's not a topic I hear about from technical people who could be contributing to the work. That's exactly the disconnect I'm calling out. At least I hear about it from people who aren't technical, who assume there is a question and we're the people to answer it, and you're right,

---

the appetite for doing it among the Caucus and the people would be equipped to grapple with it at a technical level, yeah, I haven't seen that. What I have seen is people who aren't technical, who do assume there is an issue.

I was making a suggestion about how we say what we're doing -- I'm happy to try again when there is more of the metrics work, I think the dependency really is there, but as far as the disconnect, you're right, there has been difficulty in getting technical people engaged, which we might be able to fix when there is a more narrow question to point at, but frankly, that wasn't the audience I was concerned agree. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Russ, Daniel, Liman, then Carlos. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Apologies, I don't know how my hand got up. Nothing.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I don't think the work party on metrics will change anything regarding the participation of the Coverage Work Party. I don't think we should try to find a nice excuse for the lack of interest of that work party. I think the lack of interest reflects there is somehow no real issue, and probably we should be able to build on that, rather than saying it's just

---

postponed. So that when someone comes, we can figure out, we can raise that issue. But no one was really pulling it.

FRED BAKER:

Well, yes, I'm inserting myself in the list here. Among the technical people in the caucus, clearly there is perceived to be not enough of an issue for people to say hey, I want to contribute to that. That said, if I was living in an underserved region I might be doing something from the corner, saying I've got a problem. So I do think some sort of definition of service coverage, how do we know whether there is an issue, as part of the question of whether the [inaudible] is doing what it needs to do. My viewpoint. Liman, you're next.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. I agree with you, Suzanne. I am sharing my frustration here. I fully agree that we should formulate it in a way that we blame the metrics part for now, and I am actually happy to take a new stab at it when we have some substance from the Metrics Work Party.

That said, I think in the meantime, we might want converse on how to fill this work party with the people who do see a problem, who aren't technical, to receive what they say and to ask them, what's the right phrase to ask for their help and get them to send their technical people or at least explain how they perceive, how do they know, so that process. I think we should let that simmer within the group to see if we can come up with ideas how to make this move forward at a later stage when we have more from the Metrics Work Party.

FRED BAKER: Well, I agree with you. Question for you, Liman, do you think it would be useful at the workshop when we have at least a few caucus members there and are discussing the metrics work, would it be useful to position the question and get the caucus' commentary on that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think that would be a good idea, yes. I don't think we should spend a lot of time on it, I think we should spend a little time on it and we should plant the seed within the caucus, and hopefully get that to grow and see what comes from it.

FRED BAKER: Okay, that sounds good. Okay, any other discussion on this topic? No flailing hands, I'm going to move ahead to the Resolver Behaviors Work Party. We met the report that we got was basically from Paul, who is doing some work to make a reproducible experiment that can be run; he's putting it in Github, and people have the ability to go do a request a poll and then install things.

Paul tells me at this point that code, it doesn't actually measure anything, but he's working on it to make it be able to do that and people are in a position to do a poll, observe the issues that they see, help him get the job done. So Paul's work is proceeding forward.

We also had Jeff, who periodically posts blogs saying things about measurements that he has taken and we have been very interested in figuring out a way to make those measurements be reproducible. And

---

---

Jeff reports in an email a few days ago that he really hasn't produced anything that is reproducible and at least at this point, he doesn't intend to.

So, my perception is that Jeff has pretty much opted out of that particular work party. We will have a call something during the last week of April, first couple days of May, and be able to continue with Paul's work, which I think is very valuable, and we'll kind of see where that goes. So, any comments on that? Failing that, the Metrics Work Party, Duane and Russ, any comments?

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, this is Duane. We met a week or so ago back in Prague and had a pretty good meeting. We basically went through, we had asked the participants to fill out a little survey for their interpretations of some of the questions and we went through those answers, and I think it was a good exercise. We found cases where a lot of answers were similar, similar answers to different questions led us to believe that maybe the questions were asking the same thing, for example.

We're sort of getting to the point in this work where at some point we're going to have to talk more about how the measurements are going to be performed, like some of the details, we assume that there's going to be a distributed platform where measurements can be taken from different locations. So far we haven't gotten into those details, but we might have to pretty soon.

The work party is meeting again this week, Friday, I believe, and I need to prepare some materials for that, so that we have something to talk

---

about on Thursday, and then we'll be ready for the workshop in a couple weeks. I think that's it. We're devoting a significant amount of time on this at the workshop, is that correct?

FRED BAKER: Almost all of it, yes.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, yeah.

FRED BAKER: And Russ, I believe you wanted to get in on this, as well.

RUSS MUNDY: Well, the one thing I was going to perhaps just expand on, I don't remember if we're calling it the admin group for this work party or what, but we've had several discussions between Duane and I and the staff, with respect to the issue that I think interacts, or might interact directly with the Coverage Work Party, potentially. And that is the question of whatever the metrics are, an important aspect of the metrics will be how are they measured? When sometimes gets defined to be consistent about it, you have to have a structure identified so you can take those types of measurement readings in a consistent sort of way.

So at some point in the future, but I think we all agree in admin group, that will be a second step or maybe a third step, but I definitely think

---

there is a good likelihood that there will be, in the future, interactions between the Coverage Work Party and the Metrics Work Party.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you for that. Any other comments on this? I don't see any hands raised at the moment. Moving on, then, Ken you wanted to talk about RSO Independence.

KEN RENARD:

Good morning, this is Ken. First of all, a little background on the document RSSAC 37 defines 11 guiding principles, one of them is RSOs must be autonomous and independent. So now if the ICANN community goes forth to provide input on the governance model, it's good to know exactly what this independence means. So the Board actually asked RSSAC to further define it. This kind of gives us the opportunity to justify our independence, make sure it's carried forward into the new governance model.

This document started off, Brad, you had put some blurbs from other RSSAC documents on independence, and we met at the ICANN ITF meetings. Andrew has been doing a great job editing, making a leaner and meaner document. Looking at the basic structure of the document, it is basically just a list of the types of independence we have, what they mean, and why we need to preserve this going forward.

So the first one is organizational, management structures, organizational objectives, viewpoints, jurisdictions, business practices, all with the common goal of serving the same root zone. This kind of



---

protects us from capture by any one entity. We specifically call out ICANN in that, and I think a lot of people agreed with that.

Another part of independence is financial, about funding, independent sources, any decisions on funding levels, and how to spend their money. This protects us from failure of any particular economy or market.

Independence is also architectural and engineering design, network diversity, we don't have homogeneous network typologies, different hardware, software, network providers, things like that.

Operations and administration of the networks, we have independence with respect to service interruptions and maintenance, things like that.

We also call out where RSOs are not independent, just to make sure, we are providing the exact same zone data, for the most part the same protocols, things like that.

So, those are the basic pieces of it. The next steps for the document, I think the document is in a fairly good place, it's been cleaned up, there are some new comments over the past week or so. The goal is to finalize this document at the workshop so it's done and ready to hit the streets at the ICANN Community. Hopefully this is just some wordsmithing.

So, I see that there is about 2-1/2 hours allocated at the workshop, but if we can do some read-ahead and some commenting on the Google doc, this 2-1/2 hour slot can be shortened and spend more time on metrics. So, please take a look at it. In the agenda there is the link to

---

the RSO Independence document on Google Docs. Looking forward to any comments or suggestions.

FRED BAKER:

Thank you, Ken. One comment I have on capture. As you say, the document points out the issues of capture by one company, such as ICANN, or it could be Microsoft, IBM, or anybody else. One issue that the ICANN community has had in the space since it was created, is capture by a country. Specifically they complained about the United States having a specific place with respect to the root. Do we have something in there, and I'm not looking at the text at the moment, do we have something in there talking about capture of the root or a root operator by a country?

KEN RENARD:

We don't specifically call a country, but I think that's a great idea. We did not address capture of a single root by a country or the fact that they're independent, but that might be worth trying to fit in there, if we can. So, great, thank you. I'll try to put that in there.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you, and I'll take a look at the text, as well. Now, what is the rate of change of the document over the past week? As you say, there have been some comments and updates made, there's a whole lot of line-through in the thing. What I'm wondering is, would we be in a position to take a vote at the workshop, and would we be in a

---

position to take a vote if it has been stable for a week, as I understand the rules.

KEN RENARD:

The comments are mostly just editorial, thanks to Andrew, but there are a few ideas in there. My personal thoughts, I just want to make sure everybody has had a chance to look at this and give thumbs up or thumbs down.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, well, let me encourage the people on this call, which is to say all the RSO, the RSSAC, that you take a look at it and make comments as necessary. Carlos in the chat room says that the 18th of April would be a deadline for a stable document for a 25th of April vote. So, this week would be great, certainly by the 18th. People can get in there whatever they need to get in there, or give a thumbs up, one way or the other.

FRED BAKER:

Andrew, you have your hand up.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Yeah, thanks Fred. Would it help if I went through the document and just accepted a whole bunch of the comments and kind of create a clean version? Because right now there's just a whole bunch of different colored text in there. Would that help, folks?

---

KEN RENARD: I believe so.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay, let me go ahead, I'll do that then.

FRED BAKER: Okay, sounds good. I don't see any other hands up, so I'll move along. Carlos and Ozan, you wanted to talk about workshop planning?

CARLOS REYES: Thank you, Fred. Hi everyone, this is Carlos. In the agenda and in the chat, I just posted the draft workshop schedule. So as Fred mentioned, the bulk of the time will be dedicated to metrics, but the first day we're sort of dedicating the first day to issues related to RSSAC37. So we start off with a working breakfast, which has been pretty typical for workshops. Depending on Ken's update now, we may want to adjust the amount of time dedicated to independence.

Right now we have 2-1/2 hours, maybe we need a little less time. We can evaluate that with the co-chairs and just track the progress of that document. Working with Fred, we thought it would be helpful to provide an overview of the Empowered Community. We've previously done this, but given some of the conversations about how the model from 37 might be implemented based on the concept paper from the ICANN Board, we thought it would be helpful to go over that, and we've invited the support staff lead for that, Mary Wong. She happens to be in the Washington area that week.

---

And then Brad and Fred asked me to allocate some time to discuss some proposals from Jeff for RSO funding that again could be manifested in the model. We wrap up Day 1 with a dinner that's hosted by ICANN Org. Day 2 is all metrics. There were three areas that Brad and Fred wanted me to capture on the agenda which is related to metrics work. One, what to measure, two, thresholds, and then three, how to measure. So you'll see that throughout Day 2 and then Day 3, the metrics work is divided that way.

Duane and Russ, if you have any feedback on this, on how time is allocated, or how you want to structure that, feel free to comment, and I'm happy to work with Brad and Fred on updating the agenda. And then we conclude on Day 3 with the RSSAC meeting and a vote for any documents or other items. We'll probably have some caucus members to approve. The membership committee met last week and that was after the deadline for this meeting, but there will be some things for the RSSAC to consider in late April. Sorry I skipped, Verisign will be hosting a dinner on Wednesday. And then departure is after the RSSAC meeting. So, that's an overview of the schedule.

In terms of logistics, you will be hearing from Ozan and me in the next few days, just to confirm things. For those of you that requested travel support, I think most of you have finished your airfare itineraries, hotel reservations, et cetera, that has all gone out. Feel free to be in touch with those with any questions. Fred, that's it. Ozan, do you have anything to add?

---

OZAN SAHIN: No, Carlos, I think you covered it all, thanks.

CARLOS REYES: Okay, thanks. Fred, back to you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. And now we go to reports. I'm not sure the Chairs have a lot to report that we haven't already discussed on the agenda. So, I'm going to pass on that. Kaveh, do you have anything from the Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, there has been on progress. I have seen a version of the concept paper circulated, but I was waiting to see if there are any comments before forwarding. So, this week I will forward the latest version of the concept paper which was sent by the penholders through the BCC. I was waiting to see if there are any comments or reaction. But so far nothing, so I think today or tomorrow I will forward that to RSSAC so please, if you have time, have a look at the changes.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Liman, what do you hear from your CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Actually, pretty much nothing at this point. We had a meeting in Kobe when we were there. We usually have our meetings around the 15th every month, so there has been no real activity.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and Brad isn't here, so I guess we're not going to hear from the RZERC. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: A couple of quick things from SSAC. It looks as though the NCAP work is coming to life again and so there is a likelihood that things will start to be published soon for folks that might be interested in participating in that. It is intended to be open for community input. So when you things, be ready to respond, and when they come out formally, if folks like, I can also just send a note to this list to make sure folks know it's coming.

The other thing, in case people missed what was posted, we have both a recording from our joint meeting at the last ICANN, and a transcript. Thanks to the support staff, those were both provided in a fairly timely manner, so anybody that wants to go back and look at what was discussed, it should be readily available. Also, I'd like to ask folks to just be thinking about what would be good to discuss at the next ICANN meeting, because we are again planning on a joint RSSAC meeting. That's it, thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and Daniel says he has nothing from the IAB. Naela, do you have anything from IANA?

---

NAELA SARRAS: Good morning, thanks Fred. The only thing I have is that we finished the audit for the IANA systems, this is the audit that happens every year. And so we finished it, passed it, and published the report. I have a link that I'll put in the chat root. So, that's the only development I have since the last meeting we had in Prague.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Duane, anything from you?

DUANE WESSELS: No, nothing to report.

FRED BAKER: Okay, with that, we find ourselves in AOB, and I'm going to refer to a comment that Carlos has put in the chat. Apparently there is one new sentence, there has been very little feedback, but there is a new sentence, and that relates to the Empowered Community which we'll be discussing in the workshop. Any other topics that people want to bring up? Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, one thing. Regarding the time slots for this meeting. They allowed us to take five time cells. It bit me this time, because the time zone for Europe isn't the one that we use right now and it does differ different times of the year, there are changes of the Northern Hemisphere and Southern Hemisphere, going in opposite directions, and so on.



---

So, can I suggest that whoever does the listing for the teleconference time slots, just give it one time, and the rest of us can do the calculating. I don't mind if it's Eastern time, Eastern Local time, Eastern Daylight, whatever it is, I would prefer UTC, but I'm happy with just a single one, and I can do the calculations from there.

FRED BAKER:

Well, Carlos, maybe you ought to comment on this. What I see in my calendar, the meeting flipping back and forth between 6 a.m. when we're on standard time, and 7 a.m. when we're on daylight time, which is most of the year. My understanding is that we're on UTC, is that not true, Carlos?

CARLOS REYES:

Hi Fred, this is Carlos. Yes, so typically we still do everything on UTC. What we started doing is providing the local times based on where members are located, but if it's easier we can just stick to providing the UTC time and then as Liman suggested, having everyone make the calculations.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

What's in there is irrelevant for me, it's not wrong, because it is the correct time without daylight savings, but we don't apply that here right now, it just confuses things. So, having just UTC or Eastern Time, whatever, just a single one, and then the rest of us can do the calculations for our time zones.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay, so Carlos comments in the chat, that he's noting the point. Terry agreed with you, just UTC. Does anybody have any heartburn with just staying on UTC? I don't see a lot of hands going up.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The only other thing that you could do would be to link to a website that actually will translate to a whole bunch of the zones so people can click on the link. I'm forgetting, there's a really popular one, but I'm blank at the moment.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, I use timeanddate.com. They have a nice meeting planner. So Kevin likes UTC. Terry, what are you saying? Okay, fine, let's just go with UTC. So, do we have any other issues that we want to discuss? Failing that, I think we've run out of the agenda. Let's close the meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]