
MONTREAL – RSSAC Work Session 4
Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 09:00 to 10:15 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

BRAD VERD: Good morning. Welcome to Day Three? Is that right? Day Two? Yeah, Tuesday. We have a number of things on the agenda to cover in this meeting. First on the agenda is ATRT3 is going to give us what's going on, a status. The original agenda second portion was going to be metrics, followed by prep for our joint meeting with the Board tomorrow.

Because Kaveh has a conflict later in the in the meeting, we'll switch the last two, so we'll prep for the Board meeting second, and then we'll have the metrics discussion and I will apologize to everybody, I have to leave for a different commitment shortly after this one so I will miss the second half of this meeting, but Fred will carry you through. So I will turn it over to you guys for the ATRT3. Alright, welcome.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like the floor is ours, let's roll then, shall we? For those of you who don't know us my name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr and I'm one of the Co-Chairs of the Accountability And Transparency Review Team Version 3, and this man to my right, Pat Kane, who I'm so tempted to call Paul because it upsets, see, look at that reaction. I just like to get that reaction first thing in the morning. We have a number of our ATRT members who have also joined us today; we've got Wolfgang,

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.

someone else put their hand up, yes, Vanda down the other end. And obviously, Jaap, and it wouldn't be the same without him. He's been invaluable to us.

So let's have the next slide, we're just going to give you a brief update and as we go through today's presentation, I'm quite sure most people in this room do understand what an ATRT is all about. But we'll be happy to answer any questions for anyone who doesn't. I'll give you a little bit of background on the specifics of our ATRT3, the third iteration. I just want to recognize Sébastien Bachollet who is another of our ATRT3 members. We're going to talk about sources of information for the topics that we've assessed so far.

One of the things we'd like to take a tiny bit of time with you about is the results we got from the Assessment Review and Effectiveness estimations that we did for the ATRT2 recommendations. Some of you won't be terribly surprised with those results, but we should probably share them. Talk briefly about our ATRT3 survey and gloss over accountability indicators, because well, maybe this room is different, but usually if I ask how many of you have ever bothered to look at the accountability indicators published for the organization, I'm not besieged with hands going up. But maybe this would be different.

I won't embarrass people but think about it, when did you last go in and drill down into those published accountability indicators. Yeah, right. And prioritization is a big issue for us because it's one of the overarching issues that has been identified, even in the work that

Brian Cute is doing on the evolution of the multistakeholder model. Moving to the next slide, thank you.

We are also going to be focusing in our provisional reporting on reviews, the diversity on the Board, the matters of public consultation, what constitutes what part of a public consultation, what's a public comment, what's an interaction, what's a blog, what's a letter, sort of left under the bottom of somebody's laptop, what do all these things mean, and how are they to be dealt with and how are we supposed to deal with them as a community?

Policy development process, PDP is part of what we look at and we might give you a peek into what we think we're going to be doing when. And with that, let's move on to the substantial part of today, which are some facts and figures. Next slide, thank you.

Pat's going to tell you that everything you knew about ATRT3 changed as soon as they gave the job to us.

PAT KANE:

Thank you, Cheryl. This is Pat. So under the new operating standards that we're operating under that have been in place since June, one of the changes in the review teams, is that the level and the threshold for a recommendation has changed. And so since there are bigger requirements and there's more data that has to go behind it, if you were in the streamlining of reviews discussion yesterday afternoon, there was a question about whether costing should be a part of this or

not. And so the number of recommendations that we will see out of review teams will probably significantly go down.

One of the things that you'll see from a ATRT3 is that we will have suggestions and some strong suggestions to areas that we're not going to dig deeper down on actual recommendations. So what are the requirements for the recommendations? Of course it is identification of that, definition of desired outcomes, what metrics we want, potential problems in attaining data that was needed for putting the metrics into place, and what timeframe do we expect to have this recommendation put in place. Next slide.

Definition of current baseline. Any data that's retained by ICANN or the community that we may be able to use as part of that. Industry metric sources that would be applicable to the recommendation any community input, any surveys or studies which we have done survey with both the structures and individuals in the community, and consensus on the recommendation. So it's either full consensus or consensus on the recommendation. Next slide.

ATRT2 completed its work in December 2013, they had 12 recommendations with 46 distinct components. The recommendations were mostly focused on the Board and the GAC. Implementation was completed or it was reported to be completed in 2018, 100% and ATRT3, of course, as every review team is, mandated to go back and take a look at the implementation of the recommendations from the previous version of that review team. So,

as we did that, I'm sorry this is the background ATRT3, to cover that, Cheryl, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep, this is my part. Try to mooch into my part? We had our first meeting on the auspicious date of April 1st, 2019, and because we are the only review team that is, by law, limited, we're time bound to a 12-month period. So we have no choice about how long we last, we last 12 months, that is it, it says so in the rules. So we have to be completed by March 30, 2020. Yes, we do know that we were originally scheduled to launch a good year ahead in 2018 per the bylaws, but there were all sorts of terribly good reasons, not the least of which was the transition and the work that had been going on with IANA Transition and the CCWGs.

With that, we had an original composition around 18 members, which you can see the breakdown there. There has been a little bit of attrition, nothing that has in our view, Pat, I think you would agree, affected our working practices. One thing we might just mention to you, we had Maarten Botterman, it was our pleasure to have him as our ICANN Board member from the beginning. And notice that he is a member of our team, not a liaison to our team, an actual member. This is the first time that the review team has had a Board member representing that part of the overall ICANN world as an interested party. So it's a little more like a take from the significantly interested parties point of view than it had ever been before.

Now obviously Maarten is taking up his Vice-Chair duties in his transition at the end of this week to becoming the new Chairman of the Board, and so he's not going to spend all this extra time with us, although his input has been very real and very valuable in the work we've done so far and the Board has appointed Leon Sanchez to be his replacement with us for the rest of our work. Next slide please.

We're going to be making, and this is where you come into play, some slightly different approaches on recommendations and strong recommendations.

PAT KANE:

So certainly just a little bit before that, anything that we don't get to as a full blown recommendation based upon the standard, the new standard operating procedures is that we will make suggestions, and again strong suggestions from the group as well. So we go to the next slide, please.

So when we take a look at the ATRT2 recommendations, again, I said that in October 2018, ICANN declared that 100% of the ATRT2 recommendations were complete. When we did our assessment, what we found was that 53% were completely implemented and 18% were not implemented in terms of the assessment of the ATRT3.

And then the remainder of that was some level of partial implementation. So, it's a part of the challenge there that I think that we're facing with this whole process, is really taking a look at the prescriptive nature of some of the recommendations. And so we went

to an absolute view of what the recommendation said, and whether it was implemented or not. It may have been addressed in a different manner. They may have tried, yes Brad.

BRAD VERD: Sorry to interrupt, just a question, do any of those or 18 or 29% fall into what would have been classified as suggested?

PAT KANE: That's a great question, Brad, this is Pat. So we did not make that assessment as to where we were and that's probably something we should take a look at with this, but we did not make that assessment as to whether what it would fall or look like if we addressed those as part of ATRT3 recommendation.

BRAD VERD: Just to give you guys context, we went through the RSSAC review and it was a very less than positive experience, let's say, and we've published a document on that one, and certainly you can go back and look at, but I really like the idea of recommendations and suggestions, I really like that idea.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, of course. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, what we've done is put that on ourselves as nomenclature and so we're hoping that [inaudible] increased it. What we have had up until the new gating

that is a required, not all of the above, but most of the above need to be met before you can call it a recommendation under the new guidelines.

We did have a great deal of variability in each of the ATRTs before. We certainly did in ATRT1 when I served on that, as well. We only ever made recommendations, and so there were things that were really not worthy of being recommended that probably got through and some of these things are simply out of place in time. They are things that should in common sense be retired, but there is no methodology for doing that. And so there's a few things that we will be talking about in a minute.

PAT KANE:

And one thing I would add too is from an accountability, transparency standpoint these were all recommended under the affirmation of commitments and so since we moved on to the transition, some of them are not applicable, but we did evaluate them from an absolute wording within the recommendation itself. So we can advance two slides, please. So, ATRT3 survey, we conducted two surveys, one for structures and one for individual respondents. We had 15 respondents from the structures and we had 88 individuals that responded, of which 50 answered all of our questions. Next slide.

So the strongest responses that we received in terms of information and feedback to us as to what ATRT3 should comment on, the very first one was prioritization. Specific in organizational reviews diversity

of Board members, public comment process and support for Board decisions. Next slide.

So, given the strong support for Board decisions, we did not include Board decisions as an ATRT3 item to consider. We did have the issue of GNSO policy development based upon a lot of the ATRT2 recommendations that we had and so the priorities that we determined to the process are again prioritization, specific and organizational reviews, diversity of Board members, PDPs, and the public comment process.

Cheryl touched upon the accountability indicators, we are just getting to those, we're deliberating those at this point in time. So we've not made any recommendations or had any thoughts about recommendations yet because we're just now getting to the process of reviewing those items.

So on prioritization, it was overwhelming in terms of what we got from structures in terms of 92% said that we should take a look at it and 73% of the individuals indicated that we should take a look at prioritization, which is not surprising, given that prioritization within the Brian Cote process around the evolution of multistakeholder model and that the Board itself has written a paper that was reviewed yesterday afternoon that had to do with prioritization, as well.

So it certainly is as a topic, although I'll be quite frank, when we talked about prioritization yesterday afternoon, the room was fairly empty so it's a big topic and am I going, three people are looking at it, is it really

that big of a priority? Because I think it was mostly filled with review team members from different review teams, but anyway. Next slide please.

This is a slide, we've gotten the Board paper, we're taking a look at that. The discussion yesterday with Aubrey and Becky certainly had some good ideas and some suggestions that we will take and put that into our final deliberations.

FRED BAKER: Question for you on that topic. Is it fair to assume that you're talking with Brian Cote?

PAT KANE: Absolutely, we're pretty much in sync with Brian. Well, we're very much communicating with Brian.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we're in close and regular communication with Brian.

PAT KANE: On reviews, I want to say that when it comes to reviews and how we're looking at reviews I think we have consensus within the ATRT3 that reviews are an issue. We're taking a look at reviews, not just in the review process itself, but how the recommendations are implemented. We've got consensus, it's a problem. We do not have consensus on where we want to go and what the recommendations

are going to look like. We're taking a look what happened with the CCTRT so the first time, I kind of refer to it as a line item veto or a line item discussion on what to do with each of these recommendations.

Seven were accepted, some were put in pending, some were issued over the GNSO because they're policy related So it's the first time we've seen that from a recommendation standpoint. And then again on the operating standards we've significantly increased the requirements upon review teams in terms of how we establish and what constitutes a recommendation in terms of the data behind the recommendation. Next slide please.

So when we took a look at the specific reviews or the substance of reviews, people were dissatisfied with that review and they recommended again that we took a look at it and it was overwhelming for both structures and for individuals. On the organizational reviews, next slide, please, we also got the same thing, dissatisfaction and overwhelming response from the survey, please take a look at this. Let's take a look at the next slide please.

So when we got to take a look at the reviews from the team. We said, alright, what are we solving for? What are the components that we want to take a look at as we evaluate what our recommendations are going to be? So here are some of the items that we're taking a look at. A lack of coordination overlap between reviews sometimes results in conflicting recommendations.

There are too many reviews. Reviews have to compete for ICANN's resources. Lack of time, lack of resources. Failure to properly implement some recommendations and reporting this, I think that's one of the biggest issues that we've identified, is that if you're going to make, like we heard yesterday from Tom Barrett on the NomCom review that they came up with 27 recommendations. Is that too many recommendations to compete for all the resources, given that you've got review teams that are SSR, ATRT, RDS, et cetera.

And then it's difficult because they are siloed reviews to take a look at a holistic or a systemic review of the entire organization together. Now we've talked about this in terms of there's organizational reviews but maybe we should take a look at reviews of how organizations interact. I kind of termed that a review of the white space in terms of how these different organizations come together. Next slide please.

So we're taking a look, and some of the words on here may be a little misleading because we're not taking a look just at fewer reviews, we're taking a look at having more effective reviews. So some of the considerations on the table are streamlining or putting picket fence around certain areas within reviews and keeping the same reviews within that process, collapsing into one organizational review or one substantial review, or even getting to a specific review for everything together in one in a period of time.

Now what came up yesterday in some conversations was a continuous process of improvement, which would look a little bit different from the standpoint of having some kind of group that would spit out

recommendations over time and become smaller more discrete pieces of work. And so what we'd like to do is get some feedback from this room on that particular process and what you think, given your experience with your reviews in terms of what would some of your ideas be here or how do you feel about some of these things that we've talked about in the last couple of slides.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS:

My name is Naveed, I'm a member of SSR2 review team, actually. So I'm just wondering, because one of the difficulties that the review team has faced is in terms of data collection of the previous implementation. So I wonder if you are considering something like a specific portal or online resource where the implementation status graphically or in some form is implemented and updated over time, so that we can just, that will help the future reviews in looking at where exactly is the status. Because if we don't get the data we get the feeling that it is not implemented.

However, in some cases, we have seen later that it was partially implemented or something like that in between, because there is no way to verify where exactly is that. So it's like dispersed information scattered here and there. So it would be great to combine that into one single resource that is available online and you can just check where the implementation of a specific.

PAT KANE:

Certainly, this is Pat again. So the Dashboard would be very, very helpful from the standpoint of tracking what's there and part of again what recommendations require is identification of where data exists and where data doesn't exist, and so that would be very helpful.

I would add that the other problem with having a six year span of getting all these recommendations, trying to complete from TRT2 is what was the intent of the people that did ATRT2 and some of the conversations we're having is how do we have a shepherd or a steward that continues on from the review team so you've got at least what the thought processes were behind what was being done. So when someone comes up and evaluates, because we're going back six years now saying hey Brian, what were you guys thinking back six years ago. And Brian's not sure anymore because it's not been on the top of his radar, but we do get some feedback. So that's a great recommendation, thank you very much.

Alright, diversity on the Board. So, the question that we asked in the survey was do you consider the diversity amongst Board members satisfactory, 48% of individuals and 69% of structures responded no. In comparison, a companion question regarding which diversity elements we're missing, we had a lot of feedback on geographic, different stakeholder groups, different constituencies, as well as many identified gender issue as well.

So given the bylaws on how Board members are selected, one of the things that we're taking a look at is who is asking or suggesting, which

probably will end up with is that SOs and ACs rotate in terms of which diversity spots do they fill. Is that correct? Yes, alright.

BRAD VERD:

The only comment I'll just add, from our point of view, our concern was technical in nature as a diversity topic. The kind of the discussion we had was that diversity for the sake of diversity is not always a good thing.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

And we are trying very hard, Cheryl for the record, very hard to talk about diversities, because what it means to each of us is different. People tend to stop at geo and gender, and there's a whole lot more to it than that. And we recognize that but we do think the sending entities need to take more responsibility on ensuring that this diversity is well reflected in the Board.

At the moment, the nominating committee basically gets to play catch up and clean up and sometimes, in particular the example, obviously, that these bylaws limited is geographic diversity, you can have a lot of other diversities, because a NomCom can't reappoint someone simply because the SOs have sent too many from that same region.

And so there are all sorts of components that can happen if we're not working in synchrony and there was an excellent paper put out by the ccNSO that did a lovely analysis on that. But the other thing is, this is also one of those times when different reviews are stepping over each

other's business because a lot of this has also been looked at in the nominating committee review. Bernie, you wanted to make a comment?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes, and also let's not forget the Workstream II recommendations on diversity.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely, thank you.

PAT KANE: Alright, so I'm recognizing that we've got about four minutes left, Brad, so if we can take a look at the public consultations. One of the things that we're taking a look at is that there's a there's a well defined public comment process. But we're starting to find that we're getting more information from ICANN Board, ICANN Org through different mechanisms to include blogs and those types of things.

And so what is that feedback loop? There's no defined or definite feedback loop from the community on those types of communications that are coming from ICANN Org and ICANN Board. So, one of the things we were kicking around is how do we put in place some way to give not necessarily a full blown public comment process as we know it today, but some other kind of mechanism such as Survey Monkey, specific questions that we would ask to the community as far as feedback to what's being published.

And I think one of them that that I've been interested in is Göran published his Fiscal Year 2020 goals a few weeks ago and what is the feedback on what some of those items really mean in terms of what they're trying to achieve, what the Board's trying to ask Göran to accomplish in Fiscal Year 2020. So we're taking a look at what that means, as well. Next slide please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was it was popular, obviously to do that. I think the data there is obvious.

PAT KANE: Yeah, so it just shows that people want to have us take a look at those particular items. Next slide. Same thing there to where people would, again, just more information on that. And there we go on that. So, Cheryl, if you want to close this out because PDPs we're still waiting under consideration by ATRT3 and I think we have next steps.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you could forward a few slides down, and again, there we go. So, this is where we are at this point in time, and we'll try and land this plane on an estimated time of arrival. ATRT3 is currently planning to publish a draft report for public consultation in mid December and we're planning on closing that at the end of January 2020.

We realize that there is a great deal of competition at this time for your attention, but please do try and remember that we really do value the

input of the community and the support organizations and advisory committees are vital to get feedback on our work because it will impinge on all of yours in the future. The only way to change, for example, specific reviews, is by ATRTs. So, if we want to make a change to how specific reviews are done, which I suspect you probably have some thoughts around this room or organizational reviews, this is the only way we can do it, in fact. ATRT3 is also very concerned that we will put into practice some of what we think will be good practice in the future.

And so we're going to include a set of questions, so if you don't want to read absolutely everything and comment on everything, there are some key questions to respond to and we'll also be making sure that we have a fulsome augmented Executive Summary so that that can be utilized as well. And with that, I believe, we've got to the very last slide that says, Thank you very much. And I think we took questions as we went through, but all back to you.

FRED BAKER:

I've got a question for you. RSSAC recently went through a review and we had some comments on that which we published as an RSSAC note. Did you guys see that? Has that been factored into your thinking?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

We haven't seen it very, but we'd very much like to.

FRED BAKER: Okay, I'll send you an email.

BRAD VERD: Thanks, Fred. Any other questions? Alright, seeing none, thank you for your time. Thank you for your report.

PAT KANE: Thanks, Brad.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks a lot.

BRAD VERD: Alright, as I said earlier, I have a scheduling conflict, so I'll be stepping out, I'll be turning this over to Fred, who is going to go through prepping for the Board meeting tomorrow since Kaveh is here, and then you guys will move on to metrics and I will catch up with you guys in the SSAC meeting.

FRED BAKER: Okay, now you had some particular things that you wanted to discuss prior to the Board meeting, do you want to just bring them up?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I think it's good just to be on the same page and make sure we are aligned. Basically there are three questions to discuss, either from the Board or from [inaudible] Board. I don't think the distinction matters much. But before opening up the session. I guess I will start the session.

I will do a quick summary of what we did. I'm not going to go into much detail about all the history of 37 and 38 because we have covered it in the past meetings, so I will quickly review them like maybe a few minutes I will explain more about the recent events which was the public comment for formation of CCWG and work plan and then the changes which were made, the approval, and upcoming Board resolution, because by then we still don't have a border solution, it will be the day after that the Board will vote on forming. So we'll do that and basically we'll go to the questions.

I think we will have a summary and I will also ask Staff to show the work plan. So we have a list of upcoming steps in front of us. I don't know if Carlos, who is not in the room or others want to show this slide deck, because it is the standard slide deck, which we have all seen. We might use that or I might just talk about it. I will have a chat with Carlos to see what they prefer.

And then to the questions, there was only which I had some comment on but I know there was another one which Lehman also had brought up. The one that I had a comment on was, basically, we brought it up as a question that was asked by the Board, but just so you just to recap. When Ram Mohan was on the Board as SSAC liaison he actually

brought up a question in one of our RSSAC meetings, but it wasn't a formal question, formal in the sense that it's not in the request tracking system or anything.

This was brought up verbally in a meeting. And if you remember, we asked the route operator to reply to that. So in root ops actually, we created a document the Threats To The Router System document and we published it. So now we are going back to the boat telling them, hey, you have asked us, have you thought about mitigation of threats, what are threats for the whole system. And we are going to get back to them and tell them, hey, this is a document.

The Board technical committee has already seen that document. They were very positive, very happy. I only got positive comments. This is really good, covers basically everything, so I'm sure we will receive praises in the meeting. One thing that came up was this was never formally connected to the question by the Board. So now root ops is publishing something, but RSSAC has not published anything to refer to that document. This is more bureaucratic chain of documents, more than anything.

It was brought up by one member and of course, one possible suggestion is to just have one paragraph from RSSAC saying the Board has asked us that question, Root Ops has published that document, we think this fulfills that requirement. That basically fills the documentation hole. But the other thing is we can also discuss with them and ask, why do you even need such a thing? The document

lives there, you know it's there. Because I think that will be brought up.

FRED BAKER:

I think Brad's question, of course Brad had to leave, but Brad's question was so we sent that document to the Board in an email that said you should read this, this answers that question. So, what else is really necessary? Do I need to dress it in a gilded suit of armor?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

We never send it to the Board as such. It was sent to the BTC as basically, hey this document lives here, correct? But again, because even formally this wasn't a formal question or formal request for advice from the Board. This was just brought up in a meeting verbally. So we can also say, hey, there was a verbal question we can publish something, but that's up to us. I really don't see any difference, to be honest, even if you make a statement. I think it's just a decision we have to make either way. And I don't think anybody else over there is too much fixated on any of it.

FRED BAKER:

Now, to that end, I asked Staff and I think Andrew put together a paragraph and a link, would that respond to the concern?

KAVEH RANJBAR: From my point of view, yes, Andrew, can you put that up, if we have that? Thank you. So basically, Andrew drafted one paragraph which is again, this is very bureaucratic, from my point of view, chain of documents.

WES HARDAKER: It is bureaucratic, but I understand that the Board needs advice coming from the councils that they expect advice from and that one paragraph, there's no downside to it, so let's do it and vote on it, it seems trivial.

KAVEH RANJBAR: That's what I think as well. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, for the bureaucracy, it might seem like that. But the Board also has a tracking system and that is being used by reviews. So if it's not, if not all the checkboxes are in there when the Board undergoes review, they will receive criticism for not having followed up on these things. So I would agree with you Kaveh, it seems unnecessary, but it might actually be part of the transparency mechanisms that the communities have put in place from above.

FRED BAKER: So, this is my proposal and I'm willing to be told I'm wrong, but I'd like to have Andrew put that up in a Google doc, we can kick it around for

as long as we need to. According to our rules RSSAC 0 Version 4, it has to be stable for a week and then we vote on it. What I really wanted to do was have us just go ahead and read it tonight and vote on it tomorrow morning.

That doesn't work according to our rules. But, you know, if we can put it out there and maybe a week from now decide that it's not changing, and then take an email vote, then we should be able to give that a number and send it off to the Board. Does that accomplish your goal?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I think yes. And so what I can do, if generally we're okay with this, we can actually make sure that this is with the Board, so we show it during the meeting and say this is a statement we are planning to vote on, of course we cannot say it will be voted, does that resolve your concern?

Because there is no time pressure, it was just a concern, and if generally the Board says this is okay, then we know, and hopefully it will be voted on. This is the statement, I think it's very benign, it exactly says what it should say, nothing more, nothing less. So if you agree with that, we can show it tomorrow and say this is not yet voted on, but we will vote on it, in a week or two weeks, whenever the next RSSAC meeting is, we will have it as a formal statement.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and tomorrow I believe you're on the agenda as liaison to the Board, correct? During the RSSAC meeting tomorrow morning.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Oh yes, yes.

FRED BAKER: So, we could discuss it briefly during that slot, and then take the email process. So, okay. Second question. Well, and you will show this tomorrow, so let's not go through this now, in view of time. Let's go on to the second question.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, my other question, I think you're referring to...

FRED BAKER: Well, we had three questions that we wanted to put to the Board.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, so the second one was, which Liman also commented on, that's the question from the Board, I think that's #3, if you can scroll down a bit. Oh yes, Readiness to implement the three plans for ICANN future, I don't see the rest of the text, but it's basically asking us, which is asking all of the SOs and ACs, the Board is asking if they think, what's your feedback on these three plans, basically in short. And there was a bit of discussion on the mailing list, we can say we don't have any

comment, we can go to commenting, that's up to each individual member, I guess. But as the moderator of the session, I would like to know how do we want to proceed.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, so having talked with Cherene, and with Cherene, Maarten, and spoken with Dave Conrad, the Board, as far as I know, is very much on board with RSSAC037 and is taking the steps to make that happen. There's a fair amount of crank turning that has to happen according to the rules and part of that is that the Board will actually formally say that in a resolution this week, which, what is it, 16 months after we gave it to them, them finally saying yes seems like a good thing.

Personally, I get a little frustrated with the timing, okay it is what it is. There has been a fair amount of discussion and there will be future discussion. Thursday, Friday, I was introduced to Xavier, whatever his last name is, the CFO at ICANN. He tells me that there will be meetings that he's conducting thinking through dollars and cents with respect to RSSAC037, and he's hoping for comments from this community.

And the good news is that I live a two hour drive from where that's happening, so I can come down fairly easily and be involved in that, getting people to come from I don't know Tokyo and Rotterdam could be interesting, but we'll be coming back to this group and saying, gee, I was asked question, what do you think about this, and looking forward to your opinions.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Should we state that to the Board?

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Should we mention that in the meeting that this is going to happen and we are planning to participate, provide feedback to CFO [inaudible]?

FRED BAKER: Well, I'm certainly willing to hear that. I would think that the CFO also talks to the Board.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I know, but I think it's important if it's RSSAC intention, it's good that RSSAC states that.

FRED BAKER: I haven't heard from anybody else, but it's my intention. Okay. And then part of that really goes to the third question. So let's skip to that. And Jeff, this is really your question. So let me report. Okay, we need to go to the next page, I think. We've got the headline and that's it. Oh, okay, that's all we've got here.

So Brad and I met Saturday, had lunch with Dave Conrad and a few of his buddies and we asked him trying to edge into the question of service level expectations and service level agreements as opposed to running in there and saying this is what we've got going on now please open your kimono.

Asking them, are you thinking about this, is this somewhere on your radar. If not fine, we'll stop thinking about it. David told us that, frankly, it had not been something he was -- there were questions going around within OCTO but primarily, no, they weren't sitting down and trying to draw up formal descriptions of an SLA or contracts or anything like that.

And then when he said kind of off the top of his head, what we would probably be looking for is something like, what he gave was a description of an SLA for the RSS, not for an RSL, for the RSS, which now, two years ago, three years ago when we were talking about this, the picture I had in my mind, and I think many of us had in our minds was okay, I've got however many root server organizations and maybe there's an association or something that is a collection of them, and that something might in turn have a contract with the Board.

That would actually be responsive to the question of can I have an SLA for the RSS. He didn't comment because it hadn't been top of mind for him, but how to have an SLA with an RSL. What he wants for the RSS, is he wants the system to work, and he's looking for a computer that is looking for an answer to actually get it with high probability.

Now bringing that back to, okay, I have three servers, they're all located on the moon. How does that relate to an SLA for the RSS. His thinking simply hadn't gone that far. Last night, Brad and I had a meeting with Shireen and with Maarten. And first thing that we wanted to walk out of that meeting with was we've been meeting with you Shireen at every ICANN meeting for the past however long and we'd like to see continuity of the relationship with the Board and with the Board Chair and Maarten said yes, absolutely. You know, we've gone over that, we will have continuity.

And then we asked that question, have you thought about service levels and how you would want to structure that and we wound up having a fairly long discussion and what Göran has told Brad and I is that he would like to see a situation where the RSO does whatever it does. And then if ICANN wants more, wants to improve its statistics, add 1000 root servers, something like that, then ICANN should pay for the more that it wants arm. Which Jeff's comment yesterday, day before?

I don't think he wakes up and thinks that, is that we have been providing a service for quite some time and there is value in that. If ICANN wants to have accountability with the RSOs, then maybe it should start paying for that service or, you know, in, in some sense, account for that value and not just the additional value, but the value, because that's a value to ICANN, it's a value to the TLDs. Russ, let me let you get in.

RUSS MUNDY: Just a quick question Fred, I have not looked in much detail at the GWG charter recently. Are some of these issues supposed to be addressed in that process in terms of, particularly the funding and service level and so forth? I just don't remember.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah, I think in general, yes, but to summarize, because, what Fred is pointing out, they are all real issues, but actually I think first we have to tackle the main one. And these are all subsequent issues coming from the main one. And the main one is accountability and how ICANN wants root server appraisers to be accountable, because if they really want to say okay RSS as a system, this is the SLA for RSS. that's what we want, we want to contract out, which I think is a professional way of doing it, just as an organization if you stay away because you don't want all the details about how it works.

You just say, okay, I have to have DNS working stable and secure, so I have these minimum requirements for the root server system. If ICANN wants that and wants to go that model then basically that's one, as Fred mentioned, that's one SLA with one organization and that organization has to figure out on their own, basically, with some high level guidelines, how they do RSOs and what are the requirements, how on boarding operates, and so that will be all in that organization and how they do SL As and funding and everything. But if ICANN wants to deal with RSOs individually, with individual SLAs, then the nature of all of these questions will change.

So I think, first we have to answer that, like, what is the expectation from ICANN, and this is not org. This is not a decision about org. The community should bring in and the Board has to decide at what level they want to engage with RSOs in the long run. This is for the future. Do they want a system, or do they want to deal with operators and I think that changes a lot. If you look at the TLD model, they like to deal with registries, not registrars.

So in that sense, I guess one organization is also what they would prefer, but I think that's up for discussion and our input has a lot of value on that, a lot of weight. So if you have an opinion it would go a long way if you form an advice or something and provide it, this will definitely have some effect.

FRED BAKER:

Well, and I would argue we gave them that advice in 37. Ozan, you wanted to get in?

OZAN SAHIN:

Sorry for the interjection, this is Ozan for the record. We have about 25 minutes to the end of the session and we are now eating up from the 30 minutes that we wanted to give to RSS metrics discussion, just as a reminder.

FRED BAKER:

This session ends at 10:15, is that correct? Okay, so thank you for keeping me on track. So the other comment that I have is that in the

contracts that ICANN makes with the TLDs, it tells them that there will be root service, so that is actually a contractual requirement between ICANN and the TLDs.

From my perspective, if we want to talk about where the money would come from to fund whatever they're going to do with root operators, it should come from the people that are primarily served by the root operators which I would argue are the TLDs, it's my opinion.

So at any rate, we have had those meetings and those comments and that's pretty much as far as it's gone, and yes, we do need to move along to the Russ and Duane show, but I wanted to fill you in on those conversations that we've had with Shireen and with Maarten and with Dave Conrad.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So, for the session tomorrow and to make the conversation more fruitful, do we agree that what I just mentioned that one organization, ICANN should deal with one organization basically as the RSS and that organization should decide how the whole RSS works.

As Fred says and I agree, this is basically in 37, but if that's our interpretation, maybe it's good to start that conversation with the Board to make sure they're on the same page, they have the same understanding, because that will automatically put any discussion about direct contracts with any RSO from ICANN Org, that would put it aside.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, I don't think I'm going to have that on a Zoom call, that might be something that we want to talk about among ourselves before we go public. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: I guess was going to comment, conceptually having a Board say I want to deal with just one entity, unless the GWG somehow figures out a way to define something that you can write a contract with, RSS is, yes, it's a system from a functionality and a conceptual perspective, but there is no legal entity that is constituted.

So there would have to be, I believe, something created that would somehow then be required to do those interconnections to the actual RSOs. Hopefully the Board understands that. But it's almost like they're saying it's too hard for us to solve the problem. We want another single entity that we can just go and say, do this.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I just wanted to point out that this is kind of the golden spot for us because as soon as the GWG is formed and it starts working, of course, we have our seats there, but it will have life of its own. And it will make decisions, sometimes even our people might disagree, but there might be majority, so keep that in mind that, especially the advice we give in the period until they are operationally active will have a lot, this is personal experience, of course, but it will have a lot more weight

than what we provide during the GWG, because their distribution of power is very clear, we have three seats from RSOs and structure, but right now if there is something we want to clarify, because 37 for the GWG will be written in stone, right, these core values. So any advice also in this period will be similar to that until they're up and running and starting, then we will have a voice, but we won't be the prominent voice.

FRED BAKER: So if we want to build a legal entity, the time to do it is now, or last year.

KAVEH RANJBAR: For me it was mostly about advice.

FRED BAKER: Liman, you wanted to get in?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, having a construct where there is this single entity to deal with is, I think, not what we envisaged in 37, but It could morph into that with the GWG, and if so, then that's what the community wants to have. It doesn't necessarily mean that we have to create a new such body, we need the function again, but we might be able to attribute that to an existing body somewhere and if you just think of the general

principle with registries who contract DNS operators you actually do have a registry which could contract DNS operators, it's called IANA.

So there are ways you can work around that, but it will require a lot more discussion, I think. And also that's not the only solution, having a separate entity would also solve that problem and could be better from some perspectives, just want to hold up that are a number of alternatives here that we can work with.

FRED BAKER:

We have other comments at the table? Seeing none, I'm going to just kind of leave that question on the table, but that's something that we are going to have to figure out some kind of a resolution to. And at this point, I need to turn this over to Russ and Duane and let them finish their metrics work.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Very quick, just one second, to make sure we are ready for tomorrow. So the first question, try to do root server system that's simple, we will just go through the document and if they need that paragraph. The second one, the involving the RSS, we will go through the history and GWG where we are and then of course there will be discussions. The third question we will leave it to the floor, we don't have any specific answer, but if any individual operator wants to contribute, they can. That's basically the future plans of ICANN. Fair enough? Okay. Thank you very much.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: The comment on the strategy plan, does it have to be limited to the scope of RSSAC?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No it doesn't, anyone can comment.

FRED BAKER: And by the way, after the break, I expect the Board to walk into this room, so that's where that meeting will happen.

DUANE WESSELS: So we'll talk about metrics. Now in the last 15 minutes or so. If you don't have the document up, you might want to bring it up. I think it was on display; okay, Ozan, can you go down to page 8 and it's the very last part of Section 2, you can just click on Terminology on that tab there if you want to, I guess, Okay, just scroll down, scroll up a little bit, just want to point out that in the terminology section I added a couple of new entries here because we didn't have anything that said what a vantage point was or what the collection system was. These are very short, just to sort of get them on the record. I expect Paul Hoffman who is not able to make this meeting, might have some opinions about this.

Okay, Ozan, let's scroll down some more to the start of Section 4. I went through last night and did the sort of difficult task of changing a

lot of instances of RSO into RSI and this is the first place where the document starts using RSI. So obviously there will be some work to do in synchronizing this with the terminology document, but sort of from this point on, you will see more instances of RSI than RSO. So, this is this is a little bit of a forward reference here because here in reporting, we start talking about RSI, but then Ozan if you scroll down to, well, actually we'll just do these in order. Let's see, I'll get to that in a second.

So I also added a new Section 4.10 which Wes, is Wes still here? Yeah, this is something I'd like you to look at in particular because this is sort of based on conversations that we had. So this is the section, the title is Potential Effects of Metrics on Independence and Diversity, and it sort of makes the point our intention here is not to require root server operators into any certain architectures or design choices, that we still value diversity and independence, and it references the RSSAC 042 document which talks about independence and this sort of ends with if there is evidence that these metrics are infringing on our diversity independence that maybe that's the cause to reevaluate them.

WES HARDAKER:

Yeah, thanks, a lot of the points I think I raised were not in the meeting, so to recap, I brought up a concern with a couple of people including Brad, who's now gone, and Duane, that one thing I have a concern with about very tightened down metrics is the instant you get down to the point of we need low latency we need N number of geographical nodes, we're basically dictating architecture and one of

the whole fundamental tenants in 37 was independence of architecture and that people could come up with different things. So that's where a lot of this is coming from. And I like that wording a lot. I think that works.

The only other thing that has occurred to me in the past week thinking about this is, it would be good if somewhere we could put in a note saying if some operator believes that they want to bring something truly different and unique to the table, and in the process of doing that they could not meet one of these metrics, they could basically apply and say, I still want to be an operator and I want an exclusion to this one in order to bring this other unique thing that you're not even measuring, that's not even on the table at the moment. It might be they want to put it in a satellite, I don't know, on the moon, when is all that kind of stuff going to happen.

I've talked about putting something in a bunker, I've talked about putting something in deepest, darkest Peru, you know, the types of things that are basically going to fail under these metrics and I don't know if we want to add that kind of concept here but I'm happy with this paragraph. Thanks for adding it.

DUANE WESSELS:

I think this would be the place to put it If you did want to, I will leave it to you if you want to come up with something to add, or someone else. Ken?

KEN RENARD: I think that's a great idea. But having the notion of who would arbitrate that, who would make that decision, will be good to have in the document too.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, I think to some extent this is the wrong document to put it in, but we don't have a better one, because that's really whatever is going to come out of the GWG or 37 Biz, or something like that would be the place for that to be.

KEN RENARD: Definitely good to have the placeholder, that's a really good concept going forward.

FRED BAKER: Well, question, if a root server operator said that it was trying to address a specialized community of some kind...

WES HARDAKER: Probably a disadvantaged community, but go ahead...

FRED BAKER: It seems like that root server operator would not be providing a general global service and it might be worthwhile to simply say that these metrics in terms of the measurements coming from the 20 vantage points, whatever they are, would be of the global service and

would not be attempting to measure. You could use the same algorithms, you could use the same whatever, but would not be attempting to measure the service to a specialized community.

WES HARDAKER:

So, Brad said sort of similar statements to me and where I think I disagree with that assessment is that these metrics are designed to measure the global service as how we see them today. I suspect that there's elements of the globe that are not adequately addressed by these metrics, there may be people that we are leaving out.

We know that Africa is a gigantically developing community and if we decided to put, if somebody came along and said I really want to concentrate on Africa because it's horribly lacking at the moment but my latency is going to look really bad because I'm really concentrating on the place where I see the greatest growth and the greatest need, do we exclude them because their concentration doesn't meet our current definition of metrics?

So there may be future metrics or future things that somebody might identify and say, you know what, we know that we need to revamp metrics in the future in order to meet this missing element of a global service. In the meantime, I want to start now, I want to get this addressed now, and maybe we will redefine metrics in the later so it better covers everything. Liman has his hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, you just finished what I wanted to say. I think that we should have the metrics documented that apply to the system as it works now. I think we should have text in there that very clearly states the expectation to change this in the future in directions that we don't know right now, and I would like to see the process for making that change fairly lightweight.

I don't want to put too much, too much fuzz in here that speaks to things that we haven't even thought of yet. I'm happy to think of new things. I'm happy to make sure that we can adapt to new things, but to spend a lot of time here now about things in the future that we don't really know about yet is I think, I don't really want to use the phrase a waste of time because it's not, but I think we should focus on getting this in place first. But absolutely, to be open for future changes.

WES HARDAKER: My thinking is that the ICANN Board will ultimately have the responsibility and they would have the weight to say we read this whole proposal, it's very strange, but that's their job, not this document.

DUANE WESSELS: In the interest of time, I'm going to let Fred have the last say on this topic, and then we've got to move on.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, so this comment originated with the IPPM working group in the IDF and I got told what the difference is between a metric and measurement. A metric is how you measure something, a measurement is something that you do where you use that algorithm. And so I look at this document, and I find myself thinking that it tells me, first and foremost, how to measure things and then it turns around and talks about how to apply that, how to use that for perhaps an SLA or for something else.

My personal opinion, I would like those to be separate documents. One of them saying, I might measure latency, I might measure, whatever I'm going to measure. And then in a separate document, and if I was going to use this in a global SLA these things I would expect to be true. If I was using it in a specialized environment I might apply the same metrics in a different way.

I'm not convinced that coming in with a specialized community, I would actually change the things that I measure, I might change what thresholds I apply, there's number of things I could imagine changing, but not fundamentally what I measure or how I measure it. And I brought this comment up before, you've heard this from me before. So to me, Wes' comment is basically a request to separate the document.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah I did hear that from you before, and I understand, but I think at this point that's not realistic to separate, I mean, that's a version 2

thing or something else, because we've got a lot, I've got a lot invested in this document and we want to get to the end pretty soon. So if that's on the table, I think that's a huge, huge change. But I've only got 5 minutes left in this session, so I need to move on.

Section 5, there's a new paragraph that says a little bit more about why we use the phrase RSI and it gives an example with D root, that d.root-server.net is the identity and University of Maryland is the RSO. So just to give a little more context on that. Okay, let's scroll down. We still have I guess it's a little bit unresolved, the issue of the threshold for RSI latency. We'll talk about that in the caucus meeting later today. Scrolling, scrolling, scrolling, I guess that's pretty much it.

Also I did go through all the example, Section 8 is the examples, and previously they were very contrived with sort of ridiculous thresholds and now I've set them to the sort of the agreed upon thresholds so that readers won't be confused about why there's these two wildly different types of thresholds in the document.

Yesterday, Steve and Russ, myself met and we went through this and Steve has some proposal for restructuring the recommendation section a little bit and that that is not reflected in this document, we're sort of doing that in a side document. So, the ordering of things might change, but for the most part, the recommendations are going to stay the same, right Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: I think that's the case. But the difference, I think could be, if you will, substance, is that the table that currently makeup up 7.1 and 7.2 is actually a table of values.

The suggestion at this point and the thinking is rather than having that be specifically in a recommendation, that it be moved to a section just before that describes it as a summary, because it is indeed a summary of the values that show up in the rest of the document. That way we get away from having explicit find numeric values and recommendation. It just says, here's a summary of the values and the rest of the document. So that's something for folks to think about the impact of that.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, and then along those same lines, yesterday Brad was suggesting to put the recommendations into a separate document, to split it out like 037, 038, and so that has not been done. I think we still need to think that through and see if we really want to do that.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Just a comment regarding the document. I think it's a first document of maybe a series. So I think it's good if everything is packed into one. It's a starting point. Because then we will have a document on recommendations about something that might evolve over time. So I think it's done and we should ship it.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay, thanks. So my intention for the caucus meeting today is to give a high level overview of the document as a whole, similar to what we did in the very first session of the RSSAC workshop a month ago, so that if anyone hasn't been following along, they'll have a high level sense of what it's like. And if there are questions on particular things we can we can dive into some details.

But at this point, it'll be just a high level overview about 30 minutes long I think is what we're planning on for the session today. And I'm working on the slides and I'll get them to you. So I think that's it. We've got a couple minutes left in the session if we want to have questions right now. Oh, that's right, yeah, thank you for reminding me. So another thing we talked about yesterday was adding some examples of how do you do calculate median latency and things like that.

So I didn't get this as complete as I wanted to but I did take sort of a first pass at it and I sent them to Ozan and he can put them up on the screen here. So this is based on data from the RIPE ATLAS anchors, which I think are most like what we're proposing for this work where these are machines located in data centers, online all the time. And so this is data for the month of September. These two lines show the cumulative distributions for IPv6 and IPv4, IPv4 is shown in purple and IPv6 in green.

So for this particular operator, you can see that it has a little bit better latency over v6 than v4. The vertical line represents our 250 millisecond UDP threshold. You can scroll through all of them Ozan,

you can see the different ones, or not, that's just one of them? This is just for one operator. I did make graphs for all the other ones, well, I don't know if we want to do it now because it's time to break, maybe people want to go. But we can also display this during the caucus meeting and people can look at this. If anyone wants to see them one on one, I'll be happy to show you on my laptop.

RUSS MUNDY: Any last comments or thoughts?

DUANE WESSELS: I don't want to hold people here past the break time if you don't want to, so we can look at it later, Ozan, I think. Yeah.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, let me put the question out, do people want to stay and look at these or are people interested in a cup of coffee? Okay, let's take a break.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'll just note that the next meeting with the SSAC is a closed meeting for RSSAC and SSAC members only, and it is in this room.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]