
FRED BAKER: Let me run down the list. Cogent are you here?

PAUL VIXIE: Mm-hmm.

FRED BAKER: So, Paul is here. DISA?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson's here.

FRED BAKER: Terry was here.

MATT LARSON: I guess just Matt.

FRED BAKER: ISC, I'm here, Jeff is here. NASA?

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.

KEITH BLUESTEIN: Keith and Tom are here.

FRED BAKER: Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here.

FRED BAKER: RIPE NCC?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, UMD?

KARL REUSS: Karl is here.

FRED BAKER: USC ISI? Suzanne is here. Okay, ARL?

HOWARD KASH: Howard and Ken here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Verisign?

MATT WEINBERG: Matt is here.

FRED BAKER: And WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Kaveh is not here, so I guess the Liaison to the Board isn't here.
CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, RZERC?

BRAD VERD: Yes.

FRED BAKER: SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes.

FRED BAKER: IAB? Daniel, you're around here somewhere, there you are. Okay, IANA Functions, Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: Yes.

FRED BAKER: Root Zone Maintainer.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: Cool, and we have a number of staff here. Okay, thank you, that's the roll call. Now, what's happening with the agenda, I sent out an email 20 minutes ago or thereabouts. One of us had a flight change and needs to leave earlier than planned, and as a result, we're swapping the 9:00 meeting for the 10:45 meeting. Apologies, I know that affected Kaveh, I don't know who else it might have affected, but apologies to them. Beyond that, we have some administrivia. We have a draft ICANN66 schedule, a draft report for this that we will be talking about, three work

items, and then various reports. Is there any agenda basing to be done? People want to change the agenda in any way? Seeing none, okay, so we have reviewed the agenda. Ozan, do you want to talk about the draft minutes?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred, this is Ozan. The draft minutes from the September monthly teleconference on Monday, the 23rd of September. We haven't received any feedback or comments on that. The Action Items have been completed. If you do have any questions, I'm pausing here. Otherwise, it will be ready for a vote on this meeting.

FRED BAKER: Okay. There is a caucus membership review going on, Matt is going to report on that.

OZAN SAHIN: Fred, excuse me, the draft minutes from the 23rd of September is a vote item, so RSSAC needs to vote on them.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Fred and Ozan, just so you know, I don't know if you had the roll call already or not, but I'm on the call, Kaveh speaking.

FRED BAKER: I'm reminded we have to vote on the minutes, and yes, we do. Okay, is anybody opposed to the minutes? Are there going to be any negative

votes? Anybody abstaining? Absent that, everybody voted yes, so okay, they're adopted.

Okay, there is intended to be a caucus membership committee update this morning, Matt wasn't able to make it, so we'll defer that until next month. Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: I'm happy to give the update.

FRED BAKER: Oh, fine, Carlos go ahead.

CARLOS REYES: Matt and I met yesterday, this is Carlos, by the way. Matt and I met yesterday, as you know the membership committee has been reaching out to caucus members who haven't been active. So last month we reached out to 28 caucus members that have had no participation since they joined and we've heard back from some, we haven't heard back from 19 of them, and I think 3 asked to be removed, job assignments, life, et cetera. So we have 3 people who have asked to step down from the caucus, and we're just tracking the rest. So, Matt and I will keep you updated and hopefully by next month we will have a clearer picture of those 28 for RSSAC consideration in Montreal.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thanks Carlos. And you're on next to talk about Chair, Vice Chair, and all that.

CARLOS REYES: Thank you, so as you recall, earlier this year RSSAC approved changes to operational procedures to sunset the Co-Chair model and institute a Chair/Vice Chair model. That went through the Board because it would require changes to the bylaws and those bylaws have been approved. Now we're in the empowered community process so we have to go through a series of steps where the empowered community has to consider it, because they are changes to the ICANN bylaws.

There will be an empowered community forum at the Montreal meeting. At this point we're really not expecting any fireworks over this. The public comment proceeding over these issues didn't really yield any feedback. So everyone is anticipating that we just need to go through the motions of the empowered community approval process.

So then, when that happens and the bylaws come into effect, RSSAC 000 Version 4 will come into effect and we're anticipating that should be right along the same timing of the usual RSSAC election timeframe. So thankfully that worked out. At that point the discussions that RSSAC had in Kobe, the plan is for Brad's Co-Chair spot to essentially become the Vice-Chair spot, so that way Fred can finish his two year term, so his first year would be as Co-Chair and his second year would be as Chair, and the RSSAC would elect a new Vice-Chair later this year. So the new team would start on January 1st.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so I have another year as Chair, and we have to elect a Vice-Chair for next year. Okay. Now, Brad asked me a question yesterday about that position. Can he be the Vice-Chair? My understanding from RSSAC from Section 1.2.4 is that he has to skip a year. Am I correct in that?

CARLOS REYES: Currently RSSAC 000 Version 3 is in place, which require a year break. So, when 000 Version 4 comes into force, that is also written in there, it's just a question of whether or not the switchover impacts it, because technically it's a new role.

FRED BAKER: Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I have comment and question. I'm responsible for that paragraph and the intention was that no one should be allowed to sit for an extended period of time. The thing I want to see is that there is a gap, and if you trick that into rotating between Chair and Vice-Chair, you kind of ruin that part, so I would argue that the dictation should be just for a year's gap, and if that isn't clear from the text, we need to rewrite the text in a subsequent version of the document. That was the comment. The question is when do you see the timeframes here open for nominations and voting, and so on?

FRED BAKER: Ozan, do you remember the date of the empowered community action?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Ozan, actually it will be considered over by the last day of the ICANN meeting.

CARLOS REYES: So that would be November 8th, I think, November 7th, right around that timeframe. So the empowered community process will be over, and then at that point we can start the nomination process for RSSAC which is the usual timeframe, November, December election, starting in January. Just to clarify, there was no trying to trick any system and the conversation was just try to offer help to Fred.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here, I didn't see that happening here now. I just want to make sure that it doesn't happen sometime in the future with other people.

FRED BAKER: Speaking for myself, I would be very happy to have Brad as my Co-Chair, but my understanding of the rules is that can't be. So we'll have nominations and we'll figure that out. Okay, so that's the Vice-Chair update. Okay, Carlos, do you want to talk about the nominating committee?

CARLOS REYES: These are all related. So, you'll recall that we've been discussing the impact of the organizational review of the nominating committee. One

of the recommendations called for giving the RSSAC a vote on the nominating committee so they wouldn't be a liaison but actually a delegate on the NomCom. The Board has adopted the review and now they're moving forward. We had discussed what the impact is for this group. Frankly we're just in a holding pattern as they work through the recommendations. I think it was Recommendation 27, so they have some time to go before they start changing things. So, we'll just continue to monitor that.

They're working through the recommendations and eventually we'll hear from the NomCom and ICANN Legal about how to synchronize all of this. In my conversations with ICANN Legal and based on how they see the recommendations moving forward, it may end up being a situation where whatever conversations are happening about the governance model may actually complement this process. So we may be able to do everything in one big change to the bylaws rather than a piecemeal approach, just because of timing, really. So, any changes that happen to RSSAC as a result of the 37 implementation may complement the organizational review of the nominating committee.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, next I'm supposed to ask you at RSS governance.

CARLOS REYES:

Thank you, and then I'm done after this. I think Kaveh is on the line and I'll ask him to speak for the BTC portion of this, but yesterday the BTC had a meeting. If you recall, we put together, after the 37 and 38 documents were delivered to the Board, a few months passed and then

we put together a concept paper by the ICANN organization, 37, 38, the concept, all of this was out for public comment this summer. We received good feedback. All of that has been documented and it's publicly archived.

One of the immediate actions, though, was to consider one of the recommendations from SSAC. SSAC requested a seat on the governance working group rather than just a liaison function. So after discussions, ICANN Org proposed to go ahead and accept that and the BTC considered that yesterday. I'll pause here to see if Kaveh has anything to add about the BTC, and Kaveh, if you could share the decision and then I'll talk about next steps.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sure, thank you, can you hear me?

CARLOS REYES: Yes.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay, so basically the idea from the discussion in BTC went smooth, there are no major changes, there were a few wording changes, which I'm sure Carlos can mention. There was a bit of discussion around should we even change that or not, because the idea is this has been gone through the public comment process and all of that, so changing text, except of course the outcome of the public comment process, but changing text in this step might be basically, people might ask okay,

then you had a public comment and then you're changing text on your own. So, there was a bit of discussion on that.

But generally the BTC accepted to basically send the document as is with very small wording changes which I'm sure Carlos can point out, to the Board. So I think based on that with this planning, the Board will pass resolution in Montreal. Another bit of news is Carlos is now added to the BTC list, which I think is a very welcome addition to the BTC list, because he can first hand be part of discussions about RSSAC. He will be there until this project is done. So congratulations to Carlos, and I think it's very good for us as well, to have Carlos directly on the BTC list.

CARLOS REYES:

Thanks, Kaveh. So, just to clarify for everyone here in the room, so the BTC accepted the SSAC recommendation and there will be a resolution for the Board to consider in Montreal and then we'll get started with the convening of the GWG. Kaveh mentioned some minor wordsmithing, of course all of that will continue to be shared. Any documents that BTC reviews, Kaveh has the permission of the BTC to share, as you know. So, anything I prepare, you will still receive from Kaveh. I'm just there to help the BTC with their work. Any questions?

FRED BAKER:

Thank you, so Ozan, do you want to tell us about ICANN66?

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Fred. This is Ozan with an update on ICANN66 schedule. We circulated the draft schedule in our last monthly teleconference.

This is current version of it. As I noted previously, they want Saturday as open because of the DNS org meeting and basically we simply received two notices, one from the ICANN Board Operations Team, they're having a meeting with ICANN Board on Wednesday and for this meeting as usual they are requesting three questions by the 14th of October, but this time there is an alternative, the RSSAC can come up with a single discussion topic and submit that instead of three questions. So this will be the first thing to discuss I think at this meeting.

The other note we received is an internal note from the finance team. The finance team is looking to provide an update on FIY-21 finance notes and they are also interested to provide some updates on the following topics, the Five Year Financial Plan, FIY-21 Operating Plan, FIY-19 Financials, FIY-20 Updates, and the Accountability and Transparency Reporting. So, if there is interest from RSSAC, we will go ahead and coordinate this meeting. Basically open for discussion now for the session with the Board whether we will submit three questions or one single discussion topic and the finance session.

BRAD VERD:

Let's cover the easy one first, which I think is the finance one. So, the request came in to Fred and I, we talked about it in the Admin committee, my answer was I didn't think a lot of people would want to get a financial update, I don't know how many people have sat through financial updates, they're not very exciting. But obviously if Finance wants to give an update, Fred and I will go and do that, but I didn't know if it was worth everybody's time to sit in a meeting and get a financial update. Or, we could carve out 15 minutes in one of our

meetings and have them come in, give an update, and then leave. So, those are kind of the options, so I'd love to hear what people want.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Liman here. I'm not looking for that update, but just out of curiosity, does anyone of you know whether they will be giving that update somewhere else in the system, so if there was the odd person of RSSAC who was really, really interested, that you would sit in on another session and have roughly the same update?

BRAD VERD:

Fred and I certainly don't know.

OZAN SAHIN:

This was not a request on my side to have this update. Me and my big mouth.

FRED BAKER:

For the record, Terry is now in the room. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, topics and questions for the ICANN Board. My initial thought is that the big topic that I have for the ICANN Board is what is going on with RSSAC37. Are there other questions that are on the table? I don't see any. I guess, Brad, we can tell them that would be the topic we want to talk about. Do you agree?

BRAD VERD: The only other question maybe that can come up is do they feel that we are doing everything to address their concern about the narrative. They asked us back in San Juan is the narrative is something bad happens, and I know that we've talked about the document from the root server operators here in this room, that was a direct result of that question and it might just be worth asking them, do they have what they need or is there something more. I don't know, that's the only thing if I'm like trying to pull stuff out that might be worth asking.

FRED BAKER: Okay, I think that's reasonable and we can point them to that document, I mean, it's online.

BRAD VERD: They might not be aware of that document, I don't know.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, I think if you want to bring it up, we should share the document beforehand.

FRED BAKER: Well, it has been shared about a month ago. Okay, we show probably let them know. And we've kind of already talked about the financial briefing as in we probably don't really need one.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, one thing I noticed actually in conversations with Andrew and Paul Hoffman last week, currently the RSSAC caucus meeting conflicts with an OCTO session on emerging identifier technology. It's easier for us to move the caucus meeting than to move the OCTO session. Is that something you would like to do? My sense is yes, just from reading the room. I don't want to target the same audience for that. So, if so, my suggestion is we'll probably move the caucus meeting down to where the RSSAC meeting is now, so that we have a full 90 minutes, and then I don't think the RSSAC info session is as necessary anymore, now that we have the tutorials and the public meeting.

Basically what happens is the info session, the content is just split across the tutorials and the meeting anyway, so limits some of the presentations that you will have to give that week, and we'll just move the meeting to that morning, if that is okay with everyone. I'm trying to avoid the conflict of that session with OCTO.

BRAD VERD: That sounds like a reasonable approach to me.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, I don't object. Anybody else? It seems reasonable. Yeah, I have a personal grump with tutorials, tutorials, tutorials, and tutorials. We're having a meeting the GAC and that's actually on the GAC calendar, it doesn't show up here. But I find myself wanting to send [inaudible] off to the tutorial, because that's basically what we're going to talk about. Bard?

BRAD VERD: Instead, we can just bring the tutorial to them, I think that's what they want.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You want my tutorial from last time I gave a tutorial to the GAC?

FRED BAKER: Well, we have a tutorial, it's even been approved by the RSSAC. I think we have one change to it and that is that it mentions BBQ. Whatever, we'll survive. Okay, any other comments on ICANN66?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I just feel like I have to say this, even if it gets thrown down. At some point, do we want to mention to the Board that we are on a track, however convoluted the path is, in which we're going to end up asking for, we're going to end up offering to so something involving SLAs, at least some portion of us who are capable of it, and we're sort of, it feels unnatural to go such long periods of time without touching base and saying does this make sense, are we still on track. I'm just wondering, is that a sub rosa thing that you do in the back hall of a cocktail reception, or is that a question we actually bring up, that, hey, are you guys thinking about amounts of money in contractual terms and things like that, because we are.

KAVEH RANJBAR: May I responde? Kaveh speaking.

FRED BAKER: Kaveh, go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah, so basically the idea is the Board is aware and actually the discussion about the call to finance, how much money is required, they are already talking about this stuff. They know there will be a need for money at some point, and also the SLAs are aware. But I definitely think it is valuable if it comes from RSSAC again to the Board, so just to raise awareness, and also this will be documented for another point in time that we have already pointed to them. So, I think it's a good idea to bring it up with the Board and just inform them, not asking for a decision or something, but just inform them that this is the trajectory, this is what we foresee will happen. They are aware, but I think it really helps to reinforce that.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so we have three items to bring to the Board. Did those get captured in the minutes? Okay. Thank you, Brad, Jeff, and Kaveh. Okay. Moving on, we have a draft report for the October workshop, Steve, wherever you are.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, I was wondering if you can click on that. So, this is roughly kind of a template of the RSSAC reports. At RSSAC meetings we started

to produce a short report summarizing what's been discussed at the workshop and over the years this has become more of a pro forma. So, Staff borrowed the report template from the last one, so the only thing that changes is the middle paragraph where we talk about the progress for the RSS metrics work party, what was discussed, and just a high level, what was discussed during these two days. So I will send out the link to RSSAC shortly after this call and then I think we give a period of time where people can review, provide comments, edit the document, and then probably for a vote. So this is kind of a skeleton, a template, additional information needs to be filled out. So, that's a quick update.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and that vote will happen in the November monthly meeting, right?

STEVE SHENG: That's for RSSAC to decide, that seems to be the most logical time. It could also be an online vote if you want sooner. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

BRAD VERD: If this is non-contentious, which I think a lot of this is, there is no publication coming out of this meeting like we have in the past, it seems like if we could just put like a week feedback on this thing and then just do an online vote and have it done before the ICANN meeting. Because

then you've got something else to give the Board just to let them know that we've been working. Let them know that we're spending their money.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, so expect that, we'll get a draft report, we can knock it around a bit, and then vote on it. Work Items, we have two active work parties right now and some documents that need some sprucing up. Duane or Russ, can I get you to talk about what we've been doing?

DUANE WESSELS:

Yes, this is Duane. So, as is reflected in the workshop report here, almost all the time here at the workshop has been spent talking about metrics and we've had very, very good discussions, very pleased with the progress we've been able to make. We went through some general points but really the meat of it was to go through the individual metrics and measurements and come up with recommended thresholds for those. So, for the most part, we've accomplished that.

Some of the metrics, some of the methodologies are going to change, we've talked about ways in which they need to be improved and we need to, after this meeting, we need to go back and start editing the document to reflect that. We've come up with some new techniques especially in the RSS metrics, which I'm very happy with, and again, as this document says, the goal is to try to wrap this up by the end of the year. We'll have a couple more work party calls where what we've discussed here has been presented, come up with a final version. This

work will be presented at the caucus meetings at ICANN and ITF and then presented to RSSAC for some final comments and votes.

FRED BAKER: And that vote is likely to be in the January timeframe.

DUANE WESSELS: I think January would be earliest, yeah, that's our aggressive schedule that we set for ourselves so the earliest would be about in January, if something happens then it would be pushed back a little bit.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, thank you. Brad?

BRAD VERD: Well that's the goal, we want to do it right, so we don't want to rush it just to get something out. It is a deadline we put on ourselves to get something done, but there is nothing binding for that.

FRED BAKER: And I'm not trying to create anything binding, I'm just trying to figure out what the game plan is, so, okay, cool. Thank you. Okay, the other active work party we have right now is on modern resolver behaviors. Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

A recap of what we talked about last was that the test bed is complete. Some people have at least looked at it, no one is really using it, as far as I can tell, but it's complete. Right now in the test bed there is a fake route so that it can sign using much shorter TTLs so that when you run a test to see how does something prime and re-prime, you don't have to wait two days, the TTL is like 60 seconds. Some people didn't like the 60 seconds, they thought that was too short, so the tool that I made to do the fake route had hardwired the 60 seconds in so I'm in the last throes of making that variable, making tool part of the test bed, and documenting my code, which I really never thought anyone was going to look at, as compared to other code that I write, which I do, that one, I thought oh, this is such a hack, no one is going to look at this.

So, I'm now going through it and trying to document it without actually refactoring it. So that should be done in the next few weeks, and my intention, I think I'll be able to make it, even though we have new work from this meeting, is to actually present it and finish at the RSSAC caucus meeting, at the next ITF meeting. I'm not absolutely sure that will happen, but if not, it will happen soon after that.

FRED BAKER:

Looking now once again at the ICANN agenda, Sunday, November 3rd, we have three work sessions dedicated to metrics, and two of those mention updates to RSSAC 2, RSSAC 23, and RSSAC 26. So the other work item going on, not a work party in the usual sense, but some changes going on and there will be discussion about that as Andrew is doing some work on those things. Andrew, can I get you to talk about that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah, hi, this is Andrew. RSSAC 002V3 has a recommendation that the RSSAC should revisit RSSAC 002 every year, so it's that time. I started a discussion in the caucus list a couple weeks ago for topics that people may want to update to create RSSAC 002V4. So in the end I got seven topics, and Staff will begin setting up some calls to work through those topics. I'll probably draft like a straw man edit for each one of those and we'll discuss each one, we'll try to have a call where we only discuss two topics at a time, so that for people who aren't interested in specific topics, they don't have to join all the calls, but that's the plan right now.

FRED BAKER: Those are Staff calls? Those are RSSAC calls? Who do you expect to be on the call?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: These are going to be RSSAC caucus calls. So there's no work party, I thought that was a little bit too heavy in the admin committee, but there will be probably just Doodles sent out to the RSSAC caucus and anyone who wants to join the calls can join.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. So, now we're at the section about reports, and I'm called on, and Brad's name isn't there, so I can't make him the stuckee, so I think the Co-Chair's report comes down to we have a fair amount of a number of balls in the air. We are coming up to the end of the year and with that, the end of two work parties, the work that Andrew just spoke

about. We are changing the way the Chair role changes and we will have a nomination process and an election for a new Vice-Chair. So everybody, please think, yes, I want to be the Vice-Chair. So you can be thinking about that, who you want to have as the Vice-Chair and what that process should be. Do you have anything to add there, Brad?

BRAD VERD:

The only thing I'll add is that we have a scheduled call with Göran which is the normal call before the ICANN meetings, he calls all the SO/AC leadership and it's like the 15th or something. So if you guys have something you specifically want us to talk to Göran Marby about, let us know, happy to do that, but right now it's, usually it's kind of just a casual conversation. He usually has a couple topics that he wants to cover and he asks how things are going, type of thing. Unless you want us to ask somewhat, let us know and we'll tell you about it in the meeting in Montreal.

FRED BAKER:

So, next on the list is Kaveh speaking for the ICANN Board.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Basically there is nothing more than the BTC meeting from yesterday, which we discussed and nothing more than that.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Liman here, a couple things. As you probably all know from the note to the email list, we now have a bit of an interesting situation in the CSC where we have two vacancies out of the four voting members, and that led to the interesting situation that I am current the interim Chair of the CSC, hopefully only for a very short time. So, Byrum Holland who is one of the two members from the ccNSO, he has been the Chair since the inception of the group, he has now stepped down, which he did in quite orderly manner, and he said so well ahead of time. But another member suddenly got a new job which put her in a conflict of interest situation, so she had to step down for that reason without much notice and I cannot really blame her for that, either. So we have two vacancies.

Now, the process to refill these vacancies is well underway. The process is such that it has to be approved by both the ccNSO and the GNSO and they have to approve not only their own appointed members, but also the entire slate of members of the CSC. So both of these organizations have to approve the entire slate, and that's an ongoing process. I think that the ccNSO is fairly well ahead of that, the GNSO, not quite so yet. But it should be a small matter, I don't see any controversies there, but it's not done yet.

So I will probably be leading the October meeting on October 15th. We'll see, depending on how quickly this is resolved in the GNSO and ccNSO whether we are able to elect a new Chair in the October meeting or if we will have to push that to the November meeting, I don't know that yet. In order to work with this, we had to change a few things in

the procedures document for the CSC, especially how to conduct work when there are vacancies. Because there is only a very limited number of voting positions, so having one removed or even two removed creates an imbalance in the democracy of the group.

So now there is a ruling that says if there are vacancies, the power of the group is limited to processing the monthly reports and all decisions have to be unanimous in order to carry. So these are adjustments that we've just made to the procedures document. Beyond that, what happened was that there have been a couple delays in the contract for the PDI operations where we have seen that these are not, the thresholds were too low, it just didn't make sense, and that said, we had a number of reports where PDI hasn't been able to report 100% compliance with the contract, just because the thresholds are totally broken.

But the process for changing them was very heavy. So first we had to change the process, which is done, and now we have proposed changes to the [inaudible] so hopefully in the near future you will be able to give us better report and you wouldn't feel that extreme pressure that was put on you from the thresholds. That completes my report. Any questions?

FRED BAKER:

And I not that Naela is smiling. Brad, do you want to talk about RZERC?

BRAD VERD: If I can quickly go back to the Chair update real quick. I know it's been out on the mailing list, but I just want to make sure everybody - so, Fred and I are giving an update to the GAC at the ICANN meeting, you mentioned it's not on the larger RSSAC schedule, it's on the Co-Chair schedule, but I don't believe it's a closed meeting, so if people want to come, you can come.

FRED BAKER: No, I checked that with Manal and it's an open meeting. It's on the GAC calendar, and so on and so forth, and anybody, including us, us welcome.

BRAD VERD: And this update is the 37, 38 update if they have questions. It's the same stuff we've been doing, it's just the GAC is finally kind of like, oh, maybe we should ask some questions or understand this better. So that's happening just so everybody is aware. Regarding RZERC there has been no activity and nothing to report. There is a meeting in Montreal because RZERC has to meet once a year, but there is really nothing on the agenda other than to meet and make sure we're all alive.

FRED BAKER: Are you all alive? Okay, Russ, you want to tell us about SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Fred. SSAC has had a number of ongoing activities, probably the biggest one that is related to RSSAC is the comment that was sent

on SAC106 which requested a full seat on the governance planning committee for the new governance structure. I'm personally happy to hear that progress looks like that's going to be accepted and put in place, so that's good.

The other piece that SSAC has been spending a lot of time on that's not certainly a directly related thing to RSSAC, is our work party that's ongoing for DOH, DOT, we may change the name of the work party but that's what it's referred to at this point, and the general impact and structure of what are we, SSAC, wanting to think is appropriate to say about that. So that's work that's ongoing. I don't know if we have planned results output timeframe. Suzanne, can you comment? Do we have a timeframe when we think we'll have something to say that is public on DOH DOD?

SUZANNE WOOLF:

We were hoping to be done by now, we're a little bit behind, but not dramatically, so I'm guessing somewhere around November, somewhere around the ICANN/ITF meeting cycle, which is basically November.

RUSS MUNDY:

That's something that I think from an information perspective, RSSAC would be interested in hearing what SSAC can say about that at the time of our joint meeting and also to bring up the topic of a joint meeting if anyone has a particular item that they're interested in discussing, having a time slot, we have 90 minutes for our joint meeting in Montreal, so please let me know, either privately or on the list, or whatever, and

we'll make sure that it gets put on our agenda. Just one other item of note that is on the schedule but is an unusual event, and that is the DNS SSAC workshop got moved to just the afternoon of Wednesday, which is surprising how many problems and challenges that is causing, including probably no free lunch this time at the workshop just because of the logistics of it. But the DNS SSAC workshop, it's still going under that name, but we are expanding the topic space.

So, if anyone has any topic area that they want to talk about that has some relationship to security and some relationship in some manner to DNS or the routing system, or anything else that they think is important from a security perspective, the program committee is trying to finalize things, we've got some input, and we're happy to get more. So, anything RSSAC members want to contribute to that workshop, that would be most appreciated.

BRAD VERD:

Regarding topics with SSAC, is it worth, I'm looking at Terry, maybe, is it worth talking about RPKI and the risks that have been brought up around that?

TERRY MANDERSON:

I think it's probably premature, given that the root server operators want to have a discussion about the problem statement first, and that will probably happen in Singapore, and so timing just might fly.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, thanks Brad, thanks Terry. And I did read the document that came out and I saw that it was mentioned in there. Because that is an area that folks are interested in. So when it makes sense, I think that is a good forum for discussing it, but if the timing is not right, that's fine. Anybody else have comments, thoughts, questions? Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I just have a question, do we expect a work party?

BRAD VERD: I think it's premature, we just don't know right now.

DANIEL MIGAULT: We don't know, okay.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, that concludes my report. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you much. Daniel, don't run away, we need to hear wisdom from the IAB.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I don't have anything to say.

FRED BAKER: The IAB gives us no wisdom, okay. Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: Thanks, Fred. I do have a few updates. The first one is the PTI currently has its annual engagement survey open, this is the annual survey we do with all of our partners and customers to gauge how we're doing. It's slightly retailored this year to not focus on requests, because in addition to this, we do an after request survey, after completion of each request we do a quick survey to the customer and ask them how we did on that specific request. So, in the annual one, now we're focusing more on engagement, are we present enough, are we listening enough, it's more of that. Some of you may have received this in your capacity as root server operators. The engagement survey is open until the 11th of October and it's a very short one, it takes a few minutes. I encourage you if you did receive it to please give us input on where we can improve. So, that's the first one.

The second one is the PTI budget will soon be open for public comment. If you recall earlier this summer Kim Davies did outreach with the community on what the priorities for PTI should be, he took all that and compiled it into what became the PTI proposed budget. He will be putting it out for public comment to get more input from the wider community and then once he finalizes that, it will join the ICANN budget to keep going with the ICANN budget cycle. This is per the bylaws of PTI, we have to get our budget done first, and then merge it into ICANN's budget for that cycle to be approved.

The third thing, our last update was in Marrakech, we had a session with IANA and the RSSAC and I talked to you about several things we were working on, and one of the discussions was our data in IANA wasn't always up to date on who the root server operators should be and how we get in touch with you if we need to ask anything and how you get in touch with us to tell us to make certain changes, and who authorizes those changes, et cetera. So there has been some movement on that, and I recognize Duane for helping us with this because he has been going out and doing some outreach with RSOs to get some of that data going and provide it to IANA. So I will stop here and I will ask Duane to please cover that in his update, because we have momentum on this one, and I'm very pleased with the results so far. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS:

The root server operators have a system where we maintain contacts internally and so what we've been working on is just making some sort of very slight modifications to those so that operators who want to be listed as an IANA contact can do so, and then we have some simple scripting to export that contact list and we'll probably be providing it to IANA on a monthly basis, I think is sort of what we had agreed on. We've got a lot of this in place, we just need to go back to the root operators group and get final approval to move ahead with this, and then I expect it will start happening after the Singapore meeting, so sometime in November.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks for the update. In that meeting we also talked about the intention of IANA or PTI to give a draft plan for the next KSK rollover in roughly the timeframe we are in now, and that it would be something that would be good from a timing perspective to have further discussion and input on that at ICANN66. I noticed you didn't mention anything about that, do you happen to know if that's still on schedule or if it slipped, or what the status is?

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah, thanks Russ. So it's in progress, that work is happening, and since you mentioned an update during ICANN66, we do plan to have an IANA session where we talk a little bit, we kind of terming it as three years since the transition, how are things going, and we'll go into that specific topic by then to give an update on what's going on there. I need to check with Kim and the team if that document is ready to be shared, this is not my specific area of work, so let me take that as an Action Item to check on that.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you very much, and if you could include in that, if he would be willing to do a presentation on it at the DNS SSAC workshop, I would very much appreciate that. He thought that he could, but we've kind of been holding a slot for that, so hopefully he can.

NAELA SARRAS: Sure, I will take that. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Duane, do have any words from the RZM?

DANIEL MIGAULT: No, nothing to report in that context.

FRED BAKER: Okay, which brings us to AOB. We have a meeting which we've already schedule in Montreal next month. Do we have any other things that we need to discuss?

WES HARDAKER: I have something.

FRED BAKER: Go for it.

WES HARDAKER: What's the status of RSSAC 000 in its process to get through voting and bylaws? So V3 is currently official, V4, where is that?

FRED BAKER: Carlos, can you comment on that?

CARLOS REYES:

Hi Wes, this is Carlos. RSSAC approved RSSAC 000 V4 and it has been on hold as we've gone through the bylaw amendment process. Public comment didn't yield any feedback so now we're just waiting for the Empowered Community to review it. But I think we're looking at the end of ICANN66 for all that to come into effect when the Empowered Community has their forum to review the bylaw changes. This isn't the only bylaw change they're considering, so it's a package of issues, but that ends at ICANN66.

WES HARDAKER:

Okay, thank you. So, I think once that is done and settled, I think we need to reopen 000 again to address meeting times. I think it was highly inappropriate to change today's meeting time with only 20 minutes of advance notice, and I recognize that no harm came from today's move, and it even removed an overlap and conflict of mine, so it was in some way beneficial, but my dog is not going to get a walk, think of the dogs.

However, in interest of transparency and to protect members from being slighted from participating or voting on a topic, most organizations have a requirement for advance notice of new meetings, 000 currently talks about emergency meetings as well as timing around electronic voting, but does not discuss required advance notice with respect to creating and holding meetings. So in my opinion 000 should have a minimum of advance notice time for scheduling meeting, three days is a really common value for many other organizations, for example. I'm curious about thoughts about that.

FRED BAKER: Okay, I guess we'll take that up, maybe in November. But if you need somebody to be mad at, you can be mad at me.

WES HARDAKER: I understand the reasons behind moving it, but for me, the note was sent at 540 a.m. my time and the only reason I happened to have made the meeting was because of people texting me and warning me.

FRED BAKER: Okay, my apologies. Anything else? Failing that, I think we're done, we're adjourned. Now, we have scheduled a 15-minute break and then we move into the metrics work.

BRAD VERD: So we'll pick up the metric work at 1015.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]