Root Server System Governance Working Group
Teleconference #10 | 9 July 2020 | 22:00 UTC

ATTENDANCE

RSS GWG

Joe Abley	SSAC Representative
Luis Diego Espinoza	ccTLD Registries Representative
Ted Hardie	IAB Representative
Hiro Hotta	RSO Representative
Geoff Huston	IAB Representative
Lito Ibarra	Alternate Liaison from the ICANN Board
Peter Janssen	ccTLD Registries Representative
Lars-Johan Liman	RSO Representative
Kurt Pritz	gTLD Registries Representative
Naela Sarras	Liaison from the IANA
Tripti Sinha	Liaison from the ICANN Board
Brad Verd	RSO Representative
Hanyu Yang	gTLD Registries Representative

ICANN org
Paul Hoffman
Becky Nash
Wendy Profit
Carlos Reyes

Observers
Yaxian Li

Absences

Duane Wessels	Liaison from the Root Zone Maintainer

MINUTES

Call to Order
Ted Hardie called the teleconference to order at 22:03 UTC and reviewed the proposed agenda. There were no objections to the agenda.

Administration
Carlos Reyes reviewed the draft minutes of teleconference #9 on 25 June 2020. There were no objections to publish the minutes.

Public Root Services Proposal Discussion

Ted Hardie reviewed the current PRS proposal, providing an update on the work of the drafting team. There are three separate documents for each element of the PRS proposal: the PRS Board, Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) with root service operators (RSOs), and the Strategy, Architecture, and Policy Function (SAPF).

Luis Diego Espinoza briefed the RSS GWG on the structure of the Internet Addresses Registry for Latin America and the Caribbean (LACNIC) as a potential model for the PRS Board. LACNIC members make decisions via a sovereign assembly. LACNIC is administered by a Board, which consists of seven members. An electoral commission manages elections, and a fiscal commission oversees the operations of LACNIC.

Geoff Huston noted a potential circular relationship: RSOs potentially serving on the PRS Board and PRS executing MoUs with RSOs.

Lars-Johan Liman briefed the RSS GWG on another proposal that seeks stakeholder balance on the PRS Board, where different constituencies are represented. This would include registry operators, the Internet Architecture Board for DNS protocols, ICANN as the sole member of the Limited Liability Company (LLC), and users of the root zone data, the Internet service providers (ISP) via the ISP Constituency or the Number Resources Organization and the Regional Internet Registries. The ICANN Nominating Committee would select members of the PRS Board with this representation matrix as a guide.

Geoff Huston noted that there are two approaches to the PRS Board. The first approach is a narrow function of corporate governance that is more procedural. In this model, broad representation can be accomplished via the SAPF. The second approach is much like the current ICANN Board, which oversees the ICANN organization and seeks representation from the constituencies of the ICANN community.

Lars-Johan Liman expressed support for the first approach as long as it features appropriate guardrails for how the PRS Board should be looking at feasibility of SAPF outcomes. Geoff Huston noted the guardrails in place with the global policy development process of the Regional Internet Registry community.

Ted Hardie suggested that this could be a false dichotomy and it may be possible to address both the customer and stakeholder approaches to representation. Geoff Huston emphasized that direct representation and governance are two very different things. Direct participation is safer from capture and could be better incorporated into the PRS Board.

Hanyu Yang raised concerns about technical and architectural decisions in the PRS proposal as originally envisioned in RSSAC037 for the SAPF. Ted Hardie noted that the RSS GWG discussions have evolved. PRS will be the contractual side, and SAPF will be the policy

development side. Lars-Johan Liman then stated that the current PRS Board proposal does not include appointments from ICANN as the LLC member or as instructions to the ICANN Nominating Committee.

Naela Sarras asked for clarity about who would instruct the PRS to implement SAPF outcomes: the PRS Board or the ICANN Board. Ted Hardie noted that the ICANN Board would be an appeal mechanism, keeping the actual decision-making as close as possible to the impacted community. Naela Sarras noted that the current PRS proposal is more operational. Lars-Johan Liman recommended more thinking about the appeals process. Paul Hoffman echoed the need for this clarity about the role of the ICANN Board in an appeals process. Geoff Huston agreed.

ACTION ITEM: Carlos Reyes to facilitate discussion about the PRS proposal with a drafting team consisting of Luis Diego Espinoza, Ted Hardie, Geoff Huston, and Lars-Johan Liman.

Tripti Sinha suggested that the conversation should step back to look at where authority lies and delineate from there. Kurt Pritz suggested that the drafting team could revise the PRS proposal as other functions are developed.

ACTION ITEM: Carlos Reyes to circulate the GoogleDocs of other elements of the PRS proposal and revise the PRS proposal diagram.

Any Other Business
There were no additional agenda items.

Adjournment
Ted Hardie adjourned the teleconference at 23:05 UTC.