

Root Server System Governance Working Group
Teleconference #20 | 19 November 2020 | 22:00 UTC

ATTENDANCE

RSS GWG

Ted Hardie	IAB Representative
Geoff Huston	IAB Representative
Lito Ibarra	Alternate Liaison from the ICANN Board
Peter Janssen	ccTLD Registries Representative
Lars-Johan Liman	RSO Representative
Kim Davies	Liaison from the IANA
Tripti Sinha	Liaison from the ICANN Board
Brad Verd	RSO Representative
Duane Wessels	Liaison from the Root Zone Maintainer
Suzanne Woolf	SSAC Representative

ICANN org

Adiel Akplogan
Xavier Calvez
Paul Hoffman
David Olive
Wendy Profit
Carlos Reyes

Apologies

Kurt Pritz	gTLD Registries Representative
------------	--------------------------------

Absences

Luis Diego Espinoza	ccTLD Registries Representative
Hiro Hotta	RSO Representative
Hanyu Yang	gTLD Registries Representative

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 #19 on 12 November 2020. Geoff Huston noted that an action item was missing. Ted Hardie suggested deferring approval to the RSS GWG mailing list due to the shortened review period.

ACTION ITEM: Carlos Reyes to circulate the draft minutes of teleconference #19 via the RSS GWG mailing list for review and approval.

Resourcing for PRS

Geoff Huston reviewed the proposed text about resourcing for Public Root Services (PRS). This text aligns more closely with the level and tone of the rest of the PRS proposal. The additional text discussed during teleconference 19 has been removed and serves as another document explaining the rationale for funding.

Geoff Huston noted that the ambiguity about the amount of a grant could be left up to PRS. The grant would be an expression of support for a Root Server Operator (RSO), and accepting a grant from PRS should not entail more work or better performance. It is up to each RSO to determine how to account for a grant in terms of operations and perception. PRS does not apply additional onus on the RSO. There is predictability in this model through a three-year funding cycle.

Ted Hardie asked Geoff Huston to clarify how common funding would be managed. Geoff Huston responded that the grant approach creates a common system where need is distributed across the Root Server System (RSS) rather than understand the individual circumstances of an RSO. The PRS would represent the RSS to ICANN. Duane Wessels asked Geoff Huston if RSOs would be required to sign a contract with PRS to receive funding. Geoff Huston responded that it is not necessary to create contracts in order to protect RSO independence. Ted Hardie noted the lack of transparency would raise concerns in the community.

Suzanne Woolf stated that the diversity of business and operational models of the RSOs is a strength of the RSS. Suzanne Woolf also noted that grant administration would be separate from defining performance. Geoff Huston clarified that the Strategy, Architecture, and Policy Function (SAPF) would define the acceptable level of RSO performance in alignment with RSS metrics.

Geoff Huston emphasized that the grant mechanism is being proposed to avoid defining need. There is no motivation to universally fund the existing RSOs to provide a minimum service; rather, the autonomy and capability of the RSS is financially stressing some RSOs. This pragmatic mechanism tries to provide some financial relief and assist the RSS as a whole. Ted Hardie cautioned the RSS GWG about transparently demonstrating the utility of the grant mechanism and addressing likely concerns about accountability.

Geoff Huston reviewed the new text about contingency funding for unanticipated events. PRS would determine how to draw from that fund. Ted Hardie noted that this should be needs-based, perhaps for the entire RSS, and the SAPF should have a role in determining the triggers.

Rationale for RSO Funding

Geoff Huston reviewed the proposed text providing a rationale for funding as written by Kurt Pritz. Geoff Huston noted that it is not clear if the funding would be to cover the costs of meeting a base level of performance or performance and service outcomes defined by SAPF. The objectives need clarification. Ted Hardie stated that the RSS GWG should distinguish between the needs of the overall RSS and the needs of an individual RSO. Geoff Huston elaborated that the collective RSOs should make the case to PRS, preserving their independence and autonomy.

Ted Hardie expressed a concern about how grants would be disbursed if funding were limited in the future. Geoff Huston proposed that it is up to ICANN to determine what it can fund. If more funding is required, it would be up to PRS to find other sources. Lars-Johan Liman agreed with Geoff Huston and noted that the Internet is actually a business that needs infrastructure to operate at a level that the internet community expects.

Next Steps

The next RSS GWG teleconference will continue to focus on resourcing for PRS and the rationale for RSO funding.

Any Other Business

There were no additional agenda items.

Adjournment

Ted Hardie adjourned the teleconference at 23:05 UTC.