

Root Server System Governance Working Group

Teleconference #8 | 11 June 2020 | 22:00 UTC

ATTENDANCE

RSS GWG

Luis Diego Espinoza	ccTLD Registries Representative
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
Naela Sarras	Liaison from the IANA
Tripti Sinha	Liaison from the ICANN Board
Brad Verd	RSO Representative
Duane Wessels	Liaison from the Root Zone Maintainer

ICANN org

Xavier Calvez
Paul Hoffman
Carlos Reyes
Mary Wong

Observers

Yaxian Li

Apologies

Hiro Hotta RSO Representative

Absences

Joe Abley	SSAC Representative
Kurt Pritz	gTLD Registries 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 #7 on 28 May 2020. There were no objections to publish the minutes.

Strategy, Architecture, and Policy Function Discussion

Ted Hardie reviewed two proposals for the Strategy, Architecture, and Policy Function (SAPF).

The first proposal is a Root Server System Supporting Organization (RSSSO). The RSSSO would replace the RSSAC and be a member of the Empowered Community. The RSSSO would consist of the RSS Caucus to develop policy proposals and the RSS Council to manage the work of the RSS Caucus and activate root server operator review panels to perform the Designation and Removal Function when necessary. ICANN org would perform the Secretariat, Finance, and Performance Monitoring and Measurement Functions and sign contracts with root server operators.

The second proposal is a PTI-like approach called Public Root Services (PRS). This single member Limited Liability Corporation would have its own board of directors, sign contracts with root server operators, and activate root server operator review panels to perform the Designation and Removal Function when necessary. The RSSAC would advise the PRS board of directors and also select one third of it. PRS would have its own support staff (to perform the Secretariat and Finance Functions) and would decide to build or contract the Performance Monitoring and Measurement Function.

Ted Hardie asked RSS GWG members for their reactions to the two proposals.

- Brad Verd suggested that it may be better to modify PTI than create a new PTI-like structure in the PRS proposal.
- Duane Wessels noted that the RSSSO proposal fits with other Supporting Organizations and that the PRS proposal should clarify the role of the RSSAC.
- Geoff Huston cautioned that the RSSSO would be swamped with Supporting Organization work, distracting from its core mission of providing root service. Similarly, merging root service with the current PTI would be misguided. However, the PRS model has a working chance of longevity and success because of its focus and purpose.
- Lars-Johan Liman noted that any structure in between the root server operators and the IANA functions should be lightweight and cautioned that circular relationships between the RSSAC and the PRS board of directors should be avoided. The RSSSO proposal seems heavyweight.
- Lito Ibarra noted that the PRS proposal provides more independence for root server operators.
- Luis Diego Espinoza favored the RSSSO proposal because it accommodates the complexity of the root server system in a familiar structure.
- Naela Sarras asked for more clarity about PRS as a contract holder and how policy work would happen in PRS because this is a divergence from PTI.

- Paul Hoffman suggested that the Customer Standing Committee could be another model for the SAPF. Most likely, the outcome could be a traditional Supporting Organization or something completely different. Root Ops could also be incorporated into the PRS proposal.
- Peter Janssen commented that any organization for the SAPF should be simple.
- Tripti Sinha noted that the RSSSO proposal could end up becoming too onerous. The PRS proposal has a better defined remit and mission. The role of the RSSAC in the PRS proposal needs greater clarity due to potential conflicts of interest. This could be addressed by including Root Ops instead. The PRS proposal is agile and simple.

Ted Hardie summarized the discussion. There is broad agreement to start with the PRS proposal by making it more customer-focused, refining the role of the root server operator community, and keeping it lightweight. Luis Diego Espinoza, Geoff Huston, and Lars-Johan Liman volunteered to refine the PRS proposal.

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

Lars-Johan Liman noted that the stakeholders identified by the RSSAC in RSSAC037 are not captured in the PRS proposal. Furthermore, the distinction between Root Ops and the RSSAC should remain. Tripti Sinha agreed. Ted Hardie noted that it is possible to avoid circularity in the relationships through balance.

Any Other Business

There were no additional agenda items.

Adjournment

Ted Hardie adjourned the teleconference at 22:59 UTC.