
FRED BAKER: Good morning. Let's call this meeting to order, and then we'll see who all is here. I think we're all here, frankly.

Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

MATT WEINBERG: Matt's here.

FRED BAKER: ISI? I'm sorry, USC?

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Cogent?

PAUL VIXIE: Vixie's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. University of Maryland?

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.

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: NASA? Okay. F-root, Jeff is here and I'm here.

JEFF OSBORNE: Here.

FRED BAKER: G? H? Who's here from H?

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I-root? J? Already called them. K?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And L?

TERRY MANDERSON. Terry Manderson is here.

FRED BAKER: M?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and then our various –

RYAN STEPHENSON: Hey, Fred, this is Ryan from G and Kevin Wright's on the line too.

FRED BAKER: Okay, great. Thank you. And then our various liaisons. Kaveh, you're here from the ICANN board. Liman, are you around? I don't hear him. Brad, RZERC?

BRAD VERD: Yes.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Russ, SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, Russ is here.

FRED BAKER: Daniel, I think I saw you.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes. I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: Yes. Good morning. I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Duane, are you around?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here. Good morning.

FRED BAKER: Duane is here. Did I miss anybody? Okay. So I think that constitutes a quorum. The agenda was sent out a couple of days ago, on the 21st, actually. Anybody have any changes they want to make to the agenda? Hearing none, Ozan, you want to talk about draft minutes?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Hi, everyone. I circulated draft minutes from 7th of January RSSAC monthly meeting two weeks ago, and all action items on the draft minutes have been completed.

If you do have any questions or comments about the draft minutes, I'm happy to answer it. Otherwise, RSSAC should be good to vote whether to approve the draft minutes or not. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so we have to vote on that.

WES HARDAKER: I move to approve.

FRED BAKER: Do I have a second?

PAUL VIXIE: I second.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is anybody opposed to this? Does anybody want to abstain? Failing that, I think it passes. Going on to the caucus Membership Committee, Matt, are you online?

MATT WEINBERG: I am, yes. Can you hear me okay?

FRED BAKER: Yeah, I can hear you.

MATT WEINBERG: Great. Okay, so two points of business here. The first is we did receive an application from Yazid Akanho. I apologize if I'm not pronouncing that right. The Membership Committee convened to review the application and feel that it's a good application and one that we should move forward with. The application is included in the draft as well for the agenda. So our proposal is to move forward on that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Ozan, somehow I'm looking at the e-mail from the 21st, and I don't see that name there. Am I looking at the wrong agenda?

OZAN SAHIN: I believe the name was there, the SOI wasn't. On the e-mail that I sent a week ago, I added the SOI there.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Fine. I'm just looking at the wrong e-mail then. Did anybody have [- was there] discussion? Did people have concerns? Okay. Do I have a motion to accept this candidate?

WES HARDAKER: I move to accept.

FRED BAKER: Do I have a second?

JEFF OSBORN: I second.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is anyone opposed? Hearing none, is anyone abstaining? Failing that, we've accepted the guy. Moving on to the work items.

MATT WEINBERG: Hold on, I just want to talk about another thing though, Fred, please.

FRED BAKER: Go for it.

MATT WEINBERG: One thing that I talked about in the past was the Membership Committee has worked to review both participation and contributions of caucus members and attendance to meetings, things like that. We targeted caucus members who had been with the caucus for at least two years and who had had the least amount of participation, meaning going to an RSSAC meeting, contributing to a draft or a publication, anything like that.

There were 27 people that were identified, and our approach was we sent out the e-mail to all 27 of those people back in – I want to say

November, I could be wrong on that though. Might have been October. We redoubled our efforts here in the last few weeks and reached out to people who had not responded. I want to report on what we found.

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

MATT WEINBERG: We reached out to 27 inactive members. four people did respond and they confirmed that, "Yes, in fact, please go ahead and remove [us/me] from the caucus, we no longer want to participate." So that was done.

13 people responded saying that, "Yes, I have not participated as much as I want, but I still want to remain on the caucus and I promise to help in the future. Please keep me on the caucus." So for now, we took note of that and they'll remain on the caucus.

Ten people did not respond to two separate e-mails that we sent, and the Membership Committee's belief is that if a caucus member can't respond to two separate e-mails asking whether they're available and interested to continue being on the caucus, and they have not participated in any of the activities of the caucus, then they should be removed from the caucus. So that's the point I wanted to bring up here, and I'll be happy to discuss further, but I'd like to get a vote on that if possible.

WES HARDAKER: I missed the number that you said fell into that category. How many was that again?

MATT WEINBERG: Ten people did not respond to two separate e-mails.

WES HARDAKER: Thank you.

MATT WEINBERG: Now, some of those people don't even work at the organizations anymore, or they're not in the space anymore, but I feel like it shouldn't matter who the person is, it really matters that they haven't participated and they haven't responded to two e-mails.

FRED BAKER: Which would suggest that maybe they're not watching their e-mail or the e-mail doesn't get to them.

MATT WEINBERG: Right.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, your proposal sounds very rational to me. Do we have any discussion of that? Anybody want to comment?

PAUL VIXIE: I'd like to comment.

FRED BAKER: Yes, go ahead.

PAUL VIXIE: I was at one time on the Membership Committee, and when this was discussed, I was in favor of the type of review that has just been described, and I am favor of the sense of the Membership Committee as communicated here. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, you have your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Two things. One, I support Matt's proposal to remove them. If they cannot respond to two e-mails, that's probably because they're not interested or cannot be reached at that address, and we can't do much about that. So I suggest just going ahead and removing them.

My second comment would be that, Matt, for the ones who'd remain on the mailing list who you've been in contact with, please keep the status of what you did, so in a spreadsheet or something so that we can track trends in the future with the same people.

MATT WEINBERG:

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks.

MATT WEINBERG: Thanks, Paul and Liman, for your comments. Liman, to answer your question, yes, we are definitely tracking this. We're keeping track of when we sent the e-mails, what responses we received. Ozan's been doing a great job on this, so thank you very much to Ozan for support on this. He took over from Carlos. So yes, we're definitely doing that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Danial, you have your hand up.

DANIEL MIGAULT: My first comment is that now that we have this procedure, is it clear for the new caucus member or for the caucus that we're applying such kind of procedure? I think it would be good these people are aware of it and not become upset to receive an e-mail, "You have been silent for two years." So this is one aspect.

The other one is that when we remove someone, it would be good maybe to, "You were unreachable," not saying "You were not responsive." Very cautious on the term being used so that we don't seem we're tracking the people all the time. It's the way to present it. That's just my comment. But I support that we take some action as you mentioned.

MATT WEINBERG: Okay. Yeah, the Membership Committee did work together on the language used. We try to be as fair and polite as possible. With regard to telling people about the process, we are making amendments to the membership application page as well. We're trying to clean that up a little bit to include more information about this process.

FRED BAKER: That all sounds good. However, when I became a member of the caucus, seriously way back when, my recollection was that there was something there already. [We kind of said, you don't do anything, you're out of here.] Is there not something like that now?

MATT WEINBERG: It definitely says there's an expectation to participate and help with these things. So it's not like it's not there.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

DANIEL MIGAULT: But what I'm saying is that if we have a kind of reminder maybe on the mailing list, people get encouraged and they don't wait two years and get to participate.

MATT WEINBERG: I can make a counterargument, Daniel, that [if you need to be friendly reminded, then maybe you shouldn't be on the caucus.] That's my opinion on that.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. Yeah, I'm open. Just a phrasing thing, but if I had the [brill] thing to do, I would have let you know.

MATT WEINBERG: Sure.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, what's your plan with respect to the 13 that said, "Keep me on the list and I promise to do something?"

MATT WEINBERG: I think for now, they'll remain on the caucus and our proposal is that we wait perhaps another year. But if they still haven't done anything after a year, then that's that. It's time to move on.

FRED BAKER: That makes sense to me. Okay, so let's move this to a vote. Do we have a motion to support ditching these people?

WES HARDAKER: I'll go three for three.

FRED BAKER: Sounds good. Do I have a second?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I support that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is anyone opposed? Is anyone abstaining? Failing that, Matt, thank you for your efforts there, and I think you can act on that.

MATT WEINBERG: Okay. The Membership Committee convenes monthly. I'll talk about this at our next meeting. And just for everybody's information, we're trying to reach out to, next, about 15 or 20 people or so who are on the list to confirm that they still want to be on the caucus. So I'll report on that in the next month or two. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Sounds good. We have been saying lately that the caucus is a little over 100 people. If we're letting go of, what is it, 17 of them, that brings us down to about 90; is that correct?

MATT WEINBERG: [inaudible] round will be 14 people that we're going to remove.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Moving on then; work items. The metrics document we've been working on for, what, a year now, and I believe that we're coming to a point of accepting this document and publishing it. Am I correct on that, Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Fred. Russ and Duane, who are the co-chairs of the work party, circulated that revised document yesterday and gave RSSAC until the 10th of February, a week to review the final revisions. Originally, this was supposed to be a vote item for this meeting, but after the final revisions, now RSSAC caucus has until 10th of February to review so that RSSAC can vote on it, either online or in its monthly meeting in March.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and now I'm recalling the conversation we had yesterday. It must be too early in the morning for me. What we had talked about then was going ahead and voting on this in person in Cancun. So I'd suggest that we go ahead and do that.

DUANE WESSELS: Can I jump in?

FRED BAKER: Go for it.

DUANE WESSELS:

As Ozan said, the original plan was that RSSAC would vote on this today, but in recent weeks, myself and Paul Hoffman had been taking a closer look at some of the things in the document. We found a couple of problems, and Russ and I had some discussions with staff, and we decided to recommend additions to the document and postponing the vote for about a week.

There are two proposed editions to the metrics document at this time which we're asking the caucus to sort of approve. These are both in the correctness section. One of the additions relates to the ARPA TLD because it is served by most of the root servers, and as written today, correctness checks for .arpa, specifically the [NS set] of ARPA would fail because you would get an authoritative answer instead of a referral answer.

The other addition is something we missed also in the correctness section. The addition is to say that in a referral response, there must be at least one glue record in the response in order for it to be correct.

Ozan, is this the Google doc? Oh, this is the PDF.

OZAN SAHIN:

This is the PDF.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, I think we need to scroll up to section 5.3 to see those changes. So that's the second one. The other one is up above.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Actually, I'm not sure I agree with that one, with the A records. But we can take that offline.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, you can comment on the caucus list, or we can talk privately if you like.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It goes head on with what I teach in other courses, but there may be a special case for the root zone. So I need to think a little bit about it first.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Indeed, the root zone is a little bit special, because every glue record is sort of in-zone.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, obviously, but I'm not sure you need them.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright. We can talk further if you want.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Let's do that.

DUANE WESSELS: And then going back to the first one about .arpa, this led to a discussion with myself and Paul about zones that are served by the root servers that are not the root or the rootservers.net zone, and we went back and looked at what does RSSAC 001 say about this, what does RFC 7720 say about this, and both of those do acknowledge that ARPA is currently served by the root servers.

Brad pointed out to me that the predecessor to 7720 had text in there that said that the root servers must not serve any other zones than the root and rootservers.net. So I just wanted to point out that that seems like something – I don't know if it was intentional that that was dropped or if it got lost, but I just wanted to point out that was something that was there in the past and is not currently in the RFC.

FRED BAKER: That sounds like a comment to go back to DNSOP and ask them what they want to do with.

DUANE WESSELS: Right. Yeah. I'm not suggesting that we have a discussion about it now, but something to keep in mind. I don't think that RFC was a DNSOP RFC exactly. I think it was – I don't know, actually. I know Liman was involved, but I don't know a lot more about it than that.

FRED BAKER: In any event, I would think DNSOP is responsible for it now.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

FRED BAKER: In any event, there might be room for an errata – erratum? Okay. So, are you done? Have you covered your stuff?

DUANE WESSELS: That’s all that I wanted to say, yes. Hopefully the caucus will approve these additions, and then we can vote on it in Cancun, as you said.

FRED BAKER: Sounds good. Daniel, you still have your hand up. Is that an old hand?

DANIEL MIGAULT: It’s an old hand.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Fine, so this is deferred. We’ll come back to it in Cancun, I think. Modern resolver behavior work party, which I’m the shepherd for. Paul gave us a few paragraphs, a very short document kind of saying, “So here’s the thing, and we’ll talk about it.” I believe that he is going to make a presentation about it at DNS-OARC. That has been run by the caucus list. I have seen no comments on his proposed text.

Someone – was it you, Ozan? Pointed out minutes saying, “Well, we expect this, that and the other from Paul,” and Paul sent an e-mail back saying he doesn’t know what we’re looking for. Does anybody have any

comment on that? If not, I would suggest we consider this done. The work has basically been done by Paul, and with very little actual support or commentary from the caucus. I don't think we're going to get a lot further out of it at this point. There's a codebase that's in GitHub, people can use it to study resolvers, and we've achieved that much. So my suggestion would be that we close this work party. Did anybody have any comment on that?

Okay, so that's my motion. I move that we close this work party. Is there a second?

PAUL VIXIE: I second.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Can I ask you a question?

FRED BAKER: Go ahead. Go for it.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I think we had talked earlier about taking this report and posting it to the RSSAC caucus work party page underneath this work party. Is that still the plan at the [closing of this] work party?

FRED BAKER: That's my plan, yeah, unless someone has a better idea.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'll post that link in chat so people know where this report will be posted.

FRED BAKER: Okay. That sounds good. Okay, so my motion is on the table, and we have a second. Let's vote on it. Is anybody opposed to that? Is there anyone abstaining? Failing that, it passes.

Could I see the agenda again, please? Okay, we're moving on to Andrew, your three updates to documents. Do you want to talk about that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. Sure. Thanks, Fred. The first one is RSSAC 002 v4. The initial draft – I should say maybe we should call it the final draft – of this report has been sent to the caucus for review. I sent it out a couple of days ago, and that review will close on February 16th.

So far, there haven't been that many responses yet, but if you have something you want to say about RSSAC 002 v4, please say it on the caucus list. Barring major discussion on the caucus list, I think that document can be voted upon once this review finalizes or at least the week after this review finalizes.

The second document, RSSAC 023 v2. That's the history document. That document still needs some work. We will have a call on that document on February 10th, so if you'd like to discuss that document or work on that document, please join that call.

Finally, we have RSSAC 026 v2. That's the RSSAC lexicon. There's been some good discussion on the list on that document, and I think the next steps for that document are probably me to work with Paul Hoffman – who's shepherding that – and take all of the feedback from the list and come up with some definitions, and then send them to the caucus again. But there's been a lot of discussion on those definitions, so I don't think that discussion's finished. So I would expect another round of discussion to really finalize those, or maybe even a call, but we have to figure out the right way forward with that.

Finally, I want to put in a plug for the RSSAC tutorial How it Works slides which I sent out yesterday. There will be two sessions of the How it Works tutorial at ICANN 67. Please review those slides, and if there's anything wrong with them, please either send me feedback or send feedback to the list.

Thanks, and I'll turn it over to you, Fred, unless there are questions on those four documents.

FRED BAKER:

Well, a question for you, Andrew. Did you see that Maureen Hilyard would like to see the RSSAC tutorial turned into an ICANN Learn package?

ANDREW MCCONACHINE: I did, yes. I guess it comes down to what the priorities of the ICANN Learn team are. It's out of our hands, because that's a different activity. It's not even part of policy. But I'm definitely willing to work with those people if they have the time to create an online course for that.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, I figured starting from the slides, it should be possible to come up with a course. Thank you for coordinating with them. I don't know what they'll need from you.

And then also, apparently, we're going to meet with the ALAC folks and say something about RSSAC there. What they asked for was an update on the status of whatever, which I think we're going to have to kind say, "Well, the evolution process is this, and the place where we are right now is that the GWG has been formed and is meeting at ICANN 67." I'm not sure there's a lot more to say than that.

Brad, speaking from a GWG perspective, do you see any more that we would have to say?

BRAD VERD: No, not at this point. It's just too soon.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay, so I guess that means we're going through some abbreviated version of the tutorial and then get comment on the evolution process. We picked a slot, but we didn't pick who's going to talk. Andrew, you gave the talk with ALAC a year ago. Would you be willing to do that talk with them?

ANDREW MCCONACHINE: I can be the [stuckee] again, sure, as long as I know what I'm supposed to be talking about and I can prepare some slides in advance. Yeah, I can do that.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Well, what they asked for was an update, so I think you start from the slides that you used before, which were an abbreviated version of the tutorial, and just kind of say, "Here's where we're at."

ANDREW MCCONACHINE: Liman has his hand up, by the way.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. Liman, go for it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. This is just a quick question to Brad. Have you heard any more about the GW? I received something that said – a brief doodle or something, but I haven't seen any call to participate in meetings or anything like that. [inaudible]?

BRAD VERD: Nothing yet. Based upon the conversations I've had with Carlos, who's heading it up from ICANN, he was hoping to have a couple phone calls before the face-to-face meeting in Cancun, but I have not seen anything yet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. I won't rock the boat then. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: As long as there's an oar in the water somewhere. Okay, so Andrew, do you feel like you know what you need to know?

ANDREW MCCONACHINE: I'm going to start with the previous presentation, work on that a little bit, and then I'm going to review all those e-mails that I saw between you and Maureen, and then I'll send something to the RSSAC for review.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Sounds good. You know how to find me if you have a question. Okay, so moving on to agenda item six. Ozan, do you want to talk about our draft schedule?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. As we already started talking about ICANN 67, here's the draft schedule in its latest version. Please note the color coding on

the spreadsheet. There's a legend that you can see for the color coding. The orange color sessions are intended for the chair, vice chair. Light blue sessions are for the RSSAC, and red or pink sessions are for your awareness.

There are also the purple sessions which are technical, and we also have the GWG sessions in gray. Also, I should note the green sessions for networking, usually at the end of the day.

Andrew already talked about the How it Works tutorial on Saturday and Sunday, and that's when RSSAC starts its sessions. That's the 3:15 PM block on How it Works. And then although it's not on the schedule, I circulated calendar invites for the RSSAC dinner on Saturday night, so please by the end of this week, if you haven't responded yet, please let me know if you are planning on joining this dinner or not by responding to the calendar invitation.

And then on Sunday, the RSSAC work session will start. We have RSO identification, two sessions allocated on that, and then a closed session on RSO funding, and then the second How it Works tutorial later that day.

On Monday after welcome ceremony, it's a busy day. RSSAC admin team want to reserve a slot for the empowered community discussion, although the RSSAC already started drafting a document for a statement to GWG on empowered community. We still keep this slot, and then there's an RSSAC work session 5 session which is kind of a placeholder at the moment, but please note that this is only for 40 minutes, because

as Fred noted, ALAC wanted RSSAC leadership to give a briefing to them later in the slot.

Later on the agenda today, RSSAC will be discussing some potential future work items and the outcomes of the spreadsheet if there's any thought that we should allocate any of these potential work items to this session. And also, we [could swap] empowered community discussion if RSSAC happens to finish its draft in this regard, we could use those slots. Later that day, there'll be public forum and the plenary session, and the gala night.

Tuesday, the first thing is preparation for joint meetings, and then it will be followed by the joint meeting with the SSAC. It's a closed session. Later that day, in the afternoon sessions, RSSAC will have session to discuss again future work items, and then will have the RSSAC meeting.

Wednesday, unfortunately, DNS workshops conflict with the joint meetings with the RSSAC and ICANN board joint meeting, and then in the afternoon on Wednesday, there will be the GWG sessions and then I put the NCAP study session for your awareness as a technical session here. The joint meeting with the ICANN board will be the last RSSAC thing on the schedule, marked with the blue color.

On the final day, Thursday, there will be some – as usual – the Q&A with the executive team, public forum, the public meeting of the ICANN board, and in the morning, there will be a plenary session followed by a GWG session.

After tomorrow, it will not be possible to request changes on the schedule because the schedule will be public soon, so if you believe –

especially after discussing potential work items – the RSSAC should have any additional slots, please let me know by the end of today so that especially on Saturday, we will have some flexibility to accommodate that if you think so.

Other than that, this is the schedule part of this agenda item. I'll wait here to see if there are any questions, because we have a separate subsection for the joint meeting with the ICANN board and SSAC, and the leadership chair and the vice chair will have lunch with the Chief Technology Officer, so also, they'll talk about it.

WES HARDAKER:

A quick point. I am now the official designee for the [inaudible] for the DNSSEC workshop, [DNSSEC for beginners, so that conflicts with the lunch, I believe.] I realize there's nothing you can do about it, but I just want to make people aware.

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Wes. Any other comments on the schedule? I think Ken's hand's up.

KEN RENARD:

Do we know if the GWG sessions will be open to observers?

OZAN SAHIN:

I don't know, but I can check with Carlos Reyes, who is the lead support on that, and get back to you, Ken and the entire RSSAC.

KEN RENARD: Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Ozan, can you just please add the RSSAC dinner to that schedule as well so I remember that it happens on the Saturday when I look at the schedule?

OZAN SAHIN: I'm happy to do that, Liman. In the past, actually, we had it on the schedule. The reason we removed it this time was that sometimes, since this is an RSSAC dinner and sometimes the schedule can be accessible by RSSAC caucus as well, it can create some confusion among the RSSAC caucus members. That's why I wanted to go the way of sending you calendar invites instead of putting it there, but if this is helpful for you, I'm happy to put it back on the schedule.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. [No, then don't mind,] that was a good reason. Keep it the way it is. Thanks for explaining.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you. If there are no further questions, then maybe we can discuss if you have any questions or comments for the joint meetings RSSAC will have with the ICANN board, SSAC and the CTO.

I circulated a Google document for that to capture your feedback, and ICANN board support team has circulated actually two areas of interest for the ICANN board to discuss with RSSAC and the other SOs and ACs in its joint meeting. I put them on the Google document, but if you have any suggestions to discuss with SSAC or the ICANN board, please put them there. we have a deadline for the ICANN board, so that's the 21st of February, and please make sure to put your suggestions there. Fred and Brad will have a lunch meeting with the CTO. If you want any topics to be discussed in this lunch meeting, please also make sure to add them on the Google document. In case you don't have the link to this document, I will put it in the chat now. Are there any comments or questions about those joint meetings at this time?

FRED BAKER:

Well, I don't. I'm interested to see what points people bring up, but usually, this meeting with David Conrad, the OCTO, is basically just we go in and kind of chew the fat with him. He might bring a topic or two, we might bring a topic or two, mostly just making sure that the lines of communication are clear as opposed to a gigantic meeting.

Okay, so we should be ready to move on to future work items, right?

OZAN SAHIN:

Yes, I think so.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. You've got my name beside that. It's actually been Steve that's been driving that, and the good news is we have some names here. I

wasn't at all sure what all would go on. So how do we want to proceed with this? Seems like deciding we're going to open 27 study groups, we're going to [diffuse] all of the effort.

This is a question for the group, I'm opening this for discussion. Seems like the simplest way to approach this would be to pick the perhaps three more popular ones and ask for a shepherd and a chair and move forward with them. Does that seem like a reasonable approach?

PAUL VIXIE:

Yes and no. The elephant in the room is what you said a while ago, which is that if we combine everything that's been said on this call, we have 100 people on the caucus mailing list. Only Paul Hoffman worked on some document, got no help, got no feedback. That strikes me as a problem worth considering as we think about how to move forward on new work items. It may be that we have to have more explicit guidance for the shepherds or work party leaders as far as goosing things along or shutting them down a lot more rapidly than we've been doing.

We have a timescale of removal after notice to an inactive caucus member that has been proposed, voted for and is about to go into effect, which is one year of inactivity. That may work for individual caucus members, but it will not work for documents or other work parties. We're going to have to have a live or die criteria. It obviously lives or it obviously dies, but it can't be somewhere in-between, the zombie stage, because that's disrespectful to the people who do want to do some work. So I would like to know that we know what we're

going to do differently before we take on a new batch of work. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Ken, your name is on a couple of these, and I'm thinking specifically about what a rogue operator could do. Would you like to put together – maybe you and I, because I'm shepherd of something that kind of just barely got something done, and you as an incoming shepherd, compare notes and make a suggestion that this group could agree to?

KEN RENARD: Sure, I could come up with even like a draft SOW for that, run it by you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. That sounds good. And by our procedures, I would imagine we wind up taking a vote on this. The vote might be at ICANN 67, but I think Paul's suggestion of putting together a "how do we know the thing is dead" rule might be a good thing, and that might even be an update to RSSAC 0, how do we [shoot] a work party?

Ozan, could we scroll down through this spreadsheet? Okay, so the next one that has a number of names on it is something about gathering a local perspective. Develop a tool to gather local perspective on root servers. Ken, your name is also on that. Do you feel like you can shepherd two things, or should I be looking for another shepherd?

KEN RENARD: I don't think I'd have a problem shepherding two things, noting that one of these may not get off the ground. But with the measurement, local perspective, I could draft up an SOW for that and circulate it between you and Wes, who's also on that.

FRED BAKER: Is Wes also on that? Wes, I may draft you. Okay, but yeah, Ken, if you could put together an SOW on that. That's pretty much the end of the high-interest level, two things out of that. Yeah, Ken, if you could put together and circulate two draft statements of work, then we can decide where we want to go with that.

KEN RENARD: Will do.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. Okay. Back to the agenda. Okay, so we have a statement regarding the empowered community. Brad, your name is on that. You want to comment on that?

BRAD VERD: I think my name is on it just because I did the initial stab at the draft. I think it's out there for people to make comments on, updates to. I think it's being [shared] now. A number of you have done that. We don't have anything scheduled, like a phone call, to go through this. Maybe we should do that, and then if everybody agrees, send it for a vote and a statement to give to the GWG.

So far, I don't see really any large material changes to the document, so maybe we don't even need a phone call, unless people want to discuss it some more. Are there questions, issues that people want to go through here? Any hands?

FRED BAKER: I don't see any hands. Why don't we schedule a call in about two weeks? Today's the 4th, so that would be circa the 18th. And then we can talk about voting at the ICANN meeting if it qualifies, which I expect it will.

BRAD VERD: I'll work with Ozan and maybe we'll do this next week. Two weeks is in conflict with a couple of other meetings, APNIC and APRICOT, so I don't know if that'll cause issues with people.

FRED BAKER: Next week works for me.

BRAD VERD: Yes. I'll work with Ozan, we'll try to get a phone call done for next week so we can bring this to a closure, and put it on the docket for a vote.

FRED BAKER: Great. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: If you haven't looked at it, please go look at it and add your comments.
Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Something I was going to mention earlier – and let me mention it now – in the Puerto Rico meeting a year ago, whatever that was, there was a woman from DISA who is the liaison to – the chief scientist for the Department of Defense. Her name is [inaudible], and she was asking questions about what are we thinking in terms of [financial plans.]

So I asked Ryan to invite her as an interested observer and invited party at the table during the financial meeting that we have in ICANN 67. Let me throw this out more generally. We probably all have people that handle money that we talk with from time to time, and I think it may be useful to have them involved in the discussion.

So if you have financial people that should be sitting at the table when we're talking about financial stuff, let me know, and please invite them to be at that meeting, which is actually a closed meeting, so they can only be there if they're invited.

So Ryan, a question for you. You spoke with [inaudible]. Is she planning to come?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yes, [inaudible] is the liaison with DISA and DOD CIO, and she's also kind of assist H root as well. So what's your question, I guess, is my ...

FRED BAKER: I suggested that you invite her. Did you talk to her?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yes, she'll be at ICANN 67 and she's planning to attend.

FRED BAKER: Okay, good.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Thank you very much for reaching out, by the way. [inaudible] appreciate that.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so moving on then.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I have my hand up.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just a quick question. Is it okay to invite someone with a financial interest to join by phone?

the 14th of February, the cross-community working group will look at the comments received and then the expectation is that they will get back to all chartering organizations around May 2020 and that would be the time possibly RSSAC could approve this report as the chartering organization.

Ten days ago – moving on to the second Security, Stability And Resiliency Review Team draft report – this public comment proceeding opened, and it's going to close by 4ht of March. It's a lengthy report. I don't know if you ever looked at it, but the page 45 and 46 particularly talks about the root operations, and you might be interested to look at those pages. On page 46, there are certain recommendations from the review team. So that's also for RSSAC to consider whether it wants to provide any input, individually or by a group, on this proceeding.

FRED BAKER: This link was not in the original agenda that you sent, but it's in an agenda you sent a couple of days ago; is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: If you go to the Google Doc of the agenda, you can find a link, but since it's not existing on the previous e-mails, I'm putting the link to the report now in the chat.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Maybe you want to just put the link to the agenda.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, it's also available if you go to the agenda Google doc. The link is available also there. So basically, you first go to the public comment proceeding and then click on the draft report.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I have personally not read 50-ish pages of the SSR2, so may I suggest that we defer this to the mailing list? If people have comments on it, we can discuss it there, and people are of course welcome to make comments for their organizations directly on the public comment thing.

Hyperlocal?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Fred. There were two upcoming public comment proceedings on the ICANN.org webpage. One is the hyperlocal deployment plan, and the other one was the L-root placement methodology. So they were planned in January 2020, but last week, as we approached the end of January, there was an adjustment on the expected timeline. Now hyperlocal deployment plan is expected this month in February 2020, but the L-root placement methodology has been deferred to June.

I will be on the lookout on the opening of this hyperlocal deployment plan and I'll flag it once the reading materials are available and once the public comment is open. In late February 2020, another public comment is expected on name collision analysis project NCAP study. I'll make sure to flag those to RSSAC when they're open.

FRED BAKER: Okay, great. Thank you.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Just one thing. So the public comment is basically the ICANN publishing something and requesting comments and feedbacks?

FRED BAKER: Yeah.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay.

FRED BAKER: Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Do you have any idea who is going to deploy? If it's a deployment plan, is there a person, organization or something behind that?

FRED BAKER: Who is going to deploy the hyperlocal?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, correctly. I thought that was an individual thing each and everyone did if they wanted to. To have a plan to deploy it sounds like someone's "taking over the world."

FRED BAKER: Well, it is listed as a project that OCTO wants to do this year. It's in their list of [a thousand] projects they want to do.

PAUL VIXIE: I have a comment.

FRED BAKER: Go for it.

PAUL VIXIE: While I appreciate the quizzical nature of the question of what has to be done to deploy hyperlocal given that it is something individual recursive operators would do for themselves, I have spoken with various ICANN people about that question, and the reason they're going to be spending resources on it is that they don't think it is well enough socialized.

They think it might be terribly obscure, might need some outreach, sort of the same way the [matters effort] needed some outreach, or it might need some kind of measurement track so that when a whole bunch of recursives go dark from our point of view, they'll still be reporting their statistics somehow – a question mark.

So there is stuff that ICANN is going to do, and while I don't know why, because I consider this idea to be bad, I nevertheless believe they will be spending a lot of time on it this year. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks, Paul.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so this comes back to something that has been a subject of stomach acid on my part for a while. Many of you have probably heard me say that a DOH operator, when they download the IANA zone and populate that in their DOH space, and as a result they're not coming to the root zone to get things, they simply downloaded the – they've done an AXFR, a zone transfer from the IANA, then they are performing as a root server operator whether they have that status or not.

And I think you just said, Paul, that the similar thing is probably true than with anybody that deploys a hyperlocal root.

PAUL VIXIE: No, sir. Let me clarify. There are plenty of recursive operators who just make themselves a stealth secondary for the root zone. They used to pull the zone from one of us, but now there are actual ICANN production-level servers that are maintained for that purpose. And in that case, they're doing what you said, which is that they go dark from our point of view. They're no longer sending us queries. But they are also able to answer queries from whatever population of stub resolvers or other recursives might be sending or forwarding queries to them. So this is actually pretty common everywhere that NAT is common, and there's nothing particularly wrong with it. That's been going on for a long time, but that's different.

In the hyperlocal case, you don't answer questions about the root using this data, you only use this data to help figure out where the nameservers are that you're going to forward to without first asking the root and expecting a delegation.

FRED BAKER:

Well, fine. So what you've done is you've created an instance of the root zone for yourself. Nobody else is asking you that question, you're not responding to that question from anybody else, but you are yourself querying the IANA root zone in your hyperlocal database.

PAUL VIXIE:

Yeah, but that doesn't – the idea of wiring that is in no way new. Doug Barton put it into FreeBSD as a standard feature without telling anybody and added F-root as their primary and caused quite a stir, and that was like 15 years ago. And Google has in the past wired all of the root information directly into the 8.8.8.8 servers because it was so small and it saved them some transaction time, which they prize highly. They eventually stopped doing that, but when I asked them why, they could not account for the reason. It just fell out during some change and no one noticed.

So this is not considered controversial. The hyperlocal thing Work Stream a little bit controversial because it required code change in all of the recursive servers, and there's already been one "hair on fire" bug from you guys at ISC where the benign changes that the OCTO funded in order to support hyperlocal ended up causing serious problems and requiring an emergency patch.

So it's the fact that it adds complexity without actually adding any value that makes me label it as a bad idea, but in any case, the idea of wiring the root into a recursive so that it never has to ask the root is something that various people, including myself, have been doing for decades.

FRED BAKER:

Well, and I'm not disputing that. What I am saying, what I'm concerned about, is the Google recursive resolver, the DOH service that they offer, had been reported as being used by – what is it – the P6 botnet and by – what is it – [GUALOC] botnet. People upload a text record into the DNS server at Google and then that is used to control the botnet.

That disturbs me, and it seems like we need to say – or somebody needs to say somewhere – that if you're playing with the IANA root zone and you're downloading that into your own database, and therefore not going to the RSS, you're responsible to treat it as – to react accordingly.

PAUL VIXIE:

Let me stop you right there.

FRED BAKER:

Go ahead.

PAUL VIXIE:

I don't want this to be the long branch of this meeting, but you have conjoined a couple of things that I think we should unconjoin. The thing that's happening with botnets using DOH was predicted and it will be

the way that all botnets operate soon, because it is such a sort of evolutionary advantage. But that's a DOH problem and has nothing to do particularly with who's got what copies of the root. That is somebody saying that the Internet system as defined by various RFCs over the years that requires that your naming come a certain way is out of date and we want to do it differently. So remind me to tell you about resolverless DNS next time we're together. But that's got nothing to do with this.

Now, what I can say about the responsibility we'd like people to have if they import a copy of the root zone, they have responsibilities, is, no, they don't. It's their equipment, their network. They'll answer whatever they want, and if they want .corp or .goog or .ford or .gmc to work even though it's not an allocated domain, or if they want .xxx to not work even though it is an allocated domain, they're going to do whatever they darn well please.

So I think that we would be in good company if we were to issue a statement echoing what the IAB said about ten years ago where they made a statement – you may have even been on the IAB at that time – about the universal namespace and the importance of coherency across all Internet systems. But we can't really go further than that, because in fact, what people are doing with servers they own, clients they own on a network they own, they will do whatever they want, and if we try to tell them otherwise, we will be seen as buffoons. Thank you. I'll shut up now.

FRED BAKER:

Well, maybe I'm a buffoon. I don't know. So that would be RFC 2826 you're talking about. Okay. That's just something that is my stomach acid, so I'll let it go.

Moving on then to reports. The first report comes from Brad and myself, and I need to tell you that last week, brad and I showed up in Marina del Rey for a two-day meeting of the SO and AC chairs. It turned out that the SO and AC chairs have a responsibility – that was a surprise to me, I wasn't aware of it – given to them by the bylaws of ICANN which is – the term I've used to describe it is a [shadow board, and I've been corrected fairly directly] on that – performing some decision services and that kind of thing.

When SSR1 was auguring in and ICANN wanted to create SSR2, Brad, Tripti and various others got involved in a discussion about what that should look like. That was related to this governments function carried out by the SO and AC chairs. So Brad and I basically sat and listened to a whole bunch of chairs – notably Rod Rasmussen from SSAC and Katrina what's her name from ccNSO – talking about a need for writing some procedures and such about that. There's no direct outcome from that meeting, but that's a discussion that's going on between ICANN executives and the SO and AC chairs. Brad, do you want to add to that?

BRAD VERD:

No, I think you got it. If you were to boil it down, this was – you guys are all aware because we report back prior to each ICANN meeting, the SO/AC leadership gets together and has a meeting with Göran, a couple

board members and part of Göran's staff – this was essentially the same exact thing, it was just two days of it. And yeah, that kind of covers it.

FRED BAKER: And in my humble opinion, it was two days too long. Anyhow, so we had this meeting, and it is what it is. Kaveh, do you have any comments –

BRAD VERD: I will add that I think most people thought it was good and they were going to do it – it was going to be a regular thing, meaning I think once a year, they were going to get all the SO/AC leaders together to do this.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. I think that was in fact an outcome. The best thing about a meeting is to have another meeting. Anyhow, so Kaveh, do you have any comments from the ICANN board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No additional comment. We had a workshop, but nothing related to RSSAC was on our agenda. So basically, nothing to add. There was – on BTC, I brought up GWG as an AOB, but all the update, as I said last time [inaudible] was basically exactly the e-mail that I also forwarded to RSSAC [inaudible]. So that's all I have. Nothing more than that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Very briefly, the CSC meeting for January was actually cancelled because we didn't have that much on our agenda, so we decided to save ourselves some time. We had three things that we needed to address, and we did that by e-mail or [vote] or something. [The e-mail updates were just two] regular items, approving the report from the IANA PTI, which was again an outstanding report with 100% success on meeting the SLA, then generating our own report from that where we just [comment on that.] And the third thing was actually one of the changes that we are [working with, which is] changes to the SLA metrics for delegation and redelegation of [inaudible] is something that comes from the PTI where we've seen that there are SLAs that cannot easily be met and that are a paper construct, it doesn't work well.

So now the PTI and the CSC generated a formal proposal to change this, [and what we need is to] take the decision – approve that statement, and the next step is then to have it approved by the ccNSO and the GNSO according to our procedures. Beyond that, not much else happened on CSC. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, I see your hand up. Is that an old hand?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That is indeed an old hand. I'll fix it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Suzanne, I see your hand up.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah, I actually wanted to go briefly back to the SO/AC chairs topic.

FRED BAKER: Go for it.

SUZANNE WOOLF: The question of the role there of the SO/AC chairs as a group actually dates back to – specific powers were taken away from the ICANN board in the last [reorg] of the bylaws, and a number of people were concerned that there were decisions that were going to have to be made and issues that were going to arise that had to be dealt with by somebody, and it wasn't entirely clear who did that instead of the board. So it sounds like – and the SSR2 thing was a good, concrete example of that.

I think that it makes sense – just as a comment, we can discuss on the mailing list – for you guys, Fred and Brad, to support the call for some kind of procedure there just because the SO/AC chairs do have kind of a new role, and transparency is nice about exactly what that means. And I would hesitate to say this because it sounds like it'll turn into more work for you guys, except I think it's work you're already expected to do. So some effort at transparency about what that means would actually, I think, be a good thing to support. Thanks.

was a productive meeting, and they talked through a number of topics on potential work for RZERC to work on.

I think maybe what should be shared here is that there were a number of items that were pulled out of the RSSAC history document and kind of sent over the fence to RZERC saying maybe RZERC should write a history document. I think the takeaway from the meeting – I wasn't there, but in the notes, they said that RZERC was not going to take on the task of writing a history document around the content of the root zone. That's all I have.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Russ, word from SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Fred. First, thanks to all that helped have our somewhat coordinated, or at least consistent, documents sent forward for a response to the KSK rollover document that is just out for public comment.

I have seen a document that's a suggestion for how SSAC and RSSAC might work on these things in the future, perhaps in a more ordered way that might involve changes to procedures on both sides. But that's a topic for further discussion, and I will expect to have that on the list of our items for the agenda for our joint meeting in Cancun. As I'd put out on our list – in the chat, I hope to have that draft agenda out sometime this week, and comments of what should or shouldn't be on there are very welcome, either before I send it out or after it's sent.

One thing that came to mind that I wanted to just note without providing any specifics is the two open public comment periods for the two documents listed above, the auction proceeds and the SSR2. There are discussions in SSAC that SSAC is not totally thrilled with either one of them. I won't get into any further comment at this point – it's not appropriate – but I would urge that people do take a look at the content of those, and if we need to have some joint or some other side conversations about that, I'm happy to help out facilitating.

I think that's all I had at this point, unless anybody had any questions or comments or requests for me.

FRED BAKER: Hearing none, thank you. Suzanne, your hand is still up. Is that an old hand or a new hand?

SUZANNE WOOLF: It's old. Sorry.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad, same question.

BRAD VERD: Apologies.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So be it. Daniel, you want to talk about the IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes. Maybe the only thing I can share is that the IAB has appointed two representatives for the GWG which are Ted Hardy and Geoff Huston. It's not so much RSSAC-related, but it's not independent from. Apart from that, I think that's all.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Naela.

NAELA SARRAS: Yes. Thank you, Fred. Real briefly, the PTI is required by the bylaws to develop its own strategic plan, which the PTI is working on right now with the PTI board. There'll be a session during Cancun, a public session, to run through what IANA or PTI has in its strategic plan and present it to the community and get feedback on that.

Once the schedule is finalized and I know when the session is, I'll share it with RSSAC, but it would be very appreciated if all the communities that we work with on a regular basis come and attend the session and give input on that strategic plan and ideas presented there. So that's one topic.

Because there was a lot of mention here on the GWG, I have been appointed also from IANA to be the liaison for the GWG, so I'll be attending those sessions as well, and then the last topic is SSR2. IANA is aware of the report that's out for public comment and we're actually reviewing it now to submit our own feedback on specific pieces there that [call on] work from IANA to happen or things that call on IANA. So

we're aware of the contents of that, we know ICANN and RSSAC are called on specifically for things there in SSR2. So we're reviewing them and we'll be submitting our own comments as well. That's it from me. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Nothing to report that hasn't already been covered. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So we arrive at the AOB portion of the agenda. Does anybody have anything to bring up at this point? Failing that, our next meeting will be on the 10th of March. It'll actually be in person in Cancun. There'll be a Zoom that people can join, but I think we'll all actually be there.

With that, do I hear a motion to adjourn?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Fred, I will not be in Cancun.

FRED BAKER: Oh my goodness, life is terrible.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And I move that we adjourn.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Seconded.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Then we're done. Thank you very much, guys.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]