FRED BAKER:	Call to order, roll call. So you just told me that Cogent isn't here at the moment. Do we have a list of the different operators?
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Sure.
FRED BAKER:	I should know this by now. Okay, so DISA? Who's here?
RYAN STEPHENSON:	This is Ryan Stephenson.
KEVIN WRIGHT:	Kevin Wright also on the line.
FRED BAKER:	Cool. Okay, ICANN? Matt?
MATT LARSON:	Matt Larson here.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. ISC. Jeff and I are on the line. NASA? Welcome, Barbara. Tom, are you here?

Okay—I'm sorry?

[BARBARA SCHLECKSER]:   I think he's on leave this week.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here. Patrik probably is not.

FRED BAKER: Okay. RIPE sent apologies. UMD?

KARL REUSS: Karl is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. USC?

WES HARDAKER: Sorry. Mute. Wes Hardaker is here, and Suzanne Woolf is unavailable today. And [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: Okay. ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad is here.

FRED BAKER: And WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, great. Thank you.

So the agenda Ozan is going to show us in a moment, but we have some of our usual administrative things: going over the minutes from a month ago—

OZAN SAHIN: Fred, sorry for the interruption. I think, for the attendance, we didn't go through the liaisons.

FRED BAKER:	Oh, you're correct. I'm sorry.
OZAN SAHIN:	And the staff.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. Kaveh is not here. He would be the liaison to the ICANN Board. Liman, you are here; liaison to CSC. And Brad, you are here; liaison to RZERC. Russ, are you here?
RUSS MUNDY:	Yeah, Russ is here. Good morning.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. Good morning. IAB; Daniel, are you here?
OZAN SAHIN:	Greg, this is Ozan. Daniel sent his apologies shortly before this call.
FRED BAKER:	Okay, cool. IANA; Naela, are you here?
OZAN SAHIN:	So did Naela.

FRED BAKER:	Okay. RZM; Duane, are you around?
	And, of course, from the GWG, we have Brad and Hiro and Liman online. Did I miss anybody else?
	Failing that, Karl, you said you might have to drop off the call?
KARL REUSS:	Yeah. A tropical storm is messing with my power pretty bad right now. It can't make up its mind—up or down.
FRED BAKER:	That could be a problem. In California, the utilities, PG&E and SCE, have basically told us that we have to have secondary power, and they might turn off their electricity at any moment. So that's a standing condition here.
RUSS MUNDY:	Fred, I'm in the same shape as Karl. We're in the same geographic area.
FRED BAKER:	Yeah. Well, I suspect that's true for several of us. Brad isn't too far away.
BRAD VERD:	Oh, yeah. Thank God for UPS.

FRED BAKER: Yeah.

Moving on to the administrivia, Ozan, do you want to talk about the minutes?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Hi, everyone. I circulated the draft minutes from the previous call on the 7th of July a couple of weeks ago, and we haven't received any comments or questions related to the draft minutes. The action items from this meeting were complete. If you have any comments, staff is ready to respond to those. Otherwise, the draft minutes from the 7th of July meeting is ready for voting today. Thank you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does anybody have comments on those minutes?

Hearing none, does anybody have problems with the minutes, want to vote know no on them?

Is anybody planning to abstain?

Failing, I would presume then that we have accepted the minutes.

Jeff, do you want to talk about the RSSAC Caucus?

JEFF OSBORN: Sure. Thanks, Fred. In getting used to this role, I think you're actually the one who's going to propose the vote, but I'm going to bring up that Tim

April has applied for membership. Tim is with Akamai, and those on the IETF circuit probably know Tim pretty well. He is the senior architect of information security at Akamai in Cambridge now. Dave Lawrence, who's also on the committee, vouched well for him. I've known him for years and think he's a great guy. Very smart. He's actually getting a masters right here in my hometown of Durham, New Hampshire, which makes it seem a little parochial. But I guess that's [inaudible].

So I think you propose the vote, Fred, or I do, but the membership committee is recommending him unanimously.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And I would gather that Liman likes him from the chatroom.

JEFF OSBORN: Yes. Tim would be a great addition.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does anybody else have any comments on Tim?

OZAN SAHIN: I see Russ has his hand up.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Russ, you have your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you. Yeah, I wanted to mention that Tim is also an SSAC member and very highly respected there. I would strongly support Tim being in the caucus.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, you've put your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. I thought I'd just substantiate my support in the chatroom. I seem to remember that he's also a member of the Internet Architecture Board (IAB). As Russ said, he is one of the brighter minds in SSAC and when it comes to DNS infrastructure. So I wholeheartedly support him.

WES HARDAKER: He is not a member of the IAB, but I support him, too. Very much so.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you, Wes, but has he been?

WES HARDAKER: No. In fact, he has not even been to many IETFs, believe it or not. It feels like he has been, but he actually hasn't been to that many.

LARS-JOHAN: Okay. My mistake then. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Is anybody opposed to accepting Tim?

Does anybody plan to abstain?

Failing that, I think we have accepted him.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thanks, Fred. I've actually got two other issues from the membership committee. We've had an issue where we're going through pinging the non-responsive members of the caucus. The caucus now numbers roughly 90 people, and there were about 17 who'd been inactive for quite a while as of May. We went back and pinged them twice with the gentle, thoughtful letter from Ozan, and we're trying to figure out what to do. We now have a set of four who didn't respond to two requests to please get on the horn.

So I guess we're looking for guidance from RSSAC: should we politely let them know, due to inactivity, we've let them go and they're welcome to reapply? Should we try three times? I guess we're really just looking for feedback before we do something unilaterally.

The adjunct to that would be that there's been a request that some people like the idea of being on the mailing list but had not intended to actually be active. So that question would be, should there be two classes of membership, one that's basically a mailing list reader and the other that is an active participant who's expected to serve more actively?

FRED BAKER: Well, everybody please feel free to jump in here. Liman, your hand is still up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Oh, it's up again. Jeff, my personal stance here is that two nudgings should be sufficient, so I think we should, as you stated, politely tell them that we have let them go and they're welcome to reapply.

When it comes to your—sorry, my mind just went blank. Your second thing was what? I had a comment there, too.

JEFF OSBORN: Two levels of membership: active and mailing.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Can't we do something with the mailing list? The mailing list is open, isn't it? So why do we have to have a membership category for people who just want to view the mailing list?

FRED BAKER: Well, frankly, I think the 90 or so people that we have on the caucus right now are mostly in that second category. We have a hard time getting them to do anything. One of the conditions that we have documented of being in the caucus is that occasionally you do something.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. So my point is that we should limit the number of the members in the caucus and have a list of caucus members that are the ones who are welcome to express themselves on the mailing list, and call the others listeners.

FRED BAKER: Well, I'm really strongly questioning the category of listeners. We have difficultly getting folks to actually do something, so creating a category of "You don't have to do anything" seemed like a bad idea.

Brad, you have your hand up.

BRAD VERD: Fred, I had the same challenge you're going through right now. Jeff, I need your help with this, but in the conversation that I overheard on this topic, here's how I thought it out. I think I'm in the same camp as you are, where every individual should be in the caucus and should be contributing or they should have gone through this culling of the herd, as what Jeff referred to it as. If you don't engage and you don't participate after X amount of time, you can reapply.

However, there are a few instances, like role accounts, where people want to listen. I don't remember the example specifically, Jeff, but it was like an IAB person or an IAB e-mail address or something like that where these people aren't necessarily going to be engaged but they want to and have a reason to listen. Jeff, do you remember what the example was?

JEFF OSBORN: I don't remember the exact one, but you're characterizing it exactly, where I have called it a mailing list only. I think the person proposing it was using the term "liaison."

BRAD VERD: Yeah, it was like that. And it was perfectly reasonable for them to be on the caucus mailing list. I don't remember the example. I'd have to go back through all the spreadsheets. That's where this discuss came up. I was like, "Do we categorize somebody as just as a listener so that, one, they're not on the spreadsheet that gets policed," meaning you're not engaging, you're not contributing, so we're going to remove you after a year or two type of thing. That, I believe, gives you a little bit more context on where Jeff's second question comes from.

JEFF OSBORN: Well, the question would be we, the membership committee, could come up with, "Here are a set of things that make sense as liaison." We can let the issue arise and just throw an asterisk onto the people who ask to be in that. Or we can come to then larger group and say, "What sort of liaison relationship would you like to see?"

I think I would propose the let's see what our experience leads to and then come back if it turns out to be thorny at all.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think you got me wrong, Fred. I didn't mean that we should have two categories of members. I meant that we should have one category of members, and those are the ones who have writing access to the mailing list. The other ones should just be people have subscribed to the mailing list to listen in. I think that's a valid thing to do because the list, at least as I remembered, is open and you can look in the archives, but it's more convenient to listen in to a mailing list by receiving it in your mailbox. So I don't really want to prohibit people from doing that, as it's supposed to be an open mailing list, but to be listed on the web page of caucus members, you should be contribute. And the caucus members should be the ones who have write access to the mailing list. That's how I viewed it. And, of course, the people subscribed to the mailing list will include the liaisons who may want to do that, but that would prevent them from expressing themselves on the mailing list. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Well, those are two slightly different inputs, then, if I'm understanding it, where, in one, somebody could act as a liaison, and, in the other, they could act as a read-only mailing list person. Or I guess those two could be the same.

Brad, was Liman's characterization of that close enough to what you thought was a good idea?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I feel like the burden is going to call on the membership committee. Sorry, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: I think it comes down to policing the engagement or monitoring the engagement. There's going to be those who are engaged, and there are going to be those who listen. I think we're going to have to figure that out as we go. Maybe we don't answer it and we don't document it in our procedures document right now. Right now, there is only one or two of those that I can think of in the discussion that occurred, so it didn't consume most of the people. Most of the people signed up to be in the caucus to contribute, not to listen. Unfortunately, they're just not contributing.

JEFF OSBORN: Right. I don't think it's a big enough issue that it requires an architecture be created.

BRAD VERD: [I agree.]

JEFF OSBORN: We can talk about it and come back with some ideas, and I think we can do it on more ad hoc basis successfully, if you're alright with that.

FRED BAKER: Who is "you" in that context?

JEFF OSBORN: That's y'all; the plural of "you."

FRED BAKER: Okay.

JEFF OSBORN: That's it from the membership committee if there's no more comments. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Well, the floor is still open to discuss this. I'll give you my opinion. I think the current caucus rules say that, if you're on the list, you should be contributing. I'm not sure why we should change that. I haven't heard an argument.

As far as liaisons, we currently have a number of liaisons, and they're all on the caucus list, are they not?

JEFF OSBORN: Good question. Fred, I'm coming away from this with the idea that you get two pokes and then you're thrown off and have the ability to reapply. Where this will come up is if we throw someone off and, if they reapply, they say, "Gee, I'm really in a liaison role. Do you mind if my activity level is lower?" But we're still intending to toss them off with

the ability to reapply after two reminders don't get a commitment to do more activity.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman in the chat says that he can live with my version of things.

Ken, you said +1. Was that with regard to Tim?

KEN RENARD: That was in regard to Liman's points.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. Well, we're going to go politely continue to remind people they need to be active and, after two reminders and no commitment of further activity, we'll gently let them go and remind them they can reapply. I'll let you know how that goes at our next meeting.

FRED BAKER: Sounds good. The next thing is we have some liaison appointments. Liman, we had agreed in the last meeting that we would send you to the CSC. Does that still work for you?

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: That definitely still works for me, so I'm happy to do that for you, as long as you realize that you deviate from our procedures document. I'm slightly uncomfortable with that because I was probably the one who spoke most vividly for the rule of only two terms, but if you all agree on that, then I'm happy to serve.

FRED BAKER: Well, let me throw the question out. I believe that we decided that that was okay, but does anybody have discomfort with that at this point?

Yeah, I think the committee decided to ask you to do it again, please.

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: Then I'm happy to do that. Thank you for your confidence.

FRED BAKER: Okay. RZERC. Daniel, you volunteered to represent us in the RZERC. Does that still stand?

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: Daniel is not on the call.

FRED BAKER: Daniel is not on the call. Okay. Well, does anybody have any objection to him serving on the RZERC?

When we take a vote or are in the process of taking a vote, does anybody abstain?

EN

Failing that, it seems to me that we have accepted Daniel as our liaison to the RZERC. So thank you, Brad, for your work there over the past few years. We'll hand this off to Daniel now.

BRAD VERD: Great.

FRED BAKER: Wes, you wanted to talk about GitHub.

WES HARDAKER: Yes, please. Thanks, Fred. I really wanted to run this by you: a little bit of background history. We have an RSSAC Caucus GitHub repository that we started, I would say, two or three years ago. Currently there are eight repositories in it that have been growing over time. We used to announce it more broadly at meetings and stuff like that. I did add Duane as a co-administrator. I realized having me being the only person with access … I'd be happy to add a couple more people if other people wanted to share the role of approving new repositories coming into it and miscellaneous stuff that requires almost no work.

But more importantly, my policy has been, about adding new repositories, to add any project that is related to the RSS and not just related to specific caucus work efforts to put it as a housing place for projects related to the root server system in general, be it measurement or whatever. This "policy" came up during a conversation with somebody about whether to add his repository to the RSSAC Caucus repository list. He stated that it couldn't there because it wasn't an

official RSSAC Caucus work effort, even though it likely was going to be in the future. This made me realize I was holding this policy of openness without having discussed it with the entire RSSAC.

So I'm bringing this question to you: does anybody object to this general policy of just adding projects that seem to be related to the RSS, regardless of whether they're part of a caucus work effort itself?

I will take silence as consent if nobody says anything.

FRED BAKER: Well, I don't see any hands up, so I don't see a problem with that.

WES HARDAKER: Oh, there we go. Duane?

FRED BAKER: Duane, you want to comment?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I think the policy is fine. There hasn't been a lot of activity, really, so it hasn't been an issue. I think the policy can be liberal and a little bit play-it-by-ear. I would maybe say that, for anything that is an official work party or an official work of the caucus, maybe our policy needs to be that it should be in this repository—be a little bit more aggressive about capturing that work in this repository—because I think there have been some examples in the past where work has been done, and it did

not go into this repository, this account, which was a little bit unfortunate in my opinion.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, I agree with that, too. And I will say that this discussion today will not reflect the discussion I had with the other participant, who's going to remain nameless because he wanted to hold his repository tight to his chest and not specifically have it. So we'll come back to that at some point in the future. Thanks, Duane. I think that's a good idea.

Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I was just going to say that I support this. Let's not make a big thing out of it. It's not that many sub-repositories you're dealing with, I suppose. If we start to have a steady stream of new repositories that want to live there, then maybe we should revisit this and see how we can make your job easier by adding a bit of framework to it.

I see a point in actually attracting projects and have them under one umbrella. It would be easier to find them. Once you find one, you might find others that are interesting as well. So I think it's better to have them under one umbrella then having them spread to other various people. I support your thought of having a procedure that says that the RSSAC Caucus work should go in there, because I'm not quite happy with individual members running the RSSAC's archives or repositories for specific work items in the caucus. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER: Okay, great. I agree on all points. Andrew?

ANDREW MCONACHIE: Just a question. This is really just for software, right? I know a lot of people like to develop documents in GitHub, but you're really just planning on hosting software projects in this?

WES HARDAKER: Well, you bring up a fantastic question that I don't have an answer for. Everything there has been software-related or data-related because the RSSAC 002 is actually about data. I haven't really thought about documents.

Liman has an answer, though.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well, I was just about to add the data point that you added yourself, but also I suggest that the policy is along the lines of that people we welcome to develop documents in the repository. But, when it comes to documents, there are other mechanisms that are also useful, so I suggest that we're not quite as strict when it comes to documents as we might want to be with the software and data.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. I'd argue that it'd be very hard to force us to put documents there because we tend to use Google Docs for stuff. So that's probably not the right place to capture documents, but, if something was written in text

or HTML or LaTeX, I certainly would object to having it published there. But that's certainly a good question. Thank you, Andrew.

All right. I think that gives me the advice I needed, since I see no other hands. Thank you, all, for reaffirming and solidifying our thoughts around the caucus effort.

I do have to drop off the call here in a short bit for a DNS-OARC prep, but—

FRED BAKER: Okay. I do have one remaining question. Is this something we need to document, such as in RSSAC 0?

WES HARDAKER: Well, I generally consider RSSAC 0 to be more official, but it's been pointed out to me that it's really more a procedural type thing. So I guess that wouldn't hurt. Maybe I can try and write up a paragraph to stick in a section, hopefully near the end, as supplemental material, where some of our resources are. Does that make sense?

FRED BAKER: That might. Does anybody else have an opinion?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would welcome it, but I don't see that as critically necessary.

WES HARDAKER:	All right. I'll put it on my to-do list to write something else. If it goes in, great, but it'll be short anyway.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. Short sounds food in any event. Thanks, Wes.
	Moving on to work items, Ken, you've got two work parties. You want to talk about them?
KEN RENARD:	Sure. Thanks, Fred. The Tool to Gather Local Perspective Work Party is progressing. We met about two or three weeks ago. Andrew has developed some user narratives: the use cases of what type of user would be out there and how they would use every tool. In just a little bit, I can put those links into the chat. Please take a look at those if you have time and provide some input. It's a good start on the background on this. Again, the idea here is much more about defining a tool with a little bit less emphasis on full implementation everywhere. That said, Andrew's code, I believe, actually is in that repository. The next meeting of the work party will be on the 24th of August.
	Onto the Rogue Operator Work Party, I think things are progressing. The document is out there. Please take a look and comment on the document or even comment on the mail list. We have a few writing assignments out there. I know it's been IETF Week and OARC Week here coming, so everybody gets a homework pass on that for a little bit. The next meeting for the Rogue Operator Work Party is the 25th of August, and everybody is welcome to join in on both of those work party

conference calls, as well as comment in the documents, or send something out to the mail list. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Moving on to the financial question, we've been drafting an SLE or SLA or something like that. My sense is that we're mostly done. I guess we had a call on Thursday morning, my time. I'll basically ask this question again then, but my sense that is, at this point, we're in a position to hand this off to the GWG and just say, "This is our input on a possible SLA structure."

Does anybody have heartburn with that? Does that cause an issue?

KEN RENARD: I just wanted to mention briefly that, on the last call, I had sent out a version of that same document written in the format of a letter of intent. There's been a few comments on that. I appreciate that. Really, it only serves to, at least for our organization, putting the exact same message in in the form of a letter of intent versus an SLA. It makes our lawyers happy—happier. Again, it's a topic for discussion for the meeting on Thursday. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I do hope that people are sending this up their management chain. If we actually get something that looks like this from ICANN, I wouldn't want that to be a surprise to anyone. So [inaudible] doing that.

With that, then we'll have a meeting or we'll have a call on Thursday, and we can discuss this further.

RSSAC 0 Version 5. Andrew, do you want to comment on that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. Actually, I had a couple items to talk about with respect to RSSAC 000 v5. We had a meeting July 16th where we went through all the outstanding issues on the Update v5. The document that Ozan is showing right now is a diff from v3. So the suggestions, the colored text, is added text that will be in v5.

We have two issues remaining. We had one issue leftover from the call, and then we had a new issue that's come up. The issue that's leftover from the call that we didn't get to was the amount of time that is necessary to give notice before rescheduling either an RSSAC normal meeting or an RSSAC emergency meeting. So we went through on the call the amount of time that's necessary for planning a meeting, and I think we came to the agreement that emergency meetings should be scheduled at least 72 hours in advance but must not be scheduled less than 24 hours in advance. But we ran out of time before we could discuss rescheduling and how much notice is required before a meeting could be rescheduled. So that's one issue.

The other issue has to do with confidentiality in RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus work parties/dealing first with the amount of notice necessary before rescheduling or postponing a meeting. I would love to hear some input from the RSSAC on that. We didn't have much time to discuss it on the call. I think, Ozan, you want to go down to—yeah, you're right—161.

That's where the text would go. Is Wes still on the call? Because I know Wes had some feelings. But, no, it looks like Wes has dropped off.

Does anyone—Lars, go ahead. I'm looking for some input here, so it's great if you provide some.

Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Unfortunately and embarrassingly enough, I missed the previous meeting. I think I would say that the regular meeting, scheduled 24 hours in advance, is too tight. For an emergency meeting, it may happen, but for a regular meeting, 24 hours is too little. If it's a regular meeting, it means that we don't have any emergencies going, and I basically see no reason to schedule a meeting on that short notice. Having a plan and being able to participate is important, so I would say 72 hours there.

Rescheduling a meeting is a different thing. I think I would argue that, if you start to look at really tight timelines—I call 24 hours really tight— maybe you should look at different means of reaching people than e-mail because I will be honest and say that I don't read e-mail during my vacation, or at least as little as possible. So, if this meeting would have been rescheduled on a 24-hour notice, I probably wouldn't have noted, especially not if it would have been brought to an earlier point in time.

On the other hand, if someone had called me or sent me a text message saying, "Please note that we've moved the meeting," that would be a

different thing because I do have telephone and SMS text available at all times.

So 24 hours for regular meetings is too tight. For emergency meetings, it may happen. I would argue that there should be a sentence in there that says that the host of the meeting, or some better word, should take extra measures to reach all members of the RSSAC in case we need to reschedule something on a shorter notice than blah. That could be 72 hours or something.

Doing e-mail first is fine, and asking people to respond, saying, "Yes, I received and understood." That would work for me, but if people don't respond to that, I think going for a second communications method would be welcome. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Thanks for that input. Currently, on the question of 24 hours being too short to schedule a meeting, we currently have language which says it should be scheduled at least one week in advance and must not be scheduled less than 24 hours in advance. But I take it from your comment that that 24 hours should be changed to 72 hours. So it must not be scheduled less than 72 hours in advance.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, I think that's my opinion. I'm happy to listen to other opinions as well. If it turns out that the rest of you are happy to have such a short notice, then I will comply, but what are the arguments for having it that short for regular meetings?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: If I can characterize what people were saying on the call, it's that sometimes it may be necessary to schedule it with that short of notice, but it should be done very, very, very rarely. If someone wants to speak in favor of 24 hours, please do so. I will change it to 72 hours here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would argue that, if we need to set up a meeting on a shorter notice, we should call it an emergency meeting, and that should make things apparent because, if we need to talk on that short notice, I would argue it is an emergency. Thanks.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. That's understandable. And the text—Ozan, if you could stroll down a little bit to 1.6.2—on the timing for emergency meetings is, "should be scheduled at least 72 hours in advance, and must not be scheduled less than 24 hours in advance."

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm okay with that.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. I think that makes sense, too, where it's a clear delineation then between a regular meeting and an emergency meeting, which is 72 hours.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I agree with that.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: On the subject of postponement, I think there's a difference between moving a meeting forward and moving a meeting backwards, like postponing, like bringing it forward or postponing it. Certainly, if you—

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry. For a non-English speaker, can you please use the words "earlier" and "later"?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, that's a lot better. There's a difference between those two things, right? I don't know if we want separate times for those or if we just want to say you can never move a meeting forward; you can only move a meeting later. That might make this discussion easier.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: We could argue that the earlier times [of it] can kick in. If you want to move a meeting and have it earlier, and you do that three weeks ahead of time, I'm fine. If you do it less than 72 hours ahead of time, I'm not so fine.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. But anything greater than a week is basically just a scheduling, assuming that a meeting requires a week in advance of scheduling,

right? So, if you reschedule something that's three weeks away, that's certainly okay. It's more about less than a week.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. So why do we have text about rescheduling? Should we just have text about scheduling?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Hmm. Okay. So then the text of timing for scheduling then controls the rescheduling as well, and you just can't reschedule outside of what the controlling text is for scheduling.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's my proposal.

FRED BAKER: It makes sense to me.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Well, if people agree with that, then there's on additional text that's necessary, I think. So we'll leave as is, and if people have more comments on list, they can certainly send comments to the list. This is not going to be the last time when people get to comment on this. So we'll leave that as is for now.

FRED BAKER: So what is the current trajectory for this document? Are we expecting to approve it next month or in September or when? Well, next month is September.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I think that depends upon when Wes gets me some text about GitHub. That just came up. So we probably want that in here as well. I can work with Wes on that. I was planning on getting this to the RSSAC for approval in September, but that was before the text about GitHub that we're waiting on Wes for now.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. And Brad comments in the chatroom, "This is far too detailed." Brad, do you want to say more.

BRAD VERD: I think we need to be careful prescribing every instance you can think of for a meeting. We don't know what we don't know. I think we need to leave it up to the Chair to figure out when and if a meeting needs to be called and obviously give him some guidelines, but I feel like we've spent a lot of time on this topic and we just need to be aware of that, I guess.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And Russ buys into your comment. For the record, so do I.

So, Andrew, do you believe you've gotten out of this what you need?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Absolutely, yeah. I'll just leave the text as is and move on to the new text on confidentiality.

Ozan, can you scroll down to section 2.6.1? Perfect. You're already there. This section, 2.6.1, previously talked about confidentiality in terms of both RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus work parties. They're pretty different in terms of confidentiality because the RSSAC mailing list is closed, whereas the RSSAC Caucus mailing list is open. So the text really didn't make any sense, as it was written. So I proposed some new text to separate it out into two separate paragraphs, and then Brad gave me some good feedback on the specific confidentiality requirements for RSSAC Caucus work parties. The text that we're proposing is what's there on the screen right now.

Basically, for the RSSAC mailing list, it's confidential. If you want to share something from an RSSAC work party, you need to get the permission of the work party leader or the RSSAC first. Or it says the work party must resolve confidentiality issues related to the draft work party document before it is shared outside the RSSAC. So that's pretty straightforward for the RSSAC.

For the RSSAC Caucus, it stated, "The RSSAC Caucus mailing list is open the public. Therefore, RSSAC Caucus work party activities and working drafts are not strictly confidential. However, RSSAC Caucus members must obtain concurrence from the work party leader before publicly publishing, forwarding, or presenting any work party information." My understanding is that this is to prevent work party documents that are

being worked on within the RSSAC Caucus from being forwarded to another list, for example.

Any comments on that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Question from Liman here. We normally create mailing lists for caucus work parties, don't we?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: We've stopped doing that recently. We've just been doing the work party work on the main caucus mailing list.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Fair enough. Because the underlying question was whether the work party mailing list was open to the public or not.

Now, that question is moot, so I would … hmm. I have a problem. If the work is being done on the mailing list, which is public, why would we want to limit forwarding or publishing? We could possibly put something in that that says "outside regular caucus channels," or something along those lines, but if it's open, it's open.

FRED BAKER: Well, yes and no. This is in response to an event that happened a month ago, I think.

BRAD VERD: No, it was like a year or two ago.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, the point being that something was being discussed on the caucus list and was not finalized and was forwarded by someone to—I forget—any entity in China. My concern with that is that it has left that entity with an unresolved data point. They didn't know what they didn't know: that it wasn't final, that it might change. If it did change, they didn't know necessarily whether it had changed. So distributing it beyond the caucus list was premature. I think this is working around, or trying to, to make that not happen.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That is a fair comment. Maybe this is the simplest way to address that. So I agree because, in talking to the work party leader, the work party leader can inform how this should be [shared] somewhere else and under which conditions. So that is fair. I'm happy with that text then. Thank you.

BARBARA SCHLEKSER: I have a question regarding that. With anyone who works for the federal government, any product that they work on is going to be subject to freedom of information. So you could put that in there, which would stop people from forwarding things and say, "Hey, take a look at this," but just understand that anything that we work is, if somebody were to [inaudible]. They would have to go through the freedom of information office.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah, but if something did come out that way, then it seems like it'd be clearly something that was under discussion at the time and was not finished. Am I incorrect in that?

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: I think they could ask for anything at any time or even documents or new documents. They wouldn't have to be constrained to something that was under discussion. Now, the likelihood of someone looking for something [would be] limited. When you put absolutes in here, like "You must do this, you must do that," just understand that any government agency's hands are tied somewhat with keeping things outside of that reach.

BRAD VERD: Fred, may I?

FRED BAKER: Yeah, go ahead.

BRAD VERD: I don't disagree with that statement. I've been the subject of many FOIA requests. One, the FOIA requests take a long time. So this confidentiality topic is not a retrospective one, meaning all it's supposed to give is guidance for the work party during the work party to not share documents outside to other mailing lists and public posts and whatnot.

Clearly, it's available on the mailing list, and if somebody wants it, they can go join the mailing list or go read it. But also, with a FOIA request, you're given an opportunity to give context on that FOIA request. So, if there was something asked for and the timeline fell directly in the middle of the work party, you could give context on that, saying that "This is the document but it wasn't done," and give a pointer to the final document also.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Right. That's fine. I just have a problem with the word "must." But that's right. Just so you understand.

BRAD VERD: This is, again, during a work party, so I don't see how a FOIA request, even if one came in today … My guess is the work party would be long done before any FOIA request was processed through the U.S. government.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Very possible. Well, [maybe we] only have like 48 hours respond.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, you've got your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would just speak in support of Barbara here. I come from a part of the world where that freedom of information is very importantly, taken

very seriously. My wife is a civil servant at the Board of Customs and Communication and, on a regular basis, an in every week, deals with this. You are quite right. I strongly support that we make sure that the words allow for your situation.

I also believe that we shouldn't set our hopes to high when it comes to how long a time it takes to deal with that. I think I heard you say, Barbara, 48 hours as a maximum. That was my thinking as well. We're talking hours rather than weeks here. So, if you aren't comfortable with the words here, we should listen to you and we should adapt. Thanks.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Well, I'm just saying if I was to pass this through Legal through our legal office and say if this was an agreement, I would have a problem with the word "must obtain concurrence." So I'm just saying, outside of government, FOIA, [what] request, and then just something that allows bit of flexibility to—

FRED BAKER: Okay, Barbara. Do you have a suggestion as to the wording?

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Yeah, I could add something in there. "For normal sharing outside of an official FOIA of freedom of information request, they must obtain that concurrence."

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry to jump in.

FRED BAKER: Go ahead. You had your hand up and down.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Even if it is an official FOIA request, shouldn't the person getting that request be put into a position to then notify the work party leader that this is happening? Doesn't this verbiage allow for that or make that happen?

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: It could, but, depending on the response time of the work party, then I would still have to get a response from the work party [within that—]

BRAD VERD: [From the work party].

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Right. As long as you could meet those timeframes. Now, I understand this is far-fetched idea that someone would actually want to see something—

BRAD VERD: [inaudible] spend a lot of our time here going through these [inaudible], so I think it's fine. I feel like, with the wording right now, if you got a request or if Liman got a request from a government agency for

documentation from some work party, it seems that the work party leaders should be made known or made aware of that. I feel like—

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: I would say they could made aware, but I couldn't be restricted to getting a response from them before. If a government had input on this and they say, "Hey, want to know what influence this government person had on this document," especially when, [inaudible] groups like these, people are looking for government influence to find out who's doing what. So they must notify. I think we could notify the work party, but if it was done on [inaudible] business days. But if I wasn't to get a response within that 48 hours, I couldn't be constrained not to share that information.

FRED BAKER: Liman, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I'm thinking about words here: if we add something like "unless forced by law," or something along those lines.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Yeah. That would be fine.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Something that I'm cogitating here is we have various types of people around the world that worry about U.S. government influence

on the root of the proceedings of ICANN and so on and so forth. One thing that I would be very concerned about would be to find a reference to U.S. government having a control point somehow here.

Now, Liman, you say your wife is a civil servant. Would it make sense to simply refer to government action as in any government?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That works for me. You should ask Barbara—

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: [inaudible]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: [I] don't have problem with it, but I [see] strong support for Barbara.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Yeah. By saying "by law," then that would apply to any country's law and not just the U.S. government. [inaudible] what you [meant] before. Unless …

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now Andrew is typing some proposed text in the document. Take a look at that if you would.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Right. That's where I was looking. I was fine with what he has: "to do so by law."

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, your hand is still up. Do you have more?

Okay. He took it down. Andrew, let me turn this back to you. Are there further things that we need to discuss in this document?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: No. That was the last one. So I'm going to turn it back over to you, Fred, unless there's further discussion on this.

FRED BAKER: Let me ask you a question. What's the trajectory on this document? And what do we expect to do with it?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'm going to work with Wes to get that GitHub stuff in. I'd like to have this ready for the RSSAC to vote on at its September meeting; so next month.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So it needs to be stable then a week in advance of that.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Correct. So I'll work with Wes with week, maybe next week, and get it to the RSSAC mailing list in a stable way. Then hopefully we can vote on it in September.

FRED BAKER: Okay. That makes sense.

Now I'm looking around for the agenda. What am I—here we go. Okay. So we're moving on to reports. I'll note that Russ dropped off. He had a meeting that he had to go to that started four minutes ago. I don't really have a lot to talk about. There has been discussion on the SO and AC Chairs list about the standing committee for the independent review process. I just dropped a link to the description of the IRP in the chat. You're free to go look at that. This has been compared to a nominating committee—not that it produces nominations, per se, but it would be similar to that in its process. There seems to be some discussion that each community, each SO, each AC within ICANN would be able to contribute a person to that committee.

In a call, what, a week ago or two weeks ago, there was a discussion of, should this just be the chair? Should this be somebody else? That's an ongoing discussion. Personally, I would be quite happy to not be the person sitting in that seat because this is basically watching the ICANN Board and dealing with issues when somebody has a complaint with the behavior of the ICANN Board. So I'm going to be making a statement about it from time to time. Don't be too surprised.

Brad, do you have anything on that topic or other topics to bring up?

BRAD VERD: No. You covered it, I think.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And Kavouss is not here. Liman, comments from the CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. The CSC is fairly quiet at the moment. We've gone through a phase where we've changed a few metrics in the SLA or SLE agreement. They have now settled.

Let me see. The June report was the first one that had all these new measurements in it. I'm happy to report that PTI met them all. So that is now, so to say, done.

We also had an interaction with the IANA IFRT, the … what is this? IANA Functions Review Team. They sent us a series of questions, which we have responded to. That led to a follow-up question that we actually have to discuss. There is a document which describes the transition of the IANA to a new entity in case that is decided upon. In there, it says that ICANN should make a review with the help of the CSC. It was a question of how the CSC views this text, whether the CSC sees or understands that it has a commitment there or that it sorts itself under ICANN. My response is that, as the text is written, we expect ICANN to take the lead and call upon us if they need our help, and then we will be happy to assist and also that, if we in our normal work, see things that call upon a review of some kind, we will talk to ICANN and take that into

consideration. If that happens, we expect to be involved in the following procedures. So that's that.

Apart from that, it's pretty quiet. The only other thing we do is we're slowly—that is slowly—looking at if the CSC should look at more or different parameters than are currently covered by the SLE. The specific ones we have are DNSSEC and key generation and signing and so on. We've put that a bit on a hold because of COVID-19 because everything is in really big turmoil right now. We do keep an eye on the PTI and its emergency providers for generating and finding keys. We are going to start the activity of looking at if we need to look at something else, if we need to expand our mandate, or, after, have our mandate expanded later this fall.

So, at the moment, it's pretty quiet, but we have things looming on the horizon. Thank you. Questions?

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you, much. Now, I had a thought while you were talking concerning legal mandates and such. I should have mentioned this in her comments a moment ago. I have asked Ozan to run our draft SLA by ICANN Legal, the basic purpose being, if we forget something, if we screwed up somewhere, let's find out sooner rather than later. So heads up. We may get comments from them. I haven't been given a timeline there [inaudible] there further comments.

Moving on to the RZERC, Brad?

BRAD VERD: Nothing new to share here. I think I've shared before, but real quickly, there is one document or statement that RZERC is working on. It's the zone digest RFC that's going through the IETF. It was something that would have to go through the RZERC because it's a new record type for the root zone. Essentially, the statement is in support of it. So that's happening and should be coming out shortly.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Russ has a conflict. He's gone away. Daniel, are you here? No. Daniel isn't here. Naela, do you have anything from the IANA?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. Naela also sent her apologies, so she's not on the call.

FRED BAKER: Okay. To Duane/RZM.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Fred. Nothing to report from the RZM today.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad, Hiro, Liman, which one of you wants to speak for the GWG?

HIRO HOTTA: May I?

FRED BAKER: Sure. Go right ahead.

HIRO HOTTA: I personally could not join one of the two calls in July, so I know half of how GWG went from the Zoom recording. In the last GWG call, the conceptual diagram for RSS governance model was discussed. The diagram included ICANN's subsidiaries, single member LLC called PRS and related entities such as the ICANN Board or RSO. It was drafted by the drafting team and was discussed. Liman is a drafting team member. Among the aspects of the discussion are whether SAPF should have big power, empowered as a community for the PRS. In such a case, the PRS Board will be very lightweight. And how should it be implemented?

So it still needs, of course, more discussion. It's too early to foresee the details of the RSS governance model. We need more discussion. That's it from me. Brad and Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you, Hiro. That was very spot-on. There have been discussions in the drafting team, as you say. I am on vacation, so I'm not paying quite as much attention to this as I might do otherwise. But I have tried to participate in the telephone conferences. There is, as you say, Hiro, discussion regarding how the SAPF should relate to the PRS body that is the current strawman idea for how to process the relationship with the root server operators.

There are some things that are bells of warning for me, and one of them is that I have a gut feeling that some of the members of the drafting

team, and maybe of the entire GWG, want to see the relationship between this new organization, the PRS, and the root server operators as a pure contractual—what do you call it?—relationship with the RZERC was the subcontractor and nothing more than that. A result of that relationship would be that the root server operators would be precluded from being members of the board of the PRS. That could work out if you make the board very lightweight, and the only purpose for that board is to make sure the organization is well-run and the procedures are followed and so on, budget is kept, and whatnot. It seems like the GWG on giving the power to the SAPF. There, there is no such limitation on root server operators to participate.

So, if we can make the relationship within the SAPF and the PRS organization well-defined, and we make sure that the SAPF has the powers that it needs to, so to speak, control what's going on in the PRS, we might make this work. But continue to keep an eye on us because this is far from done yet. Thank you.

Brad, any comments?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I think I share the same concern Liman does. I am a bit concerned. I think I stated here last time that, when we did 37, we identified three stakeholders: the IAB, the ICANN community, and the RSOs. I feel like discussions thus far have not taken into account the RSOs as a stakeholder. Quite the opposite. So I think I shared this concern last time. It continues to be a concern of mine. I will continue to push back on that.

EN

I only other thing I think I've shared here also is that I feel that, if they go forward with creating this new independent identity PRS, which is essentially just like PTI, then it's got to be linked to PTI somehow, meaning the IANA root should be tied to the resolution service that serves it. So wherever PTI goes, PRS should follow. I continue stand on tables and scream that.

So that's the update. Any questions?

FRED BAKER: I think my principle comment there is that I expected that we wouldn't be contracting directly with the Board. We would contract with some entity like PTI. So, from that perspective, having the LLC seems fine.

I'm a little bit worried, speaking now as a Board member at ISC—many of us have business interests with our companies, too—of handing something that is business-critical off to somebody that has no skin in the game. I'd like to see some correlation there. So, Brad, I'm with you on making sure that the RSOs are seen as stakeholders.

BRAD VERD: Sorry, Ken. Just really quick to give you feedback on what Liman pointed out was that they went out of their way—certain members did—to make sure that the Board members on the PRS were not RSO members. They would be appointed maybe from RSSAC or the RSO members, but they were not … That was limited, basically saying they were not RSO members. I think that's what Liman was just saying.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, quite so. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So do we have further comments on the GWG report?

BRAD VERD: Ken has his hand up.

FRED BAKER: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead, Ken.

KEN RENARD: Just a quick comment. Any thoughts or discussions on should that PRS serve the secretariat function as well?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I—ah, right. No, I didn't attend the previous RSSAC meeting. So there have been discussion regarding the secretariat function. I have identified two different types of secretariat functions that need to happen. It seems like the other members of the group take it for granted to some extent that this PRS would supply the secretariat function. I would argue that that might work for some logistics that the root server operators need help with for creating meetings where we can synchronize and things like that. It might not work for other things, where we're talking about resources that are common to the root server operators, such as domain names or servers or cooperating joint use servers for communication and so on.

So there are two different types of secretariat functions that need to happen, and it could be that PRS can supply one of them without any problems. It could be that the root server operators are happy with the PRS doing for them, and that could work out well. I imagine that one or two of the members of the GWG would be quite happy to see the secretariat functions. Indeed, it's quite natural that they're kept in the PRS because that would align with their view [of] the contract relationship, where the RSO is a subcontractor. But we haven't said the last word on that.

[FRED BAKER]:   Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So we've come to the end of our agenda. Let me put that out here. Does anybody have something to raise before I close the meeting?

Hearing none, our next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, the 1st of September. So I'll see you then or be online with you then. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]