

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. We're started. I'm looking around on my desktop for an e-mail. Here we are. Okay. I guess I'm supposed to take a roll call. Here we go. Okay. Cogent. Who's here from Cogent? DISA? Keven and Ryan, are you here? ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ISC. I'm here, Jeff is here.

JEFF OSBORN: I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. NASA?

KEITH BLUESTEIN: Keith Bluestein is here.

FRED BAKER: And I believe I saw a note from Tom a moment ago.

[KAVEH RANJBAR:] Oh, yeah. He should be on.

---

*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.*

FRED BAKER:                      Yeah. Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:            Yes, Liman is here. I hope you can hear me.

FRED BAKER:                      Yes, I can hear you. RIPE? Kaveh, I heard you a moment ago.

KAVEH RANJBAR:                Yes, I am here. Happy New Year to all.

FRED BAKER:                      Thank you. University of Maryland?

KARL DEUSS:                      Karl is here.

FRED BAKER:                      USC?

WES HARDAKER:                Good morning. Wes is here.

SUZANNE WOOLF:                And Suzanne.

---

FRED BAKER: ARL?

KEN RENARD: Good morning. This is Ken Renard.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad is here.

MATT WEINBERG: Matt Weinberg, as well.

FRED BAKER: Okay. WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Kaveh. You are also the liaison to the board. Liman, you are also CSC. Brad, you are also RZERC. SSAC. Russ, are you here? IAB, Daniel?

---

DANIEL MIGAULT: I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. IANA, Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: Good morning. I am here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and RZM. Duane, are you on?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I expect we're going to have a few people adding in a moment. What do we have? Oh, agenda review. Okay. You can see the agenda in front of you. We have four votes this morning, at least one of which I expect to basically defer something to a future meeting. We have, what? Four different work items? We can talk about those things as well. Does anybody see anything that they would like to change on the agenda? Hearing none.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Russ is on his way. You can put him down as here.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. Let's move on to the administrivia. Ozan, do you want to talk about the minutes?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Hi, everyone. Happy New Year. You can see the RSSAC meeting minutes from the 3<sup>rd</sup> of December's monthly meeting in front of you now. I circulated that two weeks ago. The action items from that meeting were completed. As for feedback on these minutes, we heard from [DIDA] on the IANA functions operator report section. Based on the feedback from [DIDA] on the mailing list, I updated the document and recirculated it on the mailing list. Fred, this will be a work item for the RSSAC today. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. The question is, do we accept the minutes? Is anybody opposed to accepting the minutes? Is anybody abstaining from that? Failing that, the minutes are accepted. Okay. Going back to the agenda.

Caucus membership committee composition. People that we have had on the committee in the past are listed, there. I'm told that they have each said that they are interested in continuing. Do we have any discussion on those individuals? Hearing none, note that according to the latest version of RSSAC [zero], the vice-chair is also an ex-official member of the caucus membership committee, which is to say that this would include Brad. I'll move directly to a vote. Is anybody opposed to these people? Is anybody abstaining? Failing that, congratulations. We've got that list. Okay. Mentor selection. Ozan?

---

OZAN SAHIN:

Thanks again, Fred. Hi, everyone, again. This ICANN fellowship program mentor selection relates to a request from ICANN Org. Basically, this mentorship program was created a while ago and our current mentor for the fellowship program is Naveed Bin Rais. As the RSSAC appointee to the fellowship program, a mentor, Naveed has been supported for ICANN65/ICANN66 and he will also be supported for ICANN67 in Cancún, during which he will be mentoring fellows.

His term is coming to an end by the Cancún meeting so ICANN Org is looking for, again, mentors from supporting organizations and advisory committees for another three meeting cycles, starting with ICANN68 in Kuala Lumpur in June. This will, again, relate to three meetings: ICANN68, ICANN69, and ICANN70, during which the mentor will be mentoring ICANN fellows for these three meetings and will get travel support. And we have a deadline of submitting our name by the end of January.

I circulated a statement of interest document for the seven applicants that we received upon a note I circulated on the RSSAC Caucus list. These are Anupam Agrawal, Ramanou Biaou, Harish Chowdhary, Abdulmonem [inaudible], Ihtisham Khalid, and Dessalegn Yehuala. And while circulating the agenda for this meeting, I also added an updated SOI from Dessalegn Yehuala on the specific fellowship program mentor role.

Lastly, our current mentor, Naveed Bin Rais. The seventh applicant showed interest in this role. I don't know if you had time to look at the statement of interest document but this call is for you to discuss those applicants. If there is a motion for any of the applicants, we can go for

---

voting. Just as background information, some of those applicants are actually members of some of the Work Parties in place. Ihtisham Khalid, for instance, has been recently supported by ICANN IETF 106. He was also supported at the RSSAC workshop in Reston back in April 2019. Similarly, Abdulmonem [inaudible] was in Reston for the October workshop. Over back to you, Fred. If you have any questions, please let me know.

FRED BAKER:

Well, yeah. Having seven people as possible choices, this is, I guess, in part, a referendum on Naveed, who has been doing the job. Does anybody have any comments on him as a mentor or on anyone else as a potential mentor? Hearing none, I have a feeling this is a beauty contest.

[IMAN:]

I actually have my hand up.

FRED BAKER:

I'm sorry. Go ahead.

[IMAN:]

The only two people that I recognize having interacted with to some extent here are Naveed himself and also Ramanou Biao. Both of these people have been in the community for some time and they have been involved in the fellowship and mentorship organization for several years. I think either of those would be a good idea. For the other ones, I don't really recognize them. I don't really know how to relate them.

---

The only thing I have in front of me are the statements of interest so I have nothing extra to add for them. But at least for Naveed and Biaou, I can to some extent vouch that these are good working people of the community, which I believe would do a quite decent job of being mentors. So I can, to some limited extent, speak for them. I would be quite willing to hear other voices to mention other people in this group. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. Yeah, I was in Kolkata recently, just before the IETF meeting in Singapore. I met Anupam. I have interacted with him primarily in e-mail for a number of years. The name "Harish Chowdhary" is familiar to me. I'm not sure I could tell you the background of that but I have heard of him before. Did anybody else have comments they would like to raise? Liman, is your hand still up? Okay. Daniel, did you want to say something?

DANIEL MIGAULT:

Yeah. I have quite often interacted with Ramanou Biaou, just to mention that. He's pretty active in the community. But I have no opinion on the others. I'm just bringing that up now.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Both Liman and you have spoken regarding Biaoi, and Naveed I have met. Liman spoke concerning him a moment ago. Did anybody else have anything that they'd like to add? Now I'm looking, then, for a motion.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I have my hand up. [cross talk] or should I just speak out? I was actually Naveed's mentor when he first arrived at ICANN. We have interacted over the years. But I was going to say, does anyone in RSSAC have anything to say against any one of them? Is there anyone that you think is unsuitable to function as a mentor, here? We have heard voices in support of, but are there any opposing views in the group? Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, funny thing there, Liman. At the point where you said, "I have my hand up, could I speak?" at that particular instant, the user interface told me that you had your hand up. I don't know what happened there but there seems to be a delay, perhaps. In any event, I'm looking for a motion. [Damon]?

[DAMON ASHCRAFT:] I move that we elect Rao Naveed Bin Rais as a mentor.

RUSS MUNDY: Seconded by Russ.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is anyone opposed to having Naveed? Is anyone abstaining? Then we appear to have agreed on Naveed as our mentor person. Ozan, what is the process for getting back to the mentorship people? Is that something staff can take care of?

OZAN SAHIN: Exactly. They will get back to ICANN Org on the request but they'll note that Naveed Bin Rais has been appointed as the RSSAC fellowship program mentor for the next three ICANN meetings, starting with ICANN68.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Sounds good. And can you also, then, respond to each of these people and say, "You were selected," or, "You were not"?

OZAN SAHIN: Absolutely.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Moving onto the organizational review. Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: Thank you. Hi, everyone. This is just one of a few items that I'm wrapping up with RSSAC. This is the next step in the organizational review. As you know, RSSAC had an organizational review in 2017. In 2018, we spent most of our time going through recommendations. Those were all either reviewed, rejected, or modified. In the end, there were, I think, six recommendations that RSSAC accepted. This is providing an update to the organizational effectiveness committee of the ICANN Board. The detailed implementation plan, essentially, builds on the previous update to the OAC last September.

---

Since then, of the six recommendations, two have been completed. Two are essentially ongoing activities for RSSAC. Hopefully, those can be closed out as well. One has to do with RSSAC engaging more broadly with the community and the other has to do with RSSAC engaging in threat mitigation and risk analysis for the root server system. Again, those are ongoing activities for RSSAC. Hopefully, those can get closed out.

And then, the final two recommendations. One has to do with the membership structure of RSSAC and one has to do with improving the caucus. RSSAC has stated that both of those are tied, essentially, to any changes that come out of the evolution of the root server system governance. As that work gets underway, that will hopefully close out those two recommendations in due time. We circulated the report in December. I'm happy to answer any questions but this is fairly pro forma. Fred, back to you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Does anybody have any questions or comments that they'd like to raise at this point? Hearing none, I guess this is listed as a vote. What are we voting on? What is it, Carlos?

CARLOS REYES:

Sure. Fred, this isn't an RSSAC publication but because it's a document that RSSAC is sending to the OAC. If the vote passes, staff will finalize it and send it to the OAC. We have to have a trail of RSSAC approving every report to the OAC.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. That said, then, do we approve? Can somebody give me a motion in that regard?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I motion that we approve this report and ask to have it published.

FRED BAKER: Do we have a second?

PAUL VIXIE: Vixie seconds.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is anybody opposed to that? Do we have anybody abstaining? Failing that, I think it succeeds. We'll move onto work items. Andrew, do you want to talk about the KSK?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah, sure. This is about the document that the RSSAC Caucus is preparing to respond to IANA's proposal for subsequent KSK rollovers. This is a public comment that was initiated by IANA in early November. It ends at the end of January. It ends January 31<sup>st</sup>. There were a bunch of comments from the caucus that I took and drew up a strawman document from. And then, thank you to everyone who contributed to commenting on that and adding text or just commenting on the text as it was.

---

There is a call tomorrow to discuss this further. I believe Ozan sent out a reminder to the caucus earlier today and that call – I'm not going to repeat the time because I'll probably just screw it up – will send out to the caucus earlier. Please join the call if you can to discuss this document.

We have until the end of January so we really need to finalize it. We have about two weeks to finalize it and then it's going to have to be an online vote because we have to get it back. We have to publish it before January 31<sup>st</sup>.

BRAD VERD: Do you mean two weeks including the voting period or two weeks and then vote?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Two weeks and then vote because it must be stable for seven days prior to the vote. Exactly two weeks from today would be the 21<sup>st</sup> and that would mean the RSSAC could vote on it on the 28<sup>th</sup>. That would be kind of tight if we wanted to get it out by the 31<sup>st</sup>.

FRED BAKER: And we have to have voted on it before the 31<sup>st</sup>.

BRAD VERD: I think we shouldn't wait until the 28<sup>th</sup>. I think we should finalize it within the next week and then do the voting type of thing. I hope.

---

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah, I would hope, too. In fact, it would be really nice if we got on the call tomorrow and agreed it was done.

BRAD VERD: Correct.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Then anything that we can't resolve on the call tomorrow, we'll try to resolve on the list before this Friday. I think that that's what I'm hearing. We should really have it done early next week.

BRAD VERD: Well, yeah. Ideally, we have it done by then and then it has a week to sit there being stable. And then, we can have the vote.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I saw a hand go up from Russ.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I don't see a hand. Russ, are you waiting for me to say go? There's Russ. Okay.

RUSS MUNDY: It was a short hand. I was going to express some concern with the initial timeline that Andrew mentioned. I think that the revised one that was just discussed is probably very satisfactory and appropriate. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Anyone else? Then I think we'll leave this to that timeline. There will be a call tomorrow ... Let's see, here. That call is at 10:00 AM Pacific. Please be on it and speak your piece. Okay.

Moving ahead, what do we have? Okay, the Metrics Work Party. Russ and Duane, you have comments?

DUANE WESSELS: Hi. The Metrics Work Party had a call last month, mid-December. The call went pretty well. We had maybe five things to go through on the call and they were not really contentious. Immediately after the call, we finalized the documents and worked with staff to put on a version for final caucus review. There's a deadline to that on this Friday, January 10<sup>th</sup>. That's the caucus's deadline to finalize their review. And then, we hope that if there are no outstanding issues we can bring it to RSSAC for a vote in the February meeting.

Since our call, there has been a little bit of discussion on the list and a couple more of what I would consider minor changes. One of them was that there's a section about placement of vantage points at data centers and things like that. There are some proposed changes for that and some little bit of wordsmithing in the introduction. Did I miss anything, Russ or Steve?

RUSS MUNDY: No, I think that covers it. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: That's it. We're also a copy-editing pass. There will be a copy-editing pass shortly after the caucus finishes the review.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So everybody should have that e-mail to the caucus somewhere in their inbox. I'd suggest that we each go and read it. If there are any comments, it would be good to get them in now. We'll have a discussion on this a month from now in the February meeting.

Okay. Moving ahead. Modern Resolver Work Party. Paul sent me a proposed report a couple of days ago which I forwarded to the caucus. I basically asked for comments. I haven't seen a lot of comments in e-mail. There might be some on the document itself. It outlines the Work Party process, the history of the report, and the outcome. Though, I'm looking at the KSK rollover page. It seems like it should be Paul's page. In any event, if you have any comments on that report, it would be good to note them. Okay, yeah.

That's Paul's document that Steve just dropped in the chatroom. That goes through the tasks and the test [bed] that he developed. It says it's there. If anybody has any comments on that, I would suggest that you make them in his Google Doc so that they're all captured in the same place. Does anybody have any comments on it right now? Failing that, we'll move ahead in the agenda.

Okay. The next thing in the agenda is ... Andrew, can you talk about the publication updates?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. This is about three publication updates. It's RSSAC 002, v.4. Ozan, you can just keep it on the agenda. This is about RSSAC 002, v.4, RSSAC 023, v.2, and RSSAC 026, v.2.

RSSAC 002, v.4, we just had a meeting right before this meeting on that. I'd say that was the second meeting we had on that document. There were a couple of items that came out that I need to work on, a few action items, but I think we're getting close to finishing that one up. I don't expect that we're going to need another call on that one. We'll probably just finish things up on the list. Liman, I see your hand is raised. Did you have a question, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. I'm struggling with mute, here. I was just wondering, could you just refresh my memory? Who are the various groups that are working on these documents? When you go through each document, it's worked on by X, X, X.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It's worked on anyone who joins the calls from the caucus. These are all happening in the caucus. We haven't graded formal Work Parties or anything. All the work just happens in the main caucus mailing list.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Oh, okay. Fair enough. Thank you.

---

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. Finishing up on RSSAC 002, I don't think there is going to be another call on that. I am planning to send an updated version to the caucus, either later this week or next. Please comment on that because that will likely be, if not the final version, very close to the final version. Please comment on that, at the latest, next week. Liman, I'm going to assume that's an old hand. I think so. But if you have a comment, please say so. Thanks.

And then RSSAC 023, v.2. That's the history document. We had a call on that yesterday. That one is also progressing. There are a couple of new sections in that and there is a bit of new text. Paul Hoffman is leading that. That will probably have at least one more call, I believe, to finish up. But it is also progressing nicely, I'd say.

And then RSSAC 026, v.2. That's the terminology document, the RSSAC lexicon. That is essentially done. It's kind of in a holding pattern until the metrics document comes out. We're going to publish both of them at the same time, making sure that the terminology in the terminology document and the metrics document are the same so that it's standard terminology. That's all. Are there any questions on any of those three documents?

FRED BAKER: Well, a process question. I would expect, then, that 026 is stable or becomes stable and we discuss it, essentially, at the same time as the metrics document a month from now?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yes. Any changes to terminology in the metrics document will just be reflected in RSSAC 026 v.2.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: And I'm assuming they're going to be voted upon at the same time.

FRED BAKER: That seems reasonable. Does anybody else have comments at this point?  
Okay. Failing that, thanks for your report. We'll follow this as it goes.

Moving onto future work items. Brad and I, and staff, have been working on dates for a possible workshop. The first thing that comes to my mind, frankly, is, why are we meeting? Let's decide to travel halfway around the world and occupy a hotel room after we have a reason to do so. I'm a little strange, that way.

Now, what you're looking at is that we have a number of potential work items that the caucus proposed, I think a couple of years ... Well, okay. It's dated 11<sup>th</sup> December, so it was updated then. But mostly, these have been around for a while. We, as a group, need to edit this. We need to either say that work items are not things that we think really need to be done, there's no urgency behind them, or they just don't need to be done. Or say, "That's something we should accomplish this year." Let me

---

---

put that question to the assembled masses. Does anybody, looking through this – and the link was sent out a couple of days ago ... Steve, can you put that in the chatroom?

STEVE SHENG: One second.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Does anybody feel a need to chase one of these topics or to propose a new topic?

PAUL VIXIE: I have questions.

FRED BAKER: Go for it.

PAUL VIXIE: These topics came to us from the caucus, you say. I think that is important. The fact that the caucus wants to engage on a topic is our clearest evidence that the community itself has some interest in pursuing this. And so, we should lean in the direction of finding a set of things that we think are important out of the larger set of things that the community, through the caucus, has said are important. Now, if some of these can be dismissed because they are hobby-horses that only one person cares about, we should.

---

But bearing that in mind, we should be looking to say “yes” because, separately from that, we have to have a way of recognizing when one of these Work Parties is not going to make progress, is not going to go forward, has lost whatever momentum it had, or it never had any, and kill them off because they are walking dead. I don’t have a particular thing on this list that I am for or against. I’m just trying to establish that this is guidance to us from the community we serve. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Well, I would agree with all of that. At the same time, Liman has some experience with at least one of these. We went and set up a Work Party to go address it and, voilà, nothing happened. We couldn’t even come up with somebody to be a leader of the group. I think there is at least some question there. Steve, you’ve got a hand up.

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you, Fred and Paul. I just want to clarify a little bit. If you see this potential list of work items, there are five categories. In particular, categories three and four are the ones suggested by the caucus. Category two are just staff looking at the Metrics Work Party. One of the recommendations recommend for additional future work so we put it here. And then, category one were a list of things that were RSSAC 37/38 related. It was on a list that we put them here.

Finally, Andrew helped to put a list of the upcoming ICANN public comments for this year. We mean this to be, probably, a holistic planning tool. Out of this, the RSSAC can determine work items to take on and, in

---

particular, the ones at the workshop. I just want to add a bit of context to that. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Thank you for that. Daniel, you had your hand up for a moment and now it seems to have gone away. Are you still interested in talking?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. In the past work, there is no mention of the hyper-local ... Okay, right. I haven't seen it. Okay, right.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, okay. Deployment plan. Boy. That sounds [impressive]. Okay. Are you done, Daniel? Is that your comment?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I am. I'm done. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I think I saw something that I would categorize as work or something that I felt is supposed to be dealt with with the hopefully upcoming result of the GWG, whatever comes beyond that – what to do if a root server operator goes rogue. To me, that's something that clicks into the future plans. You could look for an intermediate solution to the problem until

---

we have that deployed but I would see that as something that the strategic and planning function in the future model deals with and takes care of. Your mileage may vary but my point is that there might be some issues in here that we can postpone and say, "That fits into the future model. We don't need to deal with it now," and thereby we can focus on other things and we can make that kind of distinction if we want to. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I'm not hearing anybody say that any of these issues are burning things they need to address right now. Am I missing something in that?

WES HARDAKER: Would it be worth sending the list to the caucus and asking for their opinions, since they'd be participating? I mean, I know that we're really just talking about prioritization.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. At this point, I'm asking about priority.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, I know. I'm actually thinking that it has been, I think, two years since a lot of this list was created. Getting a current pulse for what the community thinks is the right next prioritization step might be a good thing.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. That seems reasonable. Ozan, can you or staff put that question to the caucus?

WES HARDAKER: That's not an easy task because there's a lot of rambling in this document. It's a good document. I'm not saying anything negative. It's a brainstorming document. But it'll take a little bit of effort to come up with a reasonable poll.

FRED BAKER: It will. I'm thinking that we can put it to the caucus. I actually was going to suggest that we put it to the RSSAC specifically and we can have the RSSAC comment on the caucus discussion is you want. But if we're going to have a workshop, it'll be primarily the RSSAC in that workshop, I would think. And do you guys want to travel around the world to talk about something, is my first question? Yeah. Ozan, could you or staff please put the question to the caucus? That'll take some work, as Wes says.

And then, for those of us, may I suggest that we also comment on that e-mail that staff sends? The point being to decide what we as the RSSAC want to be doing this year. The GWG is obviously going to be off figuring out RSSAC next generation. But what do we want to be doing? Do we have further comments? Oh, Daniel. Do you want to talk?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. If we're doing a Doodle about who is interested in which items, I suggest that we also have an indication of the level of implication of the people. That includes the RSSAC people at large. If we have a good

---

prioritization, I think we can do that remotely. We don't necessarily need to meet. That's my whole point.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I think you suggested a process. I think you said that we could use Doodle and basically have people enumerate priority as they see it. Or, perhaps, pick three items and see what gets voted for or whatever.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Oh, it's more about the commitment because the thing I'd like to avoid is, "Are you interested?" "Yes." "Well, we have a lot of people. Is anyone willing to take the pen?" And the pen is still on the table for months.

FRED BAKER: Which I think Liman can talk to in some detail. Okay, good. Liman, do you want to talk?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I do. A couple of comments. I think it's a very good idea to ask the caucus for some input because that will give us a sense of what people in the caucus would like the entire system to address, and that's valuable.

And I think that we, as the RSSAC committee, should definitely comment into that process. After that, going back, I think there are lots of issues in here that would motivate actually having a meeting. These workshops have been very good in the past. We've done a lot of good work. After asking the caucus and getting input on this issue, I would suggest that –

---

sorry, Fred – that you, as a chair appoint, as we’ve done in the past, a group that generates an agenda for the workshop and takes that input into the back work to create, prioritize, and isolate the issues that you think we should address and have time to address during the workshop. I think these proposals are heading in quite the right direction. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. Yeah. I’ll be looking for that input. So staff is going to send a question to the caucus, which I would suggest that we all chime in on. Can we put a deadline on that? My experience is that deadlines drive action. You kind of say, “What does anybody think about that?” and it’s, “Well, next month I’ll look at it,” and that’s not effective. I would actually like to see commentary in the next week or two. Can we put that kind of a deadline on responses?

PAUL VIXIE:

I think without a deadline we’ll get nothing because a deadline is a form in which your hair can be on fire and that would then compete with all of the other things that all of these people will do every day that sets their hair on fire. I’m in favor of a deadline. I think the deadline itself is arbitrary other than as it would affect the ability to buy cheap airplane tickets if there is a reason to have a meeting.

I would back up six weeks from the April 14<sup>th</sup> dates that you said were the most popular and say that we’ve got to have an answer from the Doodle poll by then so that we can make an informed decision about whether to have the meeting while it’s still possible to get airplane tickets at their

---

cheapest level. So, it's arbitrary. That's the criteria I would pick just for corporate reasons.

FRED BAKER: Well, I think ICANN travel has some rules that if you want them to do something there has to be a certain amount of time in advance. Ozan or Steve, what are those rules?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Fred. Hi. If RSSAC wants to hold a workshop in mid-April then we will have a 90-day notice period for the travel team. We can extend it, possible, to the end of January. But by the end of January is the latest I think RSSAC should have a decision on whether or not to have a workshop.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So that argues, once again, for a deadline, as in, "Let's do something." If we have a decision and we notify the travel team on February 1<sup>st</sup>, I think you just told me that we can't possibly have a workshop before May. Is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: Right.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, you had some comments in e-mail to the effect that the proposed dates in April trump on Easter and Ascension Day.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: [Let's say that is cautioned, somewhat]. I thought the list of birthdays was actually not very good at all. I suggest that we turn this around and say that we take it as a starting point that we do have enough work. We have enough on our plate to motivate having a workshop. From that, we say we choose the date. From that, we choose the deadline for choosing exactly which things to address during the workshop. We can plan the dates without knowing exactly what we need to talk about.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now, the dates were come up with based on – Ozan, you did this – that nobody is competing with us. Ozan, did you observe dates in June that that was true of?

OZAN SAHIN: Yeah. We discussed this in the RSSAC admin meeting. I think we didn't even look at the June dates because it would be too soon for ICANN68. Basically, we looked at the dates on April and May. In the e-mail that I circulated, the calendar involves some of the important days and other events in April and May but not in June.

PAUL VIXIE: I heard conflicting things. I want to make sure I know what I've heard. We were told that ICANN travel needs 90 days. We were also told that it's possible to wait until the end of January before we give in the final answer. That would be 75 days. Is it the case that we can give them an answer at the end of January and still have a meeting somewhere

---

---

between April 14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup>? Or is it the case that it has to be January 14<sup>th</sup>, which is coming up pretty rapidly?

OZAN SAHIN:

Officially, it's January 14<sup>th</sup>. But relying on the past meetings, I thought I could get back to our colleagues from the travel team to see if they can accommodate the end of January and I could report back to RSSAC on that.

PAUL VIXIE:

All right. As my follow-up – I'm not using the hand protocol because it's got too much delay – I think a meeting makes sense, especially if we're trying to decide what RSSAC and the caucus are going to do this year. It makes sense to have a meeting early enough in the year that that matters.

My inclination is to say there's going to be a meeting and say that there is going to be content as soon as we have a confidence level that goes over some threshold. In other words, while the date we choose to make the decision might be arbitrary, I think the confidence in the utility function of spending all of that time on airplanes and all of that ICANN money getting us there ... What do we think? It's January 7<sup>th</sup>. What do we think about making this decision in one week's time based on a Doodle poll that would go to the caucus immediately following this meeting?

FRED BAKER:

I'm talking on my mute button. Is that a Doodle poll similar to the one that we already have posted or is that a different Doodle poll?

PAUL VIXIE: You had mentioned, Fred, a Doodle poll having to do with the possible topics for such a meeting, if the caucus could give us the input we need to determine whether there should even be a meeting. I think that since we have dedicated professional staff to do it and you're not counting on volunteers for it, a one-week turnaround is not unrealistic.

FRED BAKER: For prioritization purposes?

PAUL VIXIE: Yes.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, you're trying to get a word in edge-wise.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. To make your life easier, I will support the ...

FRED BAKER: You just went on mute, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, it's because I'm trying to use too many things at once, here. I will be willing to travel to a meeting that starts on April the 14<sup>th</sup>. The other two are not really realistic for me. You can add that to the Doodle poll. I think

---

---

that actually supports the most popular dates, anyhow. If you go for the 14<sup>th</sup>, don't worry about me.

PAUL VIXIE: Let me say that that's true for me, also. All of these dates are bad. However, the 14<sup>th</sup> through the 16<sup>th</sup> is workable if the meeting is in Amsterdam because I'm going to be in Brussels.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Amsterdam is actually preferable to me, too. But it's not a show-stopper, in my case.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Personally, I don't like the idea of going to Amsterdam. I believe Kaveh [ripe] has offered facilities. Is that correct? Kaveh apparently stepped away. Okay. Preference for Amsterdam in that.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry, I was on mute. Yes, it is correct. We can support that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Yeah. Let's send that prioritization poll to the caucus. I'll ask people to comment on it, please. Obviously, I'm going to look through that, too. Brad, you and I can talk about that on the admin call tomorrow, perhaps?

BRAD VERD: Yep.

FRED BAKER:

Let's figure out what the priority of these various topics would be. Folks, please put on your calendars a hold for the week of the 14<sup>th</sup>. Okay. Then, I think we have a game-plan, at least for figuring out what's going on. The next item that we have is a discussion of joining the Empowered Community. Brad, you might want to chime in on this. The question here is basically regarding RSSAC next generation. There has been pushback on having RSSAC, as currently constituted, be a member of the Empowered Community, in part because it's an advisory committee and we've had discussion of, "So, are we picking the people who pick us?"

That changes. We have changed that some in the bylaws, and that changes quite a bit with the deployment of RSSAC next generation. Personally, I think it would be good to at least have the option. Whether we choose to exercise it or not, it would be good to have the option, when ICANN is having some discussion on something, to be able to say, "The root operators have a concern," or, "The RSSAC has a comment to make in that thing." To do that, we pretty much have to be a member of the Empowered Community, as I understand it. From my perspective, I think it would be good for RSSAC next generation to be part of the Empowered Community. Brad, do you want to chime in on that?

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. I've kind of heard from this group over the course of creating 37/38 and discussions since, going through 37 and 38 it was clear – at least, it was raised during those discussions – that if contracts would be evolved at some point then this group might want to have a say in the board or in

---

who's on the board. And, more specifically, the ability that the Empowered Community has to raise questions or give halt to ...

I guess there are nine powers for the Empowered Community. I don't remember what they all are. But it gives powers to the community that if you're not a member you can force the board to do certain things. These were raised. They haven't been addressed, which is why I continue to raise them, to say, "Are we okay? Are we not okay?"

The thought process is that the next generation of RSSAC that comes out of the implementation of 37/38 via the GWG would address this Empowered Community question. And my thought process here is that I'm not sure that this group has consensus, one, to be a member of the Empowered Community. Two, if there is a consensus then I feel like it might be important to make a statement so that the GWG knows that going forward and has that on their radar to get it done. Those were kind of the things that I was hoping for some guidance on.

Again, this is the result of discussions over the last four years. Things change over four years. It's unclear to me where we stand as a group on this. An example I'll give from most recently is there was a letter. A letter came out just a couple of days ago from the ASO to the board, asking questions and requesting data as an Empowered Community member. If RSSAC wants to be involved in some of these decisions that the Empowered Community is going to have in front of them, then we should let them know.

This takes a lot of time to get done because this would be a fundamental bylaw change for ICANN. And as we've heard from ICANN legal, this is

---

greenfield. No one has ever done it before so they're not quite sure how to do it. This would take some time. Anyways, those are just the thoughts that have been in my head that I have learned from this group.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Let me ask for other views. Does anyone want to talk to RSSAC next generation not being a member of the Empowered Community and why we should not have the opportunity to give that voice?

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry. Can I add one other thing? The one thing I would add is that one of the reasons that was given – I think it's in the document, here – is that because of the circular relationship of appointing board members, and this and that ... And that has been resolved with bylaw changes for us, just so that people are aware that that circular reference should no longer be there.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, okay. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I'm actually with Brad, here, supporting the idea that we should be ... Sorry, the future constructs. The right party, which is still undefined, should be a member of the Empowered Community and that circulating should not be in place in the future, either, so that the root server operators have a say. And quite possibly, also, even though I'm a voting member on the board, that is future discussion and that's supposed to

---

happen in the GWG. But I think that Brad is right in saying that the GWG could probably have a good use for some statement from RSSAC regarding this. It's probably quite good to bring this up. I would support the future construct to be a member of the Empowered Community. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does that constitute a numbered document?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I think it would.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does anybody else have a comment on this topic? I see no hands. I see nothing in the chat room.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can I suggest ...?

FRED BAKER: Go for it.

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'd like to suggest that Brad and I, and more people if you're willing to join, make a draft statement as a numbered document and we discuss that at the next monthly meeting, if that's not too late. Brad?

BRAD VERD: I'm in full support of that.

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

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. Thanks, Fred. Just a quick note that I'm pretty much fully in agreement with what Brad said in terms of differentiating between SSAC and RSSAC. And I would like to ask if anyone from RSSAC would object if I let SSAC know about this apparent work effort that's going to be starting in RSSAC, to change the state of RSSAC with respect to the ECE as the process and structure changes. But I'd like to tell SSAC now. Does anyone object to that?

FRED BAKER: Well, I don't object. I'll give other people room to chime in, here.

BRAD VERD: If I may, I don't object to sharing this. I mean, this has not been a secret. RSSAC has been talking about this for a while, I feel. What I would caution you on, Russ, is just to make sure that we're not going through the effort

---

to do that now. We're going to go through an effort to give data to the GWG with the expectation that it would happen in that process.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, good. Thanks, Brad.

BRAD VERD: That's with my interpretation of things so far.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay. So that's the message you can carry. Yeah. Liman, if you and Brad could come up with a draft statement that we can discuss and vote on, we'll schedule that for the February call. Moving onto workshop planning. I think we've kind of talked about that. Ozan, do you have other things that you want to discuss at this point?

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Fred. Not really. Just on pasting the link to the Doodle poll, there are only a few RSSAC members left who haven't put their votes on the Doodle poll. If you haven't yet cast your vote, please do so. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And now, ICANN67. Ozan, you're tagged for that one.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Thank you, Fred, again. I just pasted the Doodle poll in. Staff has created a preliminary schedule for RSSAC at ICANN67 and linked it to the

---

agenda. On the schedule, we are working with SSAC support staff and the staff supporting how it works for you to determine the times for that. We [had a hold] slot for each of those meetings. Other than that, you will note on Wednesday and Thursday we have [holds] for GWG meetings.

So this is still very early in the process. I think the schedule will mature through the end of January. But this is for convenience to see the meeting is taking place from the 7<sup>th</sup> through the 11<sup>th</sup> of March 2020. It allowed us to determine ten work sessions. So depending on RSSAC's position on the future work items and what will keep RSSAC busy moving forward, we'll update those work sessions. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. This is obviously very preliminary. Does anybody have any comment at this point on this? I don't see people. Oh, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Okay. Thank you. Ozan, I understand that this is preliminary work and that it's work in progress, but it would be immensely helpful for me to have reading access to this document as it evolves because I need to plan things, also, with the CSC. Inevitably, there will be clashes. But if I can see the crucial clashes ahead of time, that will help me to navigate and also interact with the support staff for the CSC. Please, keep the link stable and please keep it readable so that people can see it. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Do we share any staff between CSC and RSSAC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I don't think so. My primary staff support people are Ria Otones and Bart Boswinkel.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

STEVE SHENG: I think that Ozan can coordinate with Ria, as well, so that the CSC and this schedule don't conflict too much. Thanks.

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

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. It was fundamentally the same request as Liman. That is that we have a stable link and that we have access to it. And because, periodically, even though we know the document can change, it's really helpful to be able to see the current state at any point in time. If we could have that, that'd be wonderful. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And one other thing I noticed when I was looking at this, yesterday, was that we have an RSSAC administrative meeting, which is to say Brad, myself, and staff, overlapping the latter half of the DNSSEC workshop. It

---

seems that it would be nice to not have that overlap. Ozan, can we separate those two?

OZAN SAHIN: Excuse me, Fred. What would you like me to separate?

FRED BAKER: On day five at 10:30, we have a meeting of you, me, Brad, and a few other people overlapping the DNSSEC workshop. I think we're going to ... Oh, and then the rest of the day, a large part of that is GWG. Okay. My first thought is that I would like to not find myself in two places at one time but maybe the GWG takes precedence, there.

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. Sure. Again, this is a work in progress. I'll keep that in mind, to avoid conflict with the DNSSEC workshop and the RSSAC annual meeting to the extent possible.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Do we have any further comments on this? Yes, let's move back to the agenda. I guess we're at "reports." To be honest, most of what we've been discussing this morning is my report. I'm trying to figure out what our game-plan is this year, what big projects we have going on, and what our timing is going to be to do so.

Doodle polls and so on and so forth. That's first and foremost in my mind. I'm obviously talking with Brad as vice-chair and with staff about them as

---

we go. I'm not sure I have a lot to add to that fact. Kaveh, do you have any comments from the board?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

No. There would be a board meeting in L.A., starting from Thursday the 23<sup>th</sup> or the 24<sup>th</sup>. Basically, Friday. There is no specific RSSAC-related item on the agenda. I guess the GWG composition will be discussed. Hopefully, by then, we'll have the full list. I know that most of the constituencies have designated their people. We are waiting for IETF and one more. I know [Aidi] has sent the call out. Their deadline is the 13<sup>th</sup> of January if I remember correctly. I assume that by then we will also have that. And I hope we'll hear that the GWG will be formed there but I don't expect anything else in that meeting. I will, of course, report back if anything comes up.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. And along with that, the SO/AC chairs are expecting to have a meeting and to meet with the board on the 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> [wall borders] meeting in Marina del Rey. Brad and I plan to be there. I should have mentioned that in my report but that's happening. Okay. Liman? Do you want to talk about the CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

A quick update. We congratulate the IANA PTI on a 100% report. That's excellent performance. It must have been during November. What's on our plate is that we're discussing about the remit of the CSC. It now has a couple of years behind it. It's probably time for us to look at if there are

---

any more or fewer things that we should monitor and look at. And in doing so, we would engage in a discussion with the IANA and ask them to look at various parameters and see if they are suitable to monitor and so on.

But also, with the board technical committee and other people, just to see if we should propose to the contracted third parties any changes to the existing list of things that we monitor. One thing that has been mentioned is the DNSSEC parameters. We're also looking at doing minor adjustments to our meeting schedule because of personal logistical problems. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Brad, RZERC? What's going on in RZERC?

BRAD VERD:

I've got no real update, there. I have maybe two things to share. One is RZERC is not going to comment on the KSK plan presented by IANA. The second piece is that they're working through their work plan for the year as they talk through potential work items. But there's nothing other than that to share right now.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. Russ? Tell me about SSAC.

---

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Fred. First, I want to express my thanks and that of the SSAC for the RSSAC effort in supporting the RSSAC as the SSAC comments on the [next post-quantum crypto] comment period that was sent in. I thank everybody that was helpful in doing that. I think it was a good exercise.

We're now in the midst of another somewhat joint – or at least we don't want to conflict with each other – RSSAC/SSAC exercise in terms of a response to the IANA KPI plan for future KSK rollovers. I will be sharing more detail tomorrow on our call, there. But one thing that has been discussed in the SSAC that I wanted to at least make RSSAC aware of is that SSAC is considering the possibility of asking for insight and a chance to look at – not necessarily make a [public view of] – the detailed plan that they are going to exercise for the rollover because this one is a higher-level, abstract plan.

I don't know if that's going to end up being in the SSAC comments but I think it probably is. I wanted to make RSSAC aware of that. And as we get, in the next week, more details nailed down, I don't know whether or not RSSAC will want to join with a request to see any subsequent documents produced by IANA PTI. So that's the main activity at this point in time. Any thoughts, comments, or responses to whether or not RSSAC might want to see additional documents about the rollover?

FRED BAKER:

Well, I personally think it would be good for us to see them. Do we have other comments? Does anybody else want to chime in on that? Brad.

---

BRAD VERD: It would be nice if the two statements, RSSAC's and SSAC's, were not in contradiction. To me, the most important message, I think, is the measurement. We'd like to see more measurement and it would be nice to hear SSAC say the same thing. I know that is in alignment with what SSAC and RSSAC have said in the past – tools to measure the success and the health of the root server system. I think that would be key. Those are my two cents.

FRED BAKER: Would that build on the metrics that we've just put together?

BRAD VERD: No, I don't think so. Those are different.

RUSS MUNDY: I don't think so. But please, Brad, if you think we have something in the metrics, there, that would be great to hear. I think it's something different that SSAC and RSSAC have mentioned several times over the years in terms of having some kind of measurement system specifically pointing at success over failure with respect to the KSK roll. Is that what you had in mind?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I really don't want to conflate the two, of the metrics work and measurement of success or stability, with the KSK rollover. Those are two separate things, I feel. Currently, in our KSK statement, we call out that the plan lacks discussion on measuring the stability implications of future

---

KSK rolls. It would be nice if SSAC and RSSAC were in alignment on that topic, I feel.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would agree with that.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, thank you. Yeah. SSAC has had that in previous statements, too. You're correct in that it would be very good for us to be consistent in that [space]. Thanks. Anybody else have thoughts or comments to feed back? Okay. Thank you, everybody. I appreciate it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Daniel, did you have a report from the IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I think the only thing I could report is about the selection of the representatives for the GWG. Initially, they waited for volunteers until the beginning of December. But because they had a very short list of people coming from the same group of people, which is mostly RSSAC, they extended that nomination period to until December 20<sup>th</sup>. And now, they've published a list of volunteers and they're waiting for feedback. I just forwarded to you the list but I can put it in the chat, too, if there is anything anyone wants to say. I don't know.

---

FRED BAKER: Well, I doubt that we're going to have time. We have five minutes left on the call.

DANIEL MIGAULT: This is mostly informative ...

FRED BAKER: And so, you dropped it into the chat?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. That's all I have to say.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

DANIEL MIGAULT: You have until January 13<sup>th</sup> to provide feedback.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And the thing that you forwarded to the RSSAC list tells us how to provide that feedback?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I hope so.

---

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay. Moving along, Naela. I believe Naela dropped off the call. Something about life intervening. No, she's here.

NAELA SARRAS: No, I'm still here, Fred. Yes. I'm still here. In terms of this group, I don't really have much to report. Obviously, I see a lot of chat about the input that we're getting from the community about the KSK rollover plans. We obviously look forward to when the public comment ends at the end of this month to take all of this input, synthesize it, and put it out for public comment. But yes, I think that, as both Brad and Russ said, having consistent statements would be really helpful for us as we synthesize the input. Of course, I know Kim will come back to the community and ask for any questions if there is more clarification that he needs. And that's it from us.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thanks much. Duane, RZM?

DUANE WESSELS: Hi, Fred. Nothing to report from me at this time.

FRED BAKER: Okay. We're now on to AOB. Kaveh, you asked to get in at this point.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. A bit before that, I just wanted to add that, please, if you have any input for IAB, please provide that because it is very useful for IAB. I know

---

how that process works and if you have preferences, please keep in mind to recommend them to our colleagues. The comment I want to add is not directly related to RSSAC but it's because I'm your board liaison. I want to send an e-mail but since this call is going to be minuted and recorded, I think it's good to have it here.

As you see, the decision to exercise the Empowered Community rights from ASO is being decided by the NRO. You see that set-up that ASO and NRO have. NRO consists of the five CEOs of the five RARs. I'm the [president. I've been sitting on] that list. But I'm also your liaison to the ICANN Board and there is a conflict of interest, of course. I just wanted to let you know. I have declared that very clearly to the board but I've also updated my conflict of interest statement.

And for that decision, I didn't do anything. I didn't discuss it with anyone, not with the ICANN Board and neither with the [NRO/EC]. I just relayed the information to our board and my colleagues in [inaudible] management team. They made a decision and it was sent to the [NRO/EC]. This process is also fully documented so there is no conflict of interest and I wasn't part of that decision for that reason. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Anybody have any questions for Kaveh on that? Failing that, we've come to the end of the agenda. The next teleconference is on the 4<sup>th</sup> of February. Other than that, we don't have anything else listed to talk about. Let me give people one final chance to stick a word in on that. Do you have anything that we need to bring up at this point? Hi, Vixie.

---

PAUL VIXIE: Will you be circulating by e-mail the results of the Doodle poll so that we can decide in a timely manner, which is to say by the 14<sup>th</sup>, whether there's going to be an April workshop?

FRED BAKER: Yeah. I'll send a note to the list. Okay. With that, I think we're done. Let's stand adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]