
FRED BAKER: Okay. We've come to order. Let's go through the roll call. Who's here from Cogent? DISA?

KEVIN WRIGHT: Kevin Wright here.

RYANE STEPHENSON: This is Ryan Stephenson.

FRED BAKER: Hi there.

RYANE STEPHENSON: Good morning.

FRED BAKER: Morning.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, can you hear me? This is [inaudible] as well. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. ICANN.

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.

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ISC, Jeff and I are both here. NASA. Netnod.

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

FRED BAKER: Okay. A minute ago, RIPE wasn't here. Has RIPE arrived?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. Kaveh is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, good. University of Maryland.

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. USC ISI.

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker's here.

FRED BAKER: ARL.

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard's here.

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign.

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

FRED BAKER: WIDE, Hiro, are you here?

HIRO HOTTA: Yeah, Hiro is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and various liaisons. Kaveh, you're here. Liman, you're here. Daniel, are you here? Suzanne is here, by the way. Russ Mundy told me that he might be a few minutes late because of traffic around voting. Russ, are you here? James Mitchell.

JAMES MITCHELL: I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And Duane Wessels.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and staff, we have Andrew and Danielle, and Ozan and Steve.

[OZAN SAHIN:] Yes, here.

FRED BAKER: Moving on down the agenda then, you can see the agenda here in front of you. Does anybody have any modifications they would like to make to it?

Failing that, moving on to administrivia, you people have seen the minutes from last month. Were there any concerns with those? Okay, and Ozan, the star here means we have to vote to accept them, right?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Fred, this is correct. And hi everyone. If I may add, just to make one point about the action items from the minutes. One action item was for the staff to suggest an appropriate place on the RSSAC webpage to post

the proposed MoU/LoI document. The RSSAC admin team worked on this and there's a webpage on the RSSAC page where we post the minutes of the RSSAC monthly meetings. And if RSSAC approves the minutes from the October meeting in this meeting, then staff will go ahead and get the minutes as well as the proposed MoU/LoI document on this page. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. Jeff, can you talk with us about the caucus?

JEFF OSBORN:

Good morning. Sure can. We're recommending the three latest applicants to the caucus. Their SOIs are connected there. Baojun Liu is a recent doctoral graduate who has published fairly extensively on DNS issues. We're recommending him. Ignatius Nkrumah is a [inaudible] from South Africa with slightly less experience, but I figure if only we discuss this, his interests are strong, he's showed a willingness to spend some time, and we think he also is a good candidate. And the idea of having to vet Steve Crocker for a position on the RSSAC caucus reminds me of considering Jesus Christ for sainthood. So I'm sort of thinking that one just kind of wins on the face of it.

So the membership committee is recommending we accept all three of those candidates to the RSSAC caucus.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. I'm going to take all three votes in one crack, unless, does somebody have an objection to me doing that? Hearing no such

objections, does anybody have a problem with any of these candidates? Jeff, I would agree that Steve Crocker's on the order of recommending Jesus Christ for sainthood. Okay, if there are no negative votes there, is anybody abstaining on any of those three? Failing that, they're accepted. Thank you, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: Great.

FRED BAKER: And Ozan reminds me I'm supposed to take a vote on the draft minutes. Does anybody have any objections to the draft minutes or things that they would like to see changed? Anybody abstaining from that ballot? Failing that, we have accepted them.

Okay, so now Jeff, do you want to talk about these NextGen ICANN RSSAC appointments?

JEFF OSBORN: Yes. The RSSAC is required to make appointments to two roles for the NextGen process, and we literally had one applicant for each of the two slots, and these folks are very well qualified members of the caucus rather than RSSAC itself. So the only thing we wanted to highlight here is whereas most of the members off the RSSAC have years of working on this, these are folks who are more peripherally involved. We thought, given that they were the only applicants and they're certainly qualified, that we would propose to accept them.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Abdulkarim of course is working with one of Ken's work parties.

JEFF OSBORN: That's right.

FRED BAKER: Dessalegn, he's been around but I don't know of current activity offhand. Okay, and we're supposed to vote on these, right?

JEFF OSBORN: Correct.

FRED BAKER: Yes, we're supposed to vote on those. Okay. And again, barring an objection, I'll take both of them at the same time. Does anybody object to me doing that? Is anybody going to vote negatively or have an issue with Abdulkarim or Dessalegn being in these roles? Failing that, is anybody abstaining? So then we accept them.

Ozan, you want to talk about selection processes?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Yes, I can, but I see Kaveh's hand is up. Could be related to ...

FRED BAKER: Oh, I'm sorry.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah, yes, Ozan. Two quick comments. One, I actually wanted to thank Jeff and rest of the caucus membership committee, because they're really doing a good job from what I see, they're very active. Thank you, because I remember when it was started, that's the time Liman was chair, and this was RSSAC reboot, and yeah, it was said that we need to set up a caucus. And me and Paul, and I think Eric from Verisign were the three who sat together, had some drinks and came up with it, but it was much less active. We wrote up the starting things and it was a few meetings per year. But I see they're much more active in presenting and showing us and what we do. So I really see evolution there and really good work. So thank you.

And a second part, maybe not directly related and I don't want to start a discussion except if people really have a comment, maybe we can discuss it on the list, but looking at the NextGen selection committee, I think actually for RSSAC, maybe we should think a bit more about our NextGen, let' say, because people come and go, and now there is a lot, but maybe we should think more about an orientation or something, an onboarding plan, which is not only introduction of what we do but also getting to know each other, or each member maybe having meetings, or I don't know. Think about the process, because we will have different people coming from different organizations, even in current setup of RSSAC. So I think it's a good thing to think about. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: I just want to say thank you, Kaveh. Most of the work is being done with Alejandro Acosta and Dave Lawrence who are really helping. And if Ozan wasn't driving it, it would be a mess. So thank you for the compliments, but Ozan deserves at least half the credit. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so Kaveh, you mentioned an onboarding process. This would be ... is that something this year, is that next year? What are you thinking about?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Actually, if people find it useful to think about this, because I don't see a rush, but maybe this is something we can add the one item that we can discuss in one of our upcoming workshops and then update 000 with whatever comes out of that, as a suggestion.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So yes, loading people on an airplane right now might be a little bit exciting. Okay, so Ozan, moving ahead.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Hi everyone again. An update on the two selection processes. The RSSAC chair selection process is underway. As you may know, the current chair, Fred Baker is completing his second year in his

first term by the end of this year, and therefore, nomination period was started on the 23rd of October and it's going to last for 30 days. And we received one nomination for the current chair, Fred Baker, from Ryan Stephenson and this nomination has a second from Paul Vixie. So this is currently the only nomination we have. The nomination period will close on the 23rd of November. Are there any comments, questions around that? I see your hand is up, Liman. Please go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Quick question to Fred. Have you accepted the nomination?

FRED BAKER: I don't think I verbally said it, but yes, I do accept the nomination.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: And if I may continue, the RSSAC caucus membership committee is not a selection process, in fact, the operational procedures does not call out a selection process for this. It only says RSSAC appoints the caucus membership committee and you just heard from Jeff that the current committee is composed of Jeff Osborn, Alejandro and Dave Lawrence, and also Brad Verd as the RSSAC vice chair as an ex officio member of this committee.

This committee serves for one year until the end of the year and the RSSAC work plan which we'll be discussing in a minute also suggests RSSAC to review, to start looking at the composition of the membership committee and start thinking about the composition of next year.

So what RSSAC did last year was the support staff for the membership committee reached out to the members of the committee in 2019 and checked whether they'd be interested to serve for another year in 2020. All of the three at that time agreed to that. These were Dave Lawrence again, Alejandro and Matt Weinberg. And then earlier in 2020, Matt Weinberg left, Jeff Osborn joined the committee and he's now serving as the chair of the committee.

Similar to last year, as the support staff for this committee, I checked with all of the members of the committee and all of the three members are happy to serve for another year in 2021. So this is really for the RSSAC to start thinking about whether to reappoint them or suggest something else. And if there are any questions or comments, I'll stop here.

FRED BAKER:

I presume we have to vote on these. Is that then in December?

OZAN SAHIN:

In December, this will still be on the agenda. And yes, the RSSAC will need to make an appointment for the 2021 membership committee in December.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And regarding the chair, I presume we also vote in December.

OZAN SAHIN: I think the committee selects its chair itself, but the RSSAC really appoints the members of the committee and the committee then selects its chair.

FRED BAKER: Perhaps I wasn't clear. I was talking about the RSSAC chair. We vote for the chair next month.

OZAN SAHIN: That is correct. Yes.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Let's move on to work items. One of the outcomes of our review last year, two years ago, we were asked to put together a formal workplan. So we copied essentially the SSAC workplan process and put together this, which you see. We discussed it last year and we've discussed it in e-mail. But what I'm looking for at this point, I'm going to very briefly step through it, and if people have comments that they would like to make, I'd be interested in that.

So every year in January, we think really hard and wonder whether the next IETF meeting has an even number, which in March, it will. It's IETF 110. In ICANN, it'll be ICANN 70. So we need to plan for a meeting at the ... This is actually for the caucus, isn't it? Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: These are planning for the ICANN meetings, and of course, the caucus meeting at IETF meeting, Fred, but in terms of the responsibility for the planning, if you look at column B, C, D, these are the responsible bodies for planning for each of the [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: So the admin committee in almost all of these cases winds up being pretty involved. So we're going to be looking at the planning of the RSSAC meetings at ICANN 70, and IETF 110, there'll be a caucus meeting. We the RSSAC and the admin committee need to ... By the way, the admin committee, let me say who that is. It's the chair, the vice chair and staff. We have a weekly call when we talk about what's going on.

BRAD VERD: That also includes the liaison to the board.

FRED BAKER: Yes, it does. So we will need to think about the ICANN Org budget and the budget request process. And obviously, then along with the caucus track, any work party activity. We have two work parties right now, so that's happening. In February, we need to talk about a workshop. We have standing invitations to go to Washington DC or to visit Amsterdam for a workshop. The big question will be what's the topic, and are we flying around again? That's done by the admin committee. We continue

to plan for upcoming meetings, look at the work party activity and request travel support.

In March, we wind up trotting off to an ICANN meeting and an IETF meeting, if it's even numbered. And basically, talk with all the liaisons. Something I've done—and this shows up further down the list—in the past month or so is to have a brief phone call with each of the liaisons that we have and kind of how are things going, are there things we should know about or be working on? So there's been that discussion. So yeah, Ozan has gone down and showed you where that is.

Okay, so in April, generally, if we're going to have a workshop, it'll be in April or May. So that happens, and we start thinking about the summer ICANN and IETF meetings. For your information, there's a discussion going on being led by Göran who is the CEO of ICANN talking with the chairs of the SOs and ACs. That includes me. Brad, you're usually on that call, aren't you?

BRAD VERD: Yes, I'm usually there.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so they are trying to work out a process for having a face-to-face ICANN meeting, and you're taking the opportunity to say, what do we want to do? Do we want to have 12 ICANN meetings a year, do we have the meetings on airplanes as opposed to in hotels? What does that look like?

And my comment to them has been that if they want to have face-to-face meetings at some point, they're going to have to have a first one, and the first one, they should expect that not everybody is going to be geared up to actually come to the meeting, maybe because their companies don't allow them to travel or they just aren't sure yet about COVID status, any number of possible reasons. But the first—and probably the first few—meetings that they have will not be as heavily attended as past meetings have been, and in my view, they can't have a meeting where half the people won't show up. What they will have to do is have a meeting in which said half of the people can come in remotely.

So there's a discussion going on around that, and no big updates at the moment, but we're starting to talk about it. Okay, so then in April, we start looking at the board liaison position, and if it's in the third year, there may be an election for that. Kaveh, where are you in your cycle?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I think this is my first year of second cycle, and it's a three-year cycle.

FRED BAKER:

Yeah, so we won't actually be doing that this year. But we have it in our workplan to actually think about that. In June, we would typically have an ICANN meeting, and that is the shorter meeting. And during the conversation about meetings that I just mentioned, one of the questions on the table has been, do we actually have three meetings a year, do we maybe do this June meeting virtually? And again, no decisions yet, but that's being discussed.

So also in June then, we would begin the NomCom election process, and see what we think about CSC and RZERC liaisons. We just did that during this last year, so we won't be doing that this year. Finish off electing a board liaison, which that's not an activity we'll need to do this year.

July, of course there is an IETF meeting. That will be IETF 111, so it's not even numbered. We'll plan for the next workshop, which will typically be in the September or October time frame if we're going to have one, and that's something that we as a group will probably need to discuss, what do we want to do with workshops?

This last year, we looked through RSSAC 0 and one of the issues was raised was that we needed to think about what happens if we only have one applicant or nomination for a position and that person has termed out. We did a minor twiddle to RSSAC 0. We're supposed to look at RSSAC 0 annually, so come July, we'll ask that question, whether there's any discussion we need to have.

We'll need to confirm the executive point of contact. Ozan, can you remind me who that is? That just a person that you talk with?

OZAN SAHIN:

Hi Fred. These are the executive point of contacts from each of the root server organizations to confirm their appointment or reappointment of their primary and alternate members. So each year, we expect four of the RSO representatives' terms to come to an end.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thanks. So this is back at the different RSOs. If we need to—and we don't this year—we'd appoint a board liaison, so on and so forth. Request travel support if we need to for ICANN and IETF meetings. August, again, we're talking about the fall workshop. Fall in the northern hemisphere. And those other things that are there.

And line 47, we're basically sending a note to the RSSAC caucus members saying, where do you stand, do you want to continue on the caucus? And the caucus membership committee will look through the statistics of people's involvement. One of the statements of the application they submit is that if they don't do anything, they'll be invited to exit stage right. And we actually did that this last year. Remind me, Jeff, how many people did we ask to not be in the caucus?

JEFF OSBORN: Oh, Jeez. Ozan, back me up. Was it seven?

OZAN SAHIN: So you're asking about the number of caucus members who were found inactive and who were dropped?

JEFF OSBORN: Yes, or asked to drop.

OZAN SAHIN: We've been doing this since September 2019 and following up, therefore in the last cycle of outreach, I think four RSSAC caucus

members in September were inactive and that's why we removed them from the RSSAC caucus list.

FRED BAKER:

Yeah. Okay, so that's going on. In September then, the plan is to have a workshop and again, that's something we need to talk about, whether we want to do that, and what the topic would be, where we would do that, so on. At that time also, we hope to receive appointment letters from the executive point of contact.

Prepare and submit an ICANN board paper. Ozan, remind me what that is.

OZAN SAHIN:

This is about, again, appointment of the RSO representatives. So the ICANN Board needs to pass a resolution and appoint them, and once they're confirmed by their appointing organizations, we work with the liaison to the board, Kaveh, and the board actually appoints them formally.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. So this is appointment of representatives of RSOs.

OZAN SAHIN:

Correct.

FRED BAKER: Okay, now that's the process that every RSO person has gone through in the past. Didn't we change that? I thought we changed that.

OZAN SAHIN: This is in the ICANN bylaws, so if you look at the RSSAC section of the bylaws, the members appointed by the ICANN Board. So it's not something we can change through the RSSAC operational procedures. It's in the ICANN bylaws.

FRED BAKER: Well, what's sticking in my head was we had a question about whether the RSSAC should participate in the Nominating Committee because it's kind of a matter of mutual appointment. If the board is appointing the members of the RSSAC and then the RSSAC is turning around and commenting on the structure of the board, there's a loop there. And part of the update process to the bylaws the last time through, I thought that got changed so that we're no longer appointed by the board.

KAVEH RANJBAR: If I may, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you. So no, that was not changed. In the bylaws, they don't appoint, lack of a better word, basically the board rubber stamps what is the representatives basically nominated by the RSOs, because it says the composition of RSSAC is a primary and a secondary from each RSO. So the names go via this process and board rubber stamps it. This was not the case of the discussion for the NomCom. That had a different ground, because we have a nonvoting member on the board. But if you're going to get voting powers and things like that, then it will change the whole [timing,] because our representative to the NomCom is nonvoting.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Then I was misremembering that. Suzanne.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Actually, I was going to defer to Kaveh on the basis that he was probably going to say for now what I was going to say. But I want to reinforce what Ozan was saying. The last time we rechartered RSSAC and went through the whole bylaws reorganization for all of ICANN, there was a very deliberate effort to make sure that the board does not control the membership of RSSAC, and I forget what wording we ended up on, but we went back and forth for a significant period of time on how to make sure that the board recognition of RSSAC's choices was explicit, but also that control over RSSAC's membership is under the control of RSSAC. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now Brad.

BRAD VERD: Maybe I want to hear Steve first. Steve, go ahead, and then I'll go.

STEVE SHENG: Thanks. So there are two changes in the bylaw. Right now, the only change that happened is the leadership structure, so changing from co-chair to chair, vice chair. The RSSAC, as part of this relation to the Nominating Committee issues, we did try to submit a change that the RSSAC member is no longer appointed by the board.

And at that time, the advice was that the appointment change should happen as part of the GWG outcomes so it is all done at once. So I think we submitted the necessary materials, and those will happen as part of the GWG outcomes so they all come at once. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad, we're back to you.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Steve got most of it. However, Steve, I don't think it's part of the GWG. This is part of the implementation of the NomCom changes. So even though what Kaveh said is accurate, out of the NomCom review, there are a number of changes happening including bylaw changes, and this is where ICANN wanted to bunch these bylaw changes together rather than do them one off.

So we as RSSAC have talked about this ad nauseum. It was one of the big sticking points, was that we were appointed by the board. So we've changed that, we're just waiting for those bylaws to be done, if that makes sense. We have all agreed with what the change would be and the wording was done and it's been submitted, we're just waiting for the rest of the process to catch up.

STEVE SHENG:

Thanks, Brad. I stand corrected. So I will double check. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. So Ozan, you want to go back to the workplan? Okay, and thank you all for that discussion. In any event, in September, we tend to make sure we know where we're at and what our membership is. Of course, that can change as it needs to, and recently, Barbara joined the committee. So that's what we would do in September.

October or November, we would have an ICANN meeting and if it's even numbered, an IETF meeting. Go through the chair and vice chair election process, which we're doing right now. And the membership committee selection process and those items, and then in December, finally elect the chair and the vice chair, appoint a new membership committee, and update the public facing documentation that we have, including this workplan.

So now, question, I guess, for Steve or Ozan, somebody. It says I December we update the workplan. This is October and we're busily

talking through the workplan. Is the idea here that we would leave it open to discussion and let the RSSAC comment back and change it?

OZAN SAHIN:

Hi Fred. Exactly. Thanks for going through the workplan in this meeting. I will go ahead and drop the link to the workplan in the chat. If you have comments on any of the items on the workplan or its timing, please provide your comments. And as you saw on the workplan itself in December, if needed, updates will be made to the workplan.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, great. So with that, does anybody have any comments on the plan as it stands right now? If not, this is something that we'll have the opportunity to talk about in November. Well, today is November, but certainly in December. And we can discuss it on the mailing list as well. Seeing no hands up, okay, so let's move on to the next agenda item.

This is Ken. Do you want to talk about your two work parties?

KEN RENARD:

Sure. The local perspective tool work party met during the ICANN meeting, slightly off its normal cadence, but there was extra participation during that meeting because everybody was in the same room, or in the ICANN meeting as well. We talked about user narratives, kind of pared them down to four, evaluating proposed locations for new instances, identifying underserved areas, recursive resolver operators, wanting to understand the root server system, and research.

So those are going to be moved into a new document. I did paste that link into the chat earlier. So it's just basically putting it into a new format, the RSSAC document format. We have some volunteers to fill in some sections, looking for additional volunteers. We have decided that implementation of these tools is out of scope for the work party. We're just going to define what the tools should measure. And the next meeting of the local perspective tool work party will be, I believe, the week of the 23rd of November. That's the Thanksgiving week here in the US. Everyone's encouraged to take a look at the document and join the next call for the local perspective tool work party.

The other work party, again, was during the week of ICANN pre-meeting, the week before, so there's definitely some increase participation, which was great. The document that we're working on has been reorganized for clarity, and really, a big part of that was removing almost all discussion of unofficial responses. And we now only have a few sentences about what we're calling non-RSO responses. These are [around] hijacks and things like that.

So of the most part, we've removed any mention of 8806, and the next topic that's hot now, it's been on the mailing list, is about guiding principles, definition of rogue operators, defined within the guiding principles and violating those. There are four guiding principles mentioned in the document which were appropriate. Two of them are objective and two are more subjective. The objective ones are that IANA is the source of the root zone and then IETF defines the technical operations. Those are pretty cut and dry and they're easy to measure and test. The subjective ones are talking about integrity and ethos of an RSO, and also the RSOs being neutral and impartial. So what's up for

discussion here is, should we remove these subjective guiding principles, or just mention them and really not treat them with the detail that we're talking for the objective ones?

So definitely encourage everyone to take a look at the caucus mailing list. There's been some activity recently, and join the discussion on the mailing list, take a look at the document and comment in the document. It'll be appreciated. And also, the next meeting for that work party will be the week of 23rd of November, and I'd appreciate, Ozan, if you had a confirmation on the dates. I just couldn't find them easily. That's it for the work party reports. Thanks.

OZAN SAHIN:

Thanks, Ken. As you said, the next meetings of the work parties are indeed on the 23rd and 24th of November, the week of Thanksgiving in the US. And I'll be circulating the current limitations on the RSSAC caucus mailing list shortly.

FRED BAKER:

Yeah, so it's Monday and Tuesday of that week. I had visions of it being on Thursday and Friday. That would be a disaster. Okay. So any comments on those work items? Seeing none, Ozan, you want to talk about the public comment periods?

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Fred. ICANN has several public comment proceedings open at the moment. The RSSAC admin team thought three of them could be of interest for the RSSAC, and the links to these public comment

proceedings and the reports on which the comments are sought were linked to the agenda for this meeting, and also, I think last week, Fred shared those on the RSSAC mailing list.

So to begin with, the first public comment proceeding is the recommendations for early warning for root zone scaling. This is a report published by ICANN Org, and this proceeding will be closing on the 23rd of November, so if RSSAC would like to comment on it, there are 20 days left. Let me go find this report. If you look at the recommendations, there are some recommendations for the early warning for root zone scaling and of course, there are references to RSOs in this document.

I see Matt's hand is up. It's probably better to leave the floor to Matt to talk about this report.

MATT LARSON:

Thanks, Ozan. So this comes from OCTO. So hopefully I'm not speaking out of turn talking about the document in this context. But this document is attempting to respond to some calls we've heard in the community periodically for a so called early warning system for root zone scaling. SAC 100 mentions this, but I don't believe SSAC was the first to mention the concept. I think they're in turn responding to that being raised elsewhere, like the subsequent procedures discussions.

So because this topic keeps coming up and there seems to be belief in some quarters that, why can't there just be some system to monitor the root zone system, and then we'll know the root server system and other

parts that that are related to the root zone, and then we'll just know if everything is okay or not.

So what OCCTO is trying to say with this document is you can't do that. it's not that easy. Ozan, could I ask you to please scroll down to section 4.1? The first sentence is really kind of the main reason we wrote this document. There are no measurements, whether made externally or reported by the RSOs themselves, that would reliably indicate issues with root scaling that a third party could detect.

So what we're trying to get across in this document in that looking at the root server system from outside, you can't make judgements about scalability and that you're better off just asking the people who are running the system, namely, the root server operators.

Now, that's an oversimplification of the document, but that is one of the main points that we're trying to get across. So if anyone agrees with that and would like to speak up and indicate your agreement or any other thoughts on the document, that would be very welcome.

OCTO did present on this at a recent ICANN meeting. I think it was Montréal, the last one before the current dark times, and there were crickets. We just didn't get much community response. So we wrote this document, and we'd be grateful if anyone wants to make any comments.

FRED BAKER:

So let me put the question to the operators, all of whom are virtually seated at the table. My perception is that at the point where there's

being a scaling problem in the root zone and it's externally visible, people can detect it by looking at their resolver or whatever, it's already very close to the brink of the cliff and it's probably pretty late in the process of doing any kind of effects. So the substance of this paragraph is demonstrably true simply because of that.

If we wanted to say something about this issue as a group, to me the obvious response would be to make that observation, which is something that I can do for the committee if you guys agree with it. Do Liman, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Yes, thank you. I want to draw your attention to an old report from 2009 which is called scaling the root. It's a lot longer than the one in front of us. It's 54 pages long, and it was made ... As one of the preparations for opening for the first round of new gTLDs. And actually, Fred, using the phrase "driving towards the cliff" was exactly the image we had when we wrote that report, but we added the word "fog." We're driving in fog towards the cliff. And the only way to do it safely is to drive slowly, because if you drive too fast, you won't be able to notice the cliff before you're over it.

So I am very happy about this document, and I think that RSSAC should make a statement. I wasn't quite aware of it, so I must have missed it in Montréal or forgot, which is more likely. I would like to read it. I definitely think we should comment on it as RSSAC, and I suggest that we give a few people the task of preparing such a comment, or if you

want to do it as the chair, but definitely, yes, we should comment in a positive way. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Russ, you have your hand up. I believe you may be locally muted.

OZAN SAHIN: Russ, we still cannot hear you. You may try reentering the Zoom room, or if you need a dial out, I can do that. Please let me know.

FRED BAKER: Okay. While we're waiting for Russ to sort that out, Daniel, you've got a comment.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. When Liman mentioned [it's a cliff,] do you expect it's going to work for N domain names and not N+1, or do you expect to see some slow degradation from [inaudible]?

FRED BAKER: Is that a question to me?

DANIEL MIGAULT: To Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I'll take that. That was exactly the question we were trying to address in that report, which I just found on the net, so I'll paste it in a few seconds in the chat. So yes, that is the question. We don't really know how the system is going to degrade when it reaches the end of its capacity, and that's why we want to drive slowly. That was the very strong message in that report. And I think, not having read it yet, the echoes I've heard about this report is that it's sending virtually the same message and it's also asking to look at the right place, which is with the operators.

And actually, Harald Alvestrand, they made a comment in relation to the old report which was that ICANN was trying to sell cars without making sure that the factory was able to produce that number of cars. So there needs to be a dialog between the root server operators and the part of ICANN that allows for expansion of the root zone.

I think right now, we don't have any problem whatsoever with that dialog or with the volume of the content. So we're nowhere near having problems, but it's something that we should keep in focus and we should be wary about keeping that dialog warm and ongoing so that we don't neglect the problem. I don't see it looming around the corner, but it is a problem that might arise in the far future if we don't maintain a good relationship between the root server operators and ICANN. So let's try to keep that up. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Thank you, Liman. And Matt drops in the chat room, "Because we don't know how the system will degrade with the scaling issues, it's

impossible to monitor from the outside.” And that comment is the contention of OCTO.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Very true. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: So Matt, do you want to say more there?

MATT LARSON: No. Thank you, Fred, but I don't think so.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Yeah, speaking strictly for myself—not even my company, just me—every so often, it seems like ICANN comes around and says, “Would you mind if we executed this process that would increase the size of the root zone by two orders of magnitude?” And I find myself looking at it and saying, “Why would you want to do that?” That doesn't seem like a very smart approach. That is a worry on my part, more in the same direction.

Russ, you say that your mic is fixed now. You have something to add here?

RUSS MUNDY: I wanted to make a point that Matt identified one of the SSAC publications that address this, but there was actually a much earlier one

in 2010, and it was SAC 46, and there was a specific recommendation in there. That was the only one I've found readily, but it may have actually shown up in a couple of others. This is clearly something that from the SSAC perspective, it's been asked about several times.

And getting specific statements out on the table, I think, is very good. And I'm also familiar with the study that Liman pointed to. I had forgotten the details of it, but yes, I think that's an excellent statement and that it would be very good for RSSAC as a body to make some response during a public comment period. That's what it was. Thank you. Sorry for the mic issues earlier.

FRED BAKER:

Not a problem. Brad.

BRAD VERD:

A couple things I wanted to add. One is that on the scaling ... I guess on the response, I feel pretty strongly that we should respond to this. The reason I say that is because we've actually called out an early warning system. I believe even some of our publications and responses to the SubPro working group asking for questions, I think we referenced the SSAC early warning call, which I believe was also called out in the CDAR report years ago. So just based upon history, I feel that we should comment.

I do have some questions maybe for Matt, but I can take them offline, Matt, on the way some of this stuff is worded. Specifically, if you go to the introduction, the last sentence in the third paragraph, I don't think

we've ever stated that the RSOs are not prepared. I think the main message that I keep hearing and I think is in our documents is that the RSOs have asked for a way to pull back. So if we reach that cliff, as Liman called out, that if we put in a change that breaks things, we can pull it back. I think that's what the reference piece was talking about. But I know we've referenced an early warning system.

And then on a personal note, I guess Matt, is there any way to work with the RSOs to do what you're saying rather than just asking them? Is there a way to create a monitoring system with the data that we all have, a health system or something? I don't know.

MATT LARSON: Can I quickly respond?

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

MATT LARSON: Sure. I guess it's certainly not clear to us though, at the risk of saying again what I said, we don't know what being close to failure even looks like, do we? I think that would require research to then figure out what might be detectable from the outside, or is nothing detectable from an external vantage point?

And then from the vantage point of the root server operators, is there some way that we could maybe create a system where everybody

shares—I don't know. I would be happy to talk about it. I'm sort of rambling.

BRAD VERD: I feel like the [inaudible] leaves it for everybody to throw it over the fence to RSSAC, so I'm trying to cut that off at the pass. That's all.

MATT LARSON: Well, that wasn't necessarily the intent. We're not trying to throw it to RSSAC. What we're trying to say is stop asking for an early warning system as if it's something that somebody could just easily create. And what we're trying to say is it's not that easy. No one party can do it. It would be a big undertaking, and you'd have to ask all the people who are involved. So that's not to say it can't be done, it's just that we don't know what it would look like and it would take the input of a whole lot of parties.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Suzanne.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thanks Fred. I think it's worth remembering that the whole early warning idea came up as an alternative when RSSAC and SSAC were both being asked to name a number, a hard limit on root scalability. And I guess the question is, I'm evaluating this document as we look at what to say about it, I think being asked to name a hard number is still untenable. So I really sympathize with what Matt just said about this is a

lot of work and a moving target, but I think we should at least confirm that the only thing that would be worse would be being asked to name a hard number and approach what amounts to the same question from that angle, because I think we ended up with this idea as an alternative to that and that is still not—naming a hard number is still not an approach I think we want to be boxed into. Which makes it very difficult, but ...

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Russ, your hand is up.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Fred. It seems to me that it sounds like we're going to send a response of some sort from RSSAC in the public comment time for this. But it seems to me that we should make some mention of RSSAC 47 in that response, which is not a solution per se, but it is at least pointing to a body of work that RSSAC has published that describes some things that can be used to do measuring of the system, especially the system as a whole, even though it wasn't really intended to, I don't believe, to identify when we're going to fall over the cliff, it was definitely an attempt to define how you could measure the system as a whole as well as the individual RSOs.

So it's not as if RSSAC hasn't said and published what I believe are some useful things. And it does seem reasonable that we should point to these in any comment we make. And there may be other publications too, but that certainly is one that came to my mind. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: So now if we're supposed to file a comment, we need to do that within the next three weeks. Is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Fred, this is correct. There are 20 days before this proceeding closes.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so now I'm thinking about a speedy process by which to achieve that. I'll assume that that involves coming up with some set of words, perhaps in a document, and agreeing to that set of words having a seven-day stable period, taking a vote, that kind of thing.

And that frankly sounds a little precipitous. So let me approach it this way. And if somebody has a better idea, by all means say so. But I can put together some words hopefully summarizing this conversation, and put that out in an e-mail to the RSSAC list. What I'll ask then is that staff, Ozan, Andrew, somebody pick that up, put it in a Google doc, and we can all take a few days to add to that as we need to. And then be in a position to have a stable period and take a vote before the 25th, 26th of November.

Does that process seem appropriate? Does anyone have any comment on that? 23rd, okay.

STEVE SHENG: Fred, in addition to your plan, I would also want to probably reserve a time for a teleconference, because just hearing from the conversation here, there's a difference of opinion voiced. So I think we want to reserve a time for a teleconference in case there are disagreements on the document. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, and so if we were to take a vote by the 23rd, that's a Monday, the stable period would have to start no later than the Monday before. And so now pulling up my calendar, the Monday before would be the 16th, and if we're going to have a meeting of some kind, then that suggests that we should have that meeting perhaps on the 9th, which is amazingly close.

I'm happy to have such a meeting, but what that says is we need to light a fire under creating a basis for it. So let's assume that we're doing that, and on an accelerated schedule—Ozan, can I get you to put out a Google doc or a Doodle for possibly having a meeting on the 9th of November?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. Absolutely, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. And I'll send out that e-mail very shortly. I assume that I will have managed to miss important points. So like I say, I'm asking staff to put that in a Google doc, put it out and people can start whacking on that. And ideally, after the meeting on the 9th, then we would pretty

much finish up that thing. we can come to closure during the 10th through the 13th and then go through stable period and vote. And it would be really nice if the vote was before the 23rd since the closing of comments is on the 23rd. So I think we would want to actually have that vote no later than the 20th, which will be during the IETF meeting. I don't know about you guys, I'm going to be awake in the middle of the night a lot that week.

Does anybody object to that particular plan? So Suzanne has done some comments in chat, so has Steve Sheng. Ozan, is there an easy way to get the contents of the chat? I suppose I could select all and copy it out. But is there an easy way to get all of the contents from the chat?

OZAN SAHIN:

Well, I do see three dots at the right bottom corner of the chat, but I don't know if this is an exclusive right for the host of the meeting. So even if you cannot see that, I can copy the chat and send it to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Well, if I select that thing, I see a button there that says "save chat." So it says that the chat is saved. Now the next question is where that would be. Hopefully that's somewhere on my computer. I may come back to you on that.

Okay, so I think we've worked out a process for the recommendations on root zone scaling, and I think we have violent agreement that it's something we want to comment on. Now, coming to the IANA naming function, do we have comments that we want to make on that?

OZAN SAHIN: Fred, I see hands from Brad and Suzanne. And reminding, Suzanne is also the liaison to the IFRT, so she can probably talk through the recommendations.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Suzanne being in that position, let me recognize you first.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thanks Fred. I'll keep it real brief, because I actually have to drop in a couple minutes for a day job thing. But as far as the report and the review effort, it's one of the bylaws mandated reviews. The document looks long because it's very thorough. It went through the contract of the IANA function with PTI and the relevant bylaws pretty much clause by clause. So it was a thorough and detailed effort. But kind of the upshot of it is it's the most drama-free ICANN process I think I've ever been involved in. and I mean that in a highly complementary way. The task was straightforward, which was determine if the IANA naming functions activity is being undertaken first consistently with the bylaws and contracts that were set up to govern it, and second of all, if there's anything that isn't addressed or issues that are arising for the IANA team that aren't addressed in the current framework. And the recommendations ended up being very brief and straightforward, having to do with publishing specific documents and making sure that an apparent discrepancy between the ICANN bylaws and the contract governing PTI, there's an apparent discrepancy where there's basically

two clauses that overlap, and the suggestion is to reconcile them by deleting one or the other so that there's only one.

The process was really very straightforward. I think the outcomes are very straightforward as far as the recommendations, and there's nothing that's jumping out at me, rereading it, that suggests we should be concerned as RSSAC or have objections to the recommendations. They're very operationally oriented, all of it.

I do think that somebody besides me should have looked it over fairly closely just to make sure that I'm not overlooking something, but it seems very straightforward and I'm not sure we need to file comments. I'm reasonably sure we do not need to object or raise big concerns about anything in here.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Brad, you've got your hand up.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. Thanks, Suzanne. I just want to expand on that a little bit. And I have a question for you, Suzanne, as a member of the review team. I commend you, the document is really good. I think, like you said, it's really straightforward. I think there's nothing to concern RSSAC here. I guess my question is, does the review team want support of RSSAC? I.e. a statement saying just that, "This looks good, please move forward?" And the reason I ask that is that we the RSOs and RSSAC have stated our close tie to IANA, so I'm just curious if we should weigh in and say, "Good job, please follow through on this" type of thing?

SUZANNE WOOLF: You know, I was wondering that and I realized I am not certain. I will ask and report back.

FRED BAKER: Okay. That's something you can do on the list. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. Yes, I was going to state my support for doing that. And I realize that my support doesn't have to be as strong as I first thought, because the Customer Standing Committee, which I chair, has stated its support for the recommendations that pertain directly to the CSC. The relationship between ICANN and the CSC and the PTI, or rather, the IANA function is involved in one of these recommendations. And we have written an official note to support that specific recommendation, and in general, giving positive feedback about the report.

I agree that this is good work, and I think it should receive formal support. So it isn't too hard to write those few lines to say, "Yes, thank you for doing a good job, please move on." It's very short, but it conveys a message that give the people in the committee confidence and it also shows—displays the support it receives from this little part of the community, namely RSSAC, and I think since the IANA function, as Brad mentioned, also relates to the root server function or root server operations in a close tie, I think the optics of sending such a small little letter is probably very good. Thanks.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I'm happy to defer to that.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Suzanne, you offered to go off and ask a question, get an answer and let us know. If you could do that in the next couple of days, I'd appreciate that.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay.

FRED BAKER: Meanwhile, my sense is that we're in violent agreement. Is there any dissent, anyone that is concerned about the report one way or another? Failing that, let's take a process to generate that couple of sentences. Question on the sentences. Is that something we can simply write at the appropriate website, or is that something that needs to go in as a document? What's the form of that?

STEVE SHENG: Fred, I think it can be very short, but I would recommend a document for historical records. This can be submitted to the public comment box. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. That was my thought as well. It's nice to know when you're out of left field.

Okay, so I'll work with staff to get that going and we can talk about that this week. and again, that closes the 2nd of December, which is three weeks from now. So we need to agree on it fairly quickly.

Okay, and now, the third item there, 6(c), the recommendations for ICANN root name service strategy and implementation, does anybody have comments on that report? Brad, you have your hand up.

BRAD VERD:

Just a quick one. I don't know if RSSAC should comment on it, but my initial read of the document—and this is just initially, I haven't spent a lot of time on it and I apologize—is that there's conflation between two roles. One as an RSO and one as the overseer of the RSS. And that I guess is my only initial concern. I don't know if other people see that or have read it, but that's clearly something that I'm reviewing.

FRED BAKER:

Yeah. One thing that concerns me, just looking at the table of contents, seems like this is largely about L root and hyperlocal. Okay, so let me do this. For the moment, let me simply throw that as a topic to the mailing list. If people have comments on it, let's assemble those comments.

As far as how the IMRS is structured, that's L root's purpose, and I'm not sure we have any valid comment. But there might be other aspects of the report that we want to comment on. So let's, in e-mail, start pulling together those comments and assemble however we would want to respond.

So moving on in the agenda, I believe the next stop is for Brad and I to comment. I've already said that there's a discussion going on among the SOAC chairs with Göran, and the question there is, what is the process by which we decide to meet further?

I'll try to keep people aware as this goes on, but right now, it's at a very early stage. Part of the question there, as I said, is how many times a year should we meet. Should we reduce from three to two or one or something like that?

And I'm not sure I have an opinion, but that discussion is going on. Brad, is there anything you want to bring up?

BRAD VERD: No, you covered everything that we talked about.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah, so no new topic or discussion in the board. In the interest of time, I'm not going to go over it because I think all of you were in the meeting with the board and GWG. It was mostly an update from our side and then also GWG.

Quickly to cover two points. A, my general read of the board and their understanding of the process, personally, I'm happy with it. Different board members have different understanding of how this works. I think

all have a good grasp on the dynamic, what RSSAC is doing here, what GWG is doing, and then the [differences are] communicated. So that, I think, is positive.

Second point which came up as a question afterwards from one of the colleagues, after the meeting of RSSAC board and GWG, was there was a reference to IANA and then ICANN control over PTI IANA. I just want to clarify that because from the board—and this was discussed within the board and also with Göran as a board member and CEO, the slides that were presented by GWG [inaudible] as it was mentioned, that's not the plan but they used PTI as an example.

And Göran made a comment which was discussed a bit, but I understood that maybe it was not clear enough. And his comment was basically PTI is under control of ICANN, and we don't want such a construct because PTI has five board members, three of them are directly selected by ICANN and the other two, ICANN delegates that to NomCom. But they have control of the PTI.

And that's not what we are looking for. So that's the understanding of GWG and the board and ICANN Org as stated by Göran, but I just want to make sure this is clear. That's where we stand. That's my report.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. Liman here with a report from the CSC. Our last meeting was the joint meeting with the PTI board, which we have once a year, and

we did a bit of cross informing from the board and so one thing that we looked into was how the PTI operates in these times of COVID, because typically, the PTI will engage a lot with its customers during physical meetings and direct contact and they can't right now. So they had to change their modus operandi a bit to adapt to the situation we have. And there was a bit of discussion also regarding they are doing a survey to their customers.

There was also a bit of information from the PTI board regarding the budget work. There will be no major changes to the budget for the PTI. What else? Well, the last report from the PTI was, again, 100% compliance with the SLAs so there's nothing to worry about there. As I mentioned, we sent a comment to the IFRT in support of their report. And yes, we've had a few changes in the committee. So our liaison from the GAC has retired and been replaced with a gentleman from Nepal, and that actually puts a spin on our hitherto very solid meeting times. Now we're actually spread with a total spread across the globe which makes it a nightmare. ICANN people are used to that, but it's still a nightmare. We had a good time until then.

We also see one of the liaisons, the person from the GNSO Noncontracted Party House, James Gannon had to retire because he was suddenly in a position of conflict of interest as he was appointed to the board of the PTI. So he stepped down immediately when that was clear. So we are now expecting the GNSO constituency group there to provide us with a new liaison. But since it's just a liaison, we don't have to jump through all the hoops of replacing voting members, which is another nightmare. Sorry, it's not a nightmare, it's just a very complicated process that takes a long time.

So we are now investigating when would be a suitable time of day to have our meetings. The next one would still be at our usual time though. End of report. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. And I'll note that if you look in the chat, Suzanne and Matt have needed to drop off. We are actually at the end of our allotted 90 minutes, so we'll follow the agenda but we're heading toward the end of the meeting. Daniel, you are on the list twice, for the RZERC and the IAB. Do you have any comments from either of them?

DANIEL MIGAULT:

As the IAB liaison, mostly, I provided my feedbacks on the mailing list. Just to mention that we discussed with the IAB and mostly Wes, and we decided that it might be a good thing that I report a little bit more from IAB meetings to [RSSAC] even though the topics might not be strongly related to [RSSAC] activity. But as long as there is a relation to, it might be worth bringing it back to the mailing list. So that's the path we're taking. And currently, most of the discussion is about the private TLDs. The current status is that the IAB and the ICANN Board are currently exchanging on how to deal with that [inaudible] some recommendations about the naming are being provided. So that's all for the IAB. And we have an IAB meeting tonight.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. Russ, you have any comments from the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Just to make it real short, thanks to all that participated in the joint RSSAC-SSAC meeting as part of the ICANN joint meeting, and we're planning on doing another one, so folks can be thinking about the next one, but nothing further to report at this time. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. Okay, and then the IANA functions operator. James Mitchell is replacing Naela. James, you have big shoes to stand in there. Do you have any comments from the IANA functions operator?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi Fred. I saw in the chat that James also left the meeting a couple of minutes ago, but he dropped a note as his report. He flagged the draft PTI IANA FY2020 operating plan and budget public comment proceeding which is open, and I will just copy and paste his note for those who are interested.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Duane, do you have comments?

DUANE WESSELS: Hi Fred. No comments today. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. GWG. Liman, Brad, Hiro?

BRAD VERD: Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was going to toss it to you because I was so focused on the CSC stuff that I forgot that I also have the GWG to report from.

BRAD VERD: So hopefully both of you guys were in the ICANN meeting, you guys got the update there as to where they're headed with a separate LLC, separate community, and those details are getting kind of worked out. I think the most recent development that was a bit surprising to me, that is super early, which is why we've only had one phone discussion on it, which is the funding. What's being thrown out there right now is a grant model which is no strings attached, just here's some money. Which I understand why they chose it and I know there are a number of people in support of it. My question is that it really doesn't address the accountability question, which is the original question for [37,] how do we get accountability for the RSOs?

But those discussions are just starting. And then lastly, the group decided to go from a meeting every two weeks to a meeting every week in an effort to try to get back onto this arbitrary schedule that we have. I think I got it. Is that all, Liman, Hiro?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, I think that caught a lot of good stuff in very framework words. Thank you.

HIRO HOTTA: Thank you. I think that's it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you very much. Going on to AOB. I mentioned earlier that ICANN is thinking about possibilities for how do we have a public meeting and when might we do that. There is a survey that they've put out basically to gather the community's viewpoint, and I would encourage each of us to take a look at it and respond to the survey. That is due actually later in the week. The 5th is a Thursday. So please take a look at that and comment as you see fit.

So next meeting then is the 1st of December, it's just after thanksgiving if you're in the US. Ozan, do you have a list of the action items that have come out of this meeting? I know I've taken a couple in terms of sending e-mails.

OZAN SAHIN: I will go ahead and circulate a Doodle poll for a meeting on the 9th of November to talk about the RSSAC input to the early warning for root zone scaling public comment, and staff will also post the minutes from October meeting as well as the proposed MoU/LoI on the RSSAC website. ICANN staff will also reach out to relevant ICANN function to inform them of the ICANN appointments on the NextGen at ICANN committees. And also, staff will move the early warning public comment proceeding over to a Google doc so that RSSAC can provide their comments on a Google document. These are the action items that I

noted from this meeting, but I'll also go through the recording and note if there are more.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, great. Thank you. So I think then we're done, unless somebody has—speak now or hold your peace. Anybody else have anything else they want to discuss at this point? I don't see any hands, so with that, then I'll go ahead and adjourn. Our next meeting is on the 1st of December. Thank you for attending today.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you all. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]