

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, Ozan, could you put up the list of who I'm supposed to call? Because I always forget somebody if I don't have a list in front of me. So, let's run through who I expect to be on the call.

Cogent, Paul, are you here?

PAUL VIXIE: I am.

FRED BAKER: Okay, DISA? Kevin and Ryan?

KEVIN WRIGHT: This is Kevin.

RYAN STEPHENSON: This is Ryan.

KEVIN WRIGHT: I think Ryan's still trying to get on, yeah.

FRED BAKER: Okay, ICANN? Matt and Terry.

---

*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's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, ISC? I can see Jeff, and I'm here.

JEFF OSBORN: [inaudible]

FRED BAKER: NASA? Barbara and Tom, are you here?

TOM MIGLIN: I'm here. This is Tom. I think Barbara's on too.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Netnod? Liman? Patrik?

OZAN SAHIN: This is Ozan, Fred. We received a note from Liman saying he would be joining late. So, we expect him to join in 30 minutes.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And we got a similar note from Daniel. RIPE NCC?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, Kaveh's here.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay, University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: USC ISI? I heard Jeff's voice earlier. Suzanne, are you around?

WES HARDAKER: Oh, that'd be Wes, not Jeff. But Suzanne [doesn't seem to be around.]

FRED BAKER: Oh, I'm sorry.

WES HARDAKER: That's okay. I think it's just me.

FRED BAKER: Okay, ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard's here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

---

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro's here.

FRED BAKER: And Kaveh, you're the Liaison to the Board. Liman's joining us in a little bit. Daniel will join us in about 40 minutes, he said in an e-mail. SSAC? Russ Mundy, are you around?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, Russ is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, IAB? Daniel, still waiting. IANA Functions Operator? James, are you here?

JAMES MITCHELL: I'm here.

---

FRED BAKER:                      Okay, Root Zone? Duane?

DUANE WESSELS:                Yes, Duane is here.

FRED BAKER:                      And we have several from staff. Danielle's going to join later, I guess. Okay, so, I guess that constitutes a quorum. Brad, let me turn this over to you.

BRAD VERD:                        Good Morning...

FRED BAKER:                      Oh, wait a second. I'm supposed to go over the agenda, right?

BRAD VERD:                        Yeah, you go over the agenda and the minutes.

FRED BAKER:                      Yeah, okay. So, now you're looking at the agenda. Does anybody have any changes that they would like to make to the agenda? Hearing none, that's the agenda. Minutes, that was sent around. Does anybody have any objections to the minutes? Anybody abstaining? Well, that's that. We accept the minutes. So, now Brad, let me turn this over to you.

---

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Fred. So, this is number 4B. This is the RSSAC Chair election. We have one candidate, one nominee, Fred Baker who is our current serving chair. The—whoa, okay, his statement of interest is now shown on screen. There are no other candidates, so by rules of acclimation, we will—we would go forward with Fred. So, my—I guess I will open it up for discussion right now. Is there any discussion on this topic? I don't see any hands; I don't hear anybody. Do I have a motion to accept Fred as our new chair by acclimation?

WES HARDAKER: So moved.

BRAD VERD: I heard somebody say second. I just don't know who?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh speaking, I'm seconding.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. All right, well, congratulations Fred on another term as RSSAC chair.

FRED BAKER: Well, thank you for the vote of confidence.

---

BRAD VERD: I guess I should ask, is there anybody abstaining from that vote? All right. So, with that, I will turn it over to Mr. Osborn, to talk about the Caucus Membership Committee.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Brad. The action today—I guess we're going to have a vote on continuing with the membership. But as for new members, we had one, one applicant, Dan Mahoney. And those of you that serve on Root-ops know Dan. Dan—I wondered whether I had to stay out of the vote because Dan has worked for me for over seven years. He is extremely knowledgeable in the ways of Root-ops and all things F-Root. So, I really, highly recommend him for the—for membership in the Caucus.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, he's a [no brainer.]

JEFF OSBORN: Right. So, I never remember. Do we have to have a vote, or do I simply say we're recommending it and it happens? I forget the process.

FRED BAKER: I think we actually have a vote, but it works out to the equivalent of what you just said.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay.

PAUL VIXIE: It would be good going into the vote if you would state the position of the membership committee, on this. Because the expectation is that it would be somebody we don't as well as we know Dan. And that some background investigation would've been done. So, what's the position of the committee, was the only thing I know before I vote.

JEFF OSBORN: Sure. The membership committee is made up of the three of us: Alejandro Acosta, Dave Lawrence, and myself. Many of you know either some or all three of us. We were unanimous and all of us have known and worked with Dan in various roles for quite a while. So, this was, as Wes said, this was a no brainer. Dan is extremely qualified. I'm sure that his management gives him all the time he needs to help out with Caucus matters.

[BRAD VERD]: I move that we add this member.

JEFF OSBORN: Second?

[WES HARDAKER:] Second.



---

FRED BAKER: Okay—yes, I’m not on mute. With that, we have a recommendation. We have a motion, and a second. Is anybody objecting to Dan? Are there any abstentions? Failing that, somebody can buy Daniel a—yeah, buy Dan a cup of coffee.

So, moving on to the membership committee. We just had a list of who that constitutes. It’s Jeff and Alejandro and Dave Lawrence. You’ve had those SOIs to review. And they’ve been doing this now—Jeff, is that two years, three years?

JEFF OSBORN: I’ve just been on it for part of 2020. And the two of them were on it previously, Ozan—who knows everything—probably has better information.

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Jeff. Hi everyone. This is Ozan. Yes, Alejandro and Dave served on the 2019 Caucus Membership Committee. And then they also served on the 2020 committee, with Jeff. All of the three members are willing to serve on the 2021 Caucus Membership Committee now.

FRED BAKER: Okay, great. So, do I have a motion to accept them as our membership committee for 2021?

PAUL VIXIE: I so move.

---

FRED BAKER: Do I have a second?

WES HARDAKER: Wes seconds.

FRED BAKER: Okay, is anybody opposed? Is anybody abstaining? So fine, we now have a membership committee for 2021.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, it's an honor to serve.

FRED BAKER: So, now the RSSAC work plan, do we have a page for that? There we go. So, this is a—one of the outcomes of the review that we had in what, 2018, was that we should have a plan. And so basically, we copied what SSAC was doing. What they were doing was a spreadsheet; you're looking at the outcome of that discussion. And so, this is the different things that we do each year in January, February, and so on. And Ozan, in July—you've added a RSSAC2 review every two years—is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Jeff. Thank You. Excuse me. Yes, Fred. Thank you. This ... You reviewed the RSSAC work plan line by line in the previous RSSAC

---

meeting. The only thing that was added since then was this line 35, beginning RSSAC2 review, which wasn't on the work plan previously. But this is on the RSSAC2 as a recommendation, so I went ahead and added that and highlighted it in yellow.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And that link, could you drop it in the chatroom please? So, if people want to read that and see what we've got going on for the remainder of the year, and obviously next year; you'll be looking at that link.

And Ozan, we don't need to vote on this, correct? We're just walking through it.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, there's no official vote needed for this work plan. If RSSAC is okay with the work plan though, staff will go ahead and publish it for the year 2021.

FRED BAKER: Okay, does anybody have any objections to this particular work plan? Things you want to add; things that should be changed.

PAUL VIXIE: I don't object, but I note it's—there's a lot going on here. So, I am myself going to have to let the other denizens in my local circle know that I've got to redouble my efforts here. Several of you may be in that

---

position, where this—we're hitting a stride. There's a lot of work going on.

FRED BAKER: There is. There is. Okay. There's no vote required but I think, Ozan, you can go ahead and publish this then. And I would suggest that people look through it and see what is going to be of interest to them.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Taken as an action item.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, we're moving on to the organizational review of—Oh, Ozan, you want to take this over?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. So, earlier this year in January 2020, RSSAC approved the detailed implementation plan for the Second Organizational review of the RSSAC. And then in March 2020, the ICANN Board accepted this plan and requested the Organizational Review Implementation work party and the RSSAC to report on the progress of the implementation every six months starting by June 2020. And the first implementation progress report was submitted in June 2020. Now the second one is due by the end of December. [They'll first off work] with the Review Implementation work party to draft the second Implementation progress report and then the—the report was added to the agenda of this meeting.

---

And as a reminder, there were six recommendations that were accepted on the detailed implementation report. And out of the six recommendations, two were found to be completed: recommendations three and four. And also, the implementation of other two other recommendations were deemed ongoing, these are the recommendations 3A and 5.

And then finally, the implementation of the last two approved recommendations—recommendation 1A and 6A, which pertain to the membership of the RSSAC and the RSSAC Caucus were tied to the progress of the RSS GWG work. And by looking at the progress of the RSS GWG, the implementation work party reported that the RSS GWG work may or may not result in a change in the membership structure of the RSSAC or the RSSAC Caucus. And added that the work party hoped the—they would get more clarity on this area before the next implementation progress report due date which is June 2021. So, I shared the report on the RSSAC mailing list a week ago, this is a vote item for today. If approved by the RSSAC, then staff will submit a report to the Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee on behalf of the Review Implementation Work Party. Thanks, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. So, the big question at the moment is what does the GWG think the RSSAC is going to be six months from now, or a year from now? The issue being the recommendation that the review committee thought that maybe the RSSAC should be more than the RSOs. And well, maybe it should be, maybe it shouldn't be. We'll see what the GWG thinks. What we have done—and you're looking at this right now—is called

---

through the list of people that are on the ICANN Caucus—or the RSSAC Caucus and several of them said they didn't really want to be there anymore. We had some people that we culled out there. But that's pretty much where we stand. So, we have to comment on those two, the ICANN Board in December—is that correct, Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, yes Fred. So, if approved in this meeting, the staff will go ahead and submit the report to the Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee on behalf of the Implementation Work Party.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and that is a vote item?

OZAN SAHIN: Right.

FRED BAKER: So, the report is what we just looked at, correct?

OZAN SAHIN: Right.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, did anybody see anything in that report that they wanted to—that drew their ire? Is anybody not in favor of that report? Any abstentions? Failing that, I think we've accepted that report. So, we'll

---

move on to the IANA Naming Function Review. And again, that's a vote item. So, Ozan, can you show us the proposed statement?

So, what we're saying is in essence, that the report is fine. IANA is one of the few things around ICANN that I can unequivocally say works. Does anybody have heartburn with this report, if it goes in? So, I take it nobody is voting negatively. Do we have any abstentions? So, okay. We have accepted this report. So, Ozan, you want to talk about the statement on—I'm sorry, Steve. You sent an e-mail actually yesterday. You want to remind us what we're saying about the root Names Service?

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you. This is a public comment submission that'll be submitted as a response to ICANN's Root Name Service Strategy and Implementation. The deadline for public comment is December 8. So, looking at the current timeline, the RSSAC may be late a few days. So, Brad drafted this statement, staff put it in the Google Doc and then the—around probably, around ten people yesterday participated on the call to discuss this comment. And there was two things. One thing was, the people on the call felt comfortable with this and the agreed timeline is for a 48-hour, from yesterday till the end of day today editing of this document where Brad as the editor will address the edits. Following that, the document will go into a shortened stable review period. It's seven calendar days. In terms of working days, it's probably five working days. And that will close on Monday, and then Tuesday next week, that will be followed by a vote, if all things goes well. So, that's a quick

---

process, the background, and the context of this document. Any questions?

FRED BAKER: And you have advised your counterparts managing this vote, that we'll be a little bit late?

STEVE SHENG: Yes, we will notify the people responsible for the public comments for this particular proceeding, that the comments will come in late.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Kaveh. You have your hand up.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, thank you very much. So, I wanted to suggest that we discuss this document a bit outside of the content. Because generally, I agree with the content, but I think if you look at the bigger picture—our position in the ecosystem—this is ICANN, an organization, running their own Root services. And they publish something—let's not judge the content—as their strategy for running that service. And they're asking general public basically to—anyone can comment on that strategy so they would consider it. But then we, as RSSAC, we have a special position because we know that our composition is the existing root server operators. And now we are, as that body, making that comment. I find that a bit odd. I mean if it was let's say, Root Server operators, that's fine.



---

But I'm not saying it's against the rules, but I find it a bit strange because we are here representing an advisory committee to the Board. And we are here because we are Root server operators, let's put ourselves in ICANN's shoes, like I have a strategy and I publish it. If I have an open process, I would love anyone from any of the operators comment, because that's welcome. But if I also, as RIPE NCC let's say create a forum for server operators to discuss issues and give me advice, I would find it a bit strange if that body gives me—basically tells me how to run my own operation where I have a seat on that group, because they also have—because of the same reason—running Root operations, they have a seat in that group. So, maybe it's a consideration before going forward. I just wanted to put this on table, because yep, I think if it was happening to RIPE NCC I would've received it a bit—yep, find it a bit strange, let's say.

FRED BAKER:

Well, speaking I guess primarily from myself; I have found this OCTO report strange from the beginning. If they want to talk about the RSS, it seems like they should talk to the other operators. They should make a statement on behalf of the RSS. If they want to talk about ICANN's L-Root service, so be it, that's fine. But they should talk about the L-Root. And the idea that OCTO speaks for the RSS without talking to it, it just makes me a little bit crazy—

KAVEH RANJBAR:

That part, I agree, Fred. But may I ask, is that clear? Because again, what's written in here, I actually personally don't have an issue. If I

---

wanted to submit my own response to the public comment, I think it would be something very similar to these words. But the document is titled, ICANN's Root Name Services. That's IMRS, ICANN Managed Root Services. So, they are talking about their own service. Let's say RIPE NCC runs K-Root and we publish something as our strategy for K-Root and we also talk about other root servers, by mistake or by reason or for whatever reason I might have. That's fair, and I would love to hear comments from individual root operators. But sending it from RSSAC? I think it's not against the rules, my reading, but I find it a bit unfair. Let's put it—not finding any better word. Because this is a position that ICANN is in just because of this governance, and I think we are using it, although we are allowed to use it, but I don't find this use of the process fair. I'm all for Root-ops submitting a—basically Root independent operators individually or as a group. We all sign a letter and send it. But as RSSAC—using it as RSSAC? I find it a bit strange. Just my two cents.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, Wes. You have your hand up.

WES HARDAKER:

Yeah, I mean, I see your point, Kaveh. That's an interesting take and I was thinking about it from the same way. What happens if RIPE NCC did actually publish something similar that talked about how they were going to beef up their system in order to 'save the world' because the Root server system was going to die? Because the rest of the operators weren't doing well. I mean that's almost what is in the ICANN document. It's an end of the world type statement. And that's what this

---

is pushing back on a little bit, saying well, there's no actual facts in that other statement. And there are two different roles that are being conflated. And our final conclusion was to recommend splitting it into two documents. And so, you're right, that, would it be acceptable for RSSAC to criticize RIPE's document, if that was the case? And I think that your notion of one thing that we could do is collectively find some names or organizations that are willing to sign it [instead] and don't send it labeled as RSSAC, but send it labeled as these are the signatories that may include coincidentally all of the root operators, minus maybe a couple.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Brad?

BRAD VERD:

Kaveh, here's where I have a challenge. If we use that train of thought in everything we did, I mean we are—we being RSSAC—are approached all the time to give feedback from an RSO's perspective or actually get a report from the RSOs if their willing to do things or are capable of doing things. So, I feel like using the logic you just used, that none of these conversations should come to RSSAC, they should all go directly to Root-ops then.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

If I may Brad, fair enough. I get the point. And again, my point is also not like some ... This is more of, as I said, more of a feeling unfair. But my answer would be that this is very operational, how one operator is

---

stating the strategy for operations. Correct? I mean the statements they make is to support whatever operational decision they are making. RIPE NCC or various, I might publish statements which I might find very true, but you might find wrong or other way around. And that's fine. And again, if there's an open process, I would love to participate as an operator, but this is operational. I mean, one operator talking about their operations and asking public input—public opinion about what I wrote.

So again, I don't find it against any of the laws or rules or anything, but I think recognizing ICANN's operational, basically, role in IMRS is best for all of us, because then I think we can expect the same in all aspects. But again, I didn't bring it up to stop this, I just wanted to put it on the table because this is a challenge for me, let's put it that way. I've not decided fully, but I thought it's worth sharing.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Now let me remind you, Kaveh, where we stand with this document. We had a call on Monday to go through it, and people have taken the last couple of days to edit in some comments. You'll see some references from Wes and others. And I specifically sent a note to Matt and Terry who weren't in the meeting on Monday, it conflicted with something of theirs, asking for their comments.

Now, so we're expecting to take an electronic ballot next week, and then assuming that it passes, to file this with the public comment proceeding that is being run on the IMRS plan. And of course, it will say what this says. Are you okay with that?

KAVEH RANJBAR: So if the question is to me, first, sorry for missing the Monday call, I had also a conflict, but yeah, I'm not sure. I still need to think more about that. But personally, I think if that's the case, I would abstain from voting, RIPE NCC would abstain from voting. Of course, I will also discuss it internally, but that would be my suggested position for RIPE NCC. But still, I need to think more about that as well, as I said.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman has joined the call. I don't know if everybody saw that. Hi Liman. Does anybody else have a comment on this document? Okay, so I guess I just walked through where we stand on it. We'll be taking an electronic ballot on Monday, and people can decide what they want to do with it then, between now and then.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So you're looking for comments, just input into the document?

FRED BAKER: Yes. Today. Yes. And then starting tomorrow, hopefully it's stable.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

---

FRED BAKER: So with that, I suppose we should move along in the agenda. RSSAC caucus potential work items. We made a comment to the GWG about the empowered community. We told the GWG about that and we also passed along a PDF of the MoU/LoI work to the GWG. Publish a document that advises any bodies created as part of the RSS governance as to how they should interpret and act on data. So we have published RSSAC 47. Paul has developed the initial implementation. And I sent him a note saying that we I think are interested in the status of that, replying to his June note. And the admin committee actually suggest that the caucus review Paul's code and provide him any feedback.

1.3, I'm going to roll that up, I think. Yeah, there we go. So we proposed the MoU/LoI. And I think we have Jeff's input on the recommendation on accountability. Jeff, do you have any additional commentary there?

JEFF OSBORN: The financial part?

FRED BAKER: Yeah, sure.

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah, I had that discussion with Steve and he had put in the information I submitted. So yes.

---

STEVE SHENG: Sorry, Jeff, I still need to write it up. But let me just give a quick summary what this item is about. As part of one of the items regarding RSSAC 47 and really talking about financial aspect of increased accountability, so Jeff and I had a discussion, and one of the things, we felt this is the best time to file, to do this work, is as a response to the GWG output, especially their description of the financial element.

The other part is ... There are two parts of this, obviously subject to RSSAC discussion. The first part is whether the mere fact of accountability needs to have money exchanged, and the second aspect is, what additional elements would justify for financial aspect of increased accountability? So I think those are the two elements to be explored by RSSAC in that input to GWG. Jeff, did I summarize our conversation correctly? Anything you want to add?

JEFF OSBORN: You did. The difficult part of this that I've had a hard time getting across is what you have said ,where I believe it should cost something to simply have us under a regime that can fire us, rather than it's only for incremental improvements to the service.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now, we don't formally have a proposal from the GWG yet. We will get that sometime in the first quarter. Jeff, Liman, Hiro, do we need to make any formal comment to the GWG along the lines of what Jeff is saying?

---

BRAD VERD: It seems like we should share that sentiment. If everybody believes that that's true, we should share that with the GWG.

FRED BAKER: Well, and of course, at the moment, I know for sure that that's Jeff's viewpoint. I'm not sure that we all agree to that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think that sharing the concern might be a good idea at least. We don't necessarily have to share it as "The consensus of RSSAC is ..." It could be that this has been voiced inside RSSAC by a subgroup of members. Just to make the GWG aware of it, as Brad says. And it doesn't have to be a formal letter from RSSAC to the GWG, I think. So making the GWG aware is probably a good thing. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now, is that something that an e-mail from me to Ted would be sufficient for, or what form do we need that to take?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: My personal view is that yes, that would be sufficient. I would like to hear Brad either contradict me or chime in. Or Hiro, of course.

[BRAD VERD:] I think that's fine.



---

[HIRO HOTTA:] I agree.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Ozan, would you take an action for me to send such a note to Ted?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And then you see the admin committee recommendation that we should continue monitoring the GWG. May I ask the three of you that are on the GWG, at the point where they're filing documents in their workspace or making any proposals, would you please advise us of that and give us a link so that we can be on top of that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, noted. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So RSS metrics. What do we have there? Ozan, you want to move that up? So the initial results we're talking about here are the results that Paul is putting together. Is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes.

FRED BAKER: So we should probably tell Paul that we're waiting for some amount of comments.

PAUL VIXIE: Since you mean the other Paul, I'd like him to be identified by his last name.

FRED BAKER: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, Paul Hoffman who is writing up or has written up an initial implementation of the RSSAC 47 stuff and is putting together a reference dataset, one hopes. So Ozan, another action item for me to drop a note to Paul, making these statements, if we're all in agreement with him. And I don't hear any objections.

OZAN SAHIN: Noted, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. And when you do that, Ozan, send me the link so that I can point Paul to it.

OZAN SAHIN: Absolutely.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. Moving on. Hiro, there's a question here whether WIDE would be interested in following up on this item, RSSAC 28. Do you have any comments?

HIRO HOTTA: At the moment, no.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, should we propose the RSSAC 28 attack issues to the caucus as a work item? I guess I worded that as a question for Hiro, but I'll take any comments. Hearing none, that sounds like a no. Doesn't make sense to continue studying that. So we can put that on the back burner. Okay, 3.2, study reducing the priming response size from the recommendation of RSSAC 28. We're waiting for RZERC's recommendation. Brad, what's RZERC thinking about that?

BRAD VERD: Well, I can tell you what RZERC was thinking when I left RZERC.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. I was thinking you were still the liaison.

BRAD VERD: Is Daniel here?

FRED BAKER: Daniel was delayed joining, and I don't believe he has joined.

BRAD VERD: What I think is happening is that RZERC is putting in a recommendation to have OCTO study this, since they have resources to do this. I think that's what's happening. But I would need to confirm [inaudible] Daniel.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, that's correct, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Oh, yeah. Duane, you are on RZERC. You can ...

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. RZERC has been working on a document which will recommend further study from ICANN Org. It doesn't necessarily name OCTO specifically, but that's sort of the understanding that OCTO would be doing the work. It just sort of ties in these same recommendations that we're looking at from RSSAC 028 and adds RZERC's voice to support those recommendations. Or to support that further study.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So we don't have any action item here.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't believe so, no. Not at this time anyway.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay, so Wes dropped a note in the chat room saying for some reason, he had difficulty joining and he wonders if Daniel may have hit the same problem, whatever that problem was. Daniel's still not here.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, sometimes Zoom kind of flakes and goes to a connecting screen after you get accepted, and then it just never comes back. I kind of wonder if other people have hit that. I think somebody said in the beginning of the call it looks like multiple people were trying to join, and if you don't realize, you need to quite and restart. Maybe he assumed RSSAC doesn't happen today because he couldn't get in.

STEVE SHENG: We'll send an e-mail to Daniel.

FRED BAKER: Okay. In any event, I don't think we have a current action in 3.2. 3.3, current status is that that's complete. We released document 50. So, do we have anything additional we need to do in 3.3? Not hearing any. So going on into section 4, we have the rogue RSO work party, which is ongoing. Hosting root instances.

The admin committee is of the opinion that this is an RSO matter. So remind me, Ozan, have we told the caucus that this is out of scope? If not, I should take an action to make that statement.

---

OZAN SAHIN: I believe we have not yet, Fred. I believe we will compile the list of potential work items here and then create an Excel sheet and then ask RSSAC caucus.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So let me know what the outcome of that is. 4.3, we have an open work party. Early warning, I have made a suggestion to the caucus, and Steve has proposed a statement of work for that item. At least I saw it. Did that get shared with the rest of the RSSAC?

STEVE SHENG: No, Fred. What I took is I took your e-mail to the caucus, Steve Crocker's response, and then drafted a statement of work. I think after this call, I'll send it to caucus [inaudible] RSSAC members is on the caucus to provide input.

In addition to the input, also indicate anyone that's interested in joining this work party. At a very high level, this work party aims to build on prior work to determine what failure of the RSS might look like and investigate what indicators would be able to detect stress or failure in the system. And second is to determine whether it's even feasible to build an early warning system. And if feasible, what measurements are necessary and how could it build? So those are currently two questions. Like I said, this is based on the RSSAC caucus mailing list discussions. We'll send it to the caucus , and then you will see what the caucus say. Thanks.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now, In that Google doc, as I recall, I added some text. And I think that's the paragraph starting "Another possible outcome." Am I correct in that?

STEVE SHENG: Yes. All your suggestions have been accepted.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So what do we need to do with this? Do we need to run this around the RSSAC and get support and go on to the caucus? What do we need to do?

STEVE SHENG: Let me think. Well, one way is to send it directly to the caucus and ask for feedback as well as volunteers. That's the most open process. If RSSAC wants to consider it first, then I would recommend send a statement of work to the RSSAC and then RSSAC reviews it, have no issues, then send it to the caucus. So it's really two ways. Either one works. And the RSSAC have done both in the past.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, I guess the only real reply that I've gotten to the proposal at all is from Steve Crocker, who assumed that I knew things that I didn't know. And I've replied to him on that. So I guess I would really like the RSSAC's viewpoint or the viewpoints of the people in the RSSAC before going to the caucus. Am I just blowing smoke?

---

So let's send this to the RSSAC and give people a week to review it. And if you guys have problems, then obviously, I'm interested in your comments. Otherwise, we can plan to send the document to the caucus a week from now. Am I crazy in that?

STEVE SHENG: I think that's fine. Noted.

FRED BAKER: Okay. 4.5, the admin committee suggested that we delete this item. Did anybody have a concern with deleting this item?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Does anyone remember why it was added?

FRED BAKER: Well, I think we had a work party that was ... Liman was trying very hard to get somebody to respond to some e-mail, and basically, there was no interest. Liman, am I correct in that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. It's been a while, but I seem to remember that that was the case.

PAUL VIXIE: I am a little worried about the lack of response or lack of cooperation there, because we have caucus members from the BRICS, Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa, and this is something that if you are



---

working for some organization, for profit or nonprofit, and you live in one of those five places, you are expected to ask the question, why are we not included? And so geodiversity [is in this case] a proxy for exclusion. So I'm shocked that we didn't get any answer. This is the kind of thing I would expect various people to have just jumped on.

FRED BAKER:

Well, yeah. And specific to that, there was a blog that was published in the Financial Times, came out I think about two months ago. The chair of the IPv6 deployment, somebody in India, posted this blog basically observing that Reliance [and] three cellular operators represent together probably the largest single IPv6 deployment experience in the world, and by the way, we had Reliance talk to the IETF meeting last week and they talked about—they have a number of services that are IPv6 only that they literally don't have any IPv4 support for and people are using.

So IPv6 is moving ahead in India. The comment in the blog was that, gee, that was an argument for them to get a root service that was IPv6 only. To which I inquired around some friends of mine from India asking, how do I contact this guy? Because we all have IPv6 addresses and we have, I think, 38 different servers in India that would respond to an IPv6 address if asked.

So the comment in the blog seemed to me completely out of touch with reality. And I haven't actually contacted the guy because I haven't figured out how.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is there a draft? Or is what I'm seeing on the screen as far as we got?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If I may, this is as far as we got. There's no draft document. and Paul, I share your reaction. I was surprised when I realized that there were just crickets when I tried to reach out to the caucus. It seems that to some extent—and I'm being a bit nefarious here, but it seems like people like to complain but they don't like to work when they're offered the chance to make a difference with things like this.

So working with us is not going to bring their cause forward, because what they want is their own server, for reasons that I don't really comprehend. But working with us wouldn't give them that. It would give them better service but not their own server. So I think that might be one reason for this. But we never got as far as writing anything about this. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My recollection, there was also sort of a discussion that this would be easier to do after the current measurement work party which is ongoing right now was finished, because we'd have better tools to be able to figure out—geographic diversity was actually going to matter considering topological diversity is probably more important in things like that. So I vaguely recall that we tried to do a few things. We tried to limit the number of work parties that we were taking on as a group because too many failed. So we were trying to narrow it down [to just two.] So some of these, I thought we were thinking we could consider them afterwards. And certainly, that particular one has a follow-on

---

problem that it could really benefit from the tools work that's going on right now.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Yes. You're right. Thanks for reminding me. That is quite correct. When we didn't receive any response, we looked around and said, okay, let's take a new stab at this once we have some tools to use for measurement and when that work party has reached further. So you're quite right. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thank you, Fred. My recollection is very similar to what Liman and Wes described. This is an area that I've had a personal interest in for quite a long time. I was just absolutely shocked at the silence from the caucus folk that didn't respond with at least trying to say something. But in terms of whether or not we should drop it altogether or defer ... it might make sense rather than to drop it all together, to wait, to hold it in advance until after we get some feedback from at least the preliminary tools that Paul Hoffman has built against RSSAC 47. That way if somebody gets excited and comes back and pushes on the issue, we can say, well, we'll look at it when we get better data. Just a suggestion.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad.

BRAD VERD: I just wanted to add, I think we did have a work party that Kaveh led about Anycast placement that ended up getting shelved also along these same lines. Just giving more color. I feel like those two items, geographic diversity of root servers or identifying underserved areas and Anycast placement are in the same bucket, let's say. And we did a bunch of work there and couldn't finish it, if I recall. Is that correct, Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. That's correct, Brad. There was not enough traction, so we basically didn't follow through with the work party.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, it seems like, especially given comments made by the Russian Federation, this is an area where we should eventually produce some kind of a comment. And basically, saying that we've had these two work parties, we have tried to get some sort of understanding of the view of the world, referencing the data from ICANN, from Paul Hoffman, which we don't have yet, so we wouldn't be ready to do that. But sooner or later, we should say we asked the question, we heard crickets.

And so the two work party shepherds there were Liman and Duane, correct?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I don't remember. I was one of the shepherds for the diverse ... Sorry. Yes.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So I need to send a note to Paul asking about the data, and we already logged that as an action item on my part. Then in view of his comment, his response, whatever that is, seemed like we have the option, the opportunity to ... [service] coverage, Liman, Anycast instances, it was Kaveh.

So it seems like it would be worthwhile for Liman and Kaveh to put their heads together, come up with some kind of comment that at the right time—which is in the future after we have the data from Paul—basically saying the data doesn't show a need for an additional root server anywhere. And we've asked the caucus and the caucus has not commented. So we don't see an argument for additional root servers at this point.

Liman and Kaveh, is that something you'd be willing to take on as an action item?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's quite a reasonable thing to do, so yes on my part. And I hope so for Kaveh too.

---

KAVEH RANJBAR:                    Yeah, definitely.

FRED BAKER:                    Okay. And obviously, we'll wait until we have Paul's data to actually release that. But if you two could get started on that, I'd appreciate it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:            Yeah, we'll do that.

FRED BAKER:                    Okay, moving on to DNS resolvers. Once again, admin committee is saying delete this item. I think Paul kind of got frustrated. He put together some code and got some results, and once again heard crickets. So I think we can in fact delete the item as the admin committee suggests. Anybody have a concern with that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:            I would normally be the one to have a concern. [Therefore, I'd maybe illuminate it and see why I do not.] There is demonstrably low appetite for this topic. It is vital. I recommend it be placed in [inaudible] rather than deleted, because next time somebody asks us how come we're not doing this, we'd like to be able to show them this is what we tried to do but couldn't get started on it. Would you like to lead a work party?

So I think you guys have all heard me say that there's a three-layer cake of DNS, and stubs are at the bottom, authoritatives are at the top, and recursives are in the middle. The recursives is where all the complexity

---

and all of the CVE, [inaudible] advisories, all of the performance, all of the trouble is in that middle box. That's the complicated part. And for us to not be modeling it on a regular basis is horrible. But we can't take it on wearing our RSSAC hats. This has to be something that the community needs to want to study. I'm a little surprised that Jeff didn't say, "That sounds good, I will study that." But yeah, this is important. It's more important than as would be indicated by the response we've had to it. That's all.

FRED BAKER:

Well, yeah. And Paul actually did the work and couldn't [inaudible] any comments on it. So, fine. Let's put this in [inaudible]. Let's just say we'll pick this up again in the indefinite future. Do we have any more discussion that would be relevant to section four? I don't see any hands, I don't hear anything, so let's move on.

ICANN public comment proceedings. You gave us a lit. Do we have an action item here? Oh ,yeah, 5.1, we have an action item. Okay, so this is complete. We can take it off the list.

5.2, we'll see where things go. 5.3, Wes, every time I see this, I shake my head and say, "Why aren't we mentioning ISI's draft? Their program." Do you have any comment on that?

WES HARDAKER:

That is a local project and I'm not sure everybody in RSSAC agrees that it should be done.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. So it's been removed from the public comment proceedings. 5.4 is also OBE and we didn't comment. 5.5, we published RSSAC 48. 5.6, we're okay with that. 5.7 is closed, so that's complete.

Do we have any more in section 55 of this, Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Currently not, Fred, but I think in a few days, the upcoming public comment proceedings page will be updated and it will start to include an upcoming proceeding on the proposal from the RSS GWG which was discussed earlier in this meeting. So it will be added to this section.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And we can reasonably expect that to be done by the January call?

OZAN SAHIN: I think this, as you said, will come in the first quarter of 2021, expected in March 2021. So depending on when this proceeding is out, we'll definitely add it on the agenda of the relevant RSSAC meeting.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, so let's watch for that and add it to the agenda when that happens. So, do we need to update this document with respect to removing things that are complete, or what do we need to do next with this?



---

STEVE SHENG: Fred, I think our next step is instead of removing those, move the completed items to its own section so that it shows for historical purposes what RSSAC did in the year 2020, and then move up those items that are on the list. I think the priority is to finish the two current work parties, the rogue operator as well as the local perspective, and then see if there's enough interest to start new ones, especially on early warning systems, and then wait for GWG's proposal to provide feedback.

So that's the sense I got from the description and the discussion today. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: I'm okay with what Steve just said. Does anybody have any comment on it? Hearing none, Steve, can I get you or Ozan to reorganize this appropriately?

STEVE SHENG: Sure. Will do. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. Okay, so the next item we have is the statistical prediction of root server system failure. Do we want to add that to this document?

STEVE SHENG: That's already discussed, and the action item is for staff to send current statement of work to the RSSAC.

FRED BAKER: Okay, great. And Ken, would you like to comment on D and E here?

KEN RENARD: Sure. Two work parties are ongoing and they both met last week. The local perspective work party, like a lot of the work parties here, there's not a lot of participation and just a few core people that are participating. They're looking for volunteers to do some writing. The one thing that is somewhat getting traction is the use case of identifying underserved areas and measurement metrics in order to do that. So that certainly relates to the discussion of the other work parties that didn't move forward.

So those that are interested in that stuff, please take a look at the document and comment especially on some of the use cases and metrics being described there. It's a moving target, but we really appreciate the input.

With this work party, I think there is a path forward, but we really need people to step up and volunteer and participate in the work party to keep it alive. I just pinged Abdulkarim to see if he will send out a summary of the meeting last week. I think getting messages out on the list to the entire caucus, even if they're controversial, at least gets people talking and looking at it.

The other one, the rogue work party, we do believe this is moving forward. We're kind of reorganizing the description of what it means to be rogue. Two areas are objective and subjective descriptions. Objective

---

would be what you can measure, are people serving the wrong root data? The subjective is things like, are people not participating in good faith or not committed to the global wellbeing of the root server system?

So Paul Hoffman has graciously volunteered to write a big section of that. I'll write the other one. So there is a new document. I believe Steve actually put together a new document. Let me see if I can paste that in the chat just a little bit. But please take a look. We really need people to comment and volunteers to do some writing.

The next meeting for each of those work parties is in two weeks. that would be the 14th and 15th of December, and please join, please take a look at the documents and participate in the discussions online. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, so Liman and Kaveh, I asked you to write up a note that we would eventually publish. It might be worthwhile to confer with Ken and include some comments about the local perspective work party where once again, we're not hearing much commentary. And I don't know exactly what you want to say there, but that might be something to include under the same hood.

Okay, moving on to reports. I don't believe that I have anything to report, except that I've been elected to remain in the RSSAC and the chair position for a little while. Brad, do you have any comments?

BRAD VERD:

No, nothing to report, I think.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Kaveh, anything from the ICANN Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, nothing additional to report.

FRED BAKER: Liman, anything from CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Not much. We have replaced our representative on the IFRT, the IANA functions review team since our previous representative was relocated or he got a position on the PTI board which put him in a position of conflict of interest. So we now have Suzanne Woolf. No, sorry, that's not there. [inaudible]. Brett Carr. Wrong group. Brett Carr is now our representative there.

We had a fairly long and interesting discussion about the IANA sends out an I believe yearly customer survey. That was presented to us and we had a rather long discussion about that. So we are suggesting a few improvements for that for the future. And we also had a discussion about other work topics. About a year ago, we started to look into various areas where there should be auditing of the IANA function where there is currently none, and one of those things that popped up was the DNSSEC operations of the IANA, for instance these key generation sessions.

---

But then COVID hit, so we decided to wait with that for a bit. But now we have waited for a bit so it's time to put that back on the table to talk about that. So at our next meeting, we'll have a bit of a discussion about how to address that if we want to do something, and if so, what. But apart from that, nothing spectacular, as usual. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, I find the word "table" interesting in discussion of meeting procedures.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm sorry. I am quite aware of the distinction between British English and American English. I can never remember which one is which, and every time I use the wording in this context, I bite my tongue and say, "No, I shouldn't have." So, bring it back up.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so bring it back up being the British interpretation. When the British table something, they bring it up for discussion. In the US, when you table something, it goes away.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Thank you. I'll try to remember.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So Daniel is now with us this morning, so do we have any comment from the RZERC? Duane, I think that's a question to you.

DUANE WESSELS: Sure. Yeah. Not a lot since previous month. RZERC has two documents that it's working on. One of them, we've talked about already which is this recommendations for follow-up to RSSAC 028 which is about signing root nameserver information, and then the other one is about protecting root zone content with the ZONEMD record type. So hopefully those are both nearing completion and RZERC can go back to not doing as much.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And as long as I'm talking about Daniel, Wes, you're on the IAB. Is there anything from the IAB to report?

WES HARDAKER: Not in particular. The biggest thing that the IAB is dancing around is—I should say the IETF in general—is the DNS op discussions surrounding a private use space in the TLD land. There's still an ongoing lots of disagreement fight about that whole effort, and the IAB may be having discussions with the DNS op chairs as well as trying to figure out how to work with ISO and ICANN about possibly using .zz which is Roy Arends's proposal about using a two-letter non-country code. I won't go into the history behind it, I think most of you followed it. But that's still a major topic within everything in the IETF to be honest.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Russ, do we have any word from the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Fred. No updates or particular inputs this month.

FRED BAKER: Okay. James, any comments from the IANA functions operator?

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. No comments. Just by way of updates, we've been polling the community for dates for the next key ceremony, which we expect to hold in late January, early February. At this time, we expect it to be held in a similar fashion to that of the previous key ceremony, so that is restricted to staff only, physical presence with remote participation held in the West Coast facility. And again, signing for three quarters. Obviously, it's an evolving situation with COVID and the vaccine, but we feel that this puts us hopefully in a good position to return to KMF East and normal cadence in Q4 2021. That's sit from IANA.

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

DUANE WESSELS: Nothing to report for root zone maintainer. Thanks.

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

---

HIRO HOTTA: Financing RSO model is being discussed in GWG. It's called a grant model as reported by Brad in the previous meeting. So it means fund will be supported by PRS to RSOs that want to be financially supported. RSOs [who will be requesting it, no additional] [inaudible] service level performance commitment, so-called SLA. That's the idea at this moment.

And there'll be another type of funding called emergency funding. It is to be used by PRS and RSOs to allow RSS to respond to unanticipated events in a timely manner. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Moving on to AOB, Ozan, you want to talk about the standing panel?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Thank you, Fred. The independent review process is a form of arbitration that provides for independent third-party review of ICANN actions alleged by an affected party to be inconsistent with the ICANN bylaws, and earlier this summer, there were efforts to convene a community representatives group which would then select a slate of nominees for an omnibus IRP standing panel.

Throughout summer 2020, I shared a few announcements on the RSSAC mailing list. This was on RSSAC July meeting's agenda, and you, Fred, shared a report on the mailing list towards the end of August. It seemed like RSSAC was not interested to appoint anyone to this community



---

representatives group which will be tasked with selecting IRP standing panel.

However, about two weeks ago, the ICANN Org published an announcement on the topic and providing expecting qualifications for members of the community representatives group and also provided deadline for applications, which is the 4th of December. This announcement also clarified that individual applications from ICANN community members were also possible. However, ICANN Org added that they would reach out to relevant SOs and ACs for endorsement.

So shortly after this announcement, the support staff was approached by an RSSAC caucus member and asked how to get endorsement from RSSAC for this expression of interest, and the RSSAC admin team discussed the topic in its last meeting, and the RSSAC admin team suggests to respond back to interested RSSAC caucus members saying RSSAC found the scope of independent review process out of its remit and decided to not endorse any RSSAC or RSSAC caucus members to represent the RSSAC on the community representatives group.

That's why this was added to the agenda, to open it up for discussion and see if there are any RSSAC members opposed to this approach or response. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. So, do we have any discussion of this item?

OZAN SAHIN:

I've also put the link of the announcement in the chat again.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So I'm hearing none. So there doesn't really seem to be a need to stand on ceremony. If people have comments, Ozan has just dropped the link into the chat room, so please feel free to comment on the RSSAC list.

With that, we haven't got an assigned person for the GNSO concept paper.

OZAN SAHIN: Fred, I can take that.

FRED BAKER: Would you please?

OZAN SAHIN: Yeah. Thank you. So this concept paper was published by ICANN Org on the GNSO consensus policy development process implementation, and it suggests creation of an Operational Design Phase in this process. And when a GNSO consensus policy recommendation is approved by the GNSO council, the proposed Operational Design Phase offers a structure and methodology for preparation of ICANN Board materials. And there are two tracks on the Operational Design Phase concept paper. One is the ICANN Organization's assessment of the impact of proposed policy recommendations, and the other one is the opportunity for community feedback, which is called design feedback group on this assessment. It's illustrated on page seven, these two tracks.

---

And the ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees will then decide whether to identify any representatives to each of the design feedback groups when a group is set up. ICANN is currently seeking feedback on this concept paper. I believe the next step is that ICANN Org will collect feedback and publish a next version of the paper reflecting the input, and then there will be another opportunity for SOs and ACs to provide feedback.

So I'm not sure if everyone had a chance to review the concept paper, but if you did and you believe the RSSAC needs to comment on the paper at this point, please speak up so that we can let ICANN Org know that RSSAC would be submitting a comment. Thank you. And I see Brad has a comment in the—

BRAD VERD: Not on this. I'd like to revisit something before we break up.

OZAN SAHIN: Okay. I'll drop the link to this concept paper in the chat again if you'd like to go ahead and review,

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. Let me invite comments to the RSSAC list on that. Brad, what was it that you wanted to revisit?

---

BRAD VERD: I wanted to go back to the ... Really, I wanted to ask Kaveh a few questions regarding the statement on the IMRS strategy. Happy to take it offline or have it here, I'm just not sure when I'm going to be able to talk to him again based upon the timeline.

So Kaveh, are you still on the call?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I am.

BRAD VERD: You stated that it's odd that we're commenting on the IMRS strategy as root operators type of thing. I guess I was reading through it thinking of your comment and that you would abstain, and I guess my question is, I feel like we're not commenting on the operational aspect of the IMRS. What we're commenting on is asking for clarification. We're saying ... we actually ask for this to be broken up into the IMRS and [inaudible] the RSS, then let's talk about it. And we're not making comments on the operational aspect of the IMRS, we're making comments on the perception of somebody who is not an RSO reading this might read it.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Fair enough, Brad. As I said, I'm also not sure, I need to think more about that. But my point was this is an ... So they are basically setting or publishing, announcing their operational strategy, correct? That's the aim of the document which we are now commenting on. And then to be able to sell that operational strategy, whatever it is, they paint a picture which we take issue with, which is again fair. I'm just saying as RSSAC

taking issue with that picture because at the end, this is an operational plan, what they have published, correct? The wording and all of that, we might not like or we might take issue with, which is fair, but the aim of the document is we want to do this and this because that's how we perceive it as one of the RSOs, correct? And since this is an open process, I think other RSOs can comment, but RSSAC as a body commenting on that, yeah, again, I find it a bit odd, the setting. It's just the setting of RSSAC commenting on operational strategy of IMRS, because I think we all expect some level of independence, and if someone asks for input, of course, they are opening up the door. But then input coming from one of the bodies which is working within that organization is kind of strange. Again, this is my perception of that.

so it's not about the content of the document. I agree. But this could have happened to I assume RIPE NCC or Verisign, correct? So I publish something and I say root is crashing and all of that, and I would like, if I have an open process, I would love Verisign to comment on that document. But as a body created by myself commenting on my ... Yeah, that's a bit strange.

BRAD VERD:

So I have a hard time connecting the dots between the comment of RIPE making the same type of claims or Verisign making the same type of claims, because we're not in that role, whereas ICANN is. And I think—at least I feel like—what we're trying to ask of risk management clarity of that. That's all. We weren't commenting on the operational strategy, we're saying that this is not clear and we're asking for clarity.

---

WES HARDAKER:

So you're right that it is an operational document, but it's really talking about two different sets of operations and it conflates the two and merges them together. It does seem within RSSAC's purview to respond to things that if somebody is publishing a document through ICANN—in this case it happens to be from ICANN, but you're right, it could be from any organization—that when they make the statement that the RSS is at risk of being increasingly unable to keep pace with increasing traffic, which is in the introduction, isn't it RSSAC's responsibility to stand up and go, “No, as an advisory about the root server system, we don't agree with that statement or we don't agree with other elements of the document?”

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Fair enough. So again, I agree with you, so I'm just saying I'm on the fence. It's just more of a [forum.] Correct? So as a root operator, I would strongly say that and state that, and if there's an open process, I would submit that when there is an open process. But in this setting, because where do we draw the line for operational independence or authority of ICANN as IMRS operator, not as ICANN the body running the whole multi-stakeholder model? They have an operation and they have within their rights to publish their strategy, explain it in whatever words they want, as any of us do as an independent operator. And then it might not be the reality or not accepted by other operators, but I think drawing that line is important, because I think if you respect that, then we can expect the same respect from each other. This is not only towards ICANN.

---

So on the other hand, I understand RSSAC's role, so I'm not arguing that. So your argument also stands, but that's where I find ...

BRAD VERD:

I'm not trying to argue, Kaveh, I'm trying to understand your point of view a little better because I feel like we're asking for exactly what you're saying, meaning the IMRS can publish whatever they want for their strategy to be, and what we're saying is that there's a conflation in this document, please separate them. And that seems like a reasonable comment. But I'm trying to understand why you don't think it's reasonable.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you, Brad. Same here, I'm also trying to, as I mentioned, this is not basically saying I'm against the document. I mostly agree with the content. Maybe the text is not as clear to that, so maybe we can be more clear on that, because the conflation part of the text ... the final section I think makes it clear when we say, okay, this is recommendation to make these separate. But yeah, the part where we say it's conflated, it goes to deeper than that. So I think maybe we can actually make it clear that as an operator, of course, they're open to do that, but making a statement which covers the whole RSS, then we would like to comment on that. And if we make it clear from the beginning, then I think I'm fine. And I will try to contribute text. Let me think more about that and see if I can make changes tonight.

---

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah, Kaveh, if you could contribute text to that effect today so that we can have a stable period and a vote, I'd appreciate that.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. Sure. I will try to do that.

FRED BAKER: Because I tried to call out the RSO independence and say that RSSAC is all for that. So if RSSAC is crossing the line by making these statements, then we should certainly fix that. And if somebody thinks we're doing that, then [we can change it.]

KAVEH RANJBAR: And just to be clear, I don't think from formalities, we are breaking any line, I just think it's more of a sentiment thing. But yeah, it's also not super clear line. So I get your point and Wes's point. Let me see if I can clarify that in a proposed text.

WES HARDAKER: That would be awesome.

BRAD VERD: Just given the timelines, I wanted to ask. I wasn't trying to put you on the spot.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much.



FRED BAKER:

Okay. Now we're actually 13 minutes over time. Do we have any other comments or issues that we need to discuss today before I adjourn? Seeing no hands, then I'd like to adjourn and I'll talk with you all in the new year. Thank you very much.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**