
BRAD VERD: Good morning, all, this is Brad Verd. Let's see if other people show up. We'll wait so maybe two or three minutes after the hour to start. Thank you. [AUDIO BREAK]

Again, for those that have just joined, we're just giving a couple of minutes for late arrivals to join. We'll start here in just about a minute. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, good morning all. This is Brad. I am the shepherd for this work party from RSSAC. I am eager to get this going and I look forward to working with everybody on this. We have an agenda that has been put together by Steve Sheng in Adobe Connect, I hope everybody is there. Let's first run through introductions. We don't have everybody on the call, so rather than running through what's being projected in Adobe Connect, let's run through the participants. If you can just state who you are and your affiliations, that would be great. So, Abdulkarim, we'll start with you, if you could. [AUDIO BREAK]

It looks we're not getting audio there. Let's jump to Akira, we'll come back to Abdulkarim. [AUDIO BREAK]

It sounds like we're having mute issues this morning. Akira, are you there?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Can you hear me now?

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.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, we can hear you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay, that's fine. My name is Abdulkarim, I am from Nigeria. I am a lecturer at the university. I teach in the Department of Telecommunication Science, and I'm happy to be part of this group. I don't think I have any conflict of interest to declare. That's it.

BRAD VERD: Thank you so much. Alright, Akira, we'll try to come back to you. Next, I'm going to have a hard time pronouncing this name, so hopefully you'll jump in. Dessalegn?

DESSALEGN YEHUALA: Yeah, can you hear me?

BRAD VERD: Yes.

DESSALEGN YEHUALA: My name is Dessalegn. I work for the Computer Science Department of the Addis Ababa University as a lecturer. That's all.

BRAD VERD: Okay, thank you. Next of the participants is Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: This is Duane Wessels. I work for VeriSign and I participate in RSSAC as the liaison to the Root Zone Maintainer.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Duane. Fred?

FRED BAKER: Hi, this is Fred Baker, and I represent ISC in the RSSAC.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Fred. Ihtisham Khalid? Oh, no longer participating, disappeared from my Adobe Connect. Jaap?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Yes, this is Jaap, I hope you can hear me. I am from NLnet Labs, and we are part of the OpenINTEL Group in the Netherlands, which do a lot of metrics and my plan is to be more of an observer than an active member of this group.

BRAD VERD: Jaap, it was hard to understand all of that, your microphone might be too close, or its power is turned up. But I think we got it. Moving along, Karl?

KARL REUSS: Sorry, I was having microphone issues there. Karl Reuss, I'm with the University of Maryland and I represent us on the RSSAC.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Karl. Kazunori?

KAZUNORI FUJIWARA: I'm Kazunori Fujiwara. I work for JPRS.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. Ken?

KENNETH RENARD: This is Ken Renard from the Army Research Lab, representing ARL in the RSSAC.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Duane. Fred?

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Ken. Kevin?

KEVIN WRIGHT: This is Kevin Wright from Defense Information Systems Agency, representing RSSAC.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Kevin. Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN: This is Paul Hoffman from ICANN. I work in the CTO's office, so I'm actually not part of the L-root team. I'm just here as a researcher.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Paul. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Hi, Russ Mundy from Parsons. I am the SSAC representative to RSSAC, the liaison to RSSAC. High interest in DNS for a long time. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Russ. Ryan?

RYAN STEPHENSON: My name is Ryan Stephenson. I'm with the Department of Defense, RSSAC member for G-root.

BRAD VERD: Thanks, Ryan. Shinta?

SHINTA SATO: Hi, I'm Shinta Sato from JPRS, also working for N-root.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Shinta. Alright, I guess that's everybody. Did I miss anybody on the participant list?

STEVE SHENG: Hi Brad, I think you're missing Amir.

BRAD VERD: Okay, Amir, can you introduce yourself? I don't see him on the list.

AMIR QAYYUM: Okay, my name is Amir and I am from Capital University of Science and Technology, associated with academia and also with the research here in Pakistan.

BRAD VERD: Welcome, Amir. I think that's all the participants. And then I see we have ICANN Staff, we have Andrew, Mario, and Steve Sheng on the call. Is there anybody else that is on the call that's not in Adobe Connect? Please make yourself known now. Alright, not hearing anybody, we will move on.

So, Steve had put together a brief agenda, which just disappeared from Adobe. Can you jump back to the agenda for me, Steve? Alright, so, in the agenda we just put together a couple things here. This is the first call of the RSS Metrics Work Party. I'm just going to go over the overview, the statement of work, and then try to have an open discussion on how we want to approach this. And then, as we work

through that, things that we're going to need to cover are some of the logistics, leadership of the work party, we need a work party leader, and then, of course, next calls. For a group of this size, it is always going to be difficult, but this is something that we need to work on.

Alright, so jumping to the Statement of Work. I assume everybody has read it, spent some time on it. To me, this is a very, very important body of work that needs to be done here. And if you look at the, kind of the outputs, or in the scope, there are four big bullets. Really, there are three pieces of work, I think the fourth one is kind of just the decision that will organically be answered as we start working through this.

Essentially, the first bullet is define the verifiable metrics for the root server system. And then the second one is define measurements for the RSOs. Now, I think these are related, but different. I'll just give you my two cents on it, and then hopefully people will chime in. But I believe the goal here, of this work party, is kind of to define what "good" looks like, for the root server system as a whole, as well as individual RSOs. So, what does "good" look like?

So I think the first part of the discussion is what needs to be measured, and those are just technical measurements and those might apply for both the root server system and the root server operators. And then the second half of that discussion which I think will become much more, people will get much more engaged in, is what are the thresholds of those measurements and what should they be for a healthy and scalable root server system and root server operator. So, those are the first two bullets. I think that's a heavy lift.

The third bullet is refine the BPQ idea or methodology that was proposed in RSSAC37. That essentially goes to funding, putting a dollar figure on it. So once you define what good looks like, how much does it cost? BPQ was an attempt at a methodology, it was certainly not meant to be in concrete, and if it needs to be refined, then this is the place to have that discussion.

So, with that, I'll open it up for a little bit discussion to see, really it comes down to, do we want to break this group up into a couple different groups and start, approach the bullets individually, or do we want to take it on as I just described? Because some of the measurements will work against both the root server system and the root server operators. So having two different teams define the same measurements might not be as efficient as we want to be. Russ, I see your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY:

Yes, thanks very much, Brad. One thing that especially between bullet #1 and bullet #2, is it's not actually in the words. I think probably it's in people's heads, but it's how those two bullets tie in with each other. That's kind of what you were getting at, I think, with measurements for the system as a whole and measurements of individual items. And I don't know how that plays into how we should organize ourselves. It almost seems like there needs to be some thought given, and I'm not sure what the right time for that thought is, as to how those two get tied together and what's the right way to associated them. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: When you say 'tied together,' can you expand on that a bit for me?

RUSS MUNDY: Sure, so one of the challenges we face is that for a very long time there have been a lot of different measurements taken by many different organizations in different ways of the individual service providers of the RSOs. But trying to put them together in a meaningful way has always been a challenge, and so if we're going to use largely the types of measures that have been used for individual RSOs and figure out what combination, or how do we combine those into the overall measurement of the system, then that is one way to say okay, perhaps we should tackle bullet #2 before we tackle bullet #1, and use bullet #2 to determine bullet #1.

Or, if we go in the other way, where we try to figure out how to write down and measure the overall system as a whole, and then from that, derive numbers for bullet #2. That was kind of what I was trying to get at, especially from a how we approach it organizational perspective. Does that help, Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, absolutely, I think you articulated that very, very well. Thank you. Go ahead Paul, and then I'll follow up after Paul.

PAUL HOFFMAN: This is Paul Hoffman. So, each of these two bullets, or let me focus on the first bullet. The first bullet has a list of three things; the DRSS as a whole is online, that's #1; serving correct, that's #2; and timely, which is

#3. And then under the deliverables, it talks about possibly updating RSSAC001 and RSSAC002, and RC7720. 'Online' is measurable, 'correct' is measurable, and we've seen that in those other two. 'Timely' is something that I think other work parties have failed to be able to address for the RSS as a whole.

So, I guess I want to know, are we supposed to be inventing that measurement, or are we supposed to be getting that from other sources? And the same, quite frankly, would be true for bullet #2. It is certainly possible, as we've seen with RSSAC002 to tell whether an individual root server is online and answering queries and answering them correctly. But it doesn't seem like before, that RSSAC or the RSSAC caucus has come up with any measurement for 'timely'.

And to give an extremely example, what if it took 2 seconds for every response to come back. So I'm not sure, I guess my question for RSSAC or for you Brad, as the leader, is, are we supposed to be inventing new things here or are we supposed to be only going by already has been done? Thank you.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you. I think, Duane, let me just jump in really quick, and then I'll turn it over to you. I think really quickly, my two cents on a couple of those questions. If we need to invent something, then let's invent it. While the statement of work calls out for a set of deliverables and it kind of defines the scope, if the scope needs to be changed and if the deliverables need to be changed, then that's okay. And if that's what

this group wants to do, then that's okay, we just need to explain the change in scope and the change in deliverables.

So the statement of work is not meant to be 100% prescriptive. It's more of a guideline and if things need to change from it, then they need to change, we just need to explain that when we're done. As far as do we take what we've done or do we take the measurements that you talked about, that we have in the past? That's certainly a starting point and I think that's why from the statement of work you see RSSAC001, that is a starting point of measurements, but RSSAC001, I think we all agree, at least in the conversations I've had with a number of different people, everybody agrees that there is really not a lot of teeth in 001. So we need to be more detail driven and be more specific, and that's what hopefully the output from here will be.

To me, this body of work which I feel is really, really important, and I'm just going to get on my soapbox for just a second, and that is this body of work is really defining the technical accountability for the root server operators and the root server system as a whole. So, Paul, when you talk about what the measurements should be, I think there is a set of measurements for each root server that they should perform at X; whatever those performance measurements are, I don't know, hopefully that's what we come up with here, and then they need to perform at X level, which is the minimal level, again, we have to define that here. We need to come up with that, and we have not done that in the past, either in previous RFCs or in RSSAC.

That's where, when I started, I think that's going to be a challenging conversation, because there are going to be lots of different opinions on

that, and we're going to have to try to find a balance for everybody. And then I think, the measurements of the root server system, that is again hopefully we, meaning the community, we need to stop focusing on the individual performance of the roots to the RSOs, while that's important and it plays into the RSS, if you look at it from a customer, like a typical internet user, are they getting the service they need, and what are those measurements that are needed for, I don't know how to say it, other than a good user experience. So if it's 2 milliseconds or 200 milliseconds, or 2 seconds, that's a discussion we should have here.

But it's two separate discussions. What does the root server system performance need to be from an internet use so they have a good experience, and then there is what the root server operator, what 'good' should look like for a root server operator and defining what those measurements are. With that, Duane, go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS:

Thanks. I guess a couple things. One was when Paul is talking about the first bullet and I was agreeing with him that some of these can be hard, but then I had a very different interpretation of the phrase 'timely responses' than Paul did, because I was thinking about distribution of the zone and how long does it take an operator to begin serving a new zone, rather than responding to individual queries. So, already we have a place where we need some clarification, and I agree with you, Brad, we can fix this as we go along. We don't have to solve this right now. We can tweak that and address that as we go through the work party

BRAD VERD: And I hope we do. I hope this statement of work is not just check box, okay, we've got this, we've defined this, this, and this, okay, we're all done. We really need to define what 'good' looks like. And if that means timely response for distributing the zone, as well as answers, then we should come up with what those measurements are.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, absolutely. And the other thing that I guess I want to state is that I have pretty strong feelings about the way that the proposed scope items relate to the existing documents of RSSAC001 and 002, to me, what we're proposing for this work party today is really very different than those other two documents.

Not to say that there isn't some overlap, but I feel like the output of this work party would be a new document that may update or in some senses obsolete the other ones. But again, I feel like they're talking about very different things. Because here we're talking about externally measurable things, whereas the existing documents either refer to sort of internally self reported things or things that are not really metrics, at all.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Duane. Any other comments? Nothing? Alright. So, a couple things. Let's just talk about leadership really quick, just to fill people's heads with info and then we'll come back to this later in the call. So, we are looking for a work party leader for this and Steve, I think you're going to share what the expectations were from the work party leader, including the time commitment? Can you share that, and then

we'll come back towards the end of the call and see if we have some interested parties and talk about it.

STEVE SHENG: Sure, Brad, this is Steve. Can people hear me?

BRAD VERD: Yes.

STEVE SHENG: The role of the work party leader is to lead the work party, to produce the deliverables on time, and to accomplish that task a couple things the work party leader needs to work with the staff and the shepherd to set a schedule, a cadence of work for the work party, needs to run the work party meetings, and those usually, they're kind of the four to one rule, or three to one rule - for a one-hour teleconference, the work party leader probably needs to spend three hours, at least one hour to prepare for the meeting, the agenda with the staff ahead of time, and those would be sent out, run the meeting, and then after the meeting to follow up on action items.

And lastly, the work party leader is expected to coordinate and communicate with the shepherd on a regular basis regarding the progress and flag for them any issues foreseen, so that appropriate actions can be taken so that the work can be delivered on time. So that's kind of a rough responsibilities for the work party leader. Thanks, Brad.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you. So with that, Steve, can you go back to the statement of work? So with that, we need to find a work party leader, and given the amount of work here, and kind of the broad spectrum, maybe a couple leaders, or a co-leader would not be out of the question. I know we have co-shepherds coming from myself and Wes, Wes sent his apologies, he was not able to be on the call today, but he will participate in future calls.

Alright, we kind of talked to the scoping. Duane, you touched briefly on what might happen, do we create another document or do we obsolete these, or what not, I think those were all just questions that came up when we were putting this together, and again, the intent of what you see here in the statement of work was not to be prescriptive.

So if a new document is created, great, if we replace RSSAC001, great, if we obsolete them, great. It really is up to this group here to help figure out what we want to do going forward. I think we all agree that finding what 'good' looks like for both the root server system and root server operators is imperative and overdue. So, I'm trying to think, is there any other discussion on the scoping or where we want to go with this? Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

This is Paul Hoffman again. I am concerned with the last thing you just said, Brad, which is that it is imperative we do this, and we have an extremely tight deadline. I think that give that people have thought about this for literally decades and haven't come to any numeric

conclusions which would be useful, I think us saying that it's imperative we do this in two months might be challenging.

BRAD VERD:

Agreed, and I don't think, I have no expectation that this will be done in two months. So, I think there are some goals on trying to move this forward. I think it's been hard for a number of different reasons, political, technical things, but this isn't, how do I say this, I feel like we're, I feel like thinking of this as trying to reinvent the wheel is the wrong way to think about that. And if I'm wrong, please tell me, I'd love to have that discussion.

But there are lots of COBs out there with measurements, how to measure them, how to figure out if they're healthy, if they're not healthy, so I was trying -- to reinvent the wheel isn't necessarily how I would do this, and I'd like to reuse some of that stuff that is out there, but as I said, that was my opinion, my two cents, I think it's a very important body of work, I think it needs to be done. If I used the word, 'imperative' and you want to emphasize that, okay, but I'm not saying it needs to get done in two months.

Look, I'm a big believer, a big fan of if you're going to do it, do it right the first time. So, however long this takes is how long it takes. The timelines that we have in place right now are to get things moving and to add to the output. It is not defining the output, as far as the date, if that makes sense.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Yes, that helps, thanks, Brad. And just one note, you just threw in a new word that we need to deal with, which is 'healthy.' Just my group in ICANN, we are responsible for the internal technical health identifiers, and that word is almost as loaded as any of the other words.

BRAD VERD: Okay, I'm not, so, please, if you're taking notes of every word I say, they are not requirements, they are not anything other than my opinion, and I'm looking for the rest of the people in this group, the experts here in the caucus, to come up with what we as a group need to get things moving. How's that? Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, thanks Brad. I wanted to also note that a lot of people on the call are probably very familiar with RSSAC37 and 38. Not necessarily everybody has looked at it carefully, but this particular piece of work that we're undertaking here is, I believe, crucial for the overall success of that plan that has been laid out by RSSAC, as to how we can go about evolving the root server system. Because, at least in my opinion, one of the fundamental issues or foundations of RSSAC37 and 38 is that there is some way to measure the system as a whole.

And so then it's feasible to determine whether or not there are enough of RSOs in place, or if there are too many, or if they're functioning properly. That's at least in my opinion, one of the crucial aspects from ongoing perspective, because the ICANN Board has undertaken this and they're involved in terms of how do we go about doing the RSSAC37 and 38 recommendations. But before anything real can happen, they need

a technical foundation, and that's what I think this is intended to provide for the RSS as a whole. Thanks.

STEVE SHENG:

Brad has to...

BRAD VERD:

Sorry, hey Steve, really quick, sorry, I had my mute button on. I have to take off, I'm actually boarding an airplane here in 2 minutes, and I apologize for that, the way the scheduling worked. Steve is going to take over moderation of this discussion. But to add to what you were saying, for me, as I stated earlier when we opened the call, this body of work is the technical accountability for the root server operators and the root server system that ultimately, in my eyes, would just be a plug-in to whatever implementation happens with 37 and 38. But without a technical accountability, which is what I hope we end up with here, 37 and 38 become, I don't know what to do with it, because we've got define, in my eyes, what that is.

I keep using the term what 'good' looks like, because that's kind of easy for people to follow or understand. So, rather than defining where we are today or what's going on today, if we were to build this thing anew, what would 'good' look like as far as the technical measurements of the root server system. Let's not re-architect the root server system, that's not what I'm talking about here, I'm just talking about the measurement of those pieces that are out there. I hope that helps. I hope that is in line with what you were saying Russ, I think it is. Those are my

thoughts. Again, I apologize to everyone, I have to go board an airplane. So with that, I will turn it over to Steve, and I will continue to listen.

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you, Brad. Any other comments? Okay. Russ, you're okay with that. Perhaps I think we talked about a bit earlier about how do we go about this work, and Russ, you shared some points. I would like to have a quick discussion from people on how do you think how the work parties should approach this work. What I'm hearing is one and two are related, and three, probably comes second, third. So bullet #1 and #2, any thoughts on the work party on how we can begin the work? Really thinking for the next meeting, what can we advance to the next meeting to discuss? Any thoughts from anyone?

DUANE WESSELS:

Hey, Steve, this is Duane.

STEVE SHENG:

Hi, Duane, go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS:

It's a little bit daunting because, again, I think this is a big undertaking. But I guess one way I would see this moving forward is just to sort of collect a lot of opinions or ideas from people, just starting to head in the direction of some details on some of these metrics. So, for example, if the work party participants could each write one or two sentences on each one of these proposed metrics, then that's sort of where to start.

STEVE SHENG: Okay, so you're suggesting that each work party member try to propose one or two metrics and add an explanation?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, for example, the first bullet says, "...demonstrate that the RSS as a whole is online." So, how do you interpret that? What does that mean to you? What does it mean for the RSS as a whole to be online?

STEVE SHENG: Okay, sounds good. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Steve. I was going to suggest something similar, and since we've already encountered at least a little bit of different people read the same words in a somewhat different way, and I think that maybe what I was going to suggest is similar to Duane's suggestion, but I don't think it's quite identical; and that is, perhaps a way to do, and I think the hardest one to tackle is really the first one, for the system as a whole.

And if we could take and maybe staff could build a little thing on the Google Doc or something, that would lay out each of the pieces in that first bullet in a way that it would be easy for the work party members to say what their interpretation of what is online and how does one go about measuring. I think the only easy one there is serving the correct content, and that may not be so easy, I don't know. But certainly, "timely response," what does that mean?

And the reason I'm suggesting that perhaps we try to tackle the first bullet things first, is whether we go about assembling what it means for the system as a whole, from the existing RSO things, or if we take the system as a whole requirements and drive it into the RSO things, we don't have a very good handle today on what the system as a whole things are, so let's try to get everybody's thoughts here on the work party, as to what these words actually mean to them. Thanks.

STEVE SHENG: Thanks, Russ. So what you're suggesting is kind of a tabular format online, correct?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, something that would be easily filled out for each member to say, you know, here's what I think 'timely response' means, here's what I think 'online', and how might be able to measure it, things like that, to where they could put in 1 to 5 sentences, not a big, huge input, but at least some material to start from.

STEVE SHENG: Okay, sounds good. I have Paul and then Ken. Paul, go ahead.

BRAD VERD: Steve, can I jump in? This is Brad, sorry I'm not online so I can't raise my hand. I just want to validate or reaffirm that yeah, this is a daunting task, but to me, any time I see a daunting task, I want to break it up into small, little pieces. And I kind of see like maybe this first exercise is

nothing more than like a post-it exercise that maybe all of you have done, where to write down ideas and you throw them up on the window, and you start organizing them.

To me, I think if we just start brainstorming on what measurements are, what do we want to measure, from the root server operator to the root server system, and I think naturally what will happen is you will start to group them between the root server system and RSOs, and I think you'll naturally start to identify what those metrics are and what people believe should be and could be measured. I think if the approach of we've got to boil the ocean, this is going to be daunting and it will be really, really hard, and that's what I'd like to avoid.

So start small, let's just brainstorm on just measurements, and not even what the thresholds of those measurements are, let's just talk about what the measurements are and come up with a catalogue. Then we can group them between the root server system and the root server operators, and then we can have a discussion about what the thresholds of each of those are, on what 'good' looks like. That's my thought. Thank you.

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you, Brad. So, virtual white boarding. Your proposed appropriate is slightly different from Russ, it's essentially let's get all the measurements on the table, let's not worry about RSS versus RSO first, and definitely not worry about the threshold. So, as a general brainstorm to cast a net before going into big detail. Paul and Ken, and I want to come back to Russ on that, thanks. Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

This is Paul. First I want to support what Brad just said, about let's not worry about the actual numbers. But I think we will be more successful if we follow what Russ just suggested, which is to start with the root server system as a whole. And this goes back to what Russ said earlier in the call, which is, there is relationship between individual root server operators and the root server system as a whole when it comes to what an end user sees. The end user talks to a resolver, a resolver has pick one root server at the moment, which is the best authoritative server for whatever reason it chooses.

So, I think if we do the idea that Russ said, which is to first start with the root server system as a whole, get a bunch of ideas down, that will help us then figure out how to relate that to any aspects of individual root server operators. And as we know this from the other work party, the way that resolvers work is that they pick one for a certain period of time and sort of stick to it.

And I like the idea of what Russ said, of "break them apart." I wouldn't even put them in one document. Because as Russ said, I think we're going to have rapid complete agreement on some of them and wild meandering on the others, and I think that will be healthy.

One other point I want to make is that some people here might not know is we, in the past, and I want to check this with you, Steve, have decided to use the caucus mailing list as the mailing list for these discussions, that we don't need to use the work party specific mailing list, and therefore I think we'll get even more participation from people

who haven't been part of the work party. That seems good to me.
Thank you.

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you, just to respond to your last point, Paul, I think it is agreed to engage the whole caucus list for content discussions. So, the meeting minutes, as well as those discussions will be sent to the caucus list.
Ken?

KENNETH RENARD:

Thank you. As we're going through and proposing metrics and writing up a little bit about it, it might be useful, if possible, to add information about how you propose that we measure it, or where do you measure it from? We'll need to figure that eventually, so if there are any thoughts about that up front, that would be useful to have in our individual input to individual measurements.

STEVE SHENG:

Okay, so Ken, if I understand you correctly, what you're saying is a three-column table, the first column is kind of the high level online responses. The middle column is what do people think this means, and then the last column is how one might be able to measure that. Is that correct?

KENNETH RENARD: Yeah, and maybe even, does it apply to the RSS as a whole or the RSOs, you know start with the RSS, that's fine, but there are different things that you can fill out per measurement type.

STEVE SHENG: Okay, sounds good, thank you. It's 10 minutes to the hour. Any feedback on this?

Okay, just a very quick summary. I think what I heard is an agreement for general brainstorm discussion on the metrics. And then not worry about the threshold at this stage but definitely have the metrics listed, and then also have people to give some thought on what they think the metrics, those criteria mean, so that you can clear up any understandings. So, if that's the correct understanding, then perhaps that can, after this call, create these Google sheet or Google form, maybe like each tab for one, or separate documents, we'll figure out the best way.

Let's quickly run through the last items. Brad just mentioned about a work party leader or co-leader. Anyone on the call would like to lead or co-lead the group? We probably need to go through the exercise on a mailing list as well, because not all of them are here. But if anyone is interested, I want to hear the interest here. Duane, go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I would consider putting myself up for work party leader, especially if it wasn't just me, if we could have a co-leader situation, I think that would be great.

STEVE SHENG: Okay, sounds good. Russ, you have your hand raised?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, I'd be willing to help with that, certainly not by myself, but as a co-leader.

STEVE SHENG: Okay, great, well we already have two leaders. Anybody else? Okay, let me circulate both your names on a list and then ask for anybody else. And then we can decide that on the mailing list before the next call.

In the last five minutes I want to preview the next meetings that are already scheduled. On March 10th, which is the second day of ICANN64, we have scheduled a 3-hour window for this work, the metrics work. The time is 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. Pacific Time, 7:00 to 10:00 p.m. Eastern Time, and 9:00 to 12:00 p.m. I think in Japan time. We'll send out the details. And then, after that an ITF on Wednesday the 27th of March, 7:45 to 8:45 in Prague. There will be another opportunity for the work party to interaction meeting there. That's already scheduled. Andrew is going to be in Prague to supper that meeting.

And then I want to, as I sent out in the email, I want to try to schedule two calls on April 8th and April 22nd, so those are Mondays. It seems either Monday or Thursday are the good days for work party teleconference. So we start this one on Thursday and then kind of propose for the Monday teleconference. Do people have a strong

preference, that you definitely not make Monday? Are people okay with the same time 10:00 to 11:00 Eastern Time? Okay, hearing none, let's tentatively set that and then at later teleconferences, we can change or send out new doodle polls as needed.

Okay, I think we are at the end, almost at the top of the hour. Any last comments from anyone?

DUANE WESSELS: Hey Steve, this is Duane.

STEVE SHENG: Go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS: Just real quickly. I think your last proposed meeting date is April 22 and we have the RSSAC workshop starting on the 23rd, is that right? So, anyway, I think the 22nd may be a travel day for some of us.

STEVE SHENG: We will look into that. The workshop is Wednesday, Thursday, but we'll see.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, okay, I have it one day off then, got it.

MARIO ALEMAN: That is correct, Duane, this is Mario. So, Monday will be a travel day.

STEVE SHENG: Alright, then Monday would not be good. Okay. Anyone else? Alright, with that, thank you very much. I give you three minutes back of your time. Thank you. Bye bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]