RSSAC Executive Meeting
IETF 88 in Vancouver, Canada
3 November 2013 | 16:00 PST

Roll Call
A/J : Brad Verd
B: Bill Manning
C: Paul Vixie
D: Jason Castonguay (Proxy for Tim Shortall)
E: not present
F: Suzanne Woolf
G: Jim Cassel
H: not present
I: Lars-Johan Liman
K: Kaveh Ranjbar (proxy for Daniel Karrenberg)
L: Terry Manderson (proxy for John Crain)
M: Hiro Hotta (Proxy for Jun Murai)

IANA representative: Elise Gerich, Tomofumi Okubo
NTIA representative: not present
Verisign representative: not present
SSAC Liaison: Russ Mundy
IAB Liaison: Marc Blanchet

RSSAC 002 discussion

- Document nearly finished, a few comments from Peter not yet incorporated
- Need to have an answer for where the data will be analyzed, but don't hold up the document for future questions
- Message to the Board and announcement for ICANN website
    - Suz will work on the board announcement
- Goal is to have document by ICANN 48 in Buenos Aires

RSSAC 001 discussion

- Document hinges on RFC 2870bis
- IAB has reviewed the doc and ok with current content, can go to the process if RSSAC is ready to support it
- More work is necessary

RSSAC Restructure

- Is caucus meant to be open-ended, fully open group, or is it a set of pre-qualified people?
- Paul: the Board recognizes the Exec, the Exec recognizes the caucus
- Suz: Caucus should be a standing group with people being accountable for their expertise and COI

- Paul: should have the Exec recognize the members of the caucus, should be fairly open, should be a standing group
- Russ: should it be a membership based on SME or more related to organizational status. Would be best as a membership based on individual SME and willingness to work
- Bill: how do we manage the membership, either to clean up older participants or to manage adding people
- Paul: Agree with Bill, proposes terms for caucus members
- Bill's concerns: traditional method is terms, have a membership committee, and then submit to the Exec and a membership committee—not ask board to recognize caucus members
- Paul motions
    - Membership committee with 3 members + staff support
    - Expertise and availability has passed muster with our membership committee
    - Membership committee done by popular election, for a 3 year team
    - Membership shall serve for 1 year
    - No term limits
    - Initial membership shall be for 1, 2, 3 year terms
    - Membership Committee will not include the co-chairs or Board liaison
    - Bill Manning seconds
    - Vote: A-yes, B-yes, C-yes, D-abstention, E-n/a, F-yes, G-yes, H-n/a, I-yes, K-yes, L-yes, m-yes
    - Motion carries
- Initial volunteer pool should be the old RSSAC list
- **Action Item: Barb to arrange a call for the Membership Committee for the week following the IETF**
- Motion: Membership committee to be comprised of Jason, Kaveh, Paul
    - Seconded
    - Motion carries
    - 9 in favor
    - none against
    - no abstentions
- **Action Item: Barb to make membership committee list**
- Russ: please borrow freely from SSAC
- Paul: proposal for scope of work and process in a month

Policies and Procedures Document

- Bill: there is a policies and procedures doc for the exec, I think it's pretty clean but how to recognize liaisons that needs to be harmonized with roles and responsibilities
- Marc Blanchet will forward notes to Suz, re: liaison role from IAB
- Bill: ready for last call at the end of this week.

Roles and Responsibilities Document

- Suz: no one in the larger community has had a chance to comment on the roles/responsibilities document and this is an issue for transparency. Possibly same issue for policies doc. I want comments before last call on our two internal documents
- LJL: what might be a good timeline?
- **Action Item: Suz will work on new membership committee text**
- Suz: I can get the new material done in the next day or two. Exec needs to review the document before final call
- Review of documents in Exec by Nov 26.
- Paul: use doodle poll to capture whether people have read/voted on doc
- LJL: Documents sent out to Exec on the 12th for last call

Monthly Meetings

- LJL: new topic. We had a series of phone calls during the summer, would be good to restart having regular teleconferences. To use as checkpoints for progress of work, propose we have a teleconference every month
- PV: having it frequently and scheduled is best
- Doodle polls to be created six months in advance

New gTLDs

- Elise: How to inform RSSAC of the ramp for new gTLD introductions? Do you want it to come from Suz or some other source, or what?
- Barb: Akram has already agreed it's reasonable to forward the information, we just have to formalize
- Paul: As a meeting process matter this is a chaotic discussion that is hard to follow. Root Ops believe staff has a duty of disclosure, and once it's handed to the staff, that should take care of it
- Suz: I agree the Board is the wrong path, but we do get this message. I think if we can accomplish this piece as an operational piece that is better than administrative path.
- Bill: Elise mentioned something about when does the mail stop. But we would like to know when a change in the rate happens. So no set time to end, but to track substantial issues
- Brad: I would argue that email should go forever
- Barb: will provide update on status of notifications of rate of entry into the root
- LJL: This should be more or less automatic, should not be a major issue. I think Barb's proposal is a good way forward, will be able to facilitate resolving the issue
- Suz: the expectations for this group are changing and we should grow to meet that in terms of the data we request and need
- Paul: Until today we did not have the appropriate standing to ask, now we do, so we are asking
-

Alternates

- Hiro: How does appointing alternates work, is it just for one meeting, is it a formal process?
- Barb: I think we need to document this fully and then I can run it past legal and make sure we don't have to put this before the board, which I don't think we need to do
- Bill clarifies that a process exists in the procedures document
- Bill: The current process document does address this
- Elise: I asked that my second be added to the mailing list so that they could follow along with discussions
- Paul: I like this mailing list more at 12 than I will like it at 25
- To the extend that someone is going to be an alternate, the primary is responsible for briefing them
- Kaveh: I agree to the smaller list, but I think it's more practical to have the person be on the list
- LJL: I agree with Paul
- Bill: it is up to each organization how it deals with its alternates
- Russ: suggest keeping it small, since it's organizationally based, it's their responsibility to get the list forwarded.

Future Meetings

- Brad: will we always have a caucus meeting before the exec meeting? it was a bit disconcerting to learn certain things in the Caucus instead of Exec first.
- Brad: the question about scaling and the question about rate. I thought it was agreed on 1000/year, 20 per week
- LJL: Propose we have the meeting in Singapore, can be scheduled more fully later