**RSSAC Executive Committee Meeting Notes**
**16 June 2014 | 16:00 UTC**
**icann.adobeconnect.com/rssac**
**Adigo Conference Bridge: 8365**

**Decisions / Approved Motions**

- The RSSAC executive approved the minutes for its meetings on 5/4, 5/19, and 6/2 with staff incorporating the changes discussed on the call.

- The RSSAC will issue a statement on RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002, together with the draft documents.

**Action items:**

- Staff to publish the 5/4, 5/19, 6/2 meeting minutes. [DONE]
- Tripti to confirm with membership committee on whether the notices on application deadline has been sent to the community and confirm whether membership committee is planning to accept applications beyond this first deadline.
- Tripti to send RSSAC caucus information session details (including remote participation) to those who have expressed interest in joining the caucus.
- Steve to provide remote participation information for RSSAC London Meeting [DONE]
- Liman to send the revised agenda for the RSSAC executive sessions in London. [DONE]

- Staff to work with RSSAC Chair to prepare the publication of the statement on RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002, taking consideration of the discussion on this topic. The statements will be published as an ICANN announcement with the links to the draft RSSAC 001, 002.

- Suzanne to draft an outline on how to handle the selection of RSSAC representatives to the IANA stewardship transition coordination committee.

**Meeting notes:**

**1. Call to order**

Lars-Johan Liman called the meeting to order at 14:03 UTC.

## 2. Roll Call

Lars-Johan Liman conducted a roll call.

A/J – Absent
B – Absent
C – Absent
D – Tripti Sinha
E – Kevin Jones
F – Jim Martin, Suzanne Woolf
G – Jim Cassell
H – Howard Kash
I – Lars-Johan Liman
K – Daniel Karrenberg
L – John Crain, Terry Manderson
M – Hiro Hotta

IANA Functions Administrator – Duane Wessel
IANA Functions Operator – Elise Gerich
Root Zone Maintainer – Apologies
IAB Liaison – Absent
SSAC Liaison – Russ Mundy

Staff – Julie Hedlund, David Olive, Carlos Reyes, Barbara Roseman, Steve Sheng

## 3. Agenda Review

Liman: First thing I want to do is to introduce Steve Sheng from ICANN staff, he is an additional staff support. Would you like to introduce yourself?

Steve: Hello everyone, my name is Steve Sheng. I have been an ICANN policy staff for four years, mainly supporting the SSAC. I have supported RSSAC in IETF before its reorganization, so I look forward to working with you again. I will be working with Carlos, Barb, and Julie, to provide the best support we could. Feel free to reach out to me.

John: Thank you Steve for sorting out my outlook invite issue.

Steve: No problem.

Liman: Additions to the agenda, I think Suzanne has an addition. Would you like to comment Suzanne?

Suzanne: As a follow up of the comments we received from the IANA stewardship transition activity, ICANN is forming a coordinating committee that would be coming up with a proposal for how IANA will operate if the NTIA chooses to end its contract. RSSAC has been asked to appoint several representatives. We should discuss how we should approach them.

Liman: I propose we put it under any other business. It is an important issue that definitely needs to be addressed.

## 4. RSSAC Housekeeping

## A. Approval of minutes

Liman:  We actually have three sets of minutes we need to approve: 5/5, 5/19 and 6/2. I remember Elise has a number of comments regarding the minutes on June 2. Would you like to comment yourself, Elise?

Elise: The first comment is a discrepancy where in one places it says Daniel to draft a statement on RSSAC 001, and in another place it says to draft a statement on RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002. It seems the action lists needs to be consistent; it is either both or one.

Daniel: Sure, I don't remember. I think we can check my statement.

[STAFF NOTE: Daniel's statement referred to both RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002.]

Elise: Sure, then I think the minutes should be updated to reflect both documents.

Liman: I have no problem with that, and I propose we make that minor adjustments to the minutes.

Elise: The second items is that under the membership update, there were a discussion on whether to incrementally notify the applicants that there statements of interest are accepted or have one announcement notifying the acceptance. The decision was for one announcement. I thought it would be a good idea to document that decision.

Liman: You want that to be noted in the minutes.

Elise: Yes. I just wanted to note that a decision was made to make one announcement.

Elise: The next, on the operating procedures document, I thought we made a decision to use our F2F time in London to work on the operation procedure. If that is what we agreed, I think it should be a good idea to put it on the agenda for London meeting.

Liman: Yes. That is definitely part of the plan and I have no objection documenting that.

Elise: Finally, there were something in the minutes about an update to the DNS Dashboard. My notes were fuzzy about this. I wondered if someone could provide input to the minutes on what it means.

Liman: Was that connected to the RSSAC measurement document? To work from that to collect the statistics that can be viewed from the outside so someone from outside could have a collected view on how the root server system operates?

Russ: I have a couple of comments. I think the DNS dashboard is shown up in several places in differing context. One of the context is in the DoC NTIA contract, where it talks about a DNS Dashboard without being specific on what it is. The other context is in the SSAC work party on IANA stewardship transition, it is trying to get data on the numeric information on the amount of changes and rate of changes to give people a sense how many and what types of changes they are. As part of that discussion, I think the word dash board came up. It would be helpful if we planned on one to use it consistently.

Elise: We recorded the conversation. If someone could go through the recording and find out what it is. For IANA, we do post the root processing time, the first one we posted in April. The second one we are posting in May as soon as we get the NTIA approval. It is under the iana.org in the root processing time.

Liman: Did we record the meeting?

Steve: This meeting is recorded, I am not sure the last meeting was recorded. Regarding the discussion on DNS dashboard, this was raised by Bill Manning in the last call. The discussion the RSSAC exec have is this is a good thing for the caucus to work on.

[Correction: The RSSAC executive meeting on 6/2 is recorded].

Elise: One last request, that the ICANN London meeting dates and times are recorded in our 6/2 meeting minutes.

Liman: Yes. You have received today of a word document with more detail.

Elise: My point that even if it was a tentative schedule; we should put it on the minutes.

Liman: Fair enough. My proposal for how to handle the minutes is I ask Carlos to adjust them according to our discussion, and then we approve these minutes at the next meeting.

Elise: The proposed changes are in the Adobe Connect window. We could just approve the 6/2 meeting with those changes.

Liman: We could but would like to give the people not in the meeting a chance to review. I would like to ask for the minutes to be approved.

Daniel: I think we can just approve them with the changes. Otherwise this would be an endless process.

Tripti: I agree.

John: I agree.

Liman: OK. I am convinced. Are there objections for 6/2 meeting?

No objections.

Liman: What about 5/4?

No objections

Liman: what about 5/19.

No objections.

Liman: Ok, we approve 5/4, 5/19, and 6/2 minutes with changes. I ask ICANN staff to publish the minutes and remove the DRAFT stamp.


## B. RSSAC Caucus Formation Update

Liman: Tripti, do you have anything to report on the RSSAC caucus formation?

[Tripti temporarily lost her connection]

Daniel: First, I would like to commend the staff on the timely publication of notes and minutes, and would like to see this continue. Second, what I saw from the statement of interest, we have about a dozen now, so that's progress. So far, most of them are from the executive committee, I would like to ask if they have lined up anybody else?

Tripti: The last couple of week was active, we have received quite a bit of interest. We had one action item that we pending from last meeting that we are to take caucus members at the end of ICANN meeting, and we haven't done that yet. So the three of us haven't connected but Kaveh has been responding to those requests.

Elise: Tripti, does the membership committee still plan to send out a notice that you will be accepting applications through the end of the London meeting? Or that is overtaken by events.

Tripti: Let me Kaveh.

Elise: Is the plan that you will stop connecting it at the end of ICANN meeting in London?

Tripti: I think that is the plan, but I need to connect with membership committee members.

Jim: A quick question. Do you have a rough order of magnitude on how many non-exec caucus members are?

Tripti: I would say roughly about 15.

Liman: That's good. Have we invited them to meeting in London?

Tripti: I don't think that's happen yet. I will take that as down as an action item.

Elise: As a point of question, if we are still accepting SOI, we haven't announced that people are accepted as members. Are we putting the cart before the horse?

Liman: Good point. But didn't we talk about inviting the old RSSAC list to the meeting, at least make it known that the meeting takes place.

Daniel: I think people who have expressed interest; we should invite them to the public information session. My strong suggestion is to have remote participation

details included in that invitation. I see no problem at all for people interested in the caucus to join the information session because the public session is for the purpose of disseminating information for the people that are interested.

Tripti: I will take the action item to send out an invitation with the remote participation details.

Steve: Staff can provide the remote participation details.

Liman: Can you provide those to the whole RSSAC exec list?

Tripti: Yes, absolutely.

Liman: Elise, are you ok with this?

Elise: I am ok with this, I am just concerned that we are inviting people to a meeting and they will not be accepted just yet. We could have people who have applied the caucus ask us we have applied, when would you let me know? Could the membership committee make a decision before the meeting?

Liman: If we change the session title to "A public session and information for upcoming caucus" would that change the optics?

Elise: I am ok with what we are doing here. I am just wondering whether the membership committee can make the decision ahead of the meeting.

Liman: During the ICANN meeting, we don't have a caucus, so we don't have caucus meetings. So we have a public session on Monday, and all other meetings are for RSSAC executives.

Tripti: Daniel, do you know if Kaveh is coming to London? As we have to decide who to present at the information session for the upcoming caucus?

Daniel: I will find out, but my impression is Liman will present?

Liman: What I saw this as a RSSAC meeting, and the membership committee is an important part. What I hope to turn over the microphone to someone from the membership committee.

Liman: Looking at the draft program, we have a lot to fill out. We have some limits on these times. Julie who is support staff for the operation procedure are only available for these two times. We have also been invited to a lunch with the Board.

Tripti: I also have a question, how many of us will be attending?

Liman: We can ask.

[Liman asked around for who will be in London, here are the confirmed]

A/J – unconfirmed
B – uncofirmed
C – uncofirmed
D – Tripti Sinha - YES
E – Kevin Jones - YES
F – Jim Martin (YES), Suzanne Woolf (YES)
G – Jim Cassell (NO)
H – Howard Kash (NO)
I – Lars-Johan Liman (YES)
K – Daniel Karrenberg (YES, leaving on Thursday), Kaveh (YES, arriving on Monday)
L – John Crain (YES), Terry Manderson (NO)
M – Hiro Hotta (YES)

IANA Functions Administrator – Duane Wessel (No)
IANA Functions Operator – Elise Gerich (Yes)
Root Zone Maintainer – unconfirmed
IAB Liaison – Absent
SSAC Liaison – Russ Mundy (YES)

Liman: We have about 13 people, so it is good.

Liman: How do you want to use the time. It is ok to use not all time. But if we have time, we should use it to move the discussions forward.

Elise: On Monday morning, I would like to make our first agenda item on what we are doing for the afternoon session. What we are going to talk about, who is going to talk about it. Is it just going to be you Liman, and the chair of the membership committee sitting in the front of the room? How you want to structure the room. And also make sure how we want the flow of the afternoon session.

Liman: I think we need to have an outline before then. My sense is that the less I talk, the better.

Elise: Then my question is when will we have an outline. Should we spend sometime on today's call on this?

Liman: We should probably have a few ideas on the call today.

Daniel: I would suggest we focus the Monday morning on what happens in the afternoon. We should focus on aligning ourselves on what the caucus is, what it isn't, and what it should be doing. So it should be a focus on the caucus. I think we should not talk about the operating procedures as long as they are not directly touching the caucus. We should do that on Tuesady. On Monday, we may also be able to talk about one or two work items for the caucus, explaining those and the state they are in. On Tuesday, we should focus all the time we have on the operating procedures, and close the issues on the operating procedures, and once we are done with that, we can go and have a chat with the board that we have organized ourselves. If we have any time left on Tuesday, we can talk more about the work plans. I'd like to get the operating procedures finished. On Thursday, if we want to spend time, we can talk about the work plan. Personally, I won't be there on Thursday.

Liman: I tend to agree. I would then release Julie of duty on Monday and we talk amongst ourselves on Tuesday morning, and for her to come in to implement the changes.

Suzanne: For Wed, I say we spent some time preparing the meeting with the Board, including any questions we have about the stewardship transition, issues we want to bring up with the Board.

Liman: good idea.

Jim: Another possible item, I am concerned about the implementation of the root server monitoring being held up by the non-publishing of the RSSAC document. Is that being held entirely for the caucus, or that's something we can make progress on ourselves.

Liman: I hear you. I think my take on that it is held up for the caucus. I will put it down here.

Jim: I would agree that this would be a lower priority items from others (public session preparation, board meeting preparation), I just don't want this item to fall off the agenda completely.

Liman: alright.

Daniel: We have decided that we don't want to publish RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002 without the involvement of the caucus. So yes, it is held up by the caucus. Yes, we could look at it, but I think we have decided that we will not publish it unless the caucus takes a good look at it.

Liman: That's my current thought too.

John: Agree.

Liman: Ok. I have received the input. I will update the program. On Mondays, we will focus on preparing for the afternoon meeting. On Tuesdays we will work on the operation procedure. We will prepare changes for Julie to incorporate. After that we prepare for the board meeting, and we talk about work plan if we can. Wed, we have the board workshop. On Thursday, we can discuss the work plan and the various items that we have lined up for the caucus. It would good to have a list ready after that meeting. Does that sounds like a plan.

Russ: One thing that would be good is to have timelines and approximate completion dates on when things will occur, to get the document published. I think it gives the community a better sense that we are moving forward in getting things completed.

Liman: Yes, that will be part of the discussions that we will be having in London.

Daniel: We have a statement about RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002 with some timelines.

Liman: Yes, we have a timeline for RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002, but I think Russ is mentioning timelines for other items.

Liman: I will shake up the agenda for the meeting and send it to everyone.

Tripti: Are the only public meetings RSSAC exec have the Monday's public meetings with the Board and the meetings with the board. The rest is closed RSSAC executive sessions.

Liman: Yes. I have been requested to meet with ICANN fellows and a couple of other meetings such as with SO/AC leaders.


## 5. Procedures Document

Liman: I have asked Julie to produce some text and I would really like to make some progress. Please please comment on that, for Saturday at noon. If I don't see anything, I would ask Julie to make changes and produce a draft.


## 6. Daniel's Statement RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002

Liman: Daniel has written a document, and I thank you for that. Now there was a comment on this.

Suzanne: That would be me.  The statement is fine. It wasn't clear to me that it should mention RFC 2870-bis. This may be overtaken by events as a public statement, but I think we should send the statement via our liaison to the IAB. Then they get to decide whether wait to publish RFC 2870-bis until they have a normative reference for RSSAC 001.

Daniel: I drafted it. There were little discussion. The only open issue is whether we want to publish the draft, and which draft to publish.  I think if we make a statement, we should make a statement soon. If we want to publish the draft, we need to decide which draft to publish.

Liman: Comments, ideas?

Elise: I am in favor of publishing the statement as well as publishing both drafts at the same time. Obviously we have to decide which version of the draft to publish. I am in favor of publishing all of them.

Jim: I would be favor of publishing both drafts.

Liman: My personal view is also in agreement with you. If nothing else, to make sure something happens with this group. Anyone opposed of publishing the document.

John: I am not opposed. If we publish them, are we going to have a mechanism for people to provide input.

Jim: I have a similar comment. Once that measurement document is out there, people may want to have some statistics, and we don't have a reference implementation yet.

John: Is it better to give it to the caucus? I just want to make sure if we publish it, people have the right expectations. By people, I mean everybody.

Liman: I hear what you are saying. I am trying to balance that with showing some forward movement here.

Suzanne: Yes, we should publish the drafts and making sure the caucus will take up the work.

Daniel: If we are taking a long time to decide whether to publish drafts and if so which they are. We should just take it out and make a statement. It is more important to make a statement right now.

Suzanne: Yes.

Elise: I am supporting publishing the statement as is as well as the drafts. The question asked by Jim on if we are publishing the drafts, where does the comments go. I think it is important to publish a base document, and showing that we are continuing to take input.

Barbara: I do think there is room to publish something as a working draft, materials that are yet to be ready for public comment. It is important to demonstrate that this is the document that you wish the caucus to work one. You have to be careful about how the language is crafted. But I think it is fine publishing it as draft form and continue to evolve to document. Also whether people are expecting statistics to show up, it is already being implemented by some RSOs, and are being published by L and K I believe. Even including some statements that the RSOs are working to implement these as these guidance are developed would be appropriate, but that is an RSO decision, not an RSSAC decision. I think this is one issue you have to decide the distinction beside RSO and RSSAC. This is RSSAC, we think these are the measurements for the root server operations; it is up to the RSOs to adopt that. That would be healthy way to demonstrate that RSSAC is not merely an RSO thing. So publish it, there is a way to not provoke the ICANN community about providing the comments.

John: So I think the important nuance here is that if we publish it, which I don't disagree, we need to make it clear in the announcement, that people should join the caucus if they wish to contribute. There may be never a good way to getting people joining the caucus.

Liman: That was what I was thinking too. Maybe the right way is to publish it and make it clear that channels for input are to join the caucus and to discuss with people in the caucus once it is established. Are there people opposed to publish the draft if we phrase it as input to the caucus?

Liman: I propose now we publish Daniel's statement and taking account the discussion here and we also publish the draft versions of RSSAC 001 and 002, making clear that these are working documents and will evolve in the care of the caucus and people wishing to make input should join the caucus. Anyone opposed to that?

Elise: I think Daniel dropped out. What is the process for publishing it?

Liman: I will ask Daniel to make the changes to the statements, and will circulate to the mailing list, and I will ask ICANN staff to publish it.

Elise: I don't think the statement the needs to be revised.

Liman: Yes, I think so. Ok, let me read it once more to see if needs to be changed. The one thing I would like to bring extra care in the statement is to make sure it is a working document and not a draft that we have regular public ICANN input now, and that the caucus is the right way to do it.

Steve: Regarding your question about the mechanism of publication. One way is to publish it on the RSSAC webpage. To increase the broader circulation is to have an announcement with the statement.

Liman: My gut feeling is making a statement with the link should be the way forward.

Steve: Staff can facilitate that.

**ACTION: Staff to work with RSSAC Chair to prepare the publication of the statement on RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002, taking consideration of the discussion on this topic. The statements will be published as an ICANN announcement with the links to the draft RSSAC 001, 002.**

**7. RSSAC representation in the IANA stewardship transition coordinating committee**

Suzanne: About a month ago, we have provided ICANN input on the effort on the IANA stewardship transition effort. About 10 days ago, ICANN published a revised plan, in this plan RSSAC are asked to nominate 2 representatives.

We need to discuss with ICANN staff and other parts of the community on how big a commitment this is, it is probably a significant time commitment. Since the output of this committee is a proposal to NTIA on how to transition the stewardship of IANA, this is obviously a very important activity both in political terms and in practical terms.

My primary objective is to make sure people have operational experience provide input. It is going to be time consuming, but it is really something we can afford to ignore. I have posted URL of the most recent document. The deadline for appointing people is July 2. The SO/ACs are being strongly encouraged to identify people during the London meeting. So please take a look at the document, I am happy to share anything that I know. Specifically I have requested our meeting with the Board and senior staff about how various

activities are unfolding, so please read those document, and bring any questions. I am happy to discuss anytime. I don't think we have time to discuss on this call, but we should think about how we select people to join this effort, and how the rest of us to back them up.

Liman: Thank you Suzanne, I fully agree with you that this is an activity we should show up for. I have amended this RSSAC agenda to add this item on Tuesday afternoon in preparation for the Board meeting and on thurday afternoon. I would like to ask you to try to come up with an outline on how to handle this issue amongst ourselves and send it to the list. If you could that before the London meeting, we will have a basis for discussion.

Suzanne: I would offer to get a few bullet points together.

**ACTION: Suzanne to draft an outline on how to handle the selection of RSSAC representatives to the IANA stewardship transition coordination committee.**

## 8. AoB

Tripti: What is the status of appointment?

Steve: This is on the consent board agenda for London for appointments.

Liman: That's all. The next meeting is in London. We are adjourned.