LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Roll call. A and J. Is Brad there?.

BRAD VERD: Yes sir.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: For B root, Bill Manning? No Bill. For C root?

HANK KILMER: Hank Kilmer's here, and I think Paul Vixie is as well.

PAUL VIXIE: Paul Vixie's here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Welcome. D, I think I saw Tripti. For E?

KEVIN [JONES]:   Kevin is here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. F?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Suzanne's here.

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.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: G?

JIM MARTIN: This is Jim.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello Jim. H?

HOWARD KASH: Howard here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: For I, I'm here of course. K?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Daniel is here.

JOHN CRAIN: John is here for L.

TERRY MANDERSON: Terry's here as well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. For M, Mike?

JUN MURAI: Jun Murai is here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Then the IANA functions administrator, Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: The IANA functions operator?

ELISE GERISH: Elise is here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello Elise. The root zone maintainer, Duane?

DUANE WESSELLS: Yes, I' here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liaisons. Do we have Russ Mundy, SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Marc Blanchet from the IAB?

MARC BLANCHET: I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Who's on the call from staff?

CARLOS REYES: This is Carlos Reyes.

BARBARA ROSEMAN: This is Barbara Roseman.

JULIE HEDLUND: Julie Hedlund here.

KATHY SCHNITT: This is Kathy.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Next on the Agenda is Agenda bashing. We have a mistake on my part, which is the renaming issue. That's already been decided and taken care of, so as far as we know, the RSSAC mailing list is not in preparation as the mailing list for the formal Committee. That can be dropped off the

Agenda, or rather we'll save it for making it an official transition. Any other business we want to add to the Agenda? Okay, so we have housekeeping, to review Action Items from previous meetings.

Just a quick decision to switch to the old/new mailing lists. Appoint the RSSAC NomCom Liaison. Continue our work on the Operational Procedures document and discussion of next meeting. I haven't heard any other business. If you have something in email, please repeat it here on the telephone call, because I'm behind on my emails.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I wanted to have two minutes on the IANA stewardship transition data and root server operators. It's already an AOB so I guess Steve has put it on.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: The Membership Committee also have three new people for the Caucus, so I guess we need to discuss that too and accept them, I hope.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I should also make a quick report of the status of the current documents, RSSAC 001 and 002. Going to housekeeping. I need to find the Action Items. I have a chat message here from Bill Manning. He's misplaced the call details.

SPEAKER: Liman, why don't you let the staff support read the Action Items?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's a good idea. Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: Reviewing the Action Items – Daniel Karrenberg to send an email to the Caucus mailing list about the formation of an ICG input work party.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: That must be a misunderstanding. What I volunteered to do was a framework for ourselves on what's going on. I did that. I haven't sent anything to the Caucus mailing list yet, because I wasn't sure what "ICG input work party" meant. There must have been a misunderstanding. What I did was I sent an email to the Committee about what we might need to do. If we want a Caucus thing then we have to discuss that again.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I agree with Daniel on how that was… I think it's on my slate somewhere for me to create a work item for us to discuss this on the Committee and then eventually send it to the Caucus. I agree Daniel has done… The Action Item was likely mis-worded.

CARLOS REYES: I'll revise it then to reflect that. For the next AI, staff has already noted this – for future RSSAC in-person meetings, staff will denote how attendees participated, either via in-person or via teleconference. The next AI is Carlos Reyes to publish the 10th of July and 20th of July minutes. That was completed.

Next AI – Steve Sheng to contact RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002 work party leaders about their appointments, and any feedback on the scoping documents, as well as office support for scheduling teleconferences and organizing work party efforts. Steve went ahead and completed those. Steve Sheng to notify the Caucus about RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002 work party leaders, once they accept their roles. That was also completed.

Next AI – staff to retire the rssa-cexec@icann.org mailing list and replace it with rssac@icann.org. Barbara Roseman completed this. Next. Julie Hedlund to make final edits to the Operational Procedures document and circulate revised draft with remaining issues.   This was also completed. Liman to add Membership Committee update as a consent Agenda Item for all RSSAC meetings. That was added to any other business today, so that was completed.

Finally, Julie Hedlund to incorporate the Membership Committee Charter into the Operational Procedures document. Julie just sent a revised draft, shortly before the call started, so that's been completed. Steve Sheng to send information to the Caucus about RSSAC Liaison to the NomCom and solicit candidates. That was completed, and we have three candidates.

Steve Sheng to send a schedule, by weekly teleconferences, to the mailing list, checking for conflicts, particularly with SSAC teleconferences. This was also completed. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you so much. Are there any comments regarding this? The next Item on the Agenda is minutes from July 31st. They were sent to both mailing lists, both the rssac-exec and the new/old one, rssac@icann.org. Are there any comments regarding these minutes, or can we approve them?

ELISE GERICH: I have a question for Ashley. We've listed in the minutes the root zone administrator function as the IANA functions administrator. At least in the contact it calls the NTIA role the root zone administrator. I don't know if anyone thinks that's consistent, or if it matters?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I think in the grand scheme of things, "IANA functions administrator" is fine, but since this is in a context of the root zone, it's more correct to say root zone administrator. I think it's good to have consistency across the board, so if we can just do a search and replace in all the documents, that would be great.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Carlos, did you catch that?

EN

CARLOS REYES: Yes. I noticed Ashley responded via email, so we'll go ahead and reflect that moving forward.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Are we happy to continue with that change?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: It's about this AI. I apologize, I haven't noticed the minutes coming around. This AI is about the Caucus mailing list. I think we should change that to send an email to the Committee mailing list about the root server operator participation in the ICG input, or whatever, rather than Caucus mailing list about information of the work party. Like we just discussed a minute ago. If we make that change, I'm happy with the minutes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think that makes sense, to make that change. Can you please do that, Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: I'll write it now and put the revised text in the chat. Daniel, if you let me know if you approve then I'll revise the minutes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Any other comments regarding the draft minutes? I suggest we approve these minutes with the suggested changes, and remove the draft stamp and publish them. Anyone opposed?

SPEAKER: It's a ridiculous formality, but [everyone 00:13:58] has to abstain on that since neither of us is there.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can you say that again?

SPEAKER: [Unclear] has to abstain on accepting the minutes, because we crossed our wires and neither of us was there. It's a formality. Sorry.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. I haven't heard anyone else being opposed, so I take that as passed. Okay, now we have to appoint a Liaison to the NomCom. We have three nominees. Let me see. They are Bill Manning – he has been our Liaison for several years, four or five. We also have offers from Mehmet [unclear 00:15:15] and from Warren Kumari. They are also people who I can see have [incorporated 00:15:24] their names to [unclear] to work as Liaisons. How did we want to work with this?

We have our three names. Shall we do our non-tedious voting process? Daniel?

EN

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Can I make a motion? I move that we appoint Mehmet [unclear 00:15:53] as our NomCom Liaison and appoint Bill Manning as his substitute. Any seconds?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Clarification please. Substitute – is that in case Mehmet doesn't accept, or what is this substitute?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: There was a discussion on the mailing list about immediately appointing a substitute, because there was an experience from one other Committee or so, where the Liaison was on short notice not able to perform their duties. I think it's a good idea. The idea of my motion is that Mehmet will be our Liaison, and in case Mehmet is incapacitated or for some other reason cannot do it, Bill Manning will already be pre-appointed to be in his place.

My other intention with the motion is to allow some interaction between Bill and Mehmet about Bill's experiences in the NomCom, because Mehmet hasn't done it before, as far as I know. That's the reasoning behind my motion.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. That makes sense. Do we have any seconds?

JOHN CRAIN: Who are the three candidates?

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: We have three candidates, Bill Manning, Mehmet and Warren Kumari. Daniel has made a motion. Does anyone second this motion? Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you. I know that Warren was the SSAC Liaison two years ago, I believe, and so he is also familiar with this and knows the amount of work. It is a fairly substantial amount of work, in terms of how it functions. I was the IAB Liaison last year and concluded it wasn't possible for me to do both NomCom and the ICG role.

I chose the ICG role, but I think Warren would also be a good choice. He's raised his hand. Whatever the Committee wants to do, just speaking as an experienced Liaison in several different roles here. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA: I'd like to comment on procedure. My understanding is that typically when you have more than one person up for consideration, actually if there's only one, you'd have some discussion about the candidacy of each individual before we make a motion on this. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: All right. We can do it that way. My idea was that since Daniel made the motion, I would open up for discussion if that was seconded. That might lead to something else. Point taken. Suzanne?

PAUL VIXIE: Is there a problem hearing me? I was seconding this.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: All right. I note you second Daniel's proposal. I have Suzanne and then I'm going to ask for discussion.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thanks. I guess what I have to say is part of the discussion. With the call for nominations just closed yesterday, I don't think [unclear 00:20:19]…

SPEAKER: You're being drowned out by background noise.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm muting now.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I'm not trying to make this harder than it has to be, but I do agree with Tripti that we need some consideration, since the call for nominees just closed yesterday. We haven't had any discussion of what we're looking for or what might be the most important qualification here besides the willingness to serve. I think any of the nominees would do a perfectly

fine job, but if there's something in particular that we're looking for, something we want to consider, we should probably bring that up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is fair enough. Daniel, since you raised the motion, go ahead.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I'm not sure whether… I just wanted to get the feeling of the Committee on whether we could do that. Obviously there are people who think we shouldn't just short circuit is like this.   I'm not sure whether I can withdraw my motion, but I'd like to hear some more discussion, because particularly since Paul seconded it, maybe there are some people who agree with me that we should short circuit it this way. I'd like to hear it that way.

BILL MANNING: It is my understanding, having served in this position and seeing other people serve, that without qualification, other than being a member of RSSAC, or in the case of the Caucus, because of the quality of the people, the ability to know people in the community is what's important. I think every one of the nominees could serve and could serve well. I'm in favor of Daniel's proposition. I think Mehmet would be an excellent choice, in part because he's never served and the more people that serve, the broader set of experience we have. I'm in favor of this proposal.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you Bill. I have Marc on the speaker's list. Is there anyone who wants to speak after Marc?

MARC BLANCHET: I just want to say that in the IAB, when we consider nominating someone, if one of the candidates is on the committee within the IAB then we form a sub-group of people so that there's more free discussion on all candidates. That's just for your consideration.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Marc, you have a point, but we're small enough and we have known each other for long enough that we don't need that formality.

BILL MANNING: I will abstain from voting, but I should be able to be a part of the discussion.

MARC BLANCHET: It's just for your consideration. I'm not saying you should or should not, it was just to inform you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I think Bill's take on that is actually a good one. Since you put your name forward to abstain from voting, that's a good idea, but at least you should be part of discussion.

PAUL VIXIE: I want to say I agree with Bill's reasons. They match my reasons for seconding this motion.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I haven't heard any other proposals. I've heard a motion that was seconded.   Is anyone opposed to the idea of appointing Mehmet and Bill as a back-up person?

JOHN CRAIN: I'm not opposed to Mehmet, but I'm not sure if he has as wide an understanding of the people in the community as Warren does.   I'd personally have a preference for Warren. That's a personal preference.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Personal preference is okay. Do I take it that you propose to put Warren in the seat instead?

JOHN CRAIN: That would be my preference, to put Warren as our first choice. It's a personal preference. It doesn't mean I'm opposed to Mehmet doing it, I just think Warren would be [unclear 00:27:32].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You're here to have personal preferences, so that's okay. Don't be shy.

SPEAKER: I share John's sentiment. My impression is in terms of breadth of knowledge and breadth of contacts with the set of people that get nominated, when… From my personal knowledge and experience, Warren has a lot better, broader set of connections, as John said. The other thing – and this is only a minor concern, but I put it out there for the Committee to consider – is that Mehmet's previous job, which I think he left only a year ago or less, was with ICANN.

Although I think it's fine from a technical requirements perspective, it might look a little odd if an immediate former ICANN employee was the NomCom person from the RSSAC.

BILL MANNING: The optics look a little weird, but the RSSAC Liaison doesn't vote. Number one. Number two, while I am impressed with Warren's credentials and breadth of knowledge, I think that Mehmet actually brings a different view. He does in fact touch a different population of user base, on a global basis, than Warren does. They're similar, but they're different. That is the kind of exposure that I think the NomCom needs when it's evaluating people. Anyway, either of them would be fine.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I have Daniel before Elise.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I wanted to say what Bill said. I think some new perspectives are not bad, and I think Mehmet has some perspectives from the younger and

EN

more geographically wide connections. Maybe not the connections in the old-school, slightly older, but I think new blood is what I intended here.

The second thing is whilst it's obvious that current employees of ICANN should be excluded, I think we should never hold past employment against people. If we were to do that, we would be poisoned for no good reason.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Elise?

ELISE GERICH: I just wanted to support what Daniel and Bill Manning said. They said it well, so I'll be quiet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. I think we now have two proposals on the table. The first proposal was to have Mehmet with Bill as back-up person, and the second is to have Warren, with Bill as back-up person. Am I missing any proposals here? I don't hear any opposition here. I'm going to suggest that we simply vote on these two proposals.

You can vote for Mehmet as the primary person, or you can vote for Warren as the primary person. In both cases, Bill is the back-up person. Of course, you can always abstain. Does that seem like a way forward?

SPEAKER: There is nothing in Robert's Rules of Order that lets us do two motions at once, but I have no objection.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. I'll probably have to read up a bit on that. Let's go forward, because there's an easy way to solve the problem. Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I was going to explain how you do that in Robert's Rules of Order, but let's do it the way you propose it first.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'll walk through this. Brad, what would you prefer?

BRAD VERD: I'd prefer Warren at this point.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Bill?

BILL MANNING: I abstain.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Paul?

EN

PAUL VIXIE: Mehmet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA: Mehmet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Kevin?

KEVIN [JONES]:   Mehmet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Warren.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Jim?

JIM MARTIN: Mehmet.

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Howard?

HOWARD KASH: Mehmet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think I would prefer Mehmet. K root, Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Mehmet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: John?

JOHN CRAIN: Warren.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Jun?

JUN MURAI: Mehmet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Counting, I have three Warrens and eight Mehmets. That makes 11 votes and one abstain. I find we have appointed Mehmet as our

primary person, with Bill Manning as our back-up person. Thank you. Since I'm on vacation, can I please ask someone from staff to announce this in a police manner to the Caucus list? Thank those who've put their names forward and announce we've made this decision in the formal Committee.

BRAD VERD: Sorry if I'm out of order here, I'm just curious, we didn't vote on the back-up, correct?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well, we had two proposals and they both proposed the same person as the back-up person.

BRAD VERD: I see.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Moving right along, let's spend some time on the Operational Procedures document. I know this is tedious work but we need to get through this and get this document published on time. Julie, thank you so much for all the good work you've done. Thank you for creating the document, which lists the issues we still need to discuss and the ones that we've covered so far.

JULIE HEDLUND: We start on page four.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: May I make a suggestion? Giving the logistics of this…

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: One moment. Julie, were you done?

JULIE HEDLUND: Just that we're starting page four, Section (1.5).

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Just that given the logistics of this, it might be somewhat unusual, but I'd suggest you let Julie take us through this, because she knows exactly what she's done and we can hear her much better than we can hear you. That's my proposal.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm quite happy to do it that way. How about you, Julie?

JULIE HEDLUND: Fine by me. Thank you very much. Thank you everyone. Just to remind everybody, what I've done is the last couple of meetings we went through outstanding issues. I sent them around and the ones that we've

completed are in the first section, and now we're in Section (2). These are the ones that have not been discussed.

I'll just note that since the last meeting John Crain sent a few comments and the clean version of the document. I've brought into this document… There are just a few comments that pertain to some of the issues that are yet to be discussed. They're not major, but I think they warrant discussion. John, if that's okay, I brought them in here, just so that [unclear 00:38:42] sequentially.

JOHN CRAIN: Yes, that's great.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thanks. Starting with Section (1.5), the proposal is to delete the section, because it's a duplicate of Section (2.7.1.1) and I think it would be useful for me to remind people what that actual section title is. (1.5) is meetings; closed meetings, public meetings, and (2.7) is essentially the same information. However, I'll note that there are some comments that John had. If we were to retain this section then we refer here and elsewhere to a specific technology, Adobe Connect.

John has noted we probably should be technology neutral and say "online conference facility" or as Suzanne and Elise note in the Net Section, (1.6.1), we could also say "appropriate supporting technology". Opening up for comments?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: "Appropriate supporting technology" is excellent. I support it.

JOHN CRAIN: I like that too.

MARC BLANCHET: You don't want to redo the procedure in five years because things are bound to change, so I agree also that it should be general.

TRIPTI SINHA: I have a question. I was scrolling down to Section (2.7.1.1) and I don't see a Section (2.7.1.1). Has it already been deleted? I'm confused. I don't see a Section (2.7) in the document, so I'm not sure if the proposal was to delete (2.7) or (1.5).

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you for that, Tripti. I see that you're correct. I don't have an explanation for that and I apologize. I think what happened was that – I do recall this now – I saw that (2.7) was a duplicate of (1.5). I think I was rather too efficient and deleted this that section and not this one. We do now actually have that information in just one place. It appears in (1.5), which is the Meetings Section.

Thank you for keeping me on my toes. I don't know what I'd do without you. Then I'd suggest that we retain this section, because it's not a duplicate. What do people think?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, we should have it in one place, and we should have it in (1.5).

JULIE HEDLUND: It actually makes sense here, especially with the following Section (1.6) and so on.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It makes sense in (1.5) you mean?

JULIE HEDLUND: Exactly.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I agree to that. It makes sense there. Keep it there.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'll retain it and change the terminology "Adobe Connect" to "appropriate supporting technology". I take that as agreed. In the interest of time I'm going to proceed this way. If there are any objections, please people, do raise them. I'm just trying to be efficient with the time. (1.6), meetings.   This is the section Suzanne and Elise both had comments on. In particular with the phrase "meetings will be held at the following locations".

Suzanne commented this seemed excessively prescriptive. Suppose we wanted to meet at the next RIPE or NANOG? Elise had a comment also on that.   "My expectation was that RSSAC, considered as an ICANN

EN

Advisory Committee, will hold its meetings at ICANN meetings." As Suzanne notes in her comment, perhaps instead of specifying IETF, the second bullet should read "ad-hoc, in-person meetings, as determined by the Co-Chairs on an as-needed basis." Comments about the new text proposed by Elise?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think this makes perfect sense. Perfect.

JULIE HEDLUND: Any objections?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Before we move on I'd like to point out that now, contrary to prior custom, we oblige ourselves to meet at all ICANN meetings. I'm not opposed to this, I just want to call it out because it's changed from what we've done before.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It doesn't say "all", does it?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: If we decide at some point not to hold a meeting at an ICANN meeting, people will wave that in our face and say, "You said you'll meet at all ICANN meetings." I'll bet that it would happen.

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. The sentence preceding this says, "The RSSAC may elect to hold…" Yes…

DANIEL KARRENBERG: It says, "Meetings will be held at the following locations."

JULIE HEDLUND: What if we changed it to, "Meetings may be held"?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: That would be fine.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That would be better, yes.

JULIE HEDLUND: Any objections?

JOHN CRAIN: Just a question. "May be" or "will typically be"? When I read something saying, "You may do this", sometimes people also read it as that means you may not do other things. Maybe that's just me being pedantic. I don't know.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Why don't we just scrap the whole thing? It's overly prescriptive. If we just scrap everything between "meetings will" and "ad-hoc basis" then we've lost nothing, I believe.

ELISE GERICH: Daniel, I understand your point. Traditionally, RSSAC has met at other places, and this is saying you will meet at ICANN meetings, which I think is the intent. I guess part of my thought was the restructuring of RSSAC and formally communicating with the Board, because this is an Advisory Committee to ICANN and its Board, as well as to the IANA Functions Operator, to the part of ICANN.

It's just a restructuring of historical RSSAC meetings, versus the restructured RSSAC meetings. That's why I think it might be important to somehow indicate there is an expectation to have meetings that coincide with ICANN meetings – whether it's every one, or at least annually, or something like that. I think it's part of the restructuring and resetting of mindsets.

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, I do agree with what Elise just put on the table. We are a Committee to the ICANN. We should at the minimum indicate that we intend to have meetings there.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I hear you. How do we phrase this well?

SPEAKER: Maybe you want to say something in the Meeting Section as [unclear 00:48:35], "RSSAC is an Advisory Committee to ICANN and will therefore meet on occasion at ICANN meetings, to provide input…" and yadda yadda.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I'm looking for the exact bylaws reference – "The ICANN community and Board." We are not just advising ICANN, but we're advising the wider community. For the reasons that Elise, Tripti and Liman also supported, I think we want to establish a preference; the expectation that wherever else we're meeting, we're also meeting on a fairly regular basis at ICANN meetings. I think Daniel's right, I don't think we want to commit to having an RSSAC meeting at every ICANN meeting, whether we need to or not.

I think we can say that it's up to ad-hoc, as needed, but we can establish the preference or the expectation that that will include ICANN meetings and such other venues, as seen as appropriate. Again, I don't think we have to make this too difficult, but the point is well taken. I think people will want to see us making that kind of commitment to specifically the ICANN community and ICANN venues.

I think "preference" is the word we're after here. It's frankly more flexible than "expectation". Does that give Julie guidance to resolve that maybe?

JULIE HEDLUND: Suzanne, we could say… Let's say we pick up the language that John Crain suggested, "Meetings will typically be held at the following locations: at ICANN meetings or other venues, as deemed appropriate; ad-hoc, in-person meetings, as determined by the Co-Chairs, and on an as-needed basis."

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay, yes, that works. It's not too prescriptive but it does have the right tone. Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Are there any objections? Okay. I've recorded the changed text and it's agreed to. Thank you. I apologize if I'm not… I do appreciate my colleagues noting when people have their hand up. I'm actually in a Word document, recording these text changes, so that I don't have to try to recall them later. That would be impossible.

Moving onto (1.6.1. No. 15). The general edit is to add "closed" in front of "meetings" throughout this section, because this section is RSSAC closed meetings, and I actually have captured that change in the revised document. There are some changes here relating to the issue we discussed before. That's to not specify a particular technology.

In the second sentence we would say, "These meetings are held periodically via teleconference, with appropriate supporting technology for recording and managing the meetings." Then in the following paragraph, "In-person, closed meetings are scheduled" – and here, the text – "where a reasonable number of RSSAC Members are present at

other meeting venues, replaced by, are scheduled by the Co-Chairs on an as-needed basis."

You can see these, but for those who may not be in the room. "An RSSAC Member may nominate" – as opposed to select "an alternate representative, in the event that he or she is unable to attend the closed meeting." In place of the next sentence, which I won't read through entirely, "Alternates may perform only the specific task for which they are deputized."

This is text that I'm suggesting to replace, "Alternates will not be treated or considered as Members outside of the specific task that they're deputized for," because one of the items we agreed to on the call on the 31st was to avoid referring to RSSAC Members, but always just referring to "RSSAC", "the RSSAC". I've rephrased the sentence to omit the word "Members", and then also not "deputized for" but "for which they are deputized".

I'm going to read through these and then we can discuss them all together. Elise noted in the reading, "RSSAC teleconference information is confidential and is maintained and distributed by support staff." She is questioning the purpose of the sentence. We publish the minutes of our teleconference meetings, as well as minutes of our face-to-face meetings.

There's a lot to digest there. Perhaps we can take, I think as agreed, the change to "appropriate supporting technology".

Any objections? Okay. In the next paragraph, comments on the changes. That is taking out, "When a reasonable number of RSSAC

Members are present at other meeting venues," and changing it to, "By the Co-Chairs on an as-needed basis." Any other changes that are there in that paragraph? Any objection? Any suggestions for other wording?

BARBARA ROSEMAN: Julie, there's some typing going on in the chat room.

JULIE HEDLUND: I see that now. I was beginning to be afraid that I'd been dropped from the call. I see Suzanne is saying, "[unclear 00:55:48] call information was confidential for closed meetings because they're closed, but there's no reason to mention it at all."   She says, "No objection on the current change."

BARBARA ROSEMAN: Hank, I see you were typing something. Did you want to continue that?

HANK KILMER: No, thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: No objections to those changes? Then they are agreed. Moving onto the next paragraph. This is Elise's comment about if we publish the minutes of the teleconference meetings as well as minutes for our face-to-face meetings, why would we say, "RRSAC teleconference information is confidential and maintained and distributed by support staff"?

I actually think that is a carry-over from text that was in the SSAC procedures. It had more to do with the fact that we don't publish the teleconference number, the Adigo number, and the teleconference code. I personally don't see any reason to keep that in there. It seems overly prescriptive, but that's just me.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think we already discussed and agreed that.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. Then I'll mark it as agreed. Moving along. Daniel suggests, "Remove the words 'support staff' from [unclear 00:57:31]. This is overly specific." It's noted here that [unclear 00:57:44] email to the RSSAC with a draft agenda and the teleconference information. This seems straightforward. Any objection? I hear none. I'm going to move ahead. If I'm going too fast, let me know.

(17). This is from Kevin. He says, "The discussion on the alternates, it's stated that alternates can only attend an RSSAC meeting if the primary's not in attendance and leaves the alternate responsibilities and functions quite vague. I'm not sure, but I don't think this is what's actually being done now, and probably not what is intended. I recommend there be a new separate, alternate section, that specifies what's truly meant.

"I think it's further necessitated by the fact that the alternates are expected to be Caucus Members, so it's more likely that alternates might be present at an RSSAC closed meeting. Alternate [body 00:58:51]. Alternates are unable to vote if the primary representative is

in attendance." Other thoughts? Suzanne had comments that she sent in just prior to the meeting on the 31st.

She says, "On alternates, I think experience to-date suggests that limiting this too much does is not helpful, including having rules that the alternate can only attend meetings if the primary's unavailable, the alternate has to be explicitly invited by the Chair. As long it's clear which person is the official member for the organization and which is holding the vote for any particular issue or meeting, I have no problem with a member and an alternate both participating in discussions and Caucus Work Parties, etcetera."

There is not some specific text proposed with this suggestion, other than that. Kevin is suggesting a new section on alternates and a description of alternates. Discussion?

SPEAKER: I think his logic makes sense. [unclear 00:59:58] alternates to only be present if the primary was not. It makes sense that the voting should be in priority order.

JOHN CRAIN: Yes, and I think that matches what we're actually doing, because it just makes sense. I fully agree with Paul.

JULIE HEDLUND: What about having [unclear 01:00:32] describes alternates? We currently don't have one.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Who takes the action of actually writing the alternates paragraph? I think that somebody has to do it, and it would be best if a Committee Member did it. Can I suggest that Kevin does it?

JULIE HEDLUND: Got it. Kevin?

KEVIN [JONES]:   I don't think I'm the person… I don't think I understand what the intent is, if I understood the intent of the alternates. What we're trying to capture in the document, I'm happy to take a look at this.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Kevin? I'd be happy to help you with that also.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. I have captured the Action Item that Kevin and Suzanne will together write a section on alternates and what they are and can do.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can I suggest that we add to that Action, with also going through the document to see which other parts we then need to remove? The alternates are mentioned here and there, so there are probably a couple of sentences that need to be stricken out of the document in other places.

JULIE HEDLUND: I can assist with that by highlighting those areas, and pulling those out, or at least highlighting them so they show up in the document, to make them easier to find? If that helps, Kevin and Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Works for me. Thanks.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. I'm noting this. Thank you. Moving along. This is (1.6.2), RSSAC public meetings. We've got a couple of issues relating to this. (18) from Daniel, "Remove the words 'these meetings are held as an integral part of the regular ICANN meetings and supported by real-time transcription and streaming of the audio'. This is overly specific. We should not limit ourselves to hold open meetings only at ICANN meetings."

I think this relates to our previous discussion, and may be OBE based on the re-write in the previous section. I'll move onto (19), because it relates directly to what (18) is. Suzanne says, "Such sessions may also occur in other venues, as may be useful." Elise adds, "And agreed upon by RSSAC." I'll just open this up for comment.

I think it gets back to the issue that Suzanne raised, as far as wanting to point out that meetings will occur at ICANN meetings, but then also allowing for the option to have meetings elsewhere.

EN

ELISE GERICH: I'm just thinking. I don't believe the SSAC has meetings elsewhere. I don't believe the GAC has meetings elsewhere. I don't think the ccNSO has meetings elsewhere. I'm curious why RSSAC would think that their public meetings would be held in other venues.

SPEAKER: The SSAC does hold a meeting – it's not a public meeting – at the IETF, and the GAC holds some calls, that are not part of their regular public stuff, but the registrars do meet in a separate forum from time to time. I think it varies quite a bit from constituency to constituency.

ELISE GERICH: Yes, but what I said is that SSAC doesn't hold public meetings in other venues. This is all about public meetings. Your other examples were also… We hold teleconferences, like we're doing right now, and those aren't public meetings.

SPEAKER: Yes, but the registrars do hold… Anyway, the point being, this does vary quite a bit from ICANN group to ICANN group.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sorry, Daniel may have been in the queue before me, but I can suggest a clarification there.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Suzanne is before me in the queue.

SUZANNE WOOLF: All I was attempting to get at there was that for some of the things that we deal with, as RSSAC, there may be times where we want input, we want to be able to hold a public session of some kind, at some venue besides an ICANN meeting. We might, for example, want to get input from network operators regarding some issue that's in front of RSSAC, for which we're responsible for advice to the Board and the ICANN community. We might want input.

We might want to make an effort, specifically to get input from outside. Having that text in there, having that intention in there, flags that for the interest in [unclear 01:07:07] and also makes it clear that we are interested in such input, if it's appropriate, and we'll consider going out and getting input from outside the usual ICANN community and the people at ICANN meetings.

It was not intended to imply a commitment or an obligation. It was intended to signal that we consider it important to have that option. Does that make it a little bit clearer?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: It does to me, and I'm next. You basically said what I intended to say. Just as an example, our last informal meeting with the Board, I think it was Steve Crocker who told us that we might want to look at Warren Kumari's ideas about distributing the root zone. I'd imagine that I might even invite the RSSAC to have a public meeting at the RIPE meetings, to interface with the operator community about something like this.

We might want to go to the IETF to get some input on this. It strikes me as totally inappropriate to have language in the Procedures Document that could be interpreted as limiting ourselves in this. I uphold my suggestion to just strike the damn sentence, and we'll become to hold meetings, [unclear 01:08:46] ICANN meetings, or elsewhere.

ELISE GERICH: I totally agree that this language should not limit the RSSAC from meeting in other venues. However, I do believe the language was meant to say that RSSAC is an organization within ICANN, and so therefore it holds regular public meetings at ICANN meetings. That doesn't limit it from having them in other venues, as the case may require, as the examples both you and Suzanne gave.

I do believe that as an ICANN Advisory Committee, it should be holding regular public meetings at ICANN meetings. That doesn't limit them from meeting elsewhere also.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I have a strong opinion that we should not limit ourselves to [unclear 01:10:16] ICANN meetings. I also would be careful of making the promise or setting the expectation that we'll have regular public meetings at the ICANN meetings. I think the text that we discussed 20 minutes ago was good, and I think these two opinions are overtaken by that. That's my opinion.

JULIE HEDLUND: That would go back to the text that we did agree to, where we said that meetings would typically be held at ICANN meetings "or other meetings, as deemed appropriate". That was just in the meetings section, but if we put that into this section then we could say, "These meetings will typically be held as part of the regular ICANN meetings, and supported by real-time transcription…" etcetera, "Such sessions may also occur in other venues," this is the part Suzanne has added. Elise has said, "And agreed upon by RSSAC. So it's not [unclear 01:11:52], but it's still indicating that RSSAC meetings will typically be held as part of the regular ICANN meetings. Is that what you were getting at, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I [unclear 01:12:08] typically. I'm struggling with [unclear]. I would say something like this, "These meetings are held at regular ICANN meetings, or other venues, as deemed necessary."

JULIE HEDLUND: Anybody disagree with that?

BARBARA ROSEMAN: I think the only question I have is, are we distinguishing here between RSSAC meetings and RSSAC Caucus meetings?

JULIE HEDLUND: This is only RSSAC meetings.

BARBARA ROSEMAN: I just wanted to be clear, that's all.

JULIE HEDLUND: Otherwise it would say "RSSAC Caucus". The change is now that the text will be stricken and we'll just have, "These meetings are held at regular ICANN meetings, or other venues, as deemed necessary."

DANIEL KARRENBERG: [unclear 01:13:36] I propose we leave the language we had agreed [unclear], Section (1.5), which applies to both closed and public meetings. Then we're done with that.

JULIE HEDLUND: It was hard to hear you, Daniel, there was a lot of buzz. You're proposing that the language that we agreed to in (1.5) would apply to both closed and public meetings?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yes, that's how I read it.

JULIE HEDLUND: That language, just to remind everybody, in (1.5) was what I was reading off before, which is where we say, "Meetings will typically be held at ICANN meetings or other venues, as deemed appropriate." That's different than what [unclear 01:14:48], Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I realize that. As I hear the discussion evolve here, I realize you could probably rip out the last sentence, what I see as (1.2). [unclear 01:15:04] these meetings are held at integral parts of regular ICANN meetings, and supported by real-time transcription and streaming of the audio. Just rip that out.

JULIE HEDLUND: That was also Daniel's proposal. We'd then substitute the language pulled from (1.5), or we'd take it as a given that it's already been said in (1.5).

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'd say we just rip it out, we don't replace it, and we take [unclear 01:15:40] from (1.5).

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you for that clarification. Is that acceptable to you, Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: That was my proposal.

JULIE HEDLUND: Just being clear. I take that as agreed. I will note that it's 11:22 by my clock, and I know we have Any Other Business. I'm just asking whether or not we should continue to go forward. The next is Section (2), RSSAC Membership. There are several proposals there.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was just keeping an eye on the time as well. I think we'll have to back off from the Procedures Document at this point, because as you mentioned, we have a few items left on the Agenda that we need to deal with. I suggest we say thank you to Julie. It's been very helpful. Let's continue it in our next meeting.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'll take the [unclear 01:16:46] document with these changes and update the issues list.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. That's very helpful. Moving along to the next Agenda Item, we have Any Other Business. We have three points. We have the IANA stewardship transition of root server operators.   We have the Membership Committee update, and we have the RSSAC 001 and 002 updates. Daniel, can I ask you to give us an update on the stewardship transition root server?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Of course.   I'll keep this very short. If you want the details, read my messages I posted last Sunday about this. The [effort 01:17:36] of it is that I believe IANA does some work for us. That is mainly when we change our service addresses. So far, IANA has been using their normal root zone change procedure like this, which involves the NTIA. If the NTIA pulls out of this then we'll need to consider whether we need to replace their role with something.

EN

I don't want to discuss that right here, but what I would like to do as a first step is I propose that the RSSAC asks the IANA to give us a description of their current procedures. We'll need that anyway. If we want to make a proposal to the ICG then a required part of this is a description of the status quo. We will need that anyway.

This is by no means prejudice on whether we want to make a proposal, but I think it's a logical step, if we ask Elise, as our IANA Liaison, to give us a briefing document about what the current procedures are at the IANA for changing [unclear 01:18:58] records in rootservers.net, and the corresponding [glue 01:19:05] file. Also, what kind of contact list the IANA keeps for us, and what the procedures are to make updates to that. Any questions about that?

SUZANNE WOOLF: What you're suggesting sounds right to me.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Elise, is this something you're willing to take on?

SPEAKER: Elise had to drop from the call.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: All right.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I discussed this with Elise informally last week, and she indicated that that would be a question they'd be willing to answer.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent. I think we should [unclear 01:20:00] that question. It makes perfect sense.

RUSS MUNDY: One of the things I think would be helpful is if Elise would identify which of the gazillion flowcharts in the ICANN proposal, as part of the contract, this work is done under. I thought I could find one. I haven't had time to look in detail. I do think it would be useful to tie it to that document, that at least is the argument that's supposed to define what's happening now.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This makes sense. I looked through that in detail and couldn't find the flowchart either. I believe the status quo is that this is dealt with in the flowchart that describes changes to the root zone in general. Let Elise answer the question. I'll formulate a question if more than what I put in my message on Sunday is needed. Then I'll add the reference to the ICANN proposal to the NTIA that you're referring to.

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, that's correct, Daniel, and it was incorporated by reference and therefore it's supposed to describe everything. My take is that it may be

buried as a subset of one of the full flowcharts, but I agree. I was not able to explicitly identify it either.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Since I'm still on vacation for a couple of weeks, Daniel, can I ask you to – on my behalf, as Chair – undertake that? To send that question to Elise?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I will do that, and I'll copy in the Committee.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Any more reports from you, Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: No, that's it. If anybody has any question about this transition stuff, I'm happy to answer them. Liman is also of course one of our representatives there, but he's been on holiday, so I guess I'm the point man. If anybody has any question at all about this, feel free to email me.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Moving along to the next Item, which is the Membership Committee updates, Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA: I'm sorry Liman, what did you say? I just heard my name.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: We're moving into the Membership Committee update. Someone mentioned there were new names to be forwarded to the formal Committee here, regarding the Caucus. I don't know whether you want to talk, or Paul. [Ricardo 01:23:23] is not on the call, as far as I know.

TRIPTI SINHA: I wasn't scheduled to speak. Paul, would you like to speak on behalf of the Committee?

PAUL VIXIE: No, I'd like you to do it.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. If you remember, at the last meeting we were going to… We forwarded four names, and we were waiting for the SOIs to come in. We failed to get one from Keith Mitchel, so I asked [Kave 01:23:45] to just go ahead and forward what he had to the RSSAC. I believe he did that earlier this morning. Bear with me. I'm catching a flight to California in a couple of hours and I'm a little distracted here.

                      The names that he forwarded were [Mark Costers, unclear 01:24:16]. I believe those might have been the names that came in the last time as well. We're forwarding that for consideration to the Members of the Caucus, to the RSSAC. We're forwarding it to the RSSAC for consideration.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: These are all very well known people. I have no objection whatsoever to taking them on, and [unclear 01:24:47] Statements of Interest as well. I see no problem here. Any other comments?

SPEAKER: I have to drop.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Are you willing to take on these three people as Members of the Caucus?

TRIPTI SINHA: Is that a motion, Liman?

JOHN CRAIN: I'll motion that we do that. I'll motion that we accept the three proposed people to the Caucus.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I second it.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I second that. If you second it, it's better.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I've heard it seconded. Is there any discussion? I end the discussion so that means the motion passes. We have three new Members. Can I ask our staff support to make sure they're put on the mailing list and welcomed into the Caucus? Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Is there anything else from the Membership Committee?

TRIPTI SINHA: Nothing. As and when SOIs come in I will bring them to the attention of this group. [Kave 01:26:23], if he's not present, Paul or I will certainly present that. Nothing else.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Moving to the last part, which is RSSAC 001 and 002, I've asked for and have received brief updates from the two parties that are working with these documents. Daniel happened to be one of the document leaders. Would you be willing to say a few words on the status of the work?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Very briefly, Alejandro and I discussed the scoping document and we're fine with the scoping document. If we need to form a department on the Committee we can do it. We've also started mailing the people who

volunteered and asking for more volunteers and comments. We've had more volunteers and comments and we're working happily. Currently the expectation is that we'll be ready well before the deadline.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. As for the other document, I did send a request to Terry and Joe. I have received a few comments from Joe, but Terry, since you're on the call, do you want to make any comments?

TERRY MANDERSON: Yes, I'm happy to make a very brief comment. Joe is currently in Haiti, teaching at a LACNIC Workshop. He's been unable to dedicate a slice of time for us to think up. I expect us to come together early next week. Straight after that we will make a call out to the Caucus. I don't anticipate any further delays, and I still expect us to meet the deadlines as provided.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Any comments regarding that? If not, I realize we've reached the end of the Agenda. We already have a message on the mailing list discussing future meetings, and I think we'll continue to do that on the emailing list. At this point, I'd like to adjourn the meeting. Any final comments?

SPEAKER: Can I make a suggestion that from that list we ask staff to make a Doodle Poll, so that we can gather some information on what people can make and what they can't?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That sounds like a good idea. Can I please ask staff support to help us with this?

STEVE SHENG: We'll do that. Thanks.

MARC BLANCHET: There may be an option, [unclear 01:29:44].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I didn't quite get that. Can you repeat that please?

SPEAKER: Marc was suggesting to put the "maybe" option in there and to enable support for time zones. Technical details.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. That makes sense. Thank you. I have one last suggestion, and that's that we now move our Committee mail traffic to the new rssac@icann.org mailing list, and that we abandon the rssac-exec mailing list. Is that okay? I hear no objections. Thank you everyone.

I'm sorry about the background noise. I make a solid promise that it will never, ever happen again that I have to do this from an amusement park – maybe other strange venues, but not this. Thank you all for participating.

SPEAKER: Thank you Liman.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]