
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: ...Minutes past the hour. I think we should start rolling. Welcome to this next meeting in the series of the RSSAC teleconferences. As usual I shall start off with a roll call and then we'll do some Agenda bashing. I'll start off with A, root-servers.net. Brad, are you there? No Brad today. B root. Bill Manning? No Bill. C root. Paul? No C root. D root?

TRIPTI SINHA: Tripti is here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: D root?

KEVIN JONES: Hello, this is Kevin.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: F root? I heard Jim at least.

JIM MARTIN: Jim, but no Suzanne today.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: G root?

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.

JIM CASSELL: This is Jim.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: H root?

HOWARD KASH: Howard here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I root, I am here. K root. Daniel? No. L root. John or Terry? No. M root? Hiro? That doesn't give us a voting quorum today. I don't think we've much to vote on. To continue, from NTIA, I thought I saw Ashley in the roster?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: From IANA, Elise?

ELISE GERICH: Good morning, or evening.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: From Verisign, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane's here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent. I think I heard Russ Mundy from SSAC as well.

RUSS MUNDY: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Wonderful. I see from IAB, Marc Blanchet in the roster?

MARC BLANCHET: Yes, hello.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello. From staff, I've heard from Steve. Who else is here from staff?

JULIE HEDLUND: Julie's here.

BARBARA ROSEMAN: Barbara's here.

KATHY SCHNITT: Kathy's here.

CARLOS REYES: This is Carlos.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Full team. Thank you. Is there anyone else on the call who hasn't spoken up yet? Okay, Agenda bashing. I had dropped the ball on the ICANN Leadership Training. You saw that one as a very late addition. I've added that to the Any Other Business. I also picked up at a late stage a request from Tripti to discuss the schedule for the LA Meeting. I've put that under Any Other Business too. Then there is a third thing, which is that, scanning the Minutes from the previous meeting, I promised to bring up a discussion about whether to make the mail archives for the RSSAC list public or not.

I'd like to add that to the housekeeping section, if that's okay, because there's discussion to be done before we continue with the editing of the Procedures Document. That is a very late addition. Are there any objections to these additions to the Agenda?

JIM MARTIN: I was just going to comment that I'd assume that any decision on whether we open the mail archives or not would require a vote, and we can't do a vote this time, so is it appropriate to have the conversation without being able to have a vote?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'd hope we can exchange views. You're quite right that we would probably not be able to take a formal decision, but we could at least try to figure out what the various standpoints are, or do you prefer to move

the discussion to a different time, when we have full quorum? It's not important to me, so I'm happy to do either.

JIM MARTIN:

My thought was that when we have everybody that could vote, that we would then have them, in the context of having heard all the discussion. If we have the discussion now and then have people come later, they wouldn't have had the benefit of that context.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

That works fine for me. Are there other opinion?

TRIPTI SINHA:

I agree with Jim Martin's opinions on this. We should have everyone at the table to at least have a health discussion before we vote on this.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Okay. I remove that proposal. I'll try and keep it in mind for the next meeting and put it on the Agenda again. We only have the LA Meeting schedule and Leadership Training under Any Other Business. Are there any other additions to the Agenda? All right. Let's get going. RSSAC housekeeping, review of AIs. We have the Minutes in the workspace. There are three AIs from the last meeting. The first one is for Carlos to publish the Minutes from the August 14th meeting on the public space. I declare that done.

Second one was for Julie to update the Operational Procedures Document with the late edit and distribute the revised draft and updated issues to the mailing list. That was done as well, I think. It's soldered into the Kevin comment that you sent out too, isn't it Julie?

JULIE HEDLUND:

Yes. There were two sets I sent out – last week, the updated and clean and red-lined version of the Ops Procedures, and the updated list of proposed edits. Then Kevin sent some additional comments and edits to that document. I sent that around yesterday and there were a few comments that needed to be addressed. I put those into the list of proposed edits that we'll talk about a little later today.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Fantastic. Third AI was for Carlos and Kathy to schedule the RSSAC teleconference for today and for September 25th. This one today is definitely done. Next on the Agenda is to approve the Minutes from the previous meeting. I think we have them from the last teleconference. Are there any comments to the draft Minutes? Are you willing to approve them?

TRIPTI SINHA:

I don't think we can approve the Minutes because we don't have quorum.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

You're quite right.

BARBARA ROSEMAN: Do you want to do a poll on the email list for approval?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I could do that. That's probably a good idea. Carlos, can you make an AI to do exactly that, for the August 28th Minutes?

CARLOS REYES: Noted. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. Are there any updates from the Membership Committee?

TRIPTI SINHA: The Membership Committee, we are not ready to forward any names to the RSSAC yet, but we have received two EOIs and I can share the names of those individuals with you. One of them is from Verisign. Is Paul on the call?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Paul has not signaled that he's on the call.

TRIPTI SINHA: The two names that we received are Kim Davies, Director of Technical Services at ICANN. The other one is Matt Weinberg from Verisign. We felt that we didn't want to forward names every month. We'll put this

as an interval every other month. These are the two names we've currently received, and at a future meeting we'll forward names to you for consideration.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, thank you.

SPEAKER: My question is, when people submit their letters of interest, do they get any response letting them know that they'll be considered and will get a response within a certain amount of time, or do they just submit it and they wait?

TRIPTI SINHA: No. Kave, who is the Chair of our Committee, does respond to them and informs them that we've received their EOI. If they haven't included a SOI we do have them forward that to us as well, and that we'll be considering their request for Membership and forwarding it to the RSSAC. They do receive an acknowledgement from us. I do not believe they're told how long they need to wait, and that perhaps should be included in the email that goes out. That was a good catch Elise. I'll forward that to the Committee.

ELISE GERICH: Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Are there any other questions for Tripti? Thank you Tripti. Moving right along. We're already at the Operational Procedures Document. Julie, would you please take the helm?

JULIE HEDLUND: I'd be glad to. Let me explain while this is coming up, specifically what I did. I took all of the changes that had been agreed to, as of the 28th of August, and I incorporated them. I also made several editorial changes based on discussions to basically clean up language – not substantive changes by any means, but changes to make things clearer. That was a document I sent around last week. I updated the list of proposed edits, and basically most of them were addressed or were OBE. The list is quite a bit shorter.

Then Kevin Jones sent a red line of the document on the 9th and that was the document I sent around yesterday. Most of Kevin's very helpful changes were clarifications and helpful edits. My plan is to accept them. I don't think they need discussions. There were a couple of comments that Kevin had that I wasn't sure how to address, so I've incorporated them into the list of proposed edits.

I'll move through the document as we go through these. Note that the date is yesterday because that's when I added the issues and comments from Kevin that I wasn't sure how to address. I put these in order. You'll see as we run through these that we're running through them in the order in which they appear in the Procedures.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just a question. The document we have in front of us in the AC is the document you've not yet distributed to the mailing list, right?

TRIPTI SINHA: I did actually. Yesterday I sent two documents. There are two documents in there – the Draft Ops Procedures proposed edits, 10th September. That's the document I'm looking at right now. Those are just the outstanding things that I wasn't sure how to address, or haven't been addressed yet but people have raised. Then there's the clean document that I had sent previously, which includes red line comments and edits from Kevin Jones.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I found it. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Back to the document, the first Item is in Section (1.2.1), the RSSAC. "The RSSAC is composed of appointed representatives of the root server operators. The ICANN Board of Directors appoints Membership from the RSSAC." There's a sentence there at the end that says, "The RSSAC is the only entity that can take formal action as the RSSAC." That was text that I think Daniel added at some point, in the many iterations of this document. Kevin asked, "Is the intent of this statement to limit Co Chair authority? Is this sentence necessary?" I wasn't sure about that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think that that's actually a correct understanding, without trying to put words in Daniel's mouth. He wants to be very careful with the quorum so the Co Chairs don't go off on a whim and make statements that aren't supported by the group.

JIM MARTIN: I interpreted it in addition to ensure that it's very clear that no one in the Caucus can construe that they can speak on behalf of RSSAC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. That's a good point too.

TRIPTI SINHA: Not for a minute did I have any sense that the comment was directed at Co Chair authority. I was actually more in-line with Jim's thinking, was that RSSAC, this particular body, is the only one that can take any action – no one else beyond this body. It was a very firm statement on that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Perhaps a question to Kevin. Do we need to put extra words in there to explain this somehow?

KEVIN JONES: I don't think so. I think with explanation, that works for me.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: What I'm thinking is that it shouldn't work only for you who's now heard the explanation. It should also work for people who read this document at a later stage.

TRIPTI SINHA: I think the question for Kevin... Kevin, when you were reading it, why did you think that it was trying to limit Co Chair authority? We don't even talk about Co Chairs yet, in Section (1).

KEVIN JONES: Because the Co Chair Section comes right after it.

ELISE GERICH: I was thinking that we didn't think of the sentence as limiting the Caucus, because we haven't mentioned the Caucus yet. If you make it too explicit, then maybe it means you're only limiting the people you mention. By having it general like this is means everybody except the RSSAC.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any other comments?

ELISE GERICH: I notice in the chat room Steve Sheng and Julie are noting that we now have a quorum.

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes. John Crain raised that because once he joined it looked like we were up to seven. I wanted to make sure we noted that. Thanks Elise. Liman, do we want to go back to items that needed votes?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think we'll continue with this.

TRIPTI SINHA: With respect then to this sentence, shall we agree that it's unchanged, as it's currently written?

ELISE GERICH: That seems practical.

TRIPTI SINHA: I would agree.

KEVIN JONES: I'm okay with it remaining as is.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, then that's agreed. Thank you. Moving along, under Co Chairs, and specifically in the sentence that says, "The RSSAC Co Chairs are responsible for working with the RSSAC to suggest priorities and conduct all meeting and gatherings of the RSSAC. Kevin's question is, "What is meant by gatherings? Do we mean other informal meetings or do we

mean work products? If the former, I suggest dropping. If the latter, I suggest using the word “work products”.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think this is just a leftover from sloppy language somewhere else. My interpretation is that if it’s more informal meetings, I support Kevin in dropping it.

TRIPTI SINHA: Kevin does make a suggestion to include “work products” if that’s what was implied. Do you know if that was implied there, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I don’t recognize the word from before, so I don’t have any history from how it landed there.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think it was maybe just the language being a little bit loose. I don’t recall any iteration of the document where this was pointing to something specific. In that case, we could just... I don’t think it meant work products, because we talk quite a bit about work products in the Caucus Section. We can say, “The RSSAC Co Chairs are responsible for working with the RSSAC to suggest priorities and conduct all meetings of the RSSAC.”

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That’s good.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay. I'm making a note. Thank you. Moving right along, I do want to say Kevin, thank you very much. Kevin really did take a very close look at the document and found some places where the language could be more clear. They weren't substantive changes but were really improvements. I want to thank you for that Kevin. Extremely helpful. Moving down into the Section (1.22.1) Co Chair election process. The start of the paragraph it says, "The standing Co Chair will conduct a roll call. Members will verbally indicate their selection."

Concerning the word "verbal" it says, "If specifying verbal voting too specific? We did not use this method of voting for our RSSAC ICG representatives."

TRIPTI SINHA: I agree with Kevin. I do believe it's too specific. I think we need to keep our options open there and just say "a vote" and drop "verbally".

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I fully agree with the two of you.

JULIE HEDLUND: Any objections to that? Then the sentence will read, "The standing Co Chair will conduct a roll call and Members will indicate their selection."

ELISE GERICH: Sorry, doesn't a roll call indicate a verbal roll call? I'm just asking for interpretation. When I think of a roll call it's like when we went through the beginning of our meeting, A, B, C, D... People respond. Where if you're actually having a vote like by secret ballot it's not really a roll call, is it?

TRIPTI SINHA: Elise, you are correct. In fact, I would recommend dropping the first sentence, since it will simply be a vote, and the modality of voting will be determined during the time of vote. It makes no sense right now to have that sentence.

JULIE HEDLUND: Let me see how that would work then in the context where this appears. "One month prior to selection, nominees will be accepted for the Co Chair position from the Members. During the meeting, additional nominations will be accepted from the Members and all nominees will indicate their intention to accept or withdraw their nomination. Then we would go directly to, "Members will indicate their selection as simple majority [unclear 00:27:17] of the voting Members will establish a new Co Chair." Then there is no step though of the Co Chair calling a vote, but it seems to me that the Co Chair does call a vote.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You're quite right. If this election happens during a teleconference, but if it's a physical meeting we actually had a different procedure, which

was an ad hoc procedure, but we did it differently at the face-to-face meeting. We should have the options open I think, just as we proposed.

ELISE GERICH: Julie, you could propose, instead of, “The standing Co Chair will conduct a roll call,” you could say, “The standing Co Chair will call for a vote,” and then you could say, “Members will indicate their selection.” Calling for a vote doesn’t necessarily mean you have to raise your hand or you have to verbally say something, or you have a secret ballot. You can determine how you vote at the time that the vote is called, can you not?

TRIPTI SINHA: I believe that’s how we did it in London.

ELISE GERICH: That’s what I remember.

JULIE HEDLUND: That sounds good to me. Any objections to that: “The standing Co Chair will call for a vote”?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think that’s good. It gives us some leeway to handle the situation where we have most of the people in the room and a few connected over telephone. Then we can find a working solution there and then.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you. I will note that change. Moving along into closed meetings, here Kevin has suggested including some text in the first sentence. Specifically, “The RSSAC closed meetings are open to the RSSAC,” and he’s inserted, “(RSSAC Caucus) and to participants invited by the Co Chairs or by formal resolution.” His comment is, “Should this say RSSAC and the RSSAC Caucus? If not, it’s presumed that the RSSAC Caucus would have to be invited by the Co Chair to attend the RSSAC closed meeting, which is really our regular RSSAC meeting. I’m not sure this is what is intended.

ELISE GERICH: Before we start that discussion Julie, I think if you go back to the section above there was another sentence that had the word “verbally” in it. Are you just going to automatically take “verbally” out of that?

JULIE HEDLUND: You’re right, there are two. I skipped over the second one. Thank you very much for catching that. That is, “In the event of a tie, a runoff will occur with Members verbally indicating their selection.” I’m going to then suggest that we take out “verbally” as we did previously, in order to be consistent.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I support that.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm making a note. Thank you very much. Thank you Elise for pointing that out. Onto the next Item, that is whether or not we want to insert "RSSAC Caucus" with respect to the attendance in closed meetings.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I don't want to automatically give RSSAC Caucus Members the right to participate in RSSAC Committee Meetings. Whatever we end up with, I would be unhappy if it automatically allows people in the room, when we're trying to discuss something really sensitive. It's easy enough to invite them. If we were to have a closed meeting, it's very easy for me to say, or for you as a group request that the Caucus be present as well. I would suggest not having the Caucus mentioned here, but I'm happy to discuss it, if there are other opinions.

JULIE HEDLUND: Kevin, since you made this suggestion, do you wish to comment?

KEVIN JONES: Actually, I think that leaving it the way it is, is in-line with what Liman wants, and so that's fine. I just wanted to make sure that we were clear about how we were allowing the Caucus to participate in RSSAC Meetings.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I just came to wonder if there's another interpretation of this text... No, because then we'd have a second set of brackets. I was thinking that if we were talking about an RSSAC Caucus closed meeting, of course the

RSSAC Caucus would be the typical participants of that meeting, but that doesn't rhyme well with the first part of the sentence, because it's that the RSSAC closed meetings are open to the RSSAC. I would suggest removing the brackets. Sorry, removing the text within the brackets.

TRIPTI SINHA: Right, and that text is text Kevin was suggesting adding, but I gather that Kevin, when you were saying, "Leave it the way it is," you meant leaving it without the inserted text?

KEVIN JONES: Correct.

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, I agree with what you're saying. There should be no ambiguity that we are talking about RSSAC closed meetings, but we need to really refine that first sentence. It says, "The RSSAC closed meetings are open." That's a contradiction of terms. What I would do is completely revise the first sentence so that it reads very clearly what we mean.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well caught. Can I suggest we instead use, "The RSSAC closed meetings are limited to the Members of RSSAC"? No, we need to...

ELISE GERICH: Maybe you want to say something like, “RSSAC will hold closed meetings and additional participants may be invited by the Co Chairs or by formal resolution.”

TRIPTI SINHA: I like that Elise. That’s very clearly stated.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I’m quite happy with that too.

JOHN CRAIN: I think Elise said, “RSSAC will hold,” and possibly that should say, “The RSSAC may hold”?

ELISE GERICH: I think that’s fine.

TRIPTI SINHA: Why the “may”? Are we not currently scheduled to have these closed meetings that we have the first Thursday of every month?

JOHN CRAIN: Yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: It would determine [unclear 00:35:40] then, the way you're stating it. "May" is somewhat non-deterministic. We have determined that we will meet once a month, and these are closed meetings, correct?

JOHN CRAIN: Okay. I can live with that.

ELISE GERICH: I agree with you Tripti.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: On the other hand, we don't know what we want to or don't want to do in the future, so that's actually closing down our future options.

JOHN CRAIN: I don't see it that way. I think the point I was also trying to make was that we're specifying that there are only two types of meetings – closed and open – and the thing that really isn't stated here is that is our Members meetings are actually closed. I don't think that needs to be stated, but by not stating it you don't need to have the statement of "you may have them" because we do have them. That's how we normally meet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm happy with Tripti's proposal.

JULIE HEDLUND: That's with "will" and not "may". Let me read it back. "The RSSAC will hold closed meetings and additional participants may be invited by the Co Chairs or by formal resolution."

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

KEVIN JONES: You could even drop the word "will" and just have "The RSSAC holds closed meetings."

JULIE HEDLUND: I've noted that. Okay. I think that one is settled. Thank you. Moving along, this was another paragraph that appears later on in the closed meetings section. "The RSSAC occasionally prepares" – and the word "occasionally" is suggested to be added by Kevin – "occasionally prepared informal notes of its meetings as an internal tool." His note is that, "Not sure that this is actually occurring on a regular basis." I wasn't sure either. I don't know if we want to make this deterministic or whether or not we wanted to leave it open. That's why I've brought it to you.

KEVIN JONES: Just so we're clear – the word "occasionally" was a suggestion to replace the word "normally".

ELISE GERICH: To prepare informal notes, does that possibly refer to transcripts? I think we've had transcripts, which people can refer to if there's a question about the way the Minutes have been compiled. I remember it one way and say Kevin remembers it another way, do we have transcripts of the meetings? Would they be considered as informal notes, because we don't publish them? They're often kept confidentially.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was under the impression that we'd decided that the transcripts, or at least loose transcripts, were supposed to be prepared by ICANN staff and sent out rather shortly after the meeting and be used as a basis for the more formal Minutes. I think I like that idea. I'd prefer to see the word "normally" and I'd rather like to see that trend be taken up again. Carlos, do you have any comment on this?

CARLOS REYES: My recollection is essentially what you just mentioned – that we do ask for transcripts and then those transcripts are the basis for reviewing the notes that we compile as staff, as well as the Minutes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I was looking for these notes, just as one thing, from the previous meeting and I didn't find any. Are they sent out via email? Have I missed them? Or are they supposed to be stored in the work area?

CARLOS REYES: Those are sent out by email. I shall resend them.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Before you do that, let me dig deeper into my mailbox, because that means I was looking in the wrong place. Back to the issue at hand, I would prefer “normally”. What do other people think?

KEVIN JONES: Liman, I can withdraw my comment. It really was just a question of I didn't know that this was taking place. I'm comfortable with the word, as long as that's something we're actually doing.

JULIE HEDLUND: I've noted that. We'll revert to the original text, which was that the RSSAC normally prepared informal notes of its meeting as an internal tool. Moving along, Section (2.5) new Caucus Member selection. Moving down... I too was confused by this. I was a little confused by your comment, Kevin, and then since you were confused I think it's worthwhile that we look at this language and see if we can make better sense of it, or write it differently. Starting about mid-way through the paragraph, as you see here it says, “It's important to note that the names of candidates who are not recommended for membership are not revealed to the RSSAC.”

This is the Caucus Membership. “However, a candidate is not prevented from contacting the RSSAC concerning the process. If a candidate appeals a decision the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee Chair shall address the appeal on a case-by-case basis. Then there's the sentence,

“Candidates who have not been recommended for Membership may not reapply within the same 12-month period as their initial application.”

Kevin’s comment is, “This does not make sense to me. 1) the first sentence makes it impossible to enforce the last sentence. 2) do we really want rejected candidates contacting a unknowing Co Chair only to have the Co Chair direct them back to the Membership Committee? By “last sentence” Kevin, did you mean the sentence that stands alone, that begins, “Candidates who have not been recommended,” or did you mean...? I wasn’t clear.

KEVIN JONES:

“Candidates who have not been recommended for Membership may not reapply within the 12-month period.” There needs to be some information of those names being transferred, because the Membership Committee only has a term of one year, so they won’t be there to block that in the 12-month period.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Good point. I’ll open this up for comment. I’m not sure what to suggest as a change. I should note though that that sentence may be a holdover from a time when these Procedures adopted some of the things that were in the SSAC Procedures. That is a statement that’s true of the SSAC Membership process. It’s not clear to me that it’s something that we want to include in the Caucus Membership process.

TRIPTI SINHA: Julie, I'm a little bit lost on the document. I know there was the Caucus Membership Committee Charter that was included, and I don't see that anywhere. I was wondering, shouldn't that come before this?

JULIE HEDLUND: Sorry, I apologize but we're not actually in the document, we're in the proposed edits. Let me tell you where that shows up. Section (2) is all about the RSSAC Caucus. (2.1) Purpose, (2) Principles, and then (2.3) Procedures, Caucus Selection, Caucus Work. Then we have (2.4), the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee Charter. That does indeed fall before (2.5), the New RSSAC Caucus Member Selection.

TRIPTI SINHA: I'm wondering if, from a logical perspective, you first want to describe how people become Caucus Members, and you describe the Membership Committee forwarding names. Then when you describe an appeal, if we ever do get to that situation and you want to describe the process, how you appeal... Anyway, this is a sidebar. Back to the original point, which was what is this appeal process? I'm just speaking from the Membership Committee's perspective. I'm not sure we've encountered that yet, so I'm not sure what the process would be.

I do agree with the comments that Kevin brings to the table, which is why would you... Just the various comments that he had; that he accepts (1) and (2). He highlights the enforcement and having them go to the Chair when they're not quite familiar with the Chair yet.

JULIE HEDLUND: Okay, I'm not sure what to suggest.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I actually don't have that much of a problem with the text. The thing that kind of bothers me is at the end. The names of the candidates are not revealed. Fine. However, a candidate may contact the RSSAC concerning the process. It doesn't say the RSSAC Co Chair, it just says the RSSAC.

JULIE HEDLUND: Maybe I missed something, but you were saying there was language that bothered you at the end? Liman, are you still there? Did we lose Liman?

KEVIN JONES: I believe he'll be back in a second.

ELISE GERICH: In the chat room it says, "I hit the wrong button on the phone. I'll be back momentarily."

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you.

ELISE GERICH: I don't know if this Internet thing's going to work!

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm back. An appeals process works so that a candidate who is rejected then contacts the RSSAC to complain about the process. That sounds just fine to me. If the candidate appeals the decision the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee Chair shall address the appeal. That's the one that bothers me. It only says "address" and this is a bit fuzzy. I think it would be more obvious to me if it said something like, "If a candidate appeals the decision, the RSSAC should address this on a case-by-case basis," meaning one step up.

KEVIN JONES: Liman, I'm agreeing with part of what you said, in that the ability of having somebody contact RSSAC is really not all that useful if all the RSSAC can do is funnel them back to the Membership Committee, which they're complaining about in the first place. I think that part we're in agreement in. I think the concern I have is that the way this would happen is that somebody would contact the RSSAC about being rejected, and we don't even know they've been rejected.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I don't see that as much of a problem. If someone comes to me and says, "The Membership Committee rejected my application to the process, I didn't like it," then I would of course say, "I'll take a look at that. I'll talk to the Membership Committee and take it on from there." Is that problematic?

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, if you remember, at the last meeting we discussed this. Should the Membership Committee reject applicants, this would be brought to the RSSAC Meeting. That we've been put in a position where we're actually making a judgment on potential candidates, and isn't it incumbent upon us to inform the RSSAC as to why we did that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, but it's to complain about the process?

TRIPTI SINHA: Right. This is to address Kevin's point that if someone complained to the RSSAC, they would know, but what I'm saying is that if we revise the process to say the Membership Committee must inform the RSSAC as to why they rejected someone, it would not be a surprise to the RSSAC.

KEVIN JONES: It would also make the other part more enforceable if there is an intent to block somebody from reapplying.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. What we need to do is to change the Procedures so that the RSSAC actually is informed that someone has been rejected? Just a question.

JULIE HEDLUND: Do you think we actually have language in another part of the document, in a slightly different section...? There is parallel language in the same section. This is something we discussed last week, as you

recalled correctly Tripti. It was the discussion about whether or not the RSSAC accepted all the recommendations from the Membership Committee, and I think that we said that the Membership Committee Chair contacts candidates.

What I'm looking at is in the center section here: "We discussed two weeks ago that the Membership Committee Chair will contact candidates and thank them for their interest in the RSSAC, but indicate that the RSSAC is not recommending their addition to the Caucus at this time. On request of the person concerned, the RSSAC explains its decision to refuse the person to the Caucus." So we do have a process where the Membership Committee is contacting candidates. I don't know whether or not...

Then we have that appeal mentioned here as well, and I wasn't quite sure how to address this. It makes sense to say then, "If a candidate appeals a Membership decision, the RSSAC Co Chair shall determine how to address the appeal on a case-by-case basis. Here we also have the possibility of an appeal, but this is when candidates are recommended by the Membership Committee to the full RSSAC, and then the RSSAC objects, and then the candidate is not accepted and has the opportunity to appeal, and then the RSSAC Co Chairs determine how to address the appeal.

If you look back up and what we've just been discussing, this other section is just talking about if the Membership Committee rejects the candidate. There is again the possibility of an appeal. Here we say that appeal is addressed by the Membership Committee Chair, because it hasn't actually gone up to the full RSSAC. There's parallel language here.

One deals with the fact that the actions are happening within the Membership Committee, and that's why it says the appeal goes to the Membership Committee Chair.

The subsequent language deals with what happens when the Membership Committee has made a recommendation to the RSSAC and the RSSAC has objected. I'm suggesting that perhaps we need parallel language here. I'm just pointing out that there's synergy here, and I'm not exactly sure how to address it. These things do seem to have a connection.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Julie, thank you so much in catching the subtlety in the differences. You're absolutely right. They are two completely different cases. Last week's case was about candidates who were rejected by the RSSAC for RSSAC Caucus Membership. What we're talking about now is the Membership Committee does not forward a candidate who has expressed an interest. If you remember last week we decided the Membership Committee will not decide who is a Member of the Caucus, they simply forward names.

Now, if we don't forward a name – and we see that instance happening in cases where someone writes to us and says, "I'd like to be a Member of the Caucus," and they don't send in their supporting material upon request, which has happened a couple of times – then you're absolutely right. We would need to specify what the process of appeal is for that kind of case, where the Membership Committee does not forward their name.

It's not so much they've been rejected for Membership, but they've not been recommended for Membership. The language is correct. If you read the language it does say, "They've not been recommended for Membership."

JULIE HEDLUND:

Thank you. Back to Liman's comment then on whether the RSSAC needs to be informed in this process, right now the process all happened within the context of the Membership Committee, but there is the point that Kevin made, that this happens in the Membership Committee, but then it's written that the candidate can contact the RSSAC as a whole, who of course has no idea what happened within the Membership Committee, because the name had not been forwarded.

I think the reason that we say that the appeal is dealt with by the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee Chair, is because this is a process within the Membership Committee. I'm just wondering whether or not we want to say that the candidate is not prevented from contacting the RSSAC concerning the process. To Kevin's point, the RSSAC hasn't known anything about this process – unless of course the RSSAC is informed, as Liman points out. The Membership Committee then informs the RSSAC that these are names that they did not forward. Then the RSSAC would know. I'm not quite sure how we want to handle this.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

The longer we talk about this, the more I actually feel that what's already there is actually pretty good. I keep repeating, I don't have a problem with someone coming up to me saying, "I have this problem

and I happen to not know about it,” because that’s my standard operation when I don’t know about things. That will lead me into investigating what’s been going on, and that’s how a normal appeal in a court works too.

You bring it to the next higher court, and they don’t have a clue what’s been going on. You bring them information, “This is what happened in the lower court, I disagree.” Then the court will have to seek information from multiple sources. That’s nothing strange to me. The fact that you didn’t know what happened doesn’t prevent you from being able to get the information and make an informed decision at a later stage. We can remove that language, because everyone is always welcome to bring anything to RSSAC’s attention.

We can reject it and say, “Not related,” or we can say, “Oops, that’s something we need to have a look at.” It’s actually superfluous text. I’m happy to leave it in as it stands. As we’ve talked about the two different scenarios here; the first one where the candidate is rejected by the Membership Committee – since that was brought up by you, Julie, I’ve come to realize that the text there is probably pretty good.

JULIE HEDLUND: Thank you Liman. Kevin, do you agree that we should leave it as-is, or do you have suggestions for changes?

KEVIN JONES: I agree that the sentence that starts with “however” is not necessary and probably should be removed. I think that it at least focuses

direction back to the Membership Committee for something that they manage, but I still feel like there needs to be a process for an ability to enforce the last sentence, that says, “Candidates who have not been recommended for Membership may not reapply within the same 12-month period.”

There is something missing from that, if those names are not being shared. You can add a statement that the Membership Committee must transfer that information over to the next Membership Committee. That would address that issue.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I fully agree with you that that needs to happen, but do we really need to specify it in the document? You are quite right, but to me it’s obvious that when a previous generation leaves the office they hand over the documentation to the incoming people for the next term. Do we need to specify that?

KEVIN JONES:

I guess I’m okay with that being omitted.

JULIE HEDLUND:

Then concerning the text that says, “However, candidates not prevented from contacting RSSAC concerning the process,” Kevin, you were suggesting that doesn’t need to be in there. Liman, you also said people could always bring things to the RSSAC so it didn’t necessarily need to be there. Should we delete that sentence?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm happy either way.

KEVIN JONES: Less is more.

JULIE HEDLUND: Then we'll delete it. I want to move to the next one. I am aware of the time. This was an AI for me to take from last time, and that was that we needed some notification going from the RSSAC to the person who's not accepted on the Caucus, that there needed to be some communication back to that person. I had put in the sentence, "On request to the person concerned, the RSSAC explains its decision to refuse to add a person to the RSSAC Caucus." We addressed the comment from Elise about whether or not the RSSAC can reject.

The concern was that if the RSSAC does reject a candidate, do we have a way of informing the person? This was a change I made. I wanted to call it to your attention. I tried to capture it from last time. Any objection to that change? Hearing none. There were just a couple more things, and I don't know if you want to go through this right now. I've got eight minutes after the hour. What I incorporated into the document was a new section for the Co Chair Election that Liman had proposed. He had questions about the text, which you'll see here on your screen, and had proposed an entirely new section.

I don't know if people had a chance to read this. It was in the document I sent out last week and of course in the version I sent yesterday. I don't know how you'd like to have us address this, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's a good question.

JULIE HEDLUND: I can go back to your original comment. You struck the language that was there before.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is the larger text chunk that contains the "verbally" things we discussed before.

JULIE HEDLUND: Right, but this is the first time we've discussed this new section. It was replacing a section that had some of the same information, but I think we've rewritten it to make it clearer.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This comes from someone else. I probably forwarded it, but...

JULIE HEDLUND: I thought you'd proposed it? Your comment here was, "is it really useful to [unclear 01:07:08] limit the number of times a Co Chair can be reelected in a row? I suggest we do." You're making some criticisms of

the text that was in the document at the time, and then proposing a rewritten section. This was quite a while back, just so you know.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It was.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm not surprised if it doesn't immediately come to your mind.

ELISE GERICH: At least on the text that you're proposing about invited guests to RSSAC Meetings, I think we covered that earlier when we changed the language.

JULIE HEDLUND: That actually is following this section. This section is (2.6.11). We actually had Section (2.7.4) on invited guests, and the question that Suzanne had, with an invited guest to be considered for the Caucus, or an invited guest to be considered for the RSSAC. What I found was that it seemed that we might need to mention this in two places – one that relates to invited guests to the RSSAC Caucus, and one that relates to invited guests to the RSSAC as a whole. That would simply be that those would be Member candidates that have not been appointed to the RSSAC, or whose terms have not commenced, might serve as invited guests.

It seemed instead that invited guests really applied primarily to the Caucus. I've broken this up into two sections. Back to the Co Chair Candidate Election, that doesn't relate to the invited guests issue, I don't think.

ELISE GERICH: Now I'm really confused. What I was trying to say is that I thought the language about invited guests to the RSSAC, we covered that earlier when we discussed we changed the language: "The RSSAC holds closed meetings, and on the request of the Co Chairs or a decision of the RSSAC, we will invite guests." It seems to me this is a repetitive thing. It just makes it more specific – the RSSAC, not the RSSAC Caucus.

JULIE HEDLUND: The difficult is that there was a section called "Invited Guests", which is what you see here, (2.7.4), that had not been deleted from the document. That is, "What is an invited guest?" In the same way that we have a section that says, "What is an alternate?" Perhaps we don't need to define what an invited guest is. That would be my question.

ELISE GERICH: That was my point. I thought that we didn't need to.

JULIE HEDLUND: That's fine. This was text that existed, and it wasn't clear to me that there would no longer be a section for invited guests. I'm happy to take it out.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I agree that we don't need to define it here, under the condition that it's somewhere else, that we can invite guests to the meeting. I think it does.

KEVIN JONES: I thought that the other instance of "invited guests" was actually limited to the Co Chairs, where this section actually makes it that the RSSAC as a whole can invite guests?

JULIE HEDLUND: It says "by formal resolution". That would be as the whole RSSAC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: As an alternative – so it can either be by invitation from the Co Chair or by formal resolution. I think that works fine. Do we need...?

JULIE HEDLUND: [Can we delete 01:12:00] these two sections?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's my proposal.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm happy to do so. Then we just have remaining the rewritten section on a Co Chair election. This section has been proposed in the latest

version of the document. I didn't see any edits from anyone on it. I don't know how much people focused on it. Kevin, did you see any questions with this section?

KEVIN JONES: I was fine with it.

ELISE GERICH: I'm assuming that when it says "from the Membership" that's only from the RSSAC Membership, not the RSSAC and the RSSAC Caucus Membership?

JULIE HEDLUND: Perhaps we need to be clearer with that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You're quite right. That's the intent at least. Yes.

JULIE HEDLUND: I think we've been trying to be very clear to say "RSSAC" or "RSSAC Caucus" so I think we need to say... Actually, we have been careful... Actually, there was one note that I think you had made, Kevin, and that was that we were trying to avoid saying "the voting Members of RSSAC" and if we want to be consistent with language here we'd just say, "The RSSAC will elect Co Chair candidates from the RSSAC." We've tried to avoid saying "Membership" and tried to be clear that we're just talking about RSSAC. If we're talking about Caucus, we say "RSSAC Caucus".

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's fine.

JULIE HEDLUND: I'm just seeing if there's anything else like that. I think there's another sentence here that says, "The standing Co Chair will..." Okay, here we have text that we've already discussed, where we said we'd changed it where the standing Co Chair will call a vote. Then we say, "Members will indicate their selection," and take out "verbally". That language is also here, and I'll make sure it's consistent with what we've already decided today.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: The same thing occurs in the penultimate paragraph, where we say, "In the event of a tie a runoff will occur with Members (verbally) indicating their selection." Take out "verbally". I'll make those changed. I'll make all the changes we've agreed to today and send around a clean document.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: By doing so, we've actually run out of opinions for the moment.

KEVIN JONES: I had a question, a last comment. It was for the work product numbering, where there was a different process being used for the public documents, that there was specific care to remove the Members from the confidential publication?

JULIE HEDLUND: I looked at that, and I didn't bring it to this group, because that was actually language that I know was picked up from the SSAC. I thought your comment made sense, that if you're numbering documents, whether they're confidential or whether they're public, there wasn't any reason not to include the publication number. I just thought that was actually good clarification, Kevin.

KEVIN JONES: Thank you.

JULIE HEDLUND: I don't have anything else. I can send a clean version.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you so much Julie. This is immensely appreciated. We'll wait for that and we will take a new stab at the following meeting, hopefully with minor touchups that we find in the cleaned-up version.

JULIE HEDLUND: I should note I may have difficulty or be somewhat constrained joining the next meeting. I'm actually going to be in [unclear 01:16:50] doing

some DNSSEC key stuff. Anyway, I operate one of the safes and we have to do some stuff at the safe. I will try and join. I might just have to coordinate my timing with Carlos and Steve.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, thank you. If there's a specific timeslot during the meeting that is less inconvenient for you, let me know and I'll try to shift the Agenda around so it fits your schedule.

JULIE HEDLUND: Will do. I'm sure I can be flexible with that as well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. now, we have two small issues left on the Agenda in the Any Other Business section. It's the LA Meeting schedule. Steve, do you know anything more about that at this moment?

STEVE SHENG: Yes Liman. We've requested slots for the LA Meeting similar to what we requested in the London Meeting. I can't send the schedule to the RSSAC list because those are not finalized yet, but I think in general, RSSAC Members should expect similar sessions to what they had in London. Carlos, do you have anything to add?

CARLOS REYES: Sure. Just so everyone's aware of what we requested, as Steve mentioned, it's very similar to London. There will be some sort of

working session on Monday. Then Tuesday will be working sessions. Wednesday, at the moment we've requested some sort of open meeting, which would constitute the Caucus Meeting we've discussed. That would be on Wednesday. Then Thursday morning would be the RSSAC business meeting – the monthly meeting.

TRIPTI SINHA: Essentially you're saying we should plan to be there Monday through Thursday, correct?

CARLOS REYES: Correct.

ELISE GERICH: I know we had several working sessions at the last ICANN Meeting, and I felt that we used that time well, particularly since we were beginning to get ourselves organized. Do we all feel that we still need so many working sessions at this upcoming ICANN Meeting?

TRIPTI SINHA: Elise, thank you. I was thinking the same thing; that if we do have all those working sessions, what's the Agenda? What's the work that we'll be working on?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I hear you and you may well be right. There are a couple of things that are looming at the horizon that we need to address. Whether we actually need two or three working slots is less obvious.

ELISE GERICH: Yes. One of the issues I had last time, Liman, was that we had all those big blocks and people kept coming in and out. Obviously because we all have other meetings, we need to concentrate on something. We have three blocks and if we only get, say, a third of the people at each of those three blocks, we can't really make much progress. Whereas if we can try to concentrate our attendance on a work session, instead of spreading it across like peanut butter, maybe it would work better.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I hear you. If I propose that we try to concentrate on one of the days. I'm trying to think whether we can use one of the other time slots for something else less formal.

STEVE SHENG: Liman, I think perhaps one thing is if the time requested would guarantee us RSSAC rooms, in those time slots, I think RSSAC doesn't have to occupy all of those slots. Perhaps what's helpful is if you could work on a detailed schedule and then by filling out that schedule it would inform us exactly how many meeting slots we need. Would that be a good approach?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, it would, at least from our perspective. What I can do is I can propose how to use that time. One idea I have in my head right now is that we could use the Monday time for those who are interested and who have the time to spare – to sit down and have an informal discussion about things that we then work through in a more formal working session on the Tuesday. Sometimes you can hash out things beforehand by just having a few people discuss it and exchange views.

It doesn't prevent other people from having different opinions, but we can at least limit the amount of exchange we need to do in one session. Let me work on a schedule and see what I can come up with. I'll propose that and you can take a stab at it and comment as you see fit.

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, it would be really good if we could get the exact times for the Monday meeting and the Thursday meeting, because that would help with travel plans.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Obviously, but I'll have to ask Steve and Carlos, because I don't know what the status is with the entire planning for the ICANN Meeting.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, so then I redirect the question to Steve. If you could, at your earliest convenience, send us the times for the Monday and Thursday?

STEVE SHENG: Thank you Tripti. We'll do that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Steve, do you have any feeling for when the final schedule will be set?

STEVE SHENG: I don't. We will pin the Meetings Team today and see when those will be available. I'm expecting them sometime fairly soon.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. All right, I would like to move onto the next Item, which is the ICANN Leadership Training offer we've received. I'm a bit [confused 01:24:35] here. One thing is that it will probably be at least partially useful for me to attend that, but I think my schedule is full that weekend – at least there are other meetings going on that I'm expected to attend, so I don't think I'll be able to make it.

Is there anyone else who thinks they could benefit from attending there? We obviously have two slots offered to us, so I'm happy to send someone else, if you want to. Please state your interest or comment in other ways?

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, could you give us a brief synopsis of the nature of this Leadership Training? What are we talking about exactly?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well, it's what I forwarded to you. That's what I know about it.

TRIPTI SINHA: I'm sorry. I haven't read that. My apologies.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I sent it out earlier today, so don't apologize. "Participants will have a chance to meet leaders from the other SOs and ACs, discuss ICANN hot policy topics in an in-depth manner, deepen the understanding of key ICANN processes, develop presentation and leadership skills focused on personal effectiveness, and run [meeting and foster 01:26:25] processes, and facilitate a topic on their topic of expertise, in accordance with the curriculum. Experienced leaders only." Let me phrase it like this: do have a look at what I forwarded.

If you feel tempted by that, please let me know and I'd be happy to forward your name. The drawback is they have a deadline of tomorrow. It won't take you that long to read the message, but if you have any interest in that, please let me know and I'll forward your name to ICANN.

KEVIN JONES: That is taking place the week before the ICANN Meeting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Good point, yes. I think I'll leave it at that actually. I won't have time to go myself. My default action will be to not forward a name to them, but if you are interested please let me know because I'm happy to forward

your name. Okay, thank you. It's one minute past half past five. Is there anything else you want to talk about right now?

KEVIN JONES: I just wanted to quickly say that for our next meeting I will actually be at a conference and I may not be able to get to a quiet place to take the call. I'll have to see how that works out.

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, for the next meeting I'm running a conference so I'll certainly not be able to attend.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Understood. Thanks for the forewarning. All right, thank you everyone for attending. See you or talk to you at the next teleconference in two weeks' time.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]