
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: We try to get going. I did send out an agenda. We, let's start with the roll call before we get to the agenda.

So, going through the [inaudible] of the letters. Is there anyone here from [inaudible], Brad, are you on the call?

BRAD VERD: Here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: B-Root? Bill Manning? No Bill. C-Root? Paul Vixie or Hank Kilmer?

HANK KILMER: Hank is here, and Paul said he was going to attend but I don't see him yet.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. From D-Root, I see excuses from Christy, and Gerry was going to step into her shoes this time. Gerry, are you on the call?

GERRY SNEERINGER: I'm here. Hello everyone. Long time no see.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Oh hello, good to hear from you again. Is Carlo on the call as well?

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.

GERRY SNEERINGER: No, it's just me.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. That's not just. You are on the call, that's great. And from E-root. Kevin, are you there?

BOBBY CATES: Kevin is not available, this is Bobby Cates speaking. I'll probably [CROSSTALK] time as well, Kevin will be out again.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. F-Root, Suzanne or Jim.

[CROSSTALK]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yup. Okay. I heard you both, thank you. E-Root, Jim or Kevin.

KEVIN WRIGHT: This is Kevin. Jim is out today.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Hello Kevin. And H-Root. Howard? No Howard. Okay, from I-Root, I am here. From K-Root, Daniel or [inaudible].

DANIEL KARREBERG: Daniel is present.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello Daniel. N-Root, John Crain [inaudible]? No one from N-Root. And from M-Root?

JUN MURAI: Jun is here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Oh, hello Jun. From NTA, I think I saw Ashely in the rooster?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Yes, I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And I think I heard Elise from the IANA?

ELISE GERICH: Yes, I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent. How about Duane from Verisign? Are you here?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane is here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent. Russ Mundy from SSAC? No Russ. Marc Blanchett from the IED?

MARC BLANCHETT: Yes, here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent. And from staff, I heard from Barbara, right?

BARBARA ROSEMAN: Yes, Barbara is here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And who else is here from ICANN staff?

STEVE CHENG: Steve is here.

CARLOS REYES: This is Carlos.

KATHY SCHNITT: And this is Kathy.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yup. Excellent, thank you all. Is there anyone who I didn't call out?

PAUL VIXIE: Hello, this is Vixie joining. Sorry I'm late.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello Paul, welcome. Excellent. [Inaudible], one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, we have nine letter members represented, which means we actually have a quorum if we have to go to some kind of vote. All right. Some agenda. You have the agenda in front of you in the Adobe Connect.

Is there anyone on the call who cannot see the Adobe Connect window right now? Who is just on the phone?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I actually can't, but don't slow down on account of me but the plug-in keeps crashing on my machine, so I'm about to try it on another machine.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. But that reminds me that I have to spell out some things a bit more, than just to refer you to the Adobe Connect window. All right. So the agenda for today is some RSSAC housekeeping, and we actually have some more than we usually do.

Review action items as usual, approve the minutes from September 11th. We also, I think, have minutes before that, from the August, was it 30th? That we didn't approve at the last meeting. Membership committee update, the RSSAC mailing list archive discussion. I don't know if we want to have that on the telephone, or if we want to postpone it to the physical meeting in Los Angeles, because we have ample time to discuss such things there.

So that's not an issue right now if you want to discuss it here now. The schedule for ICANN 51, some upcoming internal processes, we have the, hopefully the operational procedures document approval, and then I hope to have quick reports from the work parties for RSSAC 001 and 002. And should your work items, is something I want to just open your eyes.

And that actually is tied into the ICANN 51 schedule. So we might have that during the ICANN 51 discussion. And of course, as usual, any other business. We should add actually there, before any other business, we should add the next meeting, because we probably want to have one more telephone conference before the physical meeting, and the typical day would be October 9th, the Thursday in two weeks' time.

But I, myself, will probably be traveling to Los Angeles on that date, so let's look at what other options we have when we get there. So I would like to add next meeting before any other business. Any comments? Is there anything else you want to add?

SUZANNE WOOLF: This is Suzanne. I just have one quick item for any other business. I sent it out to the mist, but I want to draw two people's attention.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Remind me, since I don't have the entire [inaudible].

SUZANNE WOOLF: Oh, just I think we, the Board of Directors sort of an overview update on [inaudible], our progress on our reorganization, and basically a flag that says, "Hi, we're here, we're ready to work with you. Please bring us your questions and issues." And I drafted something which I sent to the list, and if it's okay with both, I would like to send it to the Board.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right.

SUZANNE WOOLF: And now we've taken care of it. So. No further discussion was needed, never mind any other business. That was my only other business.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. All right. More ideas? More things to discuss? If not, I will start going on RSSAC housekeeping. We should review some action items. Carlos or Steve, do you have the action list from the last meeting at hand?

STEVE SHENG: Yes Liman. I've projected on the Adobe Connect the action list from the last meeting. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry. There are there. Excellent. So, Carols to send out the minutes from August 28th and a call for approval.

CARLOS REYES: Hi Liman, this is Carlos. I did that, but it sounds like we would like to approve them on this call as well. So we'll go ahead and do that on this call.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. Looking back on the mailing list, I don't see any comments whatsoever. So, let's do that formally at this meeting. Thank you. Next, Julie [inaudible] to create a final draft of the operations procedure document. That has been done. Carlos to distribute the ICANN 51 meeting schedule to the mailing list. It was sent to me and I have distributed it to the mailing list.

So it has been done. And RSSAC members interested in participating in ICANN leadership training, contact Liman. That's been done as well. I only had interest from Bill and I've forwarded his name to the committee that deals with that function, also done.

Thank you Carlos. So, approving minutes. We have two sets of minutes. The ones from August 28th and the ones from September 11th. Are there comments or issues with these minutes? I hear none. So

unless there is any discussion, I will take, minutes are approved. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Liman? Just to formally let you know, I've abstained on this because I wasn't present at the meetings, on the 11th.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right. So you abstain from, all right, of course. You cannot approve minutes from a meeting where you didn't participate.

PAUL VIXIE: Excuse me, this is Vixie. If we were following Robert's, we would not be doing a roll call vote, and so abstention does not matter, as long as it passes, as long there.... The minutes could say passed without objection, without mentioning that people like Daniel or myself, who were not present, didn't say anything.

[CROSSTALK]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. Carlos, I guess you captured that. And thank you for the good recommendation. All right. Are there any updates from the membership committee? You have them from [inaudible], but she's not here, so Paul and Kathy, can you give us any updates?

PAUL VIXIE: The update is, we have I think one new person in the queue, who we have not gotten back to. But the rate has slowed. I believe that we have approved the membership of the last batch of two people, and I believe [inaudible] has already told the full committee that our goal is to approve every second month, rather than asking for approval every time something comes in.

So unless there are objections to that, based on the results it will have as far as [inaudible] of our response to indications of interest, that's going to remain our work style.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. And this remaining person, when do you plan to bring that to the attention of the committee, possibly together with...? When is the next time that we're supposed to expect names from you?

PAUL VIXIE: I think you could expect it in the October meeting just before ICANN.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Just taking a few notes myself here. All right. Are there any questions to the membership committee?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Yeah, there is one suggestion. In the case that someone comes up who really wants to participate in work on one current document, I would

like the membership committee to make an exception, and to do it faster. Just in case we have someone, a document leader wants to bring into [inaudible] work, I think it's important that they also formally recognize those members of the caucus.

PAUL VIXIE:

I hear the suggestion. I personally hear some merit in that suggestion. I will take it up with the membership committee, because that would be a process change as far as, you know, for example, if someone asks to join, we might have to sort of talk to them about those specific interests before we decided to place them in view. So, I hear Daniel's suggestion, I will take it up with the others.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. Any other comments or questions? All right. Moving right along. Next on our agenda is the RSSAC mailing list archive discussion. So my first question is, the issue at hand is, should the mailing list for the RSSAC committee, the archive of that mailing list would not be publically accessible?

And we wanted to have a discussion at some time, some time ago, we decided to postpone it to focus on other things. The issue remains. Do we want to discuss that here and now, or should we postpone that to the physical meeting in Los Angeles where we can have an ample timeslot to discuss internal housekeeping things? And not waste time on a phone call for that.

SAMUEL: This is Samuel. I brought this up, and I'm happy to discuss that later.

PAUL VIXIE: This is Vixie noting that I will not be, and others likewise, will not be at the physical meeting. And I think we should treat anything that really deserves discussion by the whole committee, be done in email.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. So, your proposal is to move this to the mailing list, right?

PAUL VIXIE: Well, yes but sometimes mailing list discussions are somewhat unfocused. So, you might want to manage it as if we were following Robert's and say, we have a motion on the table as follows. It is time for discussion. I will call for a vote on day X, to make sure that we actually hold the discussion and that pontification be kept to a minimum.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Fair enough.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I take an action to [revise?] this discussion.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You take an action to do what?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Revise this discussion in the matter that Paul suggests.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent, yes please. That would be much appreciative. And can you also initiate it? We should... We should also decide on a date to vote. I suggest at the next teleconference, which will be around October 9th, not on, but around.

Okay. So I hereby ask Daniel to initiate the discussion and try to shepherd that, and to make sure that we have... To make sure to point out that the discussion at that teleconference. And we will decide the date later today on the agenda. So you won't leave today without knowing what that day is.

Okay. Continuing. ICANN 51 schedule. Let me see where I put that.

Here we go. Now Carlos and Steve have received the schedule for the meeting in Los Angeles, and it's now being cast in stone. So we will have meeting sessions on the Monday, from three to six PM, a working session which will be a closed session. On Tuesday, October 14th, we will have a working session from 9 to 12 in the morning, and then from 2 to 5. And then on the Wednesday, we will have an open caucus meeting at 10:30 on the 12th.

On the Tuesday, we have a timeslot for 15 minutes to meet with the ICANN NomCom. The agenda for that meeting is not detailed to me right now, but we have a timeslot with them there. So, together with

staff, we kind of drafted the agenda items that we might want to discuss in Los Angeles.

So, you should have received that in email, I'll just read it out for those who cannot have access to that right now. So, accountability discussion, specifically with respect to RSSAC. How one, if so, which other supporting organization and advisory committee groups we might want to interact with. If so, how do we do it? Which do we want to interact with and so forth?

We should plan for activities for the first half year of 2015, to see what it is that we might want to look at in the future. There are a couple of RITF technical drafts, but we might to have a look at it. One is from, I suppose, no might not. It's a draft regarding how to scale the DNS system, the name of the draft is draft dash lee dash DNS dash scaling root.

And also how to, another one, how to securely distribute the DNS root, draft [inaudible], he has this root, this that root. So we could bring them to the table and have a look at them and see if we want to make a statement of any kind. We have a couple of housekeeping things we might want to discuss. Secondary representatives to our group. There are still a few members who haven't pointed secondary and how to handle secondary in an efficient and convenient manner.

We need to elect a new co-chair for the end of the year. Jun, your term is running out at the end of the year, and we have to make sure that that election is completed before the end of the year, and even back up

a bit so that things can be handled by the Board before the end of the year.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, that's what I understand.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. And we need to make sure that we have, that we follow the procedures and that we don't run out of time. We also have to look at appointing a Board liaison, or make sure that we have a liaison to the Board properly. RSSAC administration, how do you use the wiki, design and management of the wiki. Again, the open mailing list archives is now being moved to the mailing list, so that will be removed from this list.

Whether we can use the transcripts as meeting notes, and how to take more informal notes from meetings, and also some feedback from RSSAC support from, the support we have from ICANN staff. And that, a number of things we might want to dig within our closed meetings. For the public meeting, we could look at having reports from liaisons, we should probably to an introduction to the [inaudible] members who happen to be present, either in person or over the telephone.

And we can also look at having work party sessions during the public meetings. That's as we stand. I'm quite happy to take suggestions for more things, or in removing things. So, that would look like a starting point, at least.

PAUL VIXIE: This is Vixie. My hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry, too many windows here. Go ahead.

PAUL VIXIE: Putting my hand up.

ELISE GERICH: And this is Elise, my hand is up too.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Since I've been thrown out of Adobe Connect yet again, I can't see your hands. So please, Paul, go ahead.

PAUL VIXIE: So, given, as I said before, that I will not be at this ICANN meeting, I'll actually be in your time zone Liman, that we... I will not be present in order to help discuss the latest ATF draft. So, if this remains on the agenda to be discussed in person in Los Angeles, then I suggest that we use the next meeting, the last teleconference before the ICANN meeting itself, to give me an opportunity to at least go over the first of the two drafts that you have mentioned here because I'm the co-author.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That sounds reasonable. Yes. I'm going to ask Carlos to make a note, to make the we include that on the agenda for the next teleconference,

because it's likely that I will forget it if I don't have help to remember it.
But it sounds like a perfectly viable thing.

Any other ideas?

ELISE GERICH: Hi Liman, this is Elise.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, sorry. Elise, please go ahead.

ELISE GERICH: Okay, so in the last meeting, the London meeting, where we have a lot of blocks of time, many of us had to go in and out based on, you know, other conflicts during the ICANN meeting. Is it possible to slot certain topics at different times during the working sessions so that people could know when certain topics are going to come up? And if those are ones that are particularly of interest, not interest, I guess where you, that people would have specific interests such as the IETF drafts or interactions with SO/ACs or whatever.

You'd know and so you would know what you're going to miss, or you would know how to try to reschedule your day so that you could be there for certain topics. Could we, you know, assign certain topics to certain work sessions?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, definitely. I think that's a good idea. As you were speaking, I'm thinking here, would it make sense if I tried to create a matrix, so to speak, who can attend which session, and maybe we can also, you could say, "I cannot attend but here, here, here, and I'm interested in this and this and that." That might help me to create an agenda that, an agenda that meets minimum resistance.

I'm not going to say the best agenda, but the least bad one.

ELISE GERICH: Well, that could be one way to approach it Liman. Another is to identify which things where you'll need a quorum of members, for instance, if there is a vote. Like you have election. You need to make sure enough of the voting membership present and that you might want the matrix only for those topics so that you'll know that everyone will be there for the vote, or the discussion about the vote.

And the other, I don't know it could be pretty complex to try and schedule it. Or you could just say that they're going to go in this order, on this day, and if you finish early, you won't use the room for the rest of the day, and they'll go in this order for the next day.

I don't know, there is several ways to approach it. Maybe other people have better ideas than mine.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I hear you. I have recent requests. I'll see what I can come up, if people have ideas how to handle this, well let me know. I do understand the problem and I have all respect for that because I'm usually running in

and out myself. But I'm very glad that we don't have anything on a Thursday, that's when we have the K roll over sessions. So that happens to work for me. But the rest of you have other agendas and other priorities.

So, these I think I'm going to send out a quick message to try to pick up how many of you are likely to attend the various time slots. So I know where to put in the things that we need to vote, that's a very good idea. Any other comments?

MARC BLANCHETT:

Marc speaking. The public meeting agenda, I would suggest that the caucus being involved in, you know, handling that part of the agenda. Just a suggestion. You know, having them more involved, and you know, shaping the agenda of the other sessions.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

That's actually a good idea. I'll send out the message to the mailing list.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

This is Daniel. I don't think that is a good idea. I think what would be a good idea is to have part of the meeting dedicated to the processes that are running in the caucus, which is the RSSAC 001 and the RSSAC 002 documents and where they are. I don't think, I wouldn't see a way in which the caucus could, as a group of people, organize the participation in the open meeting.

I think what the committee could do is to ask the people present and specifically the people in the caucus if they have any comment on what RSSAC has been doing and suggestions for new work. But I don't think we should have like a caucus organized part of the meeting. I don't see the purpose and I don't see the way to organize this properly.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: All right. That's actually not how I interpreted Mark's proposal. What I took from Marc's proposal was to ask for input from the caucus for, if there are specific things that they would like to see dealt with during the meeting. That would come from individual... It wouldn't be a part of the meeting that's led by, or where the caucus is a driving force, but to give the members of the caucus an opportunity to give some idea to the agenda. I think still is a good idea. Marc?

MARC BLANCHETT: Yeah I was going to say, it was more on the principle of getting those people involved in that [inaudible] meeting. Get them involved.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Asking for input of the agenda is fine with me. There are no objections to that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Any other comments regarding the meeting in Los Angeles? All right. Moving right along, upcoming [inaudible] processes. With that, I wanted to refer to primarily the reappointment

of those members of the committee who were appointed for only one year. And following that, the appointment or re-appointment of a RSSAC co-chair, for the term that initially was for only one year.

Going forward, the co-chairs will have two years staggered, and as you know, going forward the formal members of the committee will also have staggered terms for three years, if I remember correctly. And we're kind of engaging the course now to make that happen.

The proposed way forward here is to deal with appointing the new, or re-appoint formal members of the committee first, because it could be one of these new members might want to stand for the co-chair election, it would be kind of awkward a representative was elected co-chair and then they had to step down because another person from that [inaudible] point. So to me, it makes perfect sense to look at the letter appointment and then the co-chair election.

And the way forward, we propose, Steve and I talked a little about this, that we propose the following steps to go forward. First, we ask the representative from B, C, K and M, which are the letters in question here, to provide a point of contact in their respective organizations capable of making recommendations, or rather, if you wish, appointing a member on behalf of that root service operator. And one we have that point of contact, I will send a request to this point of contact, requesting for appointment, or re-appointment of representative for three year terms.

And that will be a term starting January 21, 2015 and ending on December 31, 2017. And then two weeks after receiving my mail, we

expect the representative from the root server organizations to provide names. We ask our staff support to prepare Board paper for the ICANN Board so they can confirm these new members, and they mention they will pass that resolution.

Once that's done, we go to the next step, which is to elect or reappoint RSSAC co-chair, and for that we actually have a procedure in the new document, that's section 1.2.2.1, and you should all be familiar with that. And we could start that process by October 22. And there is a timeline in our proposal as well. So if we start on October 1 to ask for four point contacts, a week later on October 8, I can send out the request.

Two weeks later, October 22nd, we expect the names back from the Root Server organizations, and by then, we can also start the process for co-chair election. And in parallel, we can send the, create and send the paper to the Board for ratification. Any comments on that? Does it make sense?

No one. Hello? Are you still there?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sounds like a plan.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It makes sense.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, I saw the timeline in the email and so on, and it looks like a perfectly reasonable plan, which I think is why people aren't commenting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, which is fine. But there was a keen silence, so I was worried that I was being hooked off [inaudible]. So all right, I and staff will try to execute that plan. I didn't hear any objections. And that actually brings us to the height, the pentacle of this meeting, the operating procedures document. I haven't received any formal input on that, except Suzanne's message from, or is it morning, in your space.

Would you care to summarize that for us Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure. I have a couple of reservations about the document. I think it needs a little bit of copy editing and there are a couple of places where I'm not actually that comfortable with what it says, but I think it's workable. Since we had already decided that, you know, it doesn't have to be perfect to be put into production and plan on it to be a living document, I think it's ready for us to publish, to show people we've done this work, and to go ahead and start using it, you know, as the basis for our work, and we can refine the details as we go.

But I think it's time to get it published, and I'm happy to work with the staff on copy editing it pass. The email I sent had a couple of revisions, which I tried hard to just make clarifications on the changes on substance. And I think it's time to publish, warts and all, and move on.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

All right. So, are you suggesting that we make changes a little more to the document before publishing? Because I did send out a rather straight [inaudible] in which I requested substantial changes, or rather fixed text to change. And what do you see the next steps here? My plan would be that we actually go for a sign of approval here, today.

If you have text that you really want to change, I think now is the very last second to say so.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Right. And I actually proposed, I actually sent a version with the changes that I think are important to make as a contingency for a final approval, just because there are like two places where I think what we wrote really isn't clear on an important process.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Sorry. I was looking at the wrong name, I'm sorry.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

I had, I believe, two changes where less than a sentence each, where I thought we were clarifying...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you call out these changes, so that we can...? I thought we approve it like the last draft was, or make your two changes, but you have to call them out, motivate them in the meeting so that we can deal with them.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay. Let me call up the documents.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm doing the same. But I'll let you take the lead on this Suzanne.

STEVE SHENG: This is Steve. The package that staff prepared also has the latest version in Adobe Connect from Suzanne, so that's in there too.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Right. I have a couple of changes to 1.2.2.1. A little clarification in the second paragraph, so they're after each year, thereafter each year, a co-chair's term will expire and a new election will be held, just to clarify the we weren't going to assume that the co-chair wouldn't be reelected. Because originally worded, it sounded like we were going to insist on changing co-chairs, and that's not the intention.

The next paragraph, one month prior to each election, nominees will be accepted for the co-chair position from the members and announced to RSSAC on the mailing list, because there was no provision in that as written for circulating the list of nominees. During the meeting, which

includes election of a co-chair on its announced agenda, additional nominations will be accepted for members, and all nominees will indicate their intention to accept or decline their nomination.

Again, I just thought it should be clear that the meeting where we would be doing this co-chair election, would be announced in advanced, then everyone would have the opportunity to see that on the agenda. Again, a [inaudible], I noted that there is every intention of doing that, but it seemed that it should be clear on the procedure.

I have a couple of, I'm sorry, we should probably pause to review that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. Is anybody uncomfortable with making these changes? But the way I would proceed.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yes, thank you. To me, that sounded like a very basic clarification. Is anybody uncomfortable with it?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I hear no objections, so I say we do accept that change. Please go ahead.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay. Let me go ahead with that. 1.2.4, liaisons. As originally worded, this was a little awkward and a little inadequate, inaccurate. So I just [inaudible] RSSAC may have liaisons to other bodies. One of these, the

RSSAC liaison to the ICANN Board of Directors is specified by the ICANN bylaws. The only one in the ICANN bylaws, it's likely to be the only one in the ICANN bylaws.

Others may be salvaged from time to time. And again, that's a minor change that I believe simply to be a clarification, but does anybody object to that?

MARC BLANCHETT:

Marc speaking. I don't object about that, so the idea is fine for not having the liaison being specified in your operational process, as a road to [inaudible]... In August, would like to see a statement from both parties that [inaudible]. You know, by some statement that could be published in both websites.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Right understood. I had a chance to adhere, I thought there was consensus about... Previously we discussed that, so I made the minimum change that I thought was necessary to remove an inaccuracy. If we want to open up, whether we should expand this paragraph to discuss other liaisons. I'm open to that, but that wasn't the change I was proposing because I had thought we had decided to not do that now in this document.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

This is Liman. I agree with Suzanne on that. I also hear actually Marc agreeing, but I thank you Marc for bringing that back to my attention. We should actually, I must deal with that thing. We should look at

trying to express that in some kind of statement, and when we have a draft version, I think we should bring it before the entire committee.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So again, just to clarify, so I was... I'm fine, and [inaudible] is fine with the text, that is right now. And but, I want to make sure the point that we were expecting a joint statement, and that should be done kind of shortly. So that's all I'm saying.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. This is Liman. To Carlos, can you please make a note to put that on the agenda for, I was going to say next teleconference, but I think that one will be rather full with other stuff. So Marc, would you be okay if we pushed this to the physical meeting in Los Angeles? We can sit down and look at that from the table.

MARC BLANCHETT: I could start working on a draft statement and forward it to you, and also the chair. And maybe we could do this completely offline or something. It should be [inaudible]... I see this as two paragraphs. But anyway, we should try offline by email and whenever the right time for both committees to agree on something, we'll just take that time. But I would plan to do this sooner rather than later.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Well, that works for me. Are there any objections from the committee to that, that part? I and Marc try to work out a draft that we eventually put forward to the committee, when the draft has matured.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sounds right to me.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible] SSAC liaison. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. So Marc, please initiate that then. That would be great. Back to Suzanne.

SUZANNE WOOLF: 1.2.6, under support staff, I added a sentence to clarify the role of support staff, which just says they attend meetings and have access to RSSAC resources as needed to perform their duties.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I object to that change, because we very clearly said, attendance of meetings is chair's discretion, you stricken it from other places, so it shouldn't be re-added.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay. No problem. To me, it sounded like a clarification to me, but any substantive objection is enough for me to back out of it because it wasn't intended to be substantive.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Liman here. Fine. But, as a matter of pure administration here, Carlos or Steve, are you tracking these comments now? Because we will need to edit the document, and since Julie is not on the call, someone will have to make these changes to the document, remembering which to accept and which to reject.

STEVE SHENG: Liman, this is Steve. I'm keeping track of it. I can produce a revised version. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent. Thank you. Please proceed.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay. A couple of words missing, off the editing things which, you know, I could live without any of them in 2.1 and 2.2. I had an editorial comment, not a specific change on 2.3.2, which I'm happy to drop for now, but hopefully we can discuss at some later point, regarding working methods of the caucus. I would like to see us provide direction as to how some basic direction that the caucus is expected to work on consensus to get to a deliverable, before passing it to RSSAC, but this is

[inaudible] one of the things that I regarded in the process that we will discover in practice.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Right. This is Daniel. I agree, let the document be [inaudible] make mistakes, and once they make mistakes, we'll deal with them.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Right. So that specific point, I actually feel quite strongly about, but I can wait. I changed, in 2.5 under caucus member selection, a very brief change. Frankly it's a grammar correction having to do with RSSAC caucus membership committee may learn of interested candidates because the recommendation by RSSAC...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Go ahead. I don't think it's [inaudible].

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah, it wasn't intended to be. And under 3.2, again, the word consensus does appear, so I'm pointing back to the fact that we don't define it or discuss it in guidelines for document production. But again, that goes back to, I think that will come out in practice. So, I think we're... And there are no other changes in this version.

So there are a couple of specific copy edits, that... That I don't think seem substantive on the one change that Daniel felt was substantive, I'm happy to drop. And the comment on consensus, I'm happy to leave.

That's my comment on where we're at, but it's not a suggestion change to the document. Do you have enough to go forward here Liman and Steve?

STEVE SHENG: Yes, Suzanne, I have enough guidance here. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you Suzanne. Thank you Steve. Are there any other final comments? Because I'm shortly going to ask you to adopt this document with the proposed edits from Suzanne that we decided to adopt. Any other comments?

All right. Then I'm going to ask you to adopt this document. Are there any objections to adopting this document, with the edits that Suzanne now proposed, and that we adopted as changes?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Liman, just a point of order.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, please.

PAUL VIXIE: If you're trying to put the document [inaudible], I believe you should have a roll call vote. If you are asking if there are any more edits that

need to go into Steven Sheng's file before the document comes back for that roll call vote, then all you need to do is ask for objections.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I didn't quite follow that, follow.

DANIEL KARREBERG: First if there are any objections, and then if there are no objections, have a roll call vote. This is Daniel. Becoming formal, I second Paul's request of a roll call vote.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. We will do a roll call vote. So, trying to get this right now, so please object again if I don't. So our first question is, are there any objections to the edits that Suzanne proposed? And that we said we would except?

I hear none. So I will now do a roll call and ask whether you're willing to accept this document. And it will take me a second to find the roster.

Okay.

PAUL VIXIE: Liman, when you ask for the roll call, make sure that you ask with specific mention that the edits that Steve Sheng is taking back from Suzanne, from today's call, because we don't actually have the document in front of us, in its final form that you're asking the vote to be on.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I'll try to get that right. My question will be... I will call out your names, eventually, and I will ask you to support the document with, as it sits in front of you, with the edits that Suzanne proposed, and we accepted in this telephone conference. Is that fair Paul?

PAUL VIXIE: It's totally fair. Slightly irregular, but I think it's a good idea.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. So first Brad, are you willing to support it as I said?

BRAD VERD: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent. Paul, supporting?

PAUL VIXIE: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Gerry, will you support it?

GERRY SNEERINGER: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Kevin Jones, will you support it?

BOBBY CATES: It's Bobby Cates for Kevin Jones, yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry. Yeah, my rooster is wrong. So Bobby, would you support it?

BOBBY CATES: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Suzanne, would you support it?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yup.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Kevin Wright, would you support it?

KEVIN WRIGHT: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm asking myself, yes I support it. Daniel Karrenberg?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Yes, yes, yes, yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. And then we have Jun, do you support it?

JUN MURAI: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, we have a document. Okay. So, Steve and Carlos will you please make the changes that Suzanne proposed and we accepted? Carefully not making the changes that we rejected? And then prepare and publish that document, as I would guess, counting numbers would be RSSAC 003, and make it public.

I suggest you send it to the internal list, where it's kind of done, so that we know what's going out. I'm not proposing for objections or changes, just to be prepared to know beforehand what's going on, on the webpage.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you Liman. Please, I will do the guidance the committee has provided. Surely we send it out to the RSSAC committee with RSSAC 003 as the number.

ELISE GERICH: This is Elise. Just a quick question. While we didn't number our charter, right? Why we would number our procedures? Would we, I'm just curious. If we revise that this is a living document and we revise it, would it be 003.1? 003.2? Would it be 003.7 or whatever the next number would be? Or would it just be the procedures document with a revision in it?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is Liman. My personal take on this, and this is my personal take, nothing more. If we make minor changes to it, we find that we need to add a sentence here, or we need to clarify something there, or something is completely wrong, we need to remove two sentences, that would, for me, lead to a 003.1 or .2 as we go along.

But I also foresee that we eventually make a major overhaul of the document, once we used it in practice for a year or two, we realize that oh we actually need to spell out the procedures here, or this is too cumbersome, we need to make it easier here. That would lead to a new version number, a new document number for me. It would be, as you say, 007 [CROSSTALK]...

ELISE GERICH: I think my question was more of, why would this document have a number? Like 001, because I kind of thought those were working party documents that got numbered, and advice documents where this is more about a procedures, right? Like the charter and procedures, are they part of our numbered system? I just don't know, that's the question. It seems odd to have it numbered.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would like to make a couple of comments relative to what we do in SSAC, and where we are, because we've had similar challenges. I'm about 98% certain the procedures document, and SSAC is not one of our numbered publications. We have also had the challenge of when we publish something that is in the numbered series, because of the way that we've always published to this point in time, it's a sequential increase number going forward, and once it's published it's not ever been changed.

And we've seen, on occasion, the need to change it, and there has been like one or two minor editorial kinds of things. But in fact, at our recent workshop, we have had a rather vigorous discussion about how changes should be handled. So it's really not a simple process to figure out what you want to do and then follow it. So my suggestion at this point would be to not number this procedures document, because you can always put a number on it later. And the procedures document is in fact, something that talks about how the group operates internally.

It's not a recommendation or a publication that says the community ought to do thus. And so, that would be my suggestion is to not put it in the numbered series.

[CROSSTALK]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Hold on. I would like to limit the discussion here. We actually have two things on the table. The first one is, should we put a number on it or not? The second one is, how do we handle changes? I would like to consult the discussion on how to have changes, so we can prepare our minds for that and actually give the time it deserves. But we need to decide whether to put a number on this here and now.

I have Suzanne.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure. I'm not hard over it, but I think it should have a number, and what I'm thinking of is... First of all, I think our charter is, you know, is really not a RSSAC document in the sense [inaudible], or that caucus [inaudible], but more than that, I like the question or the idea, which is that it's technical standards are RFCs, but so are important process documents.

And the commitment there is that they're fully public and fully available. It just seems like the right thing to say from a perspective of transparency. With that said, I am not desperate for it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: I'm not desperate either, but I'm with Suzanne on this. My experience has been that if you number these things, you have a much better handle on history later on. It becomes clear when they change. It's just

a more orderly process, and my experience has been whenever one deviates from it in some way, it ends up being [inaudible] in history, and gives all sorts of problems when you later want to construct what happened when.

So I'm in favor of numbering it. I'm in favor if a set of changes are made, to give it a new number. And I think the benefits of that far outweigh the problems of a document about the same subject having a different number. It will remain to have the same name, and we can always refer to the current one by some other means. So I'm in favor of keeping a number.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is Liman. I am actually with Suzanne and Daniel on this. I would prefer to have a number on it, because of the reasons that Daniel stated.

PAUL VIXIE: This is Vixie. I have changed my opinion to match Liman's.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

JIM MARTIN: This is Jim Martin. I agree as well. I just thrown out as a potential option. Shall we number it 00 since it's the basis of what we do?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: ...a point on that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: My argument would be that it kind of violates the timeline, but that's probably not important. I don't [inaudible]. I'm willing to [inaudible]. So what I've heard is a majority of voices supporting adding a number, and whether it's going to be 000 or 003, will now be a matter of tossing a [inaudible]. So, I have now actually, it's the one [inaudible], it has the one [inaudible], which is actually a number, so if that one turns up it will actually be number....

Ah [inaudible], sorry, if the number comes up it would be zero, [back side?] comes up, it will be three. It will be zero. So Steve, please number the document RSSAC 000.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. Moving right along. Are there any reports from the RSSAC 001 work? That is headed by Terry, right? Isn't it? So I guess we can't really have a report here. Daniel? Do you have anything to say regarding RSSAC 002?

DANIEL KARREBERG: I have to say that there wasn't much movement in the last week or two, probably because a lot of instigation from the document leaders, and my intention is to pick this up again and move it along. But my general impression is that there are no substantive issues with the current draft, and that we can work in, work with the issues that have been raised.

So I still believe that we will finish within the deadline that the committee has set.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. No showstoppers noted this time.

DANIEL KAREENBERG; That's what I wanted to say, sorry.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, thank you, thank you. The next item on the agenda... Oh, I should ask, are there any questions? I should give the rest of you the opportunity to speak as well.

STEVE SHENG: Liman, this is Steve. I have a quick comment.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Please.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. I think, as the RSSAC caucus has newly formed, and with respect to RSSAC 001 and 002, there were lots of comment and excitement, I think it's important, just for the general atmosphere of the caucus that shows that work has been progressing, that these comments have at least been taken into consideration, otherwise, you know, after that feedback to the caucus, who lead to some of the caucus members, [inaudible] will not care in the future we call upon them to work on document.

So that's just kind of a general comment here from staff. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Steve, that's correct. And I heard him.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Good, thank you. Next agenda item is [inaudible] work items. I, as I said during the agenda [bashing?], I think that was fit into the ICANN 51 schedule discussion. I would encourage you all to think about things we need to address during 2015, and bring that to the table, either on the mailing list or at the physical meeting in Los Angeles, so that we can start to create this [inaudible], that we need for next work, to lay out a schedule for what work we need to do next year, and put priorities on things.

So I think I'll stop there. Are there any other comments regarding this here and now?

SUZANNE WOOLF:

This is Suzanne. Only that with regards to future work items, one of the purposes of the liaison statement I was suggesting to the Board, was to get the Board to think in terms of, all right, when you bring up some of these issues, you bring up an idle question in the hallway, or is it something you want RSSAC to work on? So that people will start thinking if there is anything they want us to put on our work plan, so that's actually part of the purpose of [inaudible].

I don't know if there is anything that the Board is specifically going to come up with that they're going to want us to address, but I think now is the time to make sure that they're thinking about it, so that maybe we will have heard about it by the time we try to do our work plan.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Right. And I take that as the proposal to support and expedite that Board note.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Yup.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Which I support. And that was actually my next thing, the any other business thing here. That note appeared, was it today?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah, actually, and I apologize for that. It had been started in [inaudible], but I realize that bringing it up today, if only to ask for a review over the next couple of days was probably a good idea.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have we finished with the future work yet?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes we are.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, okay. I thought we were going to... There was a question [inaudible], but okay, we can do that on the mailing list.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I did ask, but I didn't hear any comments, so I moved on. But I'm happy to let you...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. The one thing I would want some gauging of the mood in the committee, and it doesn't need to be in this meeting, but soon, is whether as a committee we want to address, you know, look at and comment on some radical proposals like [inaudible] one, and so on, and what kind of image we want to project there. Is it one that we wait until the stuff becomes more final or more, has more momentum inside the IETF and the general community, or do we want to get into these discussions early?

And what kind of general image do we want to project? So my sort of straw man is to engage, and not, and actively work against an image that makes the Root Server Operators defensive against proposals for renewal or whatever. So I think we should actively project an image that we're not digging in, and we're not, as a group, want to perpetuate our quote importance end quote.

But we can take that to the mailing list, but it's also something that is best discussed face to face. Just food for thought. That's all I wanted to say at that point.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Yeah. I think you're quite right. That's a quite valued discussion. I would like to put that on the agenda and give it some time at a future meeting. I'm trying to make a note here.

So, I would propose that we put that on the agenda at some future meeting, possibly at the next telephone conference or maybe in Los Angeles, bearing in mind that we, I expect that we will have a telephone bridge connected to the room, at least for part of the meeting.

Okay. Going back to the agenda. Suzanne Board note, proposed Board note, I propose that we give people a few days on the mailing list to comment on the proposal. But I would like to put a date before which we should send our comments. And I will turn to Suzanne for recommendation on a good date.

SUZANNE WOOLF: There is no urgency, except that I would want it into hands and minds before... So there is time for people to think about it before, where we're doing our work plan for next year. And so that any issues raised can be discussed in LA. With that said, I would like to ship it soon. Tomorrow is Friday the 26th. How about comments until Monday, end of the day?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: 29th?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah. And then if there are no substantive comments [inaudible]... This is not a big deal, it's a small thing, but I want to provide a fair summary of where we're at, and I want to provide a definite invitation to, you know, engage with us.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's a bit of a tight schedule in my mind, but if the rest of you are happy with it. Suzanne, if you're also willing to accept, the comment from someone is, no, please hold it. This is too tight.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yes, certainly.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: All right. Can I ask you Suzanne, to send out that request to the list, with the date and so on in it?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Mentioning that we did discussed it in the meeting here and that we did agree on it.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Right. Okay. And I'll look for comments or requests to hold on to it for more comments.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right. Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. That brings us to the next meeting. As I mentioned earlier, the typical date to hold that minute would be October 9th, which is the Thursday in two weeks' time. By all probability, I will be flying to Los Angeles that day, so it doesn't work for me. And so with possibly one or two of you. I would propose that we hold it at another date. I would think, I would suggest, Wednesday the 8th instead, if that works for you.

There is the alterative that we appoint a temporary chairman for that meeting, but I [inaudible], but I would propose Wednesday the 8th instead. Is that okay? Comments?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Daniel here. Wednesday the 8th doesn't work for me at all, and I think we should do it by Doodle poll. But like the Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday, or something like that. But I can already tell you that Wednesday is really, really bad for me.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. That's fair enough. Let me do a quick calculation. Los Angeles is 9 hours back from here. So it's early morning now, right now, it's half past eight in the morning on the west coast. Yes. Okay. That [inaudible]... I could probably also include the Friday in the Doodle poll, because I will have, according to my current plans, I will have arrived in Los Angeles and I will be awake during that morning.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Sure. Whatever works for you. I think we value your services as a chair, so just make a Doodle poll that has dates that are convenient for you, and we'll see when we get maximum attendance.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I'll do that. I'll make a Doodle poll as soon as I can. It will not be tonight because I have other engagements tonight, but I'll try to make it tomorrow.

Okay. Are there any other issues? Then I thank you for attending the meeting, and I especially thank you for approving the procedures

document. I am so happy that's out the door. So, see you on the mailing list and thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]