LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's five minutes past the hour. I think it's time to get going. Welcome everybody. There should be an Agenda, in your inbox at least. We'll start with the customary roll call. Please remember I have a problem watching the AC thing at the same time as I type my notes, due to lack of real estate on my screen. I'll do my best, but if your risen hand isn't noticed, please yell. Moving along, A root, Brad?

BRAD VERD: Here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello. B root, Bill?

BILL MANNING: Here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: C root, Paul?

PAUL VIXIE: Present.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello. Is Hank there as well? No Hank. From D root, I think we might be lacking D root this time. I received apologies from two people, and from

---

Jerry. Is Karl there? Okay, no one from D root. From E root I received excuses from Kevin. Maybe Bobby's here?

BOBBY CATES: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Is Jim here too?

SUZANNE WOOLF: No, in fact he's on an airplane.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: All right. G root, Jim Cassell?

JIM CASSELL: I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Do you have Kevin with you as well?

JIM CASSELL: Yes, Kevin's here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: H root, how about Howard?

HOWARD KASH: I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I root, I'm here. K root, Daniel? No Daniel. Kave, are you there? No Kave, all right. L root, John Crain or Terry? From M root, I did here Hiro?

HIRO HOTTA: Yes, I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Is [June] also joining us today?

HIRO HOTTA: No, I don't think so.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. From the NTIA, Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I'm here, thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent. I think I heard Elise from IANA?

ELISE GERICH: Yes, good morning, good afternoon and good evening.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think I heard Duane from Verisign?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, I'm present.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I also heard Russ from SSAC, right?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: How about Marc Blanchet?

KATHY SCHNITT: Mark sent his apologies Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right. From staff I heard Barbara?

BARBARA ROSEMAN: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Kathy as well?

KATHY SCHNITT: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: How about Carlos and Steve?

CARLOS REYES: This is Carlos.

STEVE SHENG: This is Steve.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I suppose we don't have Julie with us, since that part of our procedures is already taken care of, right?

KATHY SCHNITT: That's right.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: All right. Looking at the Agenda, we have some housekeeping, the usual review of AIs from previous meetings. Membership Committee update. We do need to talk about the Los Angeles meeting schedule, and that may lead to a shorter or longer version of the re-appointment of a representative of some letters [unclear 00:04:34]. I expect that will be very brief. It would be tricky to have a report since the current Work Team since neither Daniel nor Terry is on the phone. Maybe they'll join later.

I also promised to put on today's Agenda how to approach the Internet draft about the root scaling. It's on there. I made a note at the bottom that I did not put in a discussion regarding public mail archives on today's Agenda, since that was discussed on the mailing list and Daniel, who was leading the discussion, eventually withdrew his proposal. I see that is dealt with. My conclusions is the mail archive will not be made public. Of course we have Any Other Business. Is there Any Other Business you'd like to add to the Agenda?

DUANE WESSELS: I have an Any Other Business Item. We want to talk about some timing issues with TTLs on the root zone, and signature validation.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, it's on there. Anything else? All right. Then let's get going. We have a good number of AIs from the last meeting. The first one was for

Carlos to publish the minutes from the August 28th and September 11th meetings. I think that's been done, right Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: Yes, those sets of minutes have been published.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent. The text in the second one is: "Paul Vixie to refer Daniel Karrenberg's suggestion about an expedited process for Caucus Membership process for individuals expressing interest in joining an ongoing Work Party to the Membership Committee for consideration." Paul, any comments?

PAUL VIXIE: This was done.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Daniel to initiate a formal discussion on the RSSAC mailing list about the archives. That's been done and concluded. Carlos to ensure that the draft lead in a scaling root [/00 00:07:30] is added to the Agenda for the next RSSAC teleconference. That was done. Liman to propose a detailed agenda for the RSSAC working sessions at ICANN 51. That was done but very recently, so if you haven't seen it, it should be in your inbox. We're going to discuss it later on in today's Agenda.

I was to solicit input from the Caucus on the RRSAC and Caucus public meeting agenda. That hasn't happened yet. It will happen today in the

meeting. I will have to send a request to the Caucus for that. That's not done fully yet. Steve to implement the proposal for reappointment of the E, C, K and M representatives. That is underway. It's a process that's been done for several weeks and we're actually on time with it. It's also on the Agenda later today.

STEVE SHENG: I have this acknowledgement from B, C and K. I've yet to receive acknowledgement for M, so maybe if Hiro could relay this message back to the M about a response on this, that would be appreciated.

HIRO HOTTA: Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Marc Blanchet is to draft a statement about the Liaison relationship between the RSSAC and the IAB. Now, I'm relying on my totally useless memory but I think that's not yet done. It could be. I'll take it down as a question.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I don't think that's done. I can't find any reference to it since our last meeting. I was one of the people that said I wanted to see that come out.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: As far as I know, it hasn't popped up to me either. We'll take it down as not done. Next AI – Steve to distribute a Final Operations Procedures Document to the RSSAC and publish it as RSSAC 000. It was definitely circulated and I guess it's been published as well, Steve?

STEVE SHENG: It's been published. I posted the URL in the AC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was to add Daniel's suggestion about how the RSSAC should handle its response to radical proposals on the Agenda for the upcoming RSSAC meeting. I have done so. It says either for the next teleconference, which is this one, or at ICANN 51 and I decided to go for the ICANN 51 option. It's in my detailed agenda for the physical meeting. I'd say that is done.

RSSAC Members to provide comment on Suzanne's update to the ICANN Board of Directors. That's at least overtaken by events, if nothing else, but I think there were a few comments, right Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yes, there were comments and I think we have a final version. I held off a little bit longer to see if anyone else had comments, but it seems to be fine. I'm going to go ahead and ship that today, although it probably should have been shipped earlier. You can call that done now or you can wait until you see it go by, because I was going to copy in the Membership.

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well, the AI was for the group members to provide comments, so I'll take it down as done.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Right, that was done. There was a slightly revised version based on comments from Daniel and Paul and there were no additional comments on the revised version.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right. Thank you. That concludes the list of outstanding AIs. Moving right along – approve minutes from previous meeting. We have the minutes from the September 25th meeting. They've been circulated. Are there any comments? I hear no comments. I suggest we approve these.

PAUL VIXIE: I motion that we include in minutes of the 25th September meeting, as I wasn't present for the earlier one?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Does anyone second that?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Second.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Any discussion? I hear none so the motion passes. Please publish the minutes, removing the draft stamp, Carlos.

PAUL VIXIE: Liman, point of order – I was only moving that we accept the September minutes. I was not present for the August meeting. You'll need a second motion for that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry, I was only referring to one set of minutes, from September 25th.

PAUL VIXIE: Okay then.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think we've already approved all the meeting minutes prior to that one. All right. Now I realize I've made a minor mistake here, which is to put the Membership Committee update here on the Agenda, because at the last meeting we agreed to only do it once a month.

PAUL VIXIE: We have an outstanding AI. I have an update from Daniel's request from the last meeting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Please go ahead, Paul.

PAUL VIXIE: Based on Daniel's request we discussed and have agree to add to our initial qualification and statement of interest process; a question which is, "is there a current Working Group you'd very much like to be part of, such that it would be beneficial to you if we expedited the process?" our plan is if they say yes and name the Working Group or the working document, whatever it is, that they want to help with, then we'll make an out of sequence suggestion to the Committee, most likely by email, to ask for an action without a meeting. Basically we have adapted our process in order to fit Daniel's request in.

ELISE GERICH: Paul, if you've adopted that change, I think that last meeting Tripti or someone said that there were some pending applications that would be forwarded to the RSSAC next month, or whatever month it is. Are those people going to be informed that this is the new request for their SOIs?

PAUL VIXIE: Actually, the ones on the cusp didn't even come up in our discussion. Elise, or anyone on this call, do you have personal [unclear 00:15:57] that somebody in our queue wants to help with the current document? If not, I was going to let the process run the way it is.   Micro-optimization does not lead to efficiency.

ELISE GERICH: I don't have any personal knowledge of people in the queue wanting to work on the Working Group, it just seems like from making the change

and making them waiting one month – because it's a two-month cycle – that we could offer them that courtesy, but I don't have any strong feelings there.

PAUL VIXIE: I have a strong feeling for documenting the process and following it, and so the change you're asking is a heavyweight activity for a one-time benefit, and so unless somebody does feel strongly about it, we're going to let this current queue drain as normal.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can I propose something in the middle? If you have someone arriving before the next regular handling, whose appearance leads to one of these [unclear 00:17:12] that you then also… We can take a second look at also asking the people in the queue, so they won't be irritated by someone jumping the queue in front of them?

PAUL VIXIE: You make a good point. I will raise that. I think it's non-controversial and that will almost certainly be done.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Any more comments regarding the Membership Committee? I hear none. I'm moving right along to the Los Angeles meeting schedule. We have four meeting slots in LA. We have a working session on the Monday, October 13th, from 3:00 pm until 6:00 pm. We have a working session – which means a closed session –

Tuesday morning, from 9:00 am until 12:00 pm, which will have a gap in it at 10:45 am, which is already scheduled, until 11:00 am, where we have a meeting with the NomCom.

How that's going to play out I'm not quite sure yet, but there will be a time gap there. We'll see how that plays out. Then we go back in-session until noon. Then we have a second session after lunch, which is from 2:00 pm until 5:00 pm. Then we have the public session on the Wednesday, from 10:30 am until 12:00 pm. We did have a very preliminary schedule for this, so I've tried to map that out over the time slots that we have. I would be very happy to receive in put on this.

My general thinking was to have some loose discussions on the Monday, but to include in those some discussions about planning for the future, so that we can use that during the evening, maybe put that down in a more concise way, and to continue the discussion Tuesday morning. I want to reach as far as possible in that before the public meeting, so that we can tell the public meeting what our plans for the future are.

I've also decided to put the more formal stuff on the Tuesday afternoon, so there we have the housekeeping things with discussing secondaries, Co Chair election process and Board Liaison appointment, and also the more strict preparation for the public meeting. That's my general thinking. There's also a question at the end. If you have more ideas for the public meeting, they're most welcome.

There also was a suggestion to have Caucus Work Party sessions somehow weaved into the meeting structure here. They were listed under the public meeting. I don't really know how to fit that together,

and I don't know if there are any Work Parties that need time in LA. The floor is open. Please comment. I cannot believe there are no comments whatsoever to this.

SPEAKER: [00:21:33] The only comment I had is there is a bit of a conflict with the OARC stuff on Monday, in the ICANN Tech Day, just as far as the scheduling goes. I don't know how many people here were planning on being there, but clearly there's a conflict.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right.

SPEAKER: I don't know how important it is, I just thought I'd comment.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Let me address that. I did actually have that in mind, because I intend to go to the OARC meeting myself for as much time as possible. I won't be able to make the entire meeting, but as much as possible. That's one of the reasons that I wanted to put a more open discussion and planning thing on the Monday, because my plan is to continue that on the Tuesday, so those who didn't have a chance to be involved in those discussions on the Monday afternoon will have some chance on Tuesday as well. I don't know if that works for you? it works for me.

SPEAKER: I'll make it work. I just didn't know how important it was and I wanted to make sure people were aware of the conflict. That's all.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I'm looking at the suggested schedule here and I'm not sure how it's going to work out to try and get Caucus Work Party activity at this meeting, just because I thought it was fairly clear that for the most part the Caucus will be more strongly represented at other meetings other than ICANN, and trying to do nitty-gritty work as part of a public session is really challenging, and I'm not sure what it buys us, especially if we're not sure of attendance. I'm not sure how we do that in a useful way.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You mirror my thoughts. That's my thought exactly. That's why I put such a big question mark around the Work Party Session.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Let's retire that idea, unless somebody feels strongly that we should keep it, and that they know how to make it productive.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Exactly. I would like to have Terry and Daniel have a final word there, and neither are on this phone call, but I'm willing to send a specific question to them to give them a chance to ask for time.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: As I'm speaking I realize one thing we could add to the public session – or rather we could weave it into the RSSAC Status Report – to ask the Work Parties to report where they are in their own processes.

SUZANNE WOOLF: That would be good.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I'm pretty certain Daniel will not make it to LA. I hope that Terry will. If not, I'll ask them to provide a report to me, which I can give to the audience. This is the agenda we're going to work from then. Is there anyone on the call right now who will not make it to Los Angeles and that has specific requests on items you'd like to be able to participate in over telephone? Would that lead you to ask for something to be rearranged? Come on guys. I have not made a perfect Agenda.

SPEAKER: You didn't start with the "not going to be in LA" however.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I did. I should probably extend that. I'm second-guessing your thoughts here, that even for those of you who are in LA, maybe you

have conflicts with other meetings that we might be able to avoid by moving things.

ELISE GERICH: Monday is a very busy day for technical things. John Crain is typing in the chat room that there's OARC, there's the ccTLD Tech Day...

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, but these two are put together. The ccTLD and OARC are one and the same, this time. They're a big magnet, yes, they will draw people away. That's quite true. I do note that this is a fairly late afternoon slot, so I'm hoping that people will have a chance to attend a lot of the OARC stuff but maybe not all of it. Again, I'll try to put an open discussion in during this time slot, rather than decision items.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I guess one question is, if you're going to be at DNS for part of the time, are you looking for people to stand up and take ownership or leadership of the RSSAC working time on Monday, while you're not there? Or are you hoping we'll get together and be sociable.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry, I was imprecise. My plan is, first, RSSAC has priority. I definitely intend to be in the RSSAC Meeting all the time. I will leave the OARC Meeting before 3:00 pm to make it to the RSSAC Meeting. I'm not looking for someone to lead the discussion in the RSSAC Meeting. I cannot really request all of you to do the same. If you have other priorities, I do understand that. I will definitely be there for the RSSAC Meeting. I will drop the OARC Meeting when I have to.

Okay, so let's use this agenda then. I think the most important part to have telephone attendance will be the Tuesday afternoon and possibly also Tuesday morning. Does that sound reasonable? I will not object to telephone participation during the other time slots, but that's the one I would like to make more formal.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Slightly different scheduling question Liman? I'm realizing we have a 15-minute slot with the NomCom, is that correct?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's the information I have, yes.

SUZANNE WOOLF: That's not practical.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I don't know. If they come to visit us, it might be practical. If not, I don't know. This has been forwarded to me by staff.

CARLOS REYES: I can provide more background on that. Essentially, NomCom is introducing itself to various SOs and ACs, and they requested 15 minutes with the SSAC. It looks like we'll probably have to change it to 10:00 am to 10:15 am actually, but it's just 15 minutes going over who every one is on the current NomCom and the incoming NomCom and how their process works and it's an opportunity for quick questions. If all of you

feel strongly like more time, I'm happy to work that in with Gillette, who's staff support for NomCom.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It works for me.

SUZANNE WOOLF: That works for me. The concern I have is more that that the scheduling on these things can slip. There's always a few minutes for people to get settled, then a conversation gets started and then it's time to move on again. It tends to be difficult to manage, and I think we should just plan on if it takes a bit longer, that's okay. Planning for 15 minutes sounds okay for an introduction to each other's general concerns. I'm just making sure we don't assume that it's going to work exactly that way.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm with you all the way there. I also understand Carlos that the timing may not be exact so they may either request to come earlier, or be delayed or something. As long as we're prepared to make a break and receive them or go to them… The way you put it Carlos made me believe they'll actually come to us?

CARLOS REYES: Yes, that's the case.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: The conclusion I make from this is we should definitely not try to have a very formal meeting during that time slot, because we will be interrupted somehow and we should be prepared to be. As we speak about this, I seem to remember there was talk about a request from the GAC to have a joint session or cross-session of some kind. Carlos or Barbara, can you remember anything about that?

CARLOS REYES: I don't recall that, but I can check.

BARBARA ROSEMAN: I don't remember seeing anything this time from them.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That could be my memory. I'll go and research my own inbox as well. If [unclear 00:33:22] sent it only to me, and that's one of the worst ideas they've had this year.

ELISE GERICH: Liman, on the Tuesday morning session, do you want to add anything to the agenda about getting a consensus view from RSSAC to take to the ICG meetings? I think Sue and Daniel both represent the RSSAC at the ICG meeting, and it might be useful because I think they're going to meet this upcoming week also.

RUSS MUNDY: ICG is on Friday and it's an all-day meeting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. The Friday after the ICANN Meeting, yes. Good point. We should definitely put in a status report from ICG.

ELISE GERICH: Or input to you and Daniel from the RSSAC Members, as to what you might be taking back as the RSSAC position to the ICG.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, but in order for that to happen, you must have a status report to relate to, or at least point us in the direction of where to look. Good point, well taken. Do you feel that Tuesday morning is the best place for us? I'm happy to, I'm just asking for guidance.

ELISE GERICH: I was thinking Tuesday morning, because Daniel's time zone might allow him to participate, because late in the evening on California time would be more difficult, maybe. I don't know.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You're right. That sounds plausible, yes. I will check with Daniel and it's likely that I'll add that to the Tuesday morning session.

RUSS MUNDY: Also, last time there was an opportunity for each of the represented group to talk about what they were doing with respect to the ICG

activities, and not even necessarily – well, sort of a status report – and I believe last time Daniel asked – which is probably a perfectly acceptable input, if that's what's desired –, I think, we'll have to check the minutes, about the next meeting, that there might be one.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I didn't quite follow what you said here. About the next meeting?

RUSS MUNDY: Which will be the 17th, the Friday after the ICANN Meeting. It might be worth looking at the ICG minutes to see if there was any commitment made as to whether or not there would be an RSSAC input provided at the meeting on the 17th.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you for that. That's good input.

SPEAKER: [00:37:26] One other comment that I did have, relative to the ICG, that I think is very much an RSSAC point to think about, discuss and decide what they want to do, is whether or not the RSSAC does want to submit something in response to the proposal of the RFP that the ICG put out – not necessarily responding to the RFP in any direct sense, but with respect to the listing of contact information for the root operators and any changes to that information, because that, as Elise says, though there is a process it's not technically part of the contract.

Elise, I'm glad to see that that was your conclusion. That was my conclusion after looking in the contract part, but it's refreshing to know that we reached the same conclusion with respect to this particular issue. Whether or not RSSAC wants to raise it as part of this process, I think it's truly an RSSAC matter.

ELISE GERICH: I too am glad we're aligned on this, and I was hoping that we could raise it as just an RSSAC advice to ICANN of how we could develop a process for that, or RSSAC could propose a process, but either way could work.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just from my own understanding here, a process for how the IANA can maintain a contact information to the root zone operators, if that's what we're talking about?

ELISE GERICH: Right. For instance, we have ways of refreshing data with other TLD operators, but we don't have anything that's formal with the root server operators. Or if someone has moved and is no longer there then we reach out to the community that we know and try and find the right person.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: I think that's a good distinction to make – that this isn't explicitly referenced in detail. I think it's always been the understanding that

making modifications to the root zone, as far as a contract, there's no explicit detailing of that process.

ELISE GERICH: Correct.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I hear an upcoming future work item here.

SPEAKER: One of the things I noted… I think folks on the RSSAC have heard that the SSAC is putting together a document that provides an overview of what the SSAC believes is contained primarily within the current NTIA [DOC 00:40:49] ICANN Contract. This was indeed one of the things that I looked for quite hard. I happened to be the editor on the document, and Steve Sheng is doing most of the work.

We've been deeply involved in doing this, and this is an area that I did do a fair bit of looking in, to see... In the contract itself there's nothing that explicitly calls out – that I could find – and that identifies that although it wouldn't necessarily be referred to as WHOIS information, the rough equivalent of WHOIS information for the root server operators themselves. The need to have, maintain and keep current that information has been rightly recognized and completely done well on an ongoing basis for a long time, but it just doesn't happen to be in the contract.

In this whole process of NTIA saying, "We might disappear from this contract," it's a question of how should this activity be handled going forward. I think there are multiple ways to do it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I suggest we take that into the discussion on Monday afternoon and Tuesday morning, as to one of the future work items.

SPEAKER: I think that would be really good Liman. One of the things that I believe myself, Patrick, Daniel, in the ICG discussions, we've not made any explicit point about this at all. In other words, the ICG, as far as a general group, one of the points that that group could be looking at, I don't think they are even aware that this is the situation.

We're not trying to necessarily hide it, but no one has highlighted it, so it's something that's really not been discussed in the ICG, but if that's the intended path to go – and I'm not saying it should be – then it might be good to at least let the ICG know, at some point, before the January 15th deadline, that something of this nature is going to be requested for inclusion. Elise, am I too far off base on any of this, or does what I'm saying make sense?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Well, just as an observer to the process – and I stress that – my only concern from the RSSAC perspective is that there seems to be the focus of the ICG – and Russ and Elise correct me if I'm misinterpreted things –

is that the ICG has no expectation or desire to accept anything directly from anyone.

The question is, if the RSSAC does have input that they want reflected into any proposal, they would push it back to one of the operational communities, which right now seems to be defined as what the DNS Internet protocols, parameters, and the Internet number resource is. My assumption is that whatever the RSSAC input has, that would get pushed to the DNS group. That's just something you all might want to think about.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Who do you see to be the DNS group?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Well, the Cross-Community Working Group apparently is formalizing themselves.

SUZANNE WOOLF: We can defer this discussion until next week, but that actually raises a related question. The Cross-Community Working Group that's being spun up by the gNSO and the ccNSO to deal specifically with the naming issues to be covered in response to the RFP, I was curious that since SSAC and ALAC are two of the chartering groups for that, we apparently were not one of the chartering groups. I don't know if we were asked.

They've declared that participation is open to anybody who wants to show up, but consensus calls and formal actions will be determined by

the chartering groups.   I don't know that we should have been a chartering group or anything like that, but we do need to figure out if we have a particular strategy. I signed up for the list, and I think a couple of other people here did, frankly in connection with other responsibilities besides RSSAC. But we might want to make a point of at least being kept up-to-date on what they're doing and see if there are any issues arising that we should make sure we step in on. [overtalking 00:$6:34] chartered primarily by the gNSO and the ccNSO.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Elise?

ELISE GERICH: I was just going to say that maybe one of the reasons both Russ and I mentioned this might be a good agenda topic for the RSSAC to discuss on Tuesday morning is what, if any, guidance we have for you and Daniel to the ICG, and then if there's anything RSSAC wants to do independently. I don't think we should debate it further while you're on the agenda topic, but I think it would be a worthwhile topic to schedule for Tuesday morning. Hopefully those who aren't there in person can join us on the phone.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'll put it on the Agenda. Bill?

BILL MANNING:	I had some comments to make, but if you're going to put it off until Tuesday, that's fine.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Thank you. Let's continue on Tuesday. Any more comments on the agenda, or should we move onto the next current Agenda point? All right, I'll try to put together an updated version of the Los Angeles Agenda and circulate that. The next Item at hand is upcoming internal processes – the reappointment of some representatives from some letters. We did discuss and decide on a procedure at the last meeting.

PAUL VIXIE:	I have an Any Other Business Item on the Membership Committee.

| LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: | Okay. The procedure we decided on last time is here. This pertains to letters B, C, K and M. The process that we decided on is for staff to ask B, C, K and M representatives to provide a point of contact who has the clout to make recommendations on behalf of root server operators. At least we have received feedback from B, C and K, and [unclear 00:50:33] has already offered to remind M to provide that as well.

Hopefully tomorrow I will send a formal note to these points of contact, requesting appointments, or reappointments, of representatives, for three-year terms, beginning on January 1st 2015. That's the step we're coming to. By October 22nd that's the deadline for providing it back to me. We'll then give a week for staff to prepare a paper for the Board, and then eventually the Board will pass its resolution in its next meeting. |
|---|---|

This process is underway. I currently am not aware of any hiccups. I just wanted to mention that things are going ahead. Any comments?

I'll move onto the next Agenda Item, which was reports from the current Work Teams, but if Daniel and Terry are now on the call, will you please speak up? I don't hear anything. We'll have to postpone that Agenda Item and ask for updates at the Los Angeles Meeting instead. Moving along, future work item – how shall we approach documents that address the issue of scaling the root? This is the discussion that I propose we initiate here and now, but I also would like to have some time for that in Los Angeles for our face-to-face meeting.

I'd be very happy to start the discussion here and now, and I think I'm going to give the floor to Paul. I think you wanted to comment? The basis for this Agenda Item is the draft [lee 00:53:31] document. I seem to remember, using my useless memory, that you were involved in that draft?

PAUL VIXIE: Yes, I'm the [Co 00:53:39] of it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Do you have any comments or ideas on how RSSAC should react to that specific proposal or a proposal like that in general, or should we get involved, should we just be bystanders, should we make our own counter-proposals? If you don't want to take the lead I'll leave the floor open.

PAUL VIXIE:	Let me speak. I believe, having proposed that this is the right thing to so, I was obviously not wearing an RSSAC hat at the time I stated the [supposed greatness 00:54:31] of this approach, but I certainly gave a lot of thought to existing root servers and existing root server operators. The way we do [unclear 00:54:45] Anycast today, as root operators, is that each root server address has a steward to whom that address is registered, through the RIR system.

They then seek [promo 00:55:03] and partnership opportunities around the world. We've created a couple of hundred [unclear islands] for this, that then have fairly short-haul PGP announcements, and some roots have only global node letters and a mix of global and local nodes and so forth. I think it's been excellent. I wish to state that [unclear 00:55:30] and David Conrad were the inspiration for that, at least for F root.

Nevertheless, the Internet has continued to grow, and we have a couple of hundred islands of root servers on which 200 billion people depend. I do not believe that we are capable of putting enough root server instances into the world to make the world safe against either catastrophic natural disasters, Internet disasters, or deliberate attack. The sense of this this draft is to use what we've learnt from the AS112 experiment and to also use the benefits that we get from DNSSEC signing.

Then this draft ultimately requests that ICANN and the other root publication bodies, as they will then exist by the end of the IANA transition discussions, would simply take their existing root zone, with their existing name space, and remove the current set of a [AFEX and S 00:56:48] records from it, and add a different set, where that set would

point to addresses that were not under the control of any single entity and could then be advertised by anybody.

Those people would then be able to [slate the roof 00:57:07] from the ICANN publication system and answer it with correct DNSSEC, where exactly the ICANN name space, answer it at any layer of the network. Some of you are technologists and so you should chuckle at the fact that your loopback interface is a network. There's no reason in principle why you cannot have the boundary of an advertisement [unclear 00:57:30] a single virtual server inside of a larger complex. You can also do it for land, for building, for campus, for ISP, for region, or you can make them global.

Speaking now for C root, by expectation is that Cogent would decide to add this service as another [listed 00:57:54] address on the existing C root complex, so that it was able to serve both the traditional root name server address and this new, un-owned, Anycast address that is cast in the light of what we learnt from AS112. In summary, this is intended to continue the scaling of what we have been doing as root server operators for the last dozen years or so, to continue ICANN's sovereignty over at least unique stewardship over the name space.

It will not allow any new names to be created outside the ICANN process. It will completely respect the existing root server operators, and that they can all participate. That's the ultimate [unclear 00:58:44], and as to what I think RSSAC should do, I believe that every Member of the Caucus should read that draft and potentially ask questions or perhaps listen to a presentation by me and then ask questions.

The Caucus should then make up its own mind independently on whether I got it right, or whether this is a crazy, stupid idea. Let's place all blame on Bill Manning. In other words, I'm not asking at this time for RSSAC to take the position. I'm giving you guys a general overview of what it is I'm hoping to accomplish with this and what [unclear 00:59:25] is hoping to accomplish with this.

I'm proposing that the Caucus take this up as a topic with an [honest word 00:59:33] publishing a statement of impact; this environmental impact report, to say, "We, the RSSAC Caucus have looked at this and we think it is a…" check the box – a good or bad idea, for the following, very simple, couple of bullet point reasons. Here is our one-page report on that topic. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks Paul. Any comments or questions at this stage?

SUZANNE WOOLF: A meta-comment, as we get into some of these discussions, is I think these are really reasonable and important discussions for us to be having. There are actually a couple of other drafts that people tried to introduce in DNS Ops, but were also part of the same conversation about scaling the infrastructure. The only caveat I would have, as the Board Liaison and as somebody who's spent a lot of time within ICANN-land, is if we do take on any discussion of topics like this, it's deeply unfortunate – and it certainly isn't our priority to handle the unfortunate nature of us – but anything we say is going to be highly political.

It's going to be misunderstood in political ways. For instance, I think I've already reported that the draft that Paul is talking about has already been misunderstood in certain quarters as asserting that, "We can add five more root servers. It's absolutely mathematically possible, given the packet arithmetic." This is something that because it was introduced first in DNS Ops, the story going around is that the IETF is recommending that we add five more root servers. The draft says no such thing. It points out the arithmetic possibility and then says, "That would be a bad idea."

The fact that it was introduced in DNS Ops doesn't mean it's a IETF for anything. That's how people who aren't familiar with all the inside [unclear 01:01:53] of how the technical communities are organized see these kinds of things. If RSSAC is going to take on something like this, we have to be prepared to either say, "This is what we recommend and this is why we're recommending it," and be prepared to see that process through, or to say, "We don't think there's anything interesting here."

Another alternative is to wait until we're asked. There are pros and cons to that, which we can discuss when we're together in LA. As much as we want to be apolitical about this sort of thing, it's intrinsically impossible, and I believe it's really important, and will save us a lot of grief, if we accept that from the beginning and figure out how to be as straightforward and apolitical as possible, given that that's the environment we work in. A lot of topics I would say, "Let's just deal with it and figure that somebody will misunderstand or misinterpret it."

For instance, RSSAC went into those fundamentally technical topics. We can easily defend them as such. We can easily just do our work and

manage it that way, but for something like this we have to be more realistic about the political aspects. Sorry for the speech. I'll be quiet now.

BRAD VERD: Trying to speak just purely technical, Suzanne, you brought up 001 and 002. Wouldn't those fundamentally have to change to accommodate something like this? Paul, I do not think your idea is crazy or stupid.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I haven't actually thought about that. Maybe some of the others here have.

BRAD VERD: One document is about the expectations of a root server and one is about measurements. It seems like both of those change the view saying anybody is allowed to play. Maybe I'm wrong.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I'll answer that with strictly no hats at all, and then I should sit back. It would seem to me that since those documents now have no formal commitments from the existing root server operators – which I think we should fix – I think as voluntary standards, or "these are the standards you should ascribe to" they would continue to be perfectly valid, but I haven't actually thought about it or tried to reconcile those things.

Frankly, I think that's something that we should all – to the extent that we're thinking about the scaling issue and the false proposal or any other – I think that's actually a really important thing to think about. It's

the impact on the [unclear 01:04:51] impact on the commitments we're trying to make here.

BILL MANNING: We are attempting, or have attempted with much struggle, to make the root system more regularized, more measurable, more visible on its behavior. This particular draft, if widely adopted, abandons most of those efforts, because we have no way of encouraging people to instrument and measure the way we'd expect the root zone to be instrumented and measured. I'm with Brad on this. I think that if we want a measurable system, this is a weakness in the current draft.

PAUL VIXIE: It is 11 minutes after the hour. We have 18 minutes or so left before my next meeting, which is scheduled at the 90-minute mark. I do not believe that the discussion of the merits of this draft will fit in that time schedule, and I believe we should constrain ourselves to process question of what should RSSAC do about it.

To that end, I resonate strongly to Suzanne Woolf's suggestion that we wait. I don't know whether to wait until we're asked to study it, but I'd say wait until we have wisdom. That is my very strong second choice, if this Exec decides not to refer this matter to the Caucus. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I think we should definitely save the discussion about the content. I'm happy to wait and hold back for a bit. I haven't heard anyone say

anything to the contrary. I suggest we follow Paul's advice here and wait for wisdom.

BRAD VERD: I don't think we can afford to wait. I think we have to make some sort of statement, because this draft will proceed through the IETF and it will be deployed. Once it's deployed, for us to gain wisdom by looking at it after it's already left the barn, is a problem.

ELISE GERICH: I was just wondering, Paul and Bill, it seemed to me that what I also heard Paul was that you said you'd like to present this to the Caucus – that perhaps that's the right way to introduce it within the broader root server conversation in the RSSAC conversation. I think we should do as you propose; to have a presentation to the Caucus and a discussion at the Caucus Meeting. Or did I misunderstand what you said?

PAUL VIXIE: I was offering to do that, but you have foreseen the fact that I would also like to do that. [overtalk 01:08:48]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry to interrupt, but do we want to do that as an open meeting?

ELISE GERICH: No.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I can't resist here. Let me be in the queue.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Someone might be before you? Okay, Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: First of all, I think we have a broader discussion here than one specific document. There have been several, in the DNS Ops context, in the IETF, and there is a broader discussion there. The other thing is I don't think we should have a public meeting on it until we've had a little bit more chance to thrash out how we're going to handle the questions that that will raise. I'm not saying we should have a public meeting about it, but we should have some idea how we're going to handle a public conversation about it.

ELISE GERICH: All I was going to say is that I don't believe that we have a Caucus Meeting scheduled for the upcoming ICANN Meeting, which is next week. However, I'm assuming we'll be scheduling a Caucus Meeting at some point in time, so I don't know why we should say that we don't want to have this at a Caucus Meeting. I thought that was really why we had a Caucus – to get input to the RSSAC from a broader perspective.

PAUL VIXIE: I think we just didn't want it an open one. Having it at a Caucus Meeting is fine. I think what we're hearing Suzanne say is that the Caucus Meeting should not be one of the ones that's open to the public.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I agree. I'm actually, personally, honing in on the plan to discuss this at some length in Los Angeles and make a plan there. My current idea for a plan is to do what's been proposed here, which is to figure out what we want to ask for in Los Angeles and then actually present and ask at a future Caucus Meeting, which we should also plan in LA. Does that sound like a plan?

PAUL VIXIE: That's okay.

RUSS MUNDY: Liman, I think it will depend on what happens at the Meeting, but my sense is that we should point out more than one example, since there are at least two or three documents that have been written down with how to do such a thing. Each of them would make some substantial changes in how the operations would occur. Picking just a single one of them to begin with would seem to pre-dispose an answer.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Again, I was unclear. My plan was to have a wider discussion regarding this, and I definitely plan to include the other documents as well. I wasn't focusing on this specific one.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you.

SPEAKER: Liman, point of information – Warren Kumari and I are organizing an off-the-books interim meeting on this specific topic, likely to be held in Hong Kong in the first week of December. I believe that before that time, he and I will have conjoined our draft in some way.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. In what context will that meeting be held? Will it be open? Will it be in conjunction with some other conference or so?

SPEAKER: It will be open to certainly RSSAC. In fact, I can get some travel support for root server operators to attend that meeting. It will be open to others, but the point is to get it discussed, and in light of world events we all think that going to Hong Kong makes a lot of sense. There will be more information on that to come, so please keep this confidential at this time, but it will certainly be an open meeting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. All right, looking at my wall clock here, I realize that I would like to move onto the next Agenda Item. Would that be okay? Or is anyone opposed to that? I think we have a way forward with this. Any

Other Business. Timing issues with time to lives and signature validation. Who brought that up? Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Russ and I uncovered a potential problem with some timing issues between details in the root zone and signature validity periods. If you look at the TTLs today you'll see that in the root zone most of the records have one-day or two-day TTLs and the [NSR set 01:15:20] has a six-day TTL. For all of the signatures that we're generating we have a seven-day validity period. The validity period is 24 hours longer than the TTL period.

In fact, it's a little worse than that because there are some delays between the time when the zone is generated and when it's actually pushed out and published. So we had a bit less than a 24-hour window. This is a problem because if any particular root server letter or instance, which experienced a problem in getting an up-to-date copy of the zones, you could find yourself in a situation where the real-time [unclear 01:16:12] working time. For example, if today this kind of thing happened, then that [unclear 01:16:25] server would be serving out records that expire past their validity period.

I got that backwards – the records expire after the validity period. We're not aware of this problem happening to any particular root server at this point. This is just some directive work. The other thing to note is that this isn't normally a problem for validators because validators will automatically limit their TTLs to the minimum of the TTL and the validity

period, but it could be a problem for validators operating behind non-validating [operatives 01:17:15].

BILL MANNING: So fix it.

DUANE WESSELS: One of the things we're working on to fix this is to extend the validity period from seven days to ten days. According to the [DPS 01:17:33] that's a move we need to make. We can do that. We'll be sending out emails to various people informing them of the same. The other thing that we'd like to consider is perhaps reducing the TTLs on the [unclear 01:17:45] RSEP in something less than six days, to give us a little more time.

Unless anyone thinks this is a terrible idea, Verisign will be sending out a more formal request to RSSAC so that [unclear 01:18:58], and we would hope that RSSAC would then refer this to IANA.

BRAD VERD: Just to be clear, Paul, we want to fix this, but we can't make content changes to the root zone without it going through the proper channels, and the proper channels is to come from ICANN, IANA, for authorization to NTIA. That's the current setup.

PAUL VIXIE: As a point of order, it was Bill who said, "Just fix it," not Paul.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry, I apologize. Bill, we are trying to fix it. This was the best way, we thought, to get the request in to ICANN.

DUANE WESSELS: I look forward to the detailed proposal on which parameters you want to change.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I was just going to say, I think you're going the right way. I would also appreciate a write-up of the technical details so I can sit down in peace and quiet and do the analysis, and see what comes out. I think you're on the right path. I have no objections right now, but I'd like some peace and quiet to have a look at it. Personally I'm quite happy to take this on board in RSSAC.

                            I don't know if you want to go the full path of forming a Work Party process. Say we should, and I think I'd be happy to. If there's time pressure on this… We've been running like this for a couple of years so I think the answer is no, but I'll let you judge that.

DUANE WESSELS: I think the time pressure is going to be alleviated by the signature validity period, which will be happening pretty soon.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Would you be wiling to do a write-up? You don't have to make a formal request in the first round, or make an extremely formal proposal, but if you have some kind of draft text, that would be helpful.

DUANE WESSELS: Sure. I'll work on something.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Also, do you have any confidentiality aspects in this?

DUANE WESSELS: I'm requesting that the persons on the call could keep it confidential for now. I propose so, yes. I will be sending out emails to the various stakeholders and the community very soon, informing them of the signature validity. We don't have any plans at this point to publicly talk about the TTLs.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, that's good to know. Would it be okay if I shared this with some other technical guys at Netnode, when it arrives? First in line would be Ewan and Patrick, who you both know.

DUANE WESSELS: I think maybe wait for the letter.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes.   In whatever you send out, please give instruction on how we should handle it properly.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Brad and Duane, just to make sure that we don't inadvertently somehow be a hold-up on any progress, if we could share the write-up with the [Cotard 01:21:42] just to make sure that we understand how things are moving?

DUANE WESSELS: You are on the stakeholder list.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Can we move to the next Agenda point?

ELISE GERICH: Liman, can I just mention that we received an email from Kave with the Membership Committee update? I know that topic's in the past, but the Membership Committee approved and recommend two Members for Membership in this meeting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Actually, the next Agenda point in Any Other Business was the Membership Committee thing that Paul raised. Is this the same one or is this a different one Paul?

PAUL VIXIE: It's the same one. This is my AOB item.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'd like to do the poll then.

PAUL VIXIE: We have just joined the queue. We've [counted them 01:22:47] we're close enough to two months that we're going to join the queue [unclear 01:22:48] deal with the process change Liman suggested.   There are two recommendations in there. Elise can read the names, since I'm not in front of my computer at the moment. I'd like to have a vote on accepting these latest two candidates. Elise, if you please?

ELISE GERICH: Yes. The two candidates are Matt Weinberg and Kim Davies. I posted in the chat room the message from Kave, where he said, "We have two candidates in the queue, Matt Weinberg and Kim Davies. Below are their details: Matt is from Verisign. Kim is from ICANN." I don't see anything else.

PAUL VIXIE: I move that we add these two people to the Caucus and notify them as
                        such.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Does anyone second that motion?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I find it seconded. Any discussion? Thank you. I find that
                        the motion carries, and I'm happy to say that because I know them both
                        and they would be valuable additions to the Caucus.

PAUL VIXIE: Liman? I'll see that the remainder of the process is followed, as far as
                        onboarding.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent.

PAUL VIXIE: That concludes my Any Other Business.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. That brings us to the end of the meeting. I thank you all for participating.   We're on time.   I will see you either in person or via telephone call from LA. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]