LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Well, it's a few minutes after the hour, so I think we should get going. Welcome, everyone. [inaudible] agenda here. We have a proposed agenda for this meeting and it's being played in the Adobe Connect window. As usual, before we start [inaudible] the agenda, I will do the customary roll call.
	Brad Verd are you here? No Brad? What about Matt Weinberg? Bill Manning?
BILL MANNING:	Here.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Wes Hardaker? No Wes. Paul Vixie? Hank Kilmer? Tripti?
TRIPTI SINHA:	Yes, here.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Gerry Sneeringer? Gerry? Kevin Jones?
KEVIN JONES:	Here.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Hello, Kevin. [inaudible]? Jim Martin from F-root?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Jim isn't here, but Suzanne is.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello, Suzanne. Someone has an interesting audio set up. The bridge is going berserk . G-root, Jim Cassell?

JIM CASSELL: I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello. Kevin Wright?

KEVIN WRIGHT: I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello. Howard Kash?

HOWARD KASH: I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello. I am here myself. You may note here. Daniel Karrenberg?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Present.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. And [inaudible]? John Crain? No John. Terry Manderson?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Liman], Terry has sent an apology.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, thank you. Jun Murai? Hiro Hotta? [Not] present, okay. Ashley or [inaudible]? Elise Gerich? Duane Wessels?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, I'm here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And how about Russ Mundy? No. I already have regrets from Marc Blanchet. And from staff, is Steve with us here? No. Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: This is Carlos.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Kathy is here.

KATHY SCHNITT: Correct.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And Barbara?

BARBARA ROSEMAN: Okay. Let me just do [inaudible]. We have eight members present, so we do have a quorum. Okay, the agenda, [inaudible] housekeeping, review of action items, approval of minutes, membership committee update, meeting plan for 2015 including timeframe for [inaudible] workshop, schedule for the caucus meeting in Dallas and review of the rules of engagement that Tripti has made a draft for.

Then, continue hopefully with IANA stewardship transition process update. Possibly discuss the evolution of the root server model a bit. I don't want to stress that one too much. Then look at the ongoing and new work items, the [TTLs], and the new proposed one from Duane, signing or not signing the root server [inaudible]. And of course any other business. Is there any other business at this moment that we should add?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Did my item get on there?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's actually I put it under the cover of evolution of the root server model. So it's in there. I intended to discuss it there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So should we get going then? Review of action items. Could Carlos, please – yes. Give us the action items.

CARLOS REYES: To review the outstanding – or I guess all action items from the 9 and 10 February meetings in Singapore, the first action item was [inaudible] the follow-up with RSSAC [inaudible] statements of interest for the caucus.

There are a few – I think four or five – alternates who have been approved as alternates, but did not formally submit a statement of interest or consideration by the membership committee. So Steve and I are working on that. We're just getting them to submit them to the membership committee. So that's ongoing.

Next item, Tripti Sinha to draft rules of engagement. That's complete. Steve Sheng to work with RSSAC co-chairs on planning the caucus launch event. That's ongoing. I know Steve is working, liaising with the IGF for scheduling purposes.

Steve, Barbara, Carlos, and Kathy to work with the RSSAC co-chairs on drafting and submitting the special budget request. That's been complete.

Carlos to publish the revised draft minutes from the 22nd of January. That's been complete.

Kathy to schedule the approved teleconferences and meeting for 2015. That's been complete.

Steve Sheng and Carlos to onboard two new caucus members. They've been added to the mailing list and Steve has been in touch with them as well, so that's complete.

Steve Sheng to publish the approved statement on the IAB liaison. That one's complete.

And the last one is a duplicate on the draft rules of engagement.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Are there any lingering action items from previous meetings?

CARLOS REYES: No.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, excellent. What's the term? Never mind. Approve minutes from previous meetings? Do we have any minutes to approve? Yes, we do.

From Singapore. And we did postpone that at the previous meeting, didn't we? Because they were published just before. Oh, am I mixing? [inaudible]. I'm probably mixing [inaudible].

Have you had a chance to read the minutes? Are you happy with them? Do you want to make any comments? I hear no comments, so I propose that we publish these minutes on the public webpage removing the draft [inaudible] as we usually do. Carlos, could you please make that happen? Hello? Am I alone here now?

CARLOS REYES: Sorry, I was un-muting myself. Yes, I'll note that as an action item.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Okay, since Paul is not here, [inaudible] not here I think—

PAUL VIXIE: Hey.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Pardon yes?

PAUL VIXIE: Hello.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's Paul, is it?

PAUL VIXIE: I'm Paul.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, welcome. We were just walking down the agenda, approving the minutes from the Singapore meeting and we've now come to the membership committee update. I guess it's up to you, Paul, or Tripti. Do you have anything to mention?

PAUL VIXIE: I prefer Tripti to take care of this.

TRIPTI SINHA: All right. Hold on a minute; I just lost my screen. We just onboarded two members that were approved by the RSSAC. This would be Davey. I'm trying to pull up – hold on one minute, please. I believe it was Davey Song, if I got the name right, and [Declan Mah]. We did receive – were contacted by two other individuals, one who wrote on behalf of an organization as opposed to writing in as individuals. So [Kavay] has been in touch with this individual and asked them to submit an expression as individuals as opposed to asking for membership on behalf of an organization. So that's ongoing.

We were also contacted by two people who were in Singapore. And Liman, I believe they attended the session that you presented at, the Fellowship Program. They're going through the formal process of submitting their expression of interest. So that's where we are.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, thank you. Okay. Any questions for Tripti and Paul? If not, I'll continue with the meeting plan for 2015. For the [newest] future we took at fiscal meetings, we have the upcoming meeting at the IETF in Dallas, which will happen on March 22nd. That will be the first physical face-to-face caucus meeting, and it will happen in Dallas after the [root ops] meeting on the Sunday.

I did send out a draft agenda for that meeting that Tripti and I, and Steve I believe, [talked] about. We [inaudible] discussed some logistics and we're getting good help from both ICANN staff and also the IGF people to make this happen.

So our thought is to do a round of introductions, so that we all know who's who in the meeting to give a bit of background about the RSSAC history and restructure for those who are new to RSSAC. I would guess that 80% of the people in the room have been part of RSSAC for a long time, but I guess there are also two new ones.

We'll have a look at the rules of engagement which we will need to work on here and now and during the time up to the meeting, so that we have something [fairly] [inaudible] to present.

Go through RSSAC 001 and 002 and give a status report if we can about the uptake and how root server operators are working with implementing them.

Hopefully a presentation about the [TTL] work that's underway, and [inaudible].

And then finally just a general open brainstorm about ongoing and what future work items we could and should work on, which I think should have an open slot for process-related ideas, how RSSAC and the RSSAC caucus can work better to produce good advice and good results, and of course some placeholder for any ideas that come up.

Does that seem like a reasonable agenda? I think we planned for a 90-minute meeting, if I remember correctly. Any comments, any ideas?

RUSS MUNDY: Liman, this is Russ. Sorry for being late, but I had a suggestion that I wanted to toss out to see if folks were interested including this or not. Would it be reasonable to ask the Root Key Rollover Design Team to make a presentation?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It would be appropriate. Give us a chance to set some timeframes on the items we have. The only limiting factor is the time, in my own perspective. If it can be a very brief presentation, I definitely think we should have that during the brainstorm session as an idea that's something we may want to turn our attention to. Would that be a workable solution?

RUSS MUNDY: I think it's fine. I didn't know if – and I don't feel that terribly strongly about it. I didn't know if folks had even thought about it because the team has been fairly recently assembled and so forth. It might be also

an opportunity for them to outreach. I don't know if they'd be even interested in doing so or not.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just as one data point, that team has not actually met yet. I don't know if there's going to be a lot to say.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: All right. You know what?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Let's not make a formal item on the agenda about it, and as we get closer, we can stay in touch with the rollover group and see what the status is when we get near to the meeting.

RUSS MUNDY: I think that's excellent, from my perspective.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I need to make a small note about this. All right. So I'll then send out this as a tentative agenda to the caucus mailing list and start to narrow down the logistics for the meeting. I think we said that we tried to start the meeting at 3:30 and go for 90 minutes until 5:00, which means that

we will conclude just as the welcome reception starts, which would fit nicely.

TRIPTI SINHA: Before you send the agenda out to the caucus, let's make sure that we are all okay with the Rules of Engagement document. Otherwise, it's on the agenda, you send it, if we're not okay with it, then we've set an expectation, so I would do that only after we come to some kind of consensus.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Fair enough. I do agree. I do hope that we come to some kind of consensus today. I would prefer that if we feel that the Rules of Engagement are still very much up in the air, I suggest that I send a draft agenda which does not include the Rules of Engagement. And if it lands before the meeting, I will send an updated agenda. Is that fair enough?

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes, agreed.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, thank you.

STEVE SHENG: Sorry for joining late. [inaudible] agenda has already gone out to the RSSAC caucus, and on the agenda item #4 says information and discussion of interaction between the formal committee and the

caucus. It's worded very vaguely, but the agenda has already gone out to the RSSAC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I should know that. All right. So we have that in place I think. Are there any comments or requests or ideas for the Dallas meeting. Anything you would like to add, or amend, or have fixed? You're a silent bunch today, guys. We'll continue according to plan, then.

PAUL VIXIE: Your plan is a good one.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's for the Dallas meeting I think. If we look for physical meetings during the year, we still plan to meet during the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires, and of course we don't have any details for the logistics there yet, except that, according to my notes, it will happen during the – [inaudible], I'm sorry. There's a bug in the Apple Calendar thing.

It will be in the week where the Monday is, the 22nd of June. I don't really know what my travel logistics will look like, because Friday the 19th, the preceding Friday, is Midsummer Eve, which is the second biggest holiday, I would say, almost during the year in Sweden.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Then you should stay in Sweden. I'll be there for this ICG meeting on the Friday and Thursday.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. That is, indeed, [inaudible]. It will likely come to that. But that means I will travel during the weekend, so I will be there during the week. At least that's my current plan.

RUSS MUNDY: So, Liman, [inaudible] planning purposes then, if the RSSAC members are there in place ready to meet Monday morning, that should be sufficient. Is that a good interpretation?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think that would be a good interpretation, yes. I'm kind of looking here at Steve and Carlos to help me. We haven't had any formal meetings during the week and before, so I don't see any special reason to start having it right now when I have logistical restraints.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is [inaudible]. Sorry. Are you suggesting – I'm not sure what you are suggesting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm asking you whether you see a reason to suddenly start having RSSAC meeting during the weekend.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, no. We don't . . . I think for 53, we could use the old format, like meeting on [Monday afternoon Tuesday], like we did in 52. If RSSAC needs more time, we can reserve more space. But I don't foresee a need to meet the Saturday before or the Sunday.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well, then we agree. And, Russ, yes that would mean a yes to you. It's sufficient to be there Monday morning.

Okay, working from that forward in time, we have an IETF in Prague, which is in the middle of July, the Monday of the 20th of July. I'm not sure that we need to have a meeting there. It depends a bit on the outcome from the Dallas meeting to see whether people want to have physical meetings or not, if we have work to do and so on. But I think we should keep the option for having a caucus meeting in Prague. We should also keep in mind the idea we've had to have caucus meetings at other conferences than the IETF.

One of the alternatives is the RIPE meeting, but the nearest RIPE meeting is only in the beginning of May, and to have one in late March and then another one in May doesn't really make sense. Then there is no RIPE meeting until late in the fall. So the Prague IETF is still a useful option to keep.

Then we have talked about having an RSSAC workshop, not for the caucus but for the formal committee, sometime – what did you say, Tripti? Sometime in September.

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes, we were looking at the September timeframe.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And the idea is to get together for maybe two days and have longer and more relaxed discussions about items that require a more relaxed environment and more focused than we can have during the teleconferences, then we can find [inaudible] at the ICANN meetings, such as the evolution of the root server model.

                          So I ask you, not here and now, but I ask you to start looking in your calendars for suitable dates in September for having such meeting. And we will absolutely do a Doodle poll to see what we can come up with, what you should expect, something during the, let's say, middle of September.

                          Should we look at having a caucus meeting at some other meeting than the IETF? [inaudible] fall. We have a NANOG meeting in Montreal, for instance. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I look at my own agenda and I see that September and beginning of October are already pretty full, so I think what we need to do is put a Doodle poll out for possible dates and make them – I would suggest to put out quite a number of dates during September, maybe early October, because I'm already seeing if we only have one or two options, they'll probably collide with something day-job related. And we need to do it now.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Yes, we need to do it now. Absolutely. Tripti has generously offered to host it at the University of Maryland. It also depends on the availability of rooms and facilities at UMD. I will get together with Tripti and we'll make – just as you proposed, we'll make a Doodle poll with a number of dates and we will see how that ends. I know it's problematic. There are lots of conferences and lots of stuff going on, but we'll see what we can do.
	Back to my question. Do we want to have a caucus meeting at some other conference than the IETF meeting? One obvious alternative will be the NANOG in Montreal, another one would be the RIPE meeting.
	The NANOG meeting is already kind of stuffed. It has the DNS-OARC workshop just next to it.
RUSS MUNDY:	I was actually going to suggest that maybe thinking about adjacent to an OARC meeting might not be a bad choice, either.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Well, it has its pros, definitely. But it also means that – depending on what you go for. But if you go for the OARC meeting and the NANOG meeting, you will have to add some more time. On the other hand, the caucus meeting is fairly short, so maybe you can squeeze it in without adding more days to the travel schedule for the poor souls that have to travel the globe.
	The RIPE meeting is in mid-November, talking November 16th. Maybe that's a bit late. I don't know.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Would it make sense to do a poll of RSSAC and caucus members about this just saying would we want to do later in the year, so people have time to plan? But would we want to do adjacent to NANOG or OARC? Just because, to some extent, we're speculating on what caucus members would want to do, and to some extent, we all need to sort of go away and think about it a little bit.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's actually a pretty good idea. Carlos, can you make an action item on me to make a Doodle poll for basically the caucus? As all RSSAC members [inaudible] members of the caucus for the caucus to find out two more meetings after the Dallas meeting and to determine where people prefer to have these meetings.

CARLOS REYES: Yes, I'll do that. What options would you like me to provide? I've heard Prague. Or do we just want to leave it open? I just want to know how to structure the Doodle poll.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No, you don't have to do that yet. Just make a note. Make an action item and we can work on that afterwards. We don't have to do the details here now.

CARLOS REYES: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This [inaudible]. Can I have a word?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Please.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I'm still not quite sure what the purpose of highly frequent caucus meetings would be. I can see an idea of a caucus meeting like once a year or so to have a dialog or something. Also I would like to see a good remote participation on those. I'm not sure whether we need really frequent caucus meetings. My impression always was when we have work for the caucus or when the caucus wants to bring something, they can organize themselves outside the meetings, and if we have work for the caucus, we'll form work parties and those meet either virtually or physically.

But just starting another series of caucus meetings to me seems a bit out of proportion unless we really [inaudible] what we want with them.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You do have a point. I think I have two comments to that. One is that we need to keep time slots open for the case that we realize that we want to have a meeting. And unless we plan for that sometime ahead of time, we won't have that option because everything will be booked.

The second comment is that there is also a social component to the caucus that we need to maintain. We're slowly getting people in there which are not part of the regular DNS bunch, and I would like to see a way to get them into the friendly club, so to speak, so everyone knows who everyone else is and feel at ease to discuss things.

Now, I will happily take arguments for that can happen in different venues than formal caucus meetings. Maybe we should look into that instead. But I think we should provide – not necessarily by providing resources, but we should provide opportunities for the caucus to meet and socialize and sit down and have a drink, toss ideas, whatever. But [by just listening to quiet] mailing list there won't be much energy in the caucus. But I'm quite happy to take more and other ideas regarding that.

JOHN CRAIN: I'm with Daniel on this. We're planning the next caucus meeting and we don't even know what we're going to do there. There's a risk if you bring people to a formal meeting and there's not an agenda that they basically give in on it because it has little value.

For the social aspects, the way we do those in some other environments is that when we're at events, just call out to the list of people who want to get together and [even] do a [inaudible] or have a group drink or

something. The formal meetings aren't that social. People who don't know each other are not going to mix in general in those kind of environments.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, all right. Do you think, though, to the extent that we should not look at having a formal meeting in Dallas?

JOHN CRAIN: No, I think we should have formal meetings. I just don't think we should have them more than once, or a maximum of twice, a year. And I think those are mainly about making sure that those of us on the committee and those in the caucus interact and have a two-way dialogue. But we're talking now about doing one in a few months after that. If we're going to have one, we better have something to speak about if we're going to have a two-way dialog.

It's more important to me that the working groups meet regularly and get work done.

TRIPTI SINHA: I'm inclined to agree with what Daniel was saying. I also want to make the comment that we absolutely have to have the Dallas meeting, because an expectation has been set and we need to kick off the group, but let's not go meeting crazy and we've got to have concrete agenda items.

So I think we need to strike a balance. And since this is all very new, we just don't know what that balance is. So I'm not saying no to the Prague meeting, but at some point, we need to pull back, put things in perspective and just strike the right balance.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Fair enough. I haven't heard any comments speaking for more formal meetings, so I will conclude that we will remain open to having them, but we will not drive them unless we have real agenda items to discuss.

RUSS MUNDY: I just want to share a comment generally on this. I think in terms of for our purposes here today to establish tentative caucus meeting times makes perfect sense, but it also seems that it would be most reasonable to discuss during the caucus meeting in Dallas how the participants in that meeting see the need for meeting frequency to occur. Do they want to have some gatherings at some of these events?

We can say if we sort of lay tentative things out that at least the people on this call can put the marker spots on their calendar to hold them, and then if a caucus wants to do that, we have the time allocated.

I do also agree. We don't want to drive it down the caucus throat, so to speak, but if the caucus wants to meet that much and in that manner, the slots are already at least – a starting point for the slots are established.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, that sounds reasonable to me.

SUZANNE WOOLF: First of all, I have to say this isn't really an ICANN advisory committee yet, because we're doing work to avoid having meetings. I love that. I think that's fantastic. But I'm going to monkey-wrench this a little bit just by saying I do expect – it wouldn't surprise in the slightest that if real work items for the caucus came out of the summer meeting. So I think at least having a tentative plan for a meeting sometime later in the year after that is a good idea. Small work items, we don't need it. We can do it all remotely, phone calls, mailing lists and maybe a working group if it needs a little bit of face-to-face time can arrange that.

I suspect we're going to end up looking at a couple of pretty big things in the committee face to face, so having some provision, keeping a slot open for a caucus meeting is probably a good idea.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, I hear you.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I'd like to argue against Russ's and Suzanne's point, because if we don't have a current need for a meeting, I don't think we should even plan slots because of the tendency that if you have a slot that it gets used, just as a matter of principle.

I agree with Suzanne there might be substantial work, but I'm not sure whether physical meetings will be needed to progress it. So at the

moment, we don't see for a meeting, so we shouldn't even make a schedule for one that we really don't see a need for. Maybe there's other ways of doing this.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, please?

PAUL VIXIE: It's rare that I speak in opposition to something Daniel has said, but I want to support the idea of loosely scheduling this meeting. The people who join the caucus are expecting that they will be active in this area. I don't think that means we're going to form work parties to do nothing, but I do think that we need to give those people a vibrant foundation to stand on, especially given that there's going to be work that will come out of the ICANN meeting that the caucus is probably going to need to do. But they're a big group and we need to give them a chance to lay aside some travel.

But especially we just need to respect their interest in this. We, culturally speaking, the RSSAC core is made up of people who try to avoid meetings and try to avoid process, and that's good for us, but that's not what we're doing here. This business of having a caucus is, in many ways, trying to turn a cultural corner and it indicates that we should have an expectation of a fall meeting with the idea that we're going to be aggressive about killing it if it turns out to be just make work. But I really think we should go into this with the expectation that we're going to have multiple RSSAC meetings per year. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'll ask this question to the following speakers here to comment on this as well. Should we bring it up during the Dallas meeting? Should we involve the caucus in making the decision about future meetings or not? Bill, please?

BILL MANNING: I see RSSAC meetings as orthogonal to caucus meetings. I believe that the caucus should take control of its agenda and set its own meetings independent of an RSSAC Schedule. So if we wanted to, in a kick-off manner, suggest that RSSAC caucus think about holding a couple of meetings if their workload suggests it that they plan and schedule those meetings themselves, that's not something we should do on their behalf.

WES HARDAKER: I think Bill's right there. To [inaudible] it even further, the purpose of a caucus meeting in the first place – and everybody says that the purpose of an IETF meeting is to get more face-to-face time. I actually think that that's only half the truth. The other half of the truth is to motivate and spur and get movement happening.

The frequency, in my opinion, should be based on how often those types of things should happen. But having a discussion with only half of the participants – us versus everybody else – is not really sufficient. And if we went on [inaudible] they have change [inaudible] in control so that

they are motivated to do the work. Well, the first step is how often shall we meet? They need to be heavily involved in this discussion.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I now have John Crain and Daniel on the speaker list, and then I will inject myself. John?

JOHN CRAIN: Daniel actually had his hand up longer if you want to let him go first.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I still remain unconvinced that we need to schedule meetings for a caucus as a whole. I think this could better be done by – if we want to get [inaudible] as a caucus, I think we have to put issues before them and start a discussion on a mailing list, and maybe a teleconference.

I think one kick-off meeting, as we have planned it – and I haven't been arguing against that one – is sufficient for the time being. That's all.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. John?

JOHN CRAIN: I think, yes, we should absolutely have a kick-off meeting. I think we should have at least have annual meetings where we talk about the status of RSSAC and the caucus and we have an interaction. Yes, I think

we should take this to the caucus about what are the caucus members' feelings on this.

I really don't think we need to schedule specific dates. I do think we need to make it clear that there's a possibility for meetings, should the caucus want them. We shouldn't [inaudible], as people were saying. We can make it clear that they could meet at any IETF, if given notice.

I don't think we can expect them to self-arrange because they just don't have logistical capability to do that. But we could allow them a certain amount of self-selecting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Yes, I would like to caution a bit. I started to hear vibrations going, what I consider to be the wrong direction which is to start talking about we and they. To me, the caucus is something that I want to be inclusive with – not to the extent that they participate in the formal meetings that we have with the formal committee, but to the extent that we are members of the caucus and that should be an inclusive approach to them.

The second thing is I wanted just to support what John just said. We cannot expect them to do things on their own behalf because they are not organized. They are a pool of people that we rely on, but for leadership and guidance, it's actually down to us to provide that to the caucus group.

If the group is expected to do something, it will have to be under our guidance. We will have to provide the framework for the group to work in, even for making decisions about meetings and such.

That said, I think it might be a good idea to do involve them, but we will have to be there as well. We can't just send them off and say, "Go and organize yourselves."

Right now, I think I'm resting in the opinion that we should not call for any meetings yet. We should discuss it in Dallas and we probably – at least internal within RSSAC, we should keep a few dates open, but not say that the caucus . . . Unless we actually find reason to use them, which is probably somewhat down the road.

If there's strong opinions for avoiding discussions in Dallas, I would like to hear them.

So I think we should put that on the Dallas agenda and have a discussion there and see what we arrive that. I think there are good reasons in both directions here, so we probably need to involve some [inaudible] people and get some discussion going.

I think we are – pardon, yes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]. All you said [inaudible] until the point where you say we should reserve some dates, but not tell anyone. I think that's absolutely wrong. We shouldn't do that. Let's not do that. The rest of the summary was perfect.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. [As] John said before, the hands don't work. I don't know if I can rely on the speaker order here, but I have John Crain at the top of the list right now.

JOHN CRAIN: That's just me forgetting to take my hand down, sorry.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA: Actually, you took the words out of my mouth. I was getting concerned with "they" versus "us" and I was going to caution against that, and also state that someone – I didn't recognize the voice. Someone said let them go organize themselves and have a meeting. I was like no, no, no. This is going down the wrong path. We created this body as a resource to the RSSAC.

The other thing I was going to point out, Liman, we're 53 minutes into a 90-minute phone call. I would caution that we wrap this one on and move on with the meeting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. That's why I said my resting point was, because I wanted to do exactly that. But we'll put it on the agenda for the Dallas meeting and we'll discuss it further there. Apart from that, we have a table of

proposed RSSAC teleconferences and RSSAC meetings at ICANN meetings, which I think is pretty much straightforward. I don't think we need to discuss that. If there are any short comments, let's hear them, but I think it's straightforward. And we have [inaudible] already.

Okay, moving on with the agenda. Tripti, your document, Rules of Engagement. Will you please lead the discussion?

TRIPTI SINHA: Sure. This is probably a good segue into this discussion. This was an outcome of our meeting in Singapore. If you remember, at that meeting, we took stock of where we were. We created the caucus, and then we realized we haven't put together the mechanics of how the RSSAC and the RSSAC caucus will engage each other. So I offered to write a very basic document on some rules of engagement.

So if you have the document in front of you – or Carlos, could you display the document on the screen? Okay, thank you.

It's got three fundamental rules, and we're hoping that during this discussion we can add or delete. We just start with defining who the RSSAC is and the caucus and how to contact the RSSAC and the point of contact are the chairs, either or both.

And the modality. The primary modality of collaboration is online. In addition, we'll ensure that we have in-person meetings. And we just had quite an animated discussion about exactly that.

Then I go on to define three rules. Rule one essentially is what we had put into our operations document, which says that, from time to time,

there are technical matters that need more scrutiny and research. So we make a call for a work group to be established with leaders and we set them off and they do the work and they report back on this. The work group reports back on their findings with hopefully a set of recommendations and the document has been ratified.

The second rule says that members of the RSSAC caucus may identify problems that require technical scrutiny and research. So they should have some form of mechanics to be able to reach out to us to inform us of what they would like to put in front of us as a problem statement. So they do so by contacting the chairs. Then the chairs have responsibility to acknowledge receipt of the problem statement with possible next steps.

We bring it back within the RSSAC, discuss this, and if we believe that, yes, this is indeed something that needs more scrutiny, we would then apply rule one, which basically goes through the process of how we put together a work party and what steps they would follow.

Rule three essentially says that we need a forum for more in-person collaboration and dialogue and we would have these in-person meetings and they would have agendas. So the RSSAC caucus – the co-chairs of the RSSAC would arrange for leaders to talk about the ratified documents, and if there is work that is currently underway, some of the work parties, then they would potentially share their work.

Also, the ratified documents, if there were recommendations and if we acted upon the recommendations and we would share the outcomes of

those. And also we would keep a catalog of all the problem statements and what their status are.

Essentially those are three draft rules I have in place. I essentially open the floor now for discussion. Any thoughts?

KEVIN JONES: In the rule two where we discussed giving feedback for a possible next step, and then the last statement says that there's an idea that if it gets selected, it would go through the [rule one] process.

I guess in terms of I'm a little bit confused how those last two bullets interact in the sense that do those next steps recommendations change if it is actually selected? And if it's not selected, is there any other communication that goes to the submitter from the second bullet?

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, let me see if I understand your question properly. You're saying in rule two, the second bullet where it says the RSSAC chairs would acknowledge receiving the problem statement, but the next steps – I'm sorry, Kevin, I didn't fully understand what you were saying.

KEVIN JONES: Okay. In the second bullet, it says that we recommend some possible next steps.

TRIPTI SINHA: Yeah.

KEVIN JONES: But then in the third bullet, it makes it sounds like the recommendation that's still under review and something else happens. So either it gets selected as a problem statement that goes back to rule one or it doesn't.

I guess what I'm trying to figure out is, one, if it doesn't, is there any other communication that goes back to the submitter that says, no, this was not selected? And then, two, does the selection of a problem statement, does that change anything that went back as the potential next steps previously before it was selected?

TRIPTI SINHA: I see what you're saying. There's an incomplete [inaudible] statement there, which is if we decide, yes, this is a legitimate problem, then we should go to rule one. If we decide it's not, then what's the else. Correct? That's basically what you're saying.

KEVIN JONES: Yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: You're right. We should probably – this is a good catch, and I will put that down as something we need to complete. What are your thoughts? We should acknowledge where we are in the process and come back with where we stand in terms of next steps, should this not return to rule one as a work party, correct? We do owe the submitter a response

if this does not continue as a work item and explain why we don't believe it's a work item.

KEVIN JONES: I think that aligns with the type of empowerment conversations that we were having in our previous meeting.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, let me put this down. I just realized there are hands up. My apologies. I was not looking at that. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. I think the general point I wanted to raise is very similar to what [inaudible] just raised, that we need to be more, if you will, considerate of inputs that are provided and provide a response, and perhaps a way to describe the responses, that there will be a response and it could be going through the real one process or it could be an explanation of why the RSSAC as a group, as opposed to just the RSSAC co-chairs.

TRIPTI SINHA: Absolutely. Maybe that was not clear. This would definitely be vetted by the RSSAC. It's just that the person who is in communication with the caucus would be either both or one of the chairs. All right, I will complete the document.

RUSS MUNDY:	Right. More of a clarification. I think that was probably very much the intent is if somebody picked it up and looked at it as-is, it wasn't as obvious. That was the intent.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Yes. I will take care of that. I will add more precise language to make that clear, and also to ensure that the process is complete. Liman, you're next.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Thanks. I've made my comments yesterday in an e-mail to you personally, but I'll do them here as well. I'm not sure whether this is the right place, but maybe this is better described on a process document, but I don't see any words that express that the work party is expected to arrive at a rough consensus within the caucus before a document is submitted back to the RSSAC. Is that a matter of process rather than engagement? That may well be the case and I'm happy to be told so.
	My second comment is that we also don't mention the ability to keep and forward dissenting opinions documents. Again, I don't know if this is the right place, but I don't want to lose that one because I think it's an important property of the documents that we process.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Liman, the one thing that put me in a quandary with the first suggestion that you had about rough consensus within the caucus, the RSSAC is also a subset of the caucus. So in essence, the [superset] comes to consensus and then submits to the subset, correct?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. The thing I want to avoid is the work party leader saying, "I don't care what the rest of you think. I'm submitting this to the RSSAC now." There should be a way to – there should be a guideline somewhere that tells the work party that you cannot do that because you have to obtain a rough consensus before you can submit it back to the RSSAC for rubber-stamping and publication.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, all right. Is everyone okay with that? Any other conversations around what Liman just suggested? This is going to be hard to do. I see hands are up. What I'm saying is I'm opening the mic up for any other thoughts related to what Liman just said.

                      Hearing none, I'm going to put that down as something I will include in the document.

                      I agree that dissenting opinions should be stated in the document itself. Anyone opposed to that? All right, hearing none, I will move on to Daniel. Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yeah. Well, first of all, I'd like to respond to Liman in that our process document actually has language – and I don't have it in front of me right now, but [inaudible] has language about dissenting opinions.

TRIPTI SINHA: Daniel, it does have language, and the language actually states, if you look at rule one, which one is . . .

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Anyway, I didn't want to go into the details. I actually have a more general point. First of all, I'd like to say I didn't have the energy this morning to actually carefully read Tripti's rules, which were right in my mailbox at the start of the workday. So my comment is a bit more general.

Shouldn't we maybe not cast it like this like you've cast it, but cast it as a list of issues? For instance, how do we empower the caucus to suggest work items? Because our process document actually has language in there that [inaudible] caucus, but it's not as concrete. But we could list that as an issue in our meeting in Dallas with the caucus, and basically say – and solicit input from them, ask them how should we do this, rather than again going into detail [inaudible] top-down which will be perceived to be top-down by people who are members of the caucus, but not members of the committee. Wouldn't that be a better way to address this?

And then the other things – shouldn't we cast any of the more detailed procedural things as changes to the process document rather than having an additional rules of engagement thing?

So what I'm saying is wouldn't it be better to just identify the issues that we want to have more clarity about to the whole caucus and say, "Hey, how should we do this?" rather than [inaudible] [complete] language.

And the second thing is if the [concrete] language [inaudible] developing, shouldn't it be cast as direct changes to the procedures document rather than having another layer of rules?

I think the answer to both questions is, yes, of course. They're more rhetorical questions.

TRIPTI SINHA: I actually have no issue taking this content and putting it into the procedures document. I'm perfectly okay with that. Thoughts from everyone else on the other items that Daniel just put on the table?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm quite happy with doing that as well. I see now obvious value in having a plethora of documents that interact. It's better to have one document [inaudible] make a consistent. These are probably things we didn't think of. So maybe we should – have it written down is good, because we now know where to look for it, but maybe the long-term solution is to put it in the procedures document [inaudible].

But until we have that, we can have this as a reminder of how we want it to work and what we want to put in there. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Daniel, is your hand up again? No, okay. Kevin?

KEVIN JONES: So [inaudible] for this document was to leave it in draft state and it's concurrent from the caucus before we would go forward and make any changes to the operating procedures. Correct?

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes, yes. Consider this just draft content. It's being presented to you as a document, but once we all agree – and I'm going to use the word "ratify" – ratify the content of the document, then we could very easily just include it in the procedures document. That to me is a simple matter of just updating the version number and putting it in the right place within that document. I think that makes sense. And I would agree that we don't have too many documents.

                        But yeah, it's being presented as a document, but where it ends up living I'm perfectly okay with what Daniel suggested.

[KEVIN JONES]:   I guess the point I was trying to emphasize that this was not something that we were doing as RSSAC, but this was actually something we're initiating as RSSAC that will get finalized at the caucus meeting, that this is not something we're presenting to the caucus but that we're sharing with the caucus and actually asking them for feedback on before we close it out for comment.

TRIPTI SHINA: I don't know where we are on that. Liman, do you remember how this was discussed in Singapore? I'm not sure. I thought it was more of an RSSAC initiated matter. Since the RSSAC caucus is a resource to the RSSAC, we came to the conclusion that we [seated] the group, but we did not decide how we would engage them.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If you're trying to get something from my memory, you should know better. No, I don't remember, I'm sorry.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any thoughts on that? Daniel, I see your hand is up.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yeah. My thought would be to make what's before us a little bit less specific and explain more what the issues are that we identified here that we want to make rules for and have a discussion in the caucus.

Also, I'm not 100% sure whether the – I don't know the detail on the style this was written and actually fits into the procedures document. My suspicion is – and I haven't really had time to look at it. My suspicion is that there's a lot more detail here than is in the procedures document. It would really help if this was phrased or cast as let's change the procedures document exactly like this. But when you present it to the caucus, I think it needs an introduction that basically says we see this problem of how specifically can the caucus introduce work and here's how we – our draft [inaudible] on how to handle this, what's your

[thing in]. That's what we should do. Sorry, I'm a bit tired. I'm not as concise as I'd like to be.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. I see Wes. Wes, you've got your hand up.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. Actually, he just sort of said what I was planning on saying, which is that this, in my opinion, should be another document that goes to the caucus for the caucus to give feedback on. I look at this as the template for what we are starting. But again, they should be involved – "they" being . . . I keep saying that, too. It's really we and the global we, right?

TRIPTI SINHA: Exactly.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. But it's hard to find the right English terminology to make that work really well. So we as the larger set should be the body that comes up with the functionality that definitely works. Certainly how the suggestions is brought to RSSAC is the work body that the smaller we are supposed to formally publish, that the smaller "we" have a very definitive responsibility there, but we need to be as open as possible with the global we and how we come up with new bodies of work. That has to flow both ways, and I think that this document is another good starting point for where the global we can decide how this is going to work.

I think that's actually what we came out with in Singapore. I think the feel of the room was we don't want to look – RSSAC shouldn't look like a [inaudible] function as much as it could appear to. That's not our purpose. Our purpose is to make sure that the work that does get published by RSSAC is [inaudible] and sound. That's our primary purpose.

TRIPTI SINHA: Good point, Wes. Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure. The only other aspect of it that is a little bit delicate but is sort of part of the balance is that RSSAC, the committee, actually has some direct responsibility to root server operators, and the larger caucus deliberately does not. So the balancing act is between not wanting RSSAC to be, as Wes just said, a gatekeeper, but also to make sure that the advice that comes out of RSSAC processes is implementable for root server operators when it's about advising root server operators.

And I can't imagine a situation where the caucus would have a consensus position that root server operators couldn't agree to, but RSSAC saying, "Yeah, as root server operators, we can agree that this document . . ." And I'm struggling a little bit with the terminology. I'm sorry. There is an element there of kind of an additional ratification step that has to do with root server operators being held responsible for standing by the work product that comes out of the caucus. It's an accountability thing.

EN

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Any other thoughts? I'm going to close this discussion out in the interest of time. Daniel, you made a good point. My apologies this document came to the group very late, so you probably haven't had time to actually read the content.

So I'm going to go ahead and edit this document to include Kevin's suggestion to complete the statement in what we're calling rule two, and to include what Liman suggested for rough consensus and dissenting opinions to be stated.

What I'll do is I'll send it back as a draft to this group so that you can read it. Liman, I like the idea that you present this at the caucus, if this group agrees, and get rough consensus. Is this the way we'd like to engage each other? And in the end, we probably want to include the content somewhere and the procedures document makes sense, but that's just my recommendation on next steps.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I think that's good and I agree that we need to move on right now in here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So please do that. Please do a second write-up and we'll continue to discuss it on the mailing list, I think.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, all right. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Moving on with the agenda, in the interest in time, I think we're going to skip the IANA stewardship transition process update, unless you have things you want to say, Daniel?

DANNIEL KARRENBERG: Nope.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Nothing spectacular has happened. We're in the [inaudible] process state making sure that the proposals don't contradict each other and the two proposals that we have are not contradicting, so that's a pretty good state right now.

So I will move to the evolution of the root server model. I will actually also, in the interest of time, I will give the [inaudible] directly to Bill here, because you had a proposal that you wanted to [inaudible].

CARLOS REYES: Bill had to drop off. He sent an e-mail to the list.

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Oh, sorry. I didn't see that. We have ten minutes to go. I don't see that we can conduct any useful [inaudible] discussion on the major things of the evolution of the root server model, so I suggest we just keep that [inaudible] unless someone has something you wanted to say about that. Because I would like to get a quick report on what's going on the TTL work party. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Sure. So we had our first meeting that went reasonably well. The major outcome of that meeting was that we came up with six items of study that the work party would undertake.

Number one is to document the history of TTLs in the root one. Number two is to make a survey of TTLs used by TLDs, compare the authoritative TTLs to the delegated TTLs for both [NS] and [ES] records and DNS keys.

The third was to do a survey of implementations to see what their defaults are in terms of maximum TTLs that they will keep in their caches.

The fourth is to analyze DITL data and see if we can understand how recursive name servers actually do honor TTLs. The fifth was to study – to simulate what would be the [inaudible] effects of changing root zone TTLs. Obviously we would expect a lower TTL to result in an increase of traffic, but it would be good to understand more specifically how that would work.

And the last was to study the interactions between the [SOA] [inaudible] timer, and the idea that the root server might [inaudible] data. The idea

is to make sure that a root server would [inaudible] serv fails because [inaudible] zone before it began returning expired data [inaudible].

Those are what we came up with. We haven't divided up the work yet, but we have another meeting next week.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, thank you. I'm not really asking for, but have you thought anything about timeframes?

DUANE WESSELS: As far as the document overall, we discussed the schedule that is mentioned in the [inaudible] work and everyone agreed that that was reasonable. I believe that's a June deliverable if I remember correctly.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. That sounds good, thank you. Any questions for Duane? Okay, then I'm going to give the second token to you, Duane, which is your proposed work item for an investigation for whether to sign or not to sign the root server to [Inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, sure. For those of us that participate in the [root ops] meeting, you'll know that this is a topic that comes up from time to time, whether not the root servers [.net] zone should be signed. Currently it is not signed. This has come up as early as 2010. I guess late 2010. And in 2011, [Joe Abley] had written a 20-page document in the style of an

Internet draft called "Risks and Benefits of DNSSEC in the root servers [inaudible]." I'm happy to send this around if people would like to see it again.

More recently, this issue came up in the meeting that we had at the Hawaii IETF sort of in the context of continuing concerns about the [inaudible]. Whenever this sort of comes up in the [root ops] group, it gets discussion but no real action or progress. During that meeting in Hawaii, we sort of discussed that maybe this is something that the caucus should consider taking on.

My personal impression is that there's little interest or support within the root operators that the zone should be signed, but it would be good have a body like the caucus study this and sort of come to some decision on what to do rather than keep going in circles.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you, any comments? Suzanne?

SUZANN WOOLF: I was sitting here wondering if – I'm realizing that I am not signing that document. If that could be resent, I'd appreciate it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Should I just send that to the RSSAC list?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, please do that. So should we leave it at that for the moment, asking you to recirculate the Joe Abley draft and ask the RSSAC members to take a look at it and whether we find that to be material for a work statement or whether we should just put a lid on it. Any other ideas?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You'll see that it's quite detailed. This document – this [inaudible] document – looks more like something that the caucus would write. It would be [inaudible] of the work party. It's quite long for a statement of work, but anyway, you'll [see that].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. I don't remember. I remember seeing it when it came, but I don't remember the content. [inaudible] actually arrive at a recommendation?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, let's see.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Or does it just state the pros and cons and what the effects would be?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. It's just factual. It doesn't really make any recommendations.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, because that's what I would like. That's something that I could envisage from the caucus, actually discussing and arriving at a recommendation. That would be valuable.

But okay, so please do resend the draft. Let's have a look at it and let's discuss it on the mailing list to see whether we want to make a work statement out of it or not.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: With that said, I think we have arrived at any other business. No other business. So that means that those of us who go to Dallas will have a chance to meet there, and the next time we have a teleconference, it's on April 2nd. So thank you all for participating in this meeting. See you either in Dallas or talk to you in the beginning of April. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]