TRIPTI SINHA: Hello, can you hear me? Hello, can anyone hear me?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, you can hear me. I need the agenda displayed. Alright, thank you. I call this meeting to order, I'll start with a role call. VeriSign? It's [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I don't believe so.

TRIPTI SINHA: USC, Suzanne. Alright, Cogent? [AUDIO BREAK]

Moving on. From the University of Maryland, myself. NASA? Anyone from NASA? ISC?

FRED BAKER: Hi, this is Fred.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi Fred. Suzanne says, "Should I be hearing anyone, anything?" Yes, the meeting is in session. Carlos or Steve, could one of you respond to Suzanne please and let her know that the meeting is in session?

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

	DoD, who's here from DoD?
KEVIN WRIGHT:	This is Kevin Wright. [AUDIO BREAK]
TRIPTI SINHA:	Hello Kevin, anyone else?
KEVIN WRIGHT:	Just me today, thanks.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Okay. ARL, we've got Howard on?
HOWARD KASH:	Yes.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Hi, Howard. Netnod?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Lars Liman here, the only one.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Hi Liman. RIPE NCC, Kaveh you were on the [inaudible], are you still on?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I am here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, thank you. ICANN?

TERRY MANDERSON: This is Terry, good evening all or good morning, whichever it may be.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hello Terry, is anyone else joining from ICANN?

TERRY MANDERSON: I don't believe so, no.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Wide?

HIRO HOTTO: Hiro here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi Hiro, welcome. From IANA?

NAELA SARRAS: Naela here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi Naela. Root Zone Maintainer?

DUANE WESSLES: Duane's here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi Duane. IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes, I'm here, Daniel.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi Daniel. SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Russ is here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi Russ. I also notice Matt Weinberg is also here from Verisign.

MATT WEINBERG: Hi Tripti, sorry I'm late.

TRIPTI SINHA: It's alright. Russ is here, Kaveh is here as our board liaison and Liman is here as our CSC liaison, Brad is here as our RZERC liaison. In terms of

our Staff, we've got Mario, Andrew, Carlos, Steve and Kathy, so we have a full house from a Staff perspective. For the remainder of RZERC we're missing Cogent and NASA, I'm sure they'll join us. Hi Wes, let's get that recorded as well.

KEVIN JONES:	Tripti, this is Kevin, I'm sorry, I joined late.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Okay, so Kevin's here. Anyone from Cogent? The only one we're missing right now is Cogent. Someone just announced themselves, who was that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	That sounded like a bunch of feedback, if people could just mute their phones to be aware of that.

TRIPTI SINHA:	I noticed Jeff Osborn just joined as well. Alright, very good. Moving on let's do a quick review of the agenda. We'll go over Administrivia as usual, approve the minutes and we'll get an update on where we are with the organizational review, then move on to our discussion of the big advice. It takes stock of where we are with the first receptions and then go on to the discussion of the next third of the document which is performance monitoring and accountability and function and a strategic architectural and policy function.

Then review our timelines, have a short discussion on the slide deck as well as the engagement plan. Moving on, updates on work items between ones that are currently underway, Anycast, and harmonization of the anonymous procedure [inaudible]. Then updates from the co-chairs and also a review of the ICANN schedule, and a quick review on the 2018 May workshop.

At this point would anyone like to add any other agenda items? Alright, hearing none, let's go back to item number four. Carlos, you're going to need to display that agenda on the side bar for me. I'm going to turn this over to Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thanks, Tripti. That's from the January teleconference, action items have been completed [inaudible]. Back to you, Tripti, for a vote.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any discussion on the minutes from the last meeting? Alright, hearing none, I'm going to the agenda and vote. As always, I start with those not in favor, anyone not in favor? Those abstaining -- and I will abstain since I was not in attendance for the last call.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman will also abstain.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Liman and Tripti abstaining, Carlos for the record, and I shall assume the rest are in favor. The minutes are approved. Moving on to -- sorry, I just heard Terry say, "I didn't unmute in time, I would like to add any other business items, that is FY90 Budget."
	Carlos, could you add another agenda item from Terry Manderson as an ALD please? Thank you, Carlos. Moving on to item 4B, which is over to Carlos on an update on the RSSAC organizational review.
CARLOS REYES:	Thank you Tripti, hello everyone. Quick procedural update on the organizational review; later this week on Friday an independent examiner will be providing the assessment report to the review work party. This is basically just capturing their various interviews and the survey results in a written form. The review work party as you may recall is composed of the two co-chairs plus Liman, Hiro and Kaveh.
	That group will review the draft before it is published just for factorial issues. Once it's published the RSSAC will have an opportunity to provide feedback of course. Part of that will also include a webinar for the whole community and a session at ICANN 61. There are various opportunities for RSSAC to provide feedback at this stage of the review.
	The report, just a reminder, does not include any of the recommendations, this is just really the findings from the survey and the interviews. Any questions? Alright, thanks and Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: Carlos, just to emphasis, so as you were saying, the report is delivered this Friday to the working party and that gives us an opportunity to correct any findings in the assessment that are egregiously ill placed or they misunderstood something or the other, right? it's more or less [inaudible]?

CARLOS REYES: Correct, yes. This would a situation where maybe the work party calls out, oh they're really talking about a caucus in this paragraph and not the RSSAC, or factual issues like that.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, and should we find something that should be brought to the attention of the RRSAC, we will do so before the report goes out for public comment.

CARLOS REYES: Correct.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. I just want to make sure that everyone heard that. Any questions for Carlos about this procedural next step?

Alright, hearing none let's move on to the discussion of the root service evolutions. First a quick review on what we did in January. I missed the call but Brad was presiding and the goal was to discuss the first sections.

Subsequent to that, since you ran out of time, we had another call, which was not mandatory and we went over some more content.

Thank you for the discussion and where things stand right now just to let you all know is that the process we're taking is, the consolidated reports are in a Google document and that's a document that all of you are adding comments to. The admin committee, which is comprised of your ICANN Staff, your chairs and Kaveh, we then take those comments and are editing it.

Right now, the document is with me, Brad's added his comments and now it's with me and I'm editing that particular document, and then I'll send it back to Andrew for grammatical checks and so forth, and then he will upload the most recent version of the first three sections into Google Docs, and he's going to come up with some way that you will be able to see how the document is evolving without deleting the comments in the original document. We would like to maintain the original, consolidated document where everyone is commenting so that you can refer to it and see how the document is evolving.

Now I did want to point out that this is turning out to be a particularly difficult task because there are so many authors and one observation I've made is that there are lots of details that come to this document and it's not clear to me if we want to be at that level of detail for advice, for high level advice. Also, there's some comments about what things look like today when really and truly the advice is about the future.

When it's been rewritten and put out there, please review the original content with what it looks like, because the goal is to ensure that we

maintain the content and the actual message is not lost, and we may take some of the material and actually put it into an appendix, where the reader may want to review material in more detail. That's the approach we're taking right now regarding the first three sections that we've had discussions about so far. Any questions?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: The time schedule for this?

TRIPTI SINHA: The schedule is we have an in person meeting next Tuesday in the ICANN DC office, so I'm targeting that meeting as the meeting to show the admin team what it looks like and then upload it shortly thereafter, within 48 hours or so, so next week Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any other questions? Alright, hearing none, let's move on to 5A sub 2 which is now the discussion of performance monitoring and accountability function. I'm going to now pull up the documents online on my laptop. Carlos, are you actually going to display it on the screen or how are we going to do this?

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti, Andrew has provided the Google Doc link and they can review the document on their machines.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, if you could all on your personal machines look at the Google Doc, Andrew has provided the link; and by the way, this is proving to be a particularly difficult task, and I am on section seven, which says, "Performance monitoring and accountability."

Carlos, I'm on a little itty-bitty laptop, by the way, just for all of you, I'm not actually in Washington right now, I'm in San Diego attending a meeting and I'm on my little tiny laptop, so I can't see the Adobe Connect and the -- I'm struggling to go back and forth between the Adobe Connect as well as the Google Doc, so if someone's hand is raised can you please guide me to that?

Let's start the discussion with performance monitoring and accountability; would someone like to start the discussion on that? [AUDIO BREAK]

Anyone? The one observation I made was I felt some of the content is focusing on how things -- for example I think on section seven the first bullet says, "Monitoring of the RSO's for poor technical performance." I'd rather not take that tone, I'd say, "Monitor the RSO's to ensure that they perform according to specs or whatever."

Rather than focus on poor technical performance, focus to ensure that they operate at a high technical performance or point to a certain

standards document. Those are the kinds of changes that I'm thinking of making as I start to go through the document.

RUSS MUNDY: I think that's an excellent type of change to incorporate.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Russ.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: To further reduce the text just to say, "Monitor the performance."

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Liman, that's exactly what my point was. I felt like there was -- I'm going to take the very high level of abstraction and speak at that level as opposed to some of the stuff I'm running into, and I think that some folks are writing at a very detailed level and some folks are at higher level, so we're going to need to aggregate this and ensure that the tone is correct. Remember, we're talking about the future and how we'd like this to operate in the future.

FRED BAKER: Doesn't the performance monitoring and accountability function [inaudible] that's given to the designation and removal group?

TRIPTI SINHA: Correct, it produces an assessment report.

FRED BAKER: Seems like we want the same -- I agree with Liman that we're using it to monitor and would be good, except I would say monitoring and assessing.

TRIPTI SINHA: Fred, your point is let's ensure that the word assessment is in there, right?

FRED BAKER: Somewhere. I might say monitoring and assessing the performance of the root server operators.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Andrew, I think you're taking notes on this, could you make sure that in this particular section we highlight the fact that assessment reports are produced through the function?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Got it, thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Other comments?

RUSS MUNDY: I'm recalling some of our earlier discussions on this particular area where there was indeed a concern about the assessment aspects and how was the best way to get them incorporated, so I have not gone back and tried to give a careful critical, but just looking through this section, I don't see that there is that much emphasis on assessment in there and that's maybe something that as if you're looking for the editorial flow of things, you could decide whether or not more needed to be said or if it needed to be said differently. I think we had a lot of back and forth about what this does assessment actually mean.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, it's been a long time since we had that this discussion but my understanding was it was originally called the auditing function, we did not like the word audit.

RUSS MUNDY: Right.

TRIPTI SINHA: So, we went with performance monitoring and accountability and performance monitoring, there will be some very good documents in place, standards and references and so forth against which the monitoring will be done, and that we assume will flow from strategic and so forth. It would be almost like a precise science where you would have these tools in place, you'd have actual tangible results and they would be aggregated and reports would be produced.

It's much like the review that we're undergoing right now with ICANN, which is on Friday you received an assessment report; it's not a judgmental report, it's simply an assessment of this is what the data is telling us.

That's how I interpret this function, it's monitoring, it's collecting data, it will be fed into a report and the word we're using is accountability, so you have an accounting of how the operators are functioning. Is that in disagreement with what we discussed, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Well, my recollections are that we all concluded that this was a very challenging space, but the tie into assessment and accountability was -- I think that may have been where we all sort of said we'll try to deal with it when we put all the pieces together.

My recollection is that's where we are now, is to see from the document as a whole, that the accountability and assessment makes sense with the rest of the whole document. I have to say, I have not looked at it that carefully but I will take an action to read this in particular and provide comments on the side for what I see.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Alright, please do. One thing that did jump out at me when I was reviewing this last night as a matter of fact was, we have to be careful in how we use words. In the stakeholder's section we talked about who are we accountable to, and in this section we're calling it performance

monitoring and accountability, so did we mean accountability or did we mean accounting?

There's a difference in the two words and how we use them. I wasn't clear, was this a section where we simply take an accounting of our performance and thereby produce this report? Does anyone recall how we meant it? I think we meant accounting; when we were trying to steer away from using the word audit, I thought we went with accounting.

RUSS MUNDY: That's my recollection, Tripti, is it was more towards a keeping track of what was actually going on, which is an accounting type of thing as opposed to being response to some set or activities outside of the RSO's or even outside of RSSAC, which was accountability.

TRIPTI SINHA: Is everyone okay with using the word accounting here as opposed to accountability, cause we're using accountability in a -- I see Liman's hand is up. Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Thank you. I must admit, you're now getting into the finer details of the English language where I'm starting to get lost, but my [inaudible] from the view of transparency. Whatever word you choose should you come from that angle, a word that reflects the transparency that we want to create here. I leave it to you who are much more versed in English to find that word, that's the [inaudible] that I'm looking for.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Thank you, Liman. Other questions, comments on this section? Liman, is that a new hand?

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: No.

TRIPTI SINHA: Scrolling down, going through the sections, we've got [inaudible] on policy, then we've got server operator monitoring, RSS monitoring. Daniel you've got a lot of comments here, would you like to speak to any of these? You've got some on just formatting, but please don't worry about formatting, this [inaudible] looks different from a format perspective.

Then there's non-technical attributes, financial continuity and risks, planning and commitment, we have no comments on those sections. Shall I interpret the lack of comments as people are okay with those sections? Brad, go ahead.

BRAD VERD: Just really quick on 7.12 and 7.13 based upon the previous discussion, we use the word accountable in those documents. I just want to make sure we're consistent throughout the document, that's all, just calling that out.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you Brad. Moving on to, I'm down at 7.23 planning and commitments, 7.24 [inaudible] and moving on to appeal, and Ryan a comment, "Do we need to have an appeal section or can we state that the appeal should go through existing ICANN processes?" Discussion on that, please. Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL MIGAULT: My comment was just to respond to the question you raised before, Tripti. Most of my comments are more [inaudible] clarification. If I can add one, I think that the introductions should give a clarification about the documents [inaudible], so that the reader and the relations between the different sections. I think most of my comments are clarification [inaudible].

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Thank you, Daniel. The question that Ryan asked about 7.3 appeals, I see we all agree there needs to be an appeals function for sure and would leverage the appeals process that currently exists within the ICANN. Now, I'm not sure that appeals necessarily belongs in [inaudible], it might not appropriately fit here. I would agree that it needs to be in the document for sure.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry, Wes, Liman and Russ in the queue.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, in that order.

WES HARDAKER: Thanks, Tripti. I think that we do definitely have to mention appeals. I think we agreed previously that we would use the ICANN process for doing appeals and things like that, but at the same time it's important that the advice states that there will be an [inaudible] process and how an RSO should start that process.

Where it should go is an interesting question, I'm glad you brought that up; to some extent it makes sense to have one in the assessment kind of area because that's where the results are going to be, but I would agree it should be in the section that defines where actions are going to be taken. It might need to actually be in multiple sections to make sure [inaudible] short sentences in multiple places.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, thank you, Wes. Who's next?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Are we misreading this or is it having the label by choice? When I read this I don't see it as appeal of a decision taken by the performance and monitoring function but as the appeal of where the root server operator can have a dialog with the PMAF to make sure that everything is understood right and then giving a chance to rectify [inaudible] under the magnifying glass. Maybe appeal is not the correct term, the correct label.

TRIPTI SINHA: I see. It's more like remediations.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's more like it, yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Oh yes, it's remediations, thank you Liman, I think that would be an appropriate heading. Andrew, could you label that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yep, I'll take that. Got it.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Russ, did you have a question?

RUSS MUNDY: I was going to comment on the term appeal, I think change to remediation is very good. The concern that I had about this particular paragraph and its placement overall was that it was not fully clear to me whether or not this was an appeal or a remediation to something that was strictly a performance issue because it's in the performance monitoring section, which kind of infers that it would only be performance related issue that was being examined and discussed, yet it talks about non-technical assessment.

I think we need to make sure it's clear, whichever way it's supposed to go. If it's fixing a technical short coming or if it is an appeal or

remediation or something of that nature for whether or not an activity was dropped as RSO or whether or not they would have added as an RSO. The big picture thing verses a strictly technical pure performance item.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Russ. Anyone else? Alright, moving down to potential future operators, so the PMS will be responsible for the technical and non-technical qualifications of the applicant RSO's. In other words, they will play some role in identifying future RSO's. Any discussion on that?

Alright, hearing none let's move on to strategy, architecture and policy. By the way, just to remind everyone, this will all look very different because I will take it to a high level of abstraction and consolidate it [inaudible] with a different tone. Right now, we're going through the document more for content than style.

Moving on to strategy, architecture and the policy SAP function. I personally thought all the main points were in this section when I did my review last night. The scope of work, there's a section 8.11 talks about the strategic stream and then there's one that talks about the architectural stream, the policy and how this will be manifested and composed, and its relationship with stakeholders on the functions.

If I'm not mistaken, there were no comments at all, so I don't know if that's because everyone signed off on it or if no one read it.

RUSS MUNDY: Or if it was too fuzzy for people to really understand. As somebody who was on the group that put it together initially, I feel free to say that, if it's not clear enough or not understandable enough, people please comment and say so.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any comments? Okay, Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think this one has the tone that we're striving for in the entire document. Here's where we have -- it kind of condensed into bullets, it's painting the broad picture. I like the tone of this.

TRIPTI SINHA: I agree, that was -- I felt this was at the right level and I'm just beginning to wonder if that's why we really didn't get any comments cause it hit the mark but I would agree and I hope everyone agrees that this is the kind of tone we want to put into this advice.   Alright, any other comments?

Alright, hearing none, that brings us to the end of the [inaudible]. I'd like to now move on to the timeline. This is taking stock of our colorful timeline here. We are now -- look at the purple horizontal arrow and this [inaudible] where we identify [inaudible] the PMAS and the SAPS. The intent was to go [inaudible] identify any gaps and the next thing for February is an inquiry meeting that the [inaudible] is having next week.

I think we're on schedule, the only thing we need to do now is for you all to read the next evolution of the advice. As Liman asked earlier, what's the schedule for that? The goal is to release it next week for the first three sections. Any questions on timelines?

Alright, hearing none, moving on to the slide deck. This was a slide deck that Paul Vixie had requested, that be produced so that we could all take those back to our executives and keep them informed. I leave it up to each member of this committee in how they want to keep their executives informed of what's going on, the work that we're doing. Paul had requested a high level executive slide deck, that is currently available as a Google Doc.

My personal opinion is that the slide deck be used to talk the board through our work and so forth. I think it might be almost too low a level. I think we need something that's even higher level. You're welcome to ask the slide deck.

Carlos, I don't think we need to display it, but I think you've all seen it, it's a slide deck that we show to the board, I think it was in Abu Dhabi or South Africa, I can't remember where it was. Any comments or questions about that slide deck? Alright, hearing none -- did I hear someone?

WES HARDAKER: Sorry, I was looking for the button. I think it's a good start. As we move forward, especially as we take this material [inaudible] to more community I think a more refined, probably easier to view type diagram; right now these diagrams have been written for us and we

understand the process and at some point, we need some simplification.

TRIPTI SINHA: That's exactly where we are, Wes. [Inaudible], he loved the slide deck, it was at his level and he was doing deeper dives with us and so forth. I think we need a more distilled version, maybe one or two diagrams, nothing more than five to ten slides.

Anyone has any thoughts, feel free to add to it. It's not mandatory, it was just as a guide to how you talk to your executive. Moving on to the next item which is the -- go ahead, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: A technical comment actually. If I remember correctly, the slides in that deck, several of them are pixel images and when you enlarge them reading the text is really difficult, so if the source for those images, if that could be exported in vector format and put into the slides, that would make them a whole lot easier to use and discuss, and you can enlarge certain parts, [inaudible] because the form of them is difficult to [inaudible].

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you, Liman. As we refine that deck, we'll keep that in mind. Alright, the engagement plan, Carlos, could you display that? The last phone call we went over -- I wasn't on that call but Brad went over the engagement plan and asked for your input. I think someone did send an input; Carlos, who sent input, I forget, but you did get some?

The plan is, if you look in your Adobe Connect Room, the engagement [inaudible] plan is you would have ongoing engagement to our liaison; we've had quite a few to the board to CSC, RZEC, IAB, PTI, Root Zone Maintainer, SSAC, and the co-chairs coordinate with the ICANN executive team and the caucus.

We've got these ongoing modalities in place to communicate to the community and then ICANN 61, your co-chairs are invited to what's called the SO/AC leaders meeting, which is the Friday before the conference starts. At that meeting all the SO/AC chairs share what's going on within their respective communities, so we will do that at ICANN 61. At our public sessions we give an update and we'll continue to do that. We have joint meetings with the board and SSAC.

Then the May 2018, the RSSAC's co-chairs will provide a briefing at the ICANN board workshop. Carlos, do you know the dates yet of that? If you recall, just for RSAC's benefit, roughly a year ago we were in Los Angles, the board invited the chairs to come and present to the ICANN board and we did that; that's exactly this week last year I think. This time, the goal is to go to the main workshop. Kaveh or Carlos, could you share that, when's that workshop?

CARLOS REYES: It's the week after the RSSAC workshop, so May 11th through 13th.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. [CROSSTALK] I'm sorry, who was that, Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Just in Vancouver, yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. By that time, we would have had our May workshop, so our advice will be very close to being well baked and it's almost like giving everyone a sneak peek into what's to come soon. That meeting is when they get a sneak peek review of this advice that's going to be released at 62.

By that time the goal if you remember out timeline was to release it just before 62, so at the public sessions we will present that and invite ASO and ALAC, what was that? I can't remember that. Carlos, you're going to have to remind me, what is that?

CARLOS REYES: Sure. Basically, the discussions we've had in December as an admin team and then with the RSSAC and previously actually, the ASO and ALAC work groups that basically the group felt that it'd be nice for them to know what the advice is but they're not really directly impacted by any of the actions and the advice or the advice as a whole, so we would specifically invite them to any public sessions but there wouldn't any direct engagement.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, with those groups. Direct engagements would be with the board, SSAC, GNSO councils, ccNSO council and the GAC, am I right?

CARLOS REYES: Correct, at this point.

TRIPTI SINHA: This is what your engagement timeline plan looks like. Would anyone like to add to this? Anything you don't like or we're missing? Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Actually, a question. You have to help the ongoing liaisons to the various sub-groups, me being the one to the CSC; do you want us to take an initiative to engage and start informing them? I haven't so far because I haven't felt that the document is baked enough to do that. At which step, if you want me to take an initiative to inform the CSC, please give me an idea of when to do that.

TRIPTI SINHA: My sense is the active work by liaisons in terms of engagement, what happened only after the document is fairly well baked and I think, correct me if I'm wrong, that would be after the May workshop. Any thoughts on that?

LAR-JOHAN LIMAN: That sounds just like my interpretation. but that's fine for me.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Does anyone disagree with that?

RUSS MUNDY: I think that's good timing, Tripti. I in fact have done only initial input to SSAC by simply saying the RSSAC is working in this particular space with no details other than there's ongoing work.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, very good. Hearing no other comments, let's move on to the next agenda item, which is work items. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I sent a mail to ask the caucus as well. We had some feedback from some of -- actually I think it's mostly RSSAC members on the caucus group. I think we should remove this from the update because we don't have the work party anymore.

I guess I would send an email to Andrew but I guess Andrew will compile a final version based on the comments received and we will phase the document out at that point. But I think we should remove this item as a recurring item for our work items because the work party is not active.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Any questions for Kaveh? Alright, thank you, Kaveh. Moving on, 6B, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Anonymizing the work party as is actually a pretty new draft, very recently, that is for everyone to -- sorry, it's not yet for anyone, it's

within the working group, the work party to respond. Paul Hoffman, who is the editor, he has two issues that he sees as open.

One is to look at if there needs to be extra text regarding the fact that in some cases we will have truncation of activity for addresses in one of the alternative, and the other one is that he's looking for a pointer to a specific implementation of one algorithm that he's been mentioning in this document. There's still some ground work being done but there is a new version, so there's actually progress on this item. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Liman. Any questions for Liman? Alright, hearing none. Duane, packet sizes.

DUANE WESSLES: There was a packet sizes work party call last month; I was not able to make it to that call but reading the notes it looks like there was discussion -- some code provided by Jeff Huston that he had previously used in some of his tests on packet sizes, and also a discussion on the way that [inaudible] do sort of seeking the sweet spot of their advertised buffer sizes. There's going to be another call coming up, I don't know when, it's not been scheduled yet.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, thank you. Any questions for Duane? Alright, very good. Moving on to -- we've got quite a few any other business but before we move on to that, in the interest of time we've asked several of you to send in reports, so I want to thank Naela and Kaveh, who have both

sent in their reports on updates in their liaison role to IANA and the board respectively. I believe for the others, I don't think there were any updates since reports have not come in.

Moving on to the co-chair report, Cherine Chalaby, who is now chair of the ICANN board was in Washington DC and requested a meeting with your co-chairs. I was travelling at the time so I just attended the meeting by phone, so I'm going to turn it over to Brad, since he was in and met with Cherine in person. Brad, could you give a bit on the co-chair meeting with Cherine?

BRAD VERD: I was in DC, Cherine was in town for other reasons and he reached out to the SO/AC leaders that were local and wanted to meet, that was the genesis of the meeting. There was no real agenda, it was just a get together and see how things were going.

He came in, as Tripti said, she was on the phone and really it was an informal discussion but started out more around the threats to the root system and what specifically his narrative and what his narrative would be or could be if a large-scale attack happened against the root and something bad happened. What would he be telling officials, governments as to what's being done to remedy it?

The response was, the immediate narrative, basically, like the operational narrative needs to be worked out and figured out really but the evolution work that RSSAC's doing obviously is the second half of the narrative where you're putting together a framework and policies that would be addressing not necessarily these specific risks but the

operational requirements around the roots, so it would just be kind of the second half of that narrative.

We talked at length about that and he asked about the evolution work, we spoke about it. He asked when we might be in a position to be briefing the board? Again, we talked about the engagement plan that's been shared here. We then proceeded -- he brought up the meetings, so the board had a workshop last week, I think Kaveh reported on that, in LA, that there was going to be a discussion about threats to the root that was going on there and we talked about that briefly.

Then we kind of closed on a very technical discussion about the hyper local root because that's something that both Conrad and Steve Crocker had been referring to for some time now. He asked a few questions about it and we spoke a good amount of time talking to him about it and some of the risks, specifically risks around distribution, risks about losing insights to data and what I mean by that is, the example I used was the data collected for the KSK roll that lead to the pause of the KSK roll, all that data would be moved basically from between the resolver and the existing root operators down to resolvers or other pieces and so you would kind of lose some of that insight.

That was a new data point to him, that was a concern, he didn't quite understand, didn't know that prior to the discussion. We spent some time talking through that and he was very pleased with the discussion, he said it was really, really helpful to help him understand.

I think he has a much better -- I don't know what the term is, a much better understanding of even in a hyper local root world the need for

the existing root server operators to be there and be secure and stable. Since it came back to the evolution document and how important it was, essentially how he walked out. I think that covers everything, any questions or anything to change or add Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA: I just wanted to let everyone know that, as I said, I was sitting at Phoenix airport so I was just dialing in, but Matt Larson attended the meeting in person with Brad and that was because ICANN Staff, Carlos and Steve and everyone else, were in Los Angles attending I think a retreat for the policy group, so Matt Larson and Brad met with Cherine in person at the ICANN office. I see Russ has a hand up, Russ is that an old hand or is that a new hand?

RUSS MUNDY: One quick question for Brad and I guess yourself. Was there any mention or concern raised about the publication -- well, the policy statement last fall where Russia was going to on a national level essentially do their own ALT root and try to get the BRAC countries to make use of that instead of the existing ICANN root?

BRAD VERD: No, that did not come up.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Any other questions? Alright, hearing none, let's move on to topics for joint meetings at ICANN 61. We have three joint meetings thus far and they are with the ICANN board, with the SSAC and with OCTO. What you have before you are the questions that have come in from OCTO, SSAC and ICANN board, these are not questions that we have of these groups for those meetings.

First let's discuss the questions that have come in and also compile quickly some questions that we would like to bring to the table for these joint meetings. OCTO sends in three questions, and the first one talks about what are the root operators taking to mitigate DDOS risks and how can ICANN be of assistance in that area? And the current state of NSID and could operators explain why some don't support instance identification?

The third question is, in their effort to understand the [inaudible] to understand how many OS's are out there, different DNS service software and look at common points of failure, similar points of failure. To me, it wasn't clear what they meant by intra-route operator.

Kaveh, at some point, I'll turn this over Kaveh because this presentation was made to the board recently and I think he knows where this question is coming from but this all about multiple roots residing on the same physical hardware and how that really is not a good architectural element of the cloud service that we all operate collectively.

We just had an admin team meeting and these are very operationally based questions, more root ops oriented questions and we're RSSAC, so

we're wondering one, is this the right venue to discuss it and should we just simply funnel these questions back to all of you with your root op hats on and should these questions be discussed in the root op meeting and should OCTO be invited as a guest?

Anyway, I'm just throwing this out there, what was one discussion that we had this morning. Moving on to the SSAC, the questions are about name collision and the root service evolution, where are we with that, the KSK rollover status and the SSR2 update by the RSSAC and SSAC leaders. As you know there's the SSR2 was put on pause and SOAC leaders have been asked to step in and un-pause it. And there's a request to give an update.

There are two questions that have come in from the board. What are our keys, that are what are RSSAC's key goals for 2018? Evolution and advice and of course our organizational review. What are the most relevant long-term goals? Evolution advice implementation and emerging technology.

These are the things that have come in from them. Let's take it section by section and have a discussion, but even before we go there I see Liman has a hand up. Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was just going to comment on the questions. We as RSSAC have said that we will be the funnel for questions to the root server operators and these are questions that fit that bill quite well I think.

That said, it made me think answering questions is one thing, but to maintain a dialog is a different one, so maybe we need to think about the right way to maintain a dialog with for instance the OCTO and other similar bodies. Is that something we need to invent? Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Before we get into that discussion, Liman, I would like to point out that obviously joint meetings, the SSAC is the only one that's closed so the questions that have come in from the OCTO are operationally related root operation questions and when we had our admin team meeting half an hour ago an hour ago now.

We felt that we really do not want to discuss these kinds of things in an open format, especially if we're going to talk about how we handling -- what is our strategy for DDOS mitigation and so on and so forth. I'm opening the floor up for discussion, how would you like to handle this? These are certainly root op focused questions.

Russ, go ahead, and then Liman.

RUSS MUNDY: These seem to be the type of questions that should be only covered in an open meeting or even in a meeting that -- I forget what right title is, where it's not even on the agenda, where it doesn't appear to the rest of the community because I think these are very, very sensitive areas, certainly not open meeting kinds of questions that should be discussed there.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay.   That is exactly what we were discussing, the admin team. Furthermore, when you come down to this level of discussion, you would think others who attend root ops would want to be at that discussion.   Is this the right venue as well, is another we would like answered? Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That is indeed effectively the question.   I fully agree that these are sensitive things that should probably not be discussed in an open meeting.   Does OCTO have an opinion here?   Does OCTO say that we would like to discuss this in open?   We definitely need to have more people at the table.

Again, we need to find the right venue for doing this. A closed meeting at an ICANN meeting may not be the perfect thing.   On the other hand, we have a tradition not inviting people to the root operating, so we need a middle ground here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Correct me if I'm wrong, root ops we do invite guests, correct?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That has happened a few times but only for specific agenda points and this would definitely be specific agenda points, so that might actually work.   Maybe that's the right way to do it, and I think that we might even want to recommend to root ops to develop a simpler process here, to say that if people want to come to talk to the root server operators there should be an obvious way to do so.

We also reserve an hour at the beginning of the meeting or something or at the end of the meeting for people who have expressed an opinion to meet with the root ops. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. The other thing we also discussed in the admin call was London's back to back with ICANN 61, so depending on how this all shakes out, perhaps OCTO could receive an invitation to attend root ops in London. Brad, I thought I saw a hand, or did it go down?

BRAD VERD: It did. It was basically addressed by Russ and Liman. Liman, I think, or really to everybody, the OCTO meeting is an open meeting and these are items that we would be discussing and I guess my question is, are these -- this goes back to the root ops versus RSSAC; to me these are operational questions and they're not really RSSAC questions.

Now, happy to share them with -- this is my opinion, so I'm happy to share them with root ops, but having that discussion with OCTO, I think is a fine line in trying to figure where that balance is, is tough. The ICANN meetings are about policy and these are not policy questions, in my opinion.

Obviously, if the group wants to have these discussions and feels comfortable doing that, that's fine. I think we certainly need to share this with root ops and get feedback from everybody there before having that discussion, if that's the route the group wants to take. I feel better or I like the idea of inviting them to a root ops meeting and having that

discussion there behind the closed door, whereas in ICANN we've been trying very hard to have an open policy and this would only kind of deflect from that by closing it. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHAL: Wes has his hand up, and Terry makes a comment in the chatroom, he says, "If the root operators published a responsive to RSSAC 001 and 24 and we wouldn't be dealing with so many questions from OCTO." Wes, over to you.

WES HARDAKER: Thanks, Tripti. I think Brad does a very valid point that we are trying to stay away from these types of things and I think if we wanted to try and get them to go to root ops that makes some sense.

At the same time, RSSAC has offered to be the front door to root ops and if we treated these like functionally ask RSSAC questions, where everybody was responsible for taking it back to their operations in order to get answers for OCTO and then bring them back in a meeting to return those answers, assuming that each member could speak authoritatively for their operations staff, maybe not be able to change answers and go into greater detail, depending on what the role is. We could treat it like that, where he's functionally asking RSSAC to ask root ops and we have offered to that on the RSSAC.

TRIPTI SINHA: Wes, I think we're all agreeing that I think this should be funneled back to root ops, completely, but I think do we want to then continue to have

this discussion with OCTO, is the next question? I think personally, my opinion is they should be invited to a root ops meeting, to discuss this.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, my point was more that it doesn't seem as unusual because we have put ourselves in the position to answer these types of questions for OCTO and it may be that this over the line of more information then we're willing to have a long-term discussion with OCTO about on the ICANN side and we really should refer them to root ops but it does work in my mind. It's not like it can't happen at ICANN meetings where it's more convenient for them.

TRIPTI SINHA: By the way, this speaks to me, and it's my personal opinion, the schizophrenic nature of root ops and RSSAC where -- I think OCTO is being very well intentioned right now and I think they just view us as some miss mash amalgam of root ops and RSSAC, and that's what's really going on here. Terry, you're got your hand up.

TERRY MANDERSON: Thank you, Tripti. I was actually going to raise the same point about the schizophrenia of root ops and RSSAC, but I was also going to ask the question, why is OCTO special?

TRIPTI SINHA: Why are they special? How do you mean?

TERRY MANDERSON: Why should they be invited to root ops? We don't naturally open the door to root ops to any other departments within any other organizations. I want to be clear as to if OCTO is going to be invited to root ops, why are we doing that and what constructs are we doing that and what are benefits to doing that for the root operators themselves?

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Thank you, Terry. Lots of hands went up. Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: To be honest, I think we are over thinking this. The idea is, if you read my record, basically the threats to root server system was discussed and when David was explaining that generally on a very high level, what is DDOS and how DDOS can affect DNS and possibly roots, some of these things came up and he said, I don't know, basically OCTO said, we don't have detailed information about this, if the operators know they share space for example, things like that.

There were two possibilities, either to ask us informally, which they did, the other one is ask RSSAC formally and then RSSAC goes to ping every single root operator. We can also go that track, they really wanted to be efficient and that's why they ask it. If we think it's hard to manage or it's hard, they can formally ask RSSAC and RSSAC then has to handle it operator by operator.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Kaveh. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: In response to Terry, my first comment is, I would argue that if there are organizations with legitimate interests in the root service and the root server operations, I would like say that we haven't rejected a large number of them but we have had very few insistent requests to discuss things with the root server operators on the very deep technical side.

Why is OCTO special? To me they're special because they have an overview of the root zone system and they actually influence the root zone content, and that's why I see them as special. In addition to that, I would argue that they have a very high-level clue that we should strive to benefit from rather than try to reject. There's also involved policy setting functions within ICANN. I think they are actually in a way special. I would not mind to invite them to a root ops meeting for discussing certain issues. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, any other questions, comments? Alright, in the interest of time, I'd like to move on to the next section of this topic with some action items here. Brad and I, as your chairs, will funnel this and Brad, if you could do that, send these questions to root ops, is that an appropriate next step? I just want to make sure everyone's okay with that.

BRAD VERD: That's what I think the next step is and I'm happy to do that.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Carlos and Steve, since you're the conduit between OCTO and us, could you let them know where we stand with this, which is this has been taken back to root ops and we're not sure that this an appropriate discussion in an open format at an ICANN meetings but we're looking to see if that the discussion could still happen and I think root ops needs to have an internal discussion on whether they should be invited as a guest? So, is that an appropriate next step on this? Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: I think earlier, Tripti, you said you wanted to discuss questions that the RSSAC might have for OCTO?

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes, and I was actually going to go onto that. The next thing is do we have any questions for OCTO? Anyone, any questions for OCTO?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Is there anything special to gain from asking them for an update regarding the KSK rollover? They recently shared their purposed new plan for that, is there something around that that we could benefit from?

TRIPTI SINHA: Sure, why don't we do that?   Ask them for an update on the KSK rollover, and also, Conrad did a presentation of the retreat via Kaveh, so maybe he could do the same presentation for us?

KAVEH RANJBAR: If you want. Are we talking about the KSK or the presentation which he did for the root server --

TRIPTI SINHA: Both. No, I'm agreeing with [CROSSTALK]

KAVEH RANJBAR: I'm sure I can ask, but I don't know if anybody -- because it's [inaudible] about DDOS, so what's DDOS; I don't know if this group will benefit from that, that's for the very non-technical [inaudible] ICANN board, but if you want definitely I'm sure we can do that, [inaudible] slides on how DDOS has worked.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, so then that wouldn't be appropriate I guess, if that's what was discussed there. Any other thoughts on what to discuss with them? We have a meeting on the schedule with them. Liman, is that a new hand or an old hand? Okay, Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: I think it might be appropriate to ask OCTO if they had any other plans related to the root server system that it not previously been briefed to the RSSAC.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. There's a question from Terry which says, what research have they done lately? Is that somewhat along the lines what you're asking, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: It is close to that, but yeah, I think they could be grouped together. I have some informal information that indicated there might be some activities that OCTO is planning to undertake or announce or something that might have relationship to either the RS or to the provisioning side.

TRIPTI SINHA: I see, okay.

RUSS MUNDY: I don't want to me any more specific then say, are there any other plans that OCTO might have?

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: One other thing which I also mentioned in my report was that the hyper local, in general because we know as Terry reported ICANN [inaudible] are supportive of hyper local [inaudible] are also supportive of the idea, trying to figure out to how to work with vendors, to make that a reality. I think it's good to first of all see what OCTO thinks in general. I think there are positive, I haven't asked them specifically what they think on hyper local.

And the other thing is if we as a group also have position on that then we can communicate that to OCTO, the reason is in general OCTO has a lot of influence on the ICANN board. If we as a group think hyper local are a good thing and they will our operation, stating that OCTO will help him to bring that back to the ICANN board which makes it an ICANN strategy, so then ICANN invests money, training, things like that, to make that a more reality. It's not going to happen overnight but that can give us a lot of resources for this idea. I think hyper local is a good thing.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. I'm keeping account of what we're going to ask them. The KSK rollover update, their thoughts on hyper local, and clearly Suzanne is agreeing with Russ, so there's something going on within the OCTO.

Carlos, Steve, I leave it up to you and how you want to frame that question. Is there something that they'd like to share with us regarding their upcoming initiatives or research or as Terry just said, what have they been up to lately. We've got three items, anything else? Carlos, your hand is up.

CARLOS REYES: My suggestion was going to be, I'll check with Terry and Russ on the actual wording for their question and then I can go back to the OCTO team for that.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, very good. In the interest of time, we've got 10 minutes and still quite a bit to cover so I'm going to move on to the joint meeting with SSAC, which is a closed meeting. Russ, would you like to shepherd this?

RUSS MUNDY: Sure. I guess I would suggest at the time that this list was put together I was not sure whether or not there'd be an OCTO meeting with RSSAC and item 3 the KSK rollover status, if that discussion is going to be had with RSSAC and OCTO then it probably can be dropped or moved down to -- if there's time kind of item.

The other items I think are still relevant and I believe we ended up with a 45-minute session, so it will be time constraint but those are the set of things that I think from the SSAC perspective make sense either with or without the KSK rollover discussion.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay.

RUSS MUNDY: Are there things that RSSAC wanted to include that SSAC has not?

TRIPTI SINHA: Anyone, anything for discussion with the SSAC?

                       Since we are on the topic of hyper local root, we can throw that out to the SSAC and get their thoughts on that.

RUSS MUNDY: I think that's great. In fact, what I can do is I feedback to SSAC, if it's okay I'll just replace the KSK rollover item with the hyper local root discussion and have it be a joint discussion, is that [CROSSTALK]? Without having a designated RSSAC or SSAC lead on it.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Thank you. Any other thoughts? Alright, hearing none, let's move on to the joint meeting with the ICANN board. They've got questions of us. What are our key goals for 2018? I think A and B are responses to those questions, so we're saying, our two key goals, one is to relief the evolution advice and two is to respond to the organizational review. A and B are our answers, that's how we're going to respond to them.

                       Two is, what are our most relevant long-term goals? Implementation of the advice and emerging technologies, and even the evolution advice implementation, I would couch that with the feasibility of implementing it. We're going to issue the advice but then there's other stuff that's percolating on the edges like hyper local root and so forth, so that will change the way the advice is implemented and emerging technologies would be say hyper local root.

Those were our thoughts on that. Would we like to ask any questions of the board or would you like comment on our responses to the two questions that the board is asking us?

KAVEH RANJBAR: One thing that we can use the time for is, I don't know where we will be with evolution and why, but if they have any organizational views on how we should constitute for example CCWG or whatever, those are the people who have good ideas about how to move forward in that area. If it had that kind of question, I think it's a good time to ask, if they have any of those.

TRIPTI SINHA: You mean how they would implement that, is that the question Kaveh, if I understand you correctly?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. Because the parts where we are saying -- in many places we are saying we want to be part of the answer but we don't know the answer for example, so yes, how they envision implementing that, and then [inaudible].

TRIPTI SINHA: The one question I would like to ask the board is, what are their biggest concerns?   What worries them with regard to at least our subject matter here, which is the root server system, do they have any personal concerns about it? Duane, your hand is up.

DUANE WESSLES: Maybe this will come up naturally, but I guess I'd be curious to hear the board's thoughts on the next run of new gTLDs and how they think that's going to go?

TRIPTI SINHA: Very good, yup, good question. Thanks, Duane. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm somewhat afraid to open this box but do we want to ask them what are the primary issues that people are turning to the board for regarding root service? What type of pressure are they feeling from various sources?

TRIPTI SINHA: I think you're asking the same question that I was asking and I was just asking it differently, that is what are the pressures or concerns the board has regarding our space? I think we're asking the same thing. I think you're actually being a little bit more direct in asking the question.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You're probably right.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, thank you. By the way, Wes is asking a question, hyper local root just 7706 and I believe it is, correct me if anyone's perception is

different, but I think that's exactly what it is. Brad, I think your hand is next.

BRAD VERD: I think the answer to Wes is yes, and then obviously taking one step further is more than just we're resolvers but other devices. Regarding my hand up, what were we just talking about? I just lost the train of thought answering that question.

The board, yes. Do we --and this is a question, this is not a -- I'm not suggesting, I'm asking the group; should we ask about the KSK rollover? Given the data that's been shared, what is their thoughts or is this something that we need to discuss with OCTO more, the KSK rollover, given that data their finding is actually worse -- the data that lead to the pause is -- the numbers are greater but I guess they've now decided to go forward with it, so is that something that we as RSSAC are concerned about when that roll happens?

DUANE WESSLES: I think we should, especially because OCTO is now sort of on record saying they're going to ask the board for a resolution to proceed with the rollover, so I'd be curious to hear them talk about that.

BRAD VERD: Right, and that's kind of why I brought it up, the question with the board also, because the boards going to be in the middle of this if OCTO is going to ask for a resolution from the board to move forward, should

we be asking questions about this sharing our concerns, should we have any time.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, good, we got that question down, thank you Brad and Duane. By the way, we've got literally one minute. Liman, can you go real quick?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think we should frame it as what input do we have to the board because it's a technical question, it shouldn't bother the board. Thanks.

TRIPTI SIHAN: Alright, thank you. I want to close this topic out and move on to -- gosh, we've got a few more agenda items, I hope everyone's okay with spilling over by five or ten minutes. I hate to do this but this was a good discussion. I'm going to turn it over to Carlos now for 61 schedule.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti. I'll be brief because I'll send this in an email as well. As of right now the RSSAC schedule for ICANN 61 is on your screen. Saturday and Sunday will be work sessions, nothing on Monday. Tuesday and Wednesday will be a mix of open sessions and joint meetings and two work sessions interspersed in there.

I'll send this out for everyone to help with their planning. I'm going to hand it over to Kathy as well, since she's leading some of the planning.

KATHY SCHNITT:	Hi everyone, I'll be quick as well. We just want to give an idea of attendance for ICANN 61, we want to start doing for the ICANN meetings going forward. I'm going to send out a Google Form sheet that you can just fill out if you're attending, yes or no, and we're also asking for departure date and the reason we're doing that is because we know some people may be leaving early to do the IETF, so we just want to get a sense of that for scheduling purposes.
	The next thing real quick is the May 2018 workshop date, that is actually set right now for May 1st through the 3rd. I just want everyone to have that our there and to just be aware of that and that's going to be at Verisign and [inaudible]. Any questions?
UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	So, do you want each of us to send you an email, is that what you're asking?
KATHY SCHNITT:	Nope, I'm going to send you a form and you're just going to answer the two questions on the form and that will be after the call today.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Thank you, Kathy and Carlos. Terry added and AOV agenda item, FY19 ICANN organizational budget. Terry, I hope you're still on the call?

TERRY MANDERSON: I am still on the call, thank you, Tripti. I just want to put on my ICANN org hat and say that the ICANN FY19 budget and organizational plan and five-year budget outlook has been published.

You have, as engaged stakeholders and community members, approximately 29 or 30 days to comment on that organizational plan, so please do read it and provide feedback to ICANN the organization in terms of whether it meets your beliefs of what the ICANN organization should do. I just posted a link to the FY19 budget in the chat window for you benefit. Thank you, that's all I needed to say.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I looked at it and I guess what surprises me and I guess I don't necessarily need an answer here, but I think us as a group should think about it, it's interesting that given all the questions we're getting from the board and from OCTO about DDOS and threats and operational stuff, that the high level interpretation of what you read from the budget, from ICANN org, is that the support for L root seems very flat or for let's just say root operations, and that seems inconsistent with the line of questioning and discussions that are being thrown at RSSAC, it's just an observation I wanted to point out, it just seemed odd to me.

TERRY MANDERSON: I really cannot adequately respond to the observation except to state that ICANN's funding model has become flat and it's predicted to be flat over the next two, three, four years.

TRIPTI SINHA: Actually, that's been a discussion I think for the past couple of meetings, there's been great concern about ICANN's revenue stream which speaks to what's happening upstream and that everything is slowing down. I'm assuming it's related to that Terry, but I don't know.

Alright, any other questions? We're four minutes over. Alright, hearing none, I'm going to adjourn the meeting. Thank you, everyone. We'll talk to you next time.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]