KAVEH RANJBAR:	Hey, everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Hey, Kaveh.

BRAD VERD:	Good morning, everyone. Let's give it a minute or two here and we'll start when others join.
	This is Brad. Let's get started. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening depending on where you might be. I'll call to order this RSSAC meeting for March. Let's do the roll call.
	From Verisign, myself. From USC?

WES HARDAKER:	Wes is here.

BRAD VERD:	Cogent? Nobody from Cogent. University of Maryland?

TRIPTI SINHA:	I'm here. Tripti.

BRAD VERD:	Hello, Tripti. NASA?

KEVIN JONES: Kevin.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Kevin. ISC?

JEFF OSBORN: Jeff is here.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Jeff.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, hey Fred.

BRAD VERD: US DoD?

KEVIN WRIGHT: There's Kevin Wright.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Kevin.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson is here.

BRAD VERD: Oh, hey, Ryan. ARL?

HOWARD KASH: Howard here.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Howard. [inaudible]. Thank you. Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here.

BRAD VERD: Hello, Liman. From RIPE? Kaveh, I know you're here. We just can't hear
                        you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh is here. For the record, please change the RIPE to RIPE NCC.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. ICANN?

TERRY MANDERSON: Terry is here.

EN

BRAD VERD: Hello, Terry.

[JOHN]:   John is here also. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: And Hiro Hotta, or Wide, I'm sorry?

HIRO HOTTA: Yes. Hiro here.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Hiro. Alright, moving on to our liaisons. IANA functions operator?

NAELA SARRAS: Naela here.

BRAD VERD: Hello, Naela. Root zone maintainer? Duane has sent his apology. He is on trial. Liaison from IAB, apology. And apology from SSAC. Obviously, we have Kaveh from the Board of Directors, Lars from CSC. And myself from RZERC.

                             For staff, we have Mario, Andrew, Carlos, Steve, and Kathy.

EN

Did I miss anybody?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: [inaudible]. Alright. I think we got everybody. Alright. Let's move on to the agenda review. Obviously, we'll do what we always do with the administration. We'll jump into the organizational review. We'll talk about the report, next steps. We'll go into our scheduled root service evolution discussion. We'll reach out what we talked about last time with performance, monitoring function; strategy, architect, and policy function. Then we'll move into the designation removal and finance function.

We'll touch on engagement and what's coming up, and then obviously we'll jump into ICANN 61 and the agenda, what's been worked out and shared. We'll cover some [work] items. Then in any other business, we have some chair updates and the upcoming workshop in May. Then we will adjourn. Is there anything that we want to add or [change] about the agenda?

Somebody is making a bunch of noise there. If you could mute your phone if you're not talking, that would be great. Again, anything for the agenda? Just double check and make sure everybody heard that. No? Okay. Oh, and Paul, you've joined us. Welcome.

So, jump into the administration. We're going to review the minutes from the February meeting. Andrew, go ahead.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. Thanks, Brad. The minutes from the February meeting, just looking at the action items. The action items from previous meetings, Brad Verd just sent an e-mail to RSSAC discussing RSSAC 28 next steps. That hasn't been done. The action items from the February meeting, however, I could confirm all of them as done with the exception of Brad Verd to send the questions from the ICANN CTO's office to root ops because I don't have access to the root ops mailing list.

BRAD VERD: That was done, and that goes back to our discussion we're creating a response for [OCTO], from our meeting in London, our meeting [inaudible] meeting.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Then, all the action items from the previous meeting were done, so back to you, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Do I have a motion on [inaudible] before I approve the minutes?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Brad, you should put the motion on the floor to approve the minutes with the [inaudible] that we amend the one action item that has been done.

BRAD VERD: Very well. Is there a motion on the floor to approve the minutes with the modification of the action item that has been completed?

TRIPTI SINHA: I second it.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Fred. Thank you, Tripti. Moving on. Oh, it's not on the agenda, but I'm just going to make one last comment about it here. An e-mail went out yesterday, the day before yesterday, for volunteers for the membership committee. I believe we've gotten some, but again I'll just make one last request here. If you are interested, please let us know so that we can get the membership committee back up to full [force].

Moving on, organizational review. You guys have seen the review – somebody's keyboard is making a whole lot of noise. The organizational review, the assessment by the independent examiner, has been posted on the ICANN website and is out there for public consultation. I hope everybody has had a chance to read it.

There was a lot of discussion between the review work party and the independent examiner. Just to remind everybody, the review work party was Hiro, Liman, Kaveh, Tripti, and myself. There was a lot of back and forth. It actually took up a lot of our time in the last couple months.

I'll stop there and say the assessment is out there, and before we get to next steps, I'm curious if people have read it, what their thoughts are on it. Then, leading into next steps, the real question at hand is do we at

RSSAC want to provide a response, as an RSSAC response, to the independent examiner? Any thoughts? I don't see any hands up. Everybody was okay with the review and happy with what the outcome was.

FRED BAKER:　　　　　Question. Are we going to spend one of our sessions next week talking about it?

BRAD VERD:　　　　　Maybe. If everybody is okay with it, then no. But, if there's discussion that needs to be had about it, then yes. I think the short answer would be I believe the review work party is going to be putting together a response, but obviously the review work party channels the thoughts of the larger RSSAC, so looking for input and feedback.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:　　　　　Brad, can I just add to your response for Fred?

BRAD VERD:　　　　　Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:　　　　　Fred, we've got a block next week to discuss this and we were hoping that today's discussion of the assessment report is going to dictate the nature of the meeting next week, like how much time – do we need to allot more time? How intense is the discussion going to be and what's

the outcome going to be? We were hoping that we would spend some time discussing it today.

BRAD VERD: Wes, I think you had your hand up. Was that an accident?

WES HARDAKER: No, it wasn't an accident. I did read all the way through it. My hand was really up to make sure, to encourage everybody that this is a critical read. You don't have a choice. You really need to read this one all the way through. It's generally well-written. One of the things that I tried to do while reading it was that every piece of advice and statement asked myself how likely is it that this opinion holds a lot of grounding to it?

I think, clearly, one of my takeaways is even though we have tried desperately to get the word out about how we are trying to organize the caucuses, the primary work body. I think there's a lot of messages that we've wanted to get out that clearly we failed to get out. Is it our fault or is it their fault for not listening? There's a lot of inconclusion in my mind. If we failed to get that message out, how can we adapt and change to make that happen so that what we are trying to do actually has a better perceived external function. I don't have a solution to that, of course.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Thanks, Wes. That was a good comment. Suzanne, before I get to you, real quick I just want to add, so everybody understands. This is a public consultation period. This is where [inaudible] has presented their

findings to the public and are basically asking for feedback. Then in April they will be coming out with what their recommendations are, which will be what the action items are from this assessment. We don't know what those are yet, but the feedback provided now will provide input to those recommendations. So, that is why it's extremely important to read it. I think it's important that if we as a group feel that we need to provide more input or clarification to things, then we should do that.

Now, Suzanne, you had your hand up.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah. Kind of one of the things that leaped out of me just for later discussion is that one of the pieces of feedback in the assessment was that RSSAC doesn't act like other ICANN community groups, and in some ways … It's not clear whether that's a criticism or not. In some cases, it's very clear. But, overall, one of the things we have to think about is how our expectations for ourselves and our interpretation of our charter and all of that has interacted with what appears to be the rest of the community's expectations, and if we need to adjust to act more like other groups or to be more clear as Wes said about communicating why we don't engage in some of the same ways, that's probably worth looking at pretty closely.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you, Suzanne. Tripti, your hand is up.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Brad. I think it might help if we let RSSAC know. You said earlier on that the RWP, the RSSAC work party, worked for close to two months with [in trial]. I think it would be good to share with this group exactly what we did. If I may, I'll speak on behalf of the RWP and let you know what the engagement was about.

We had several meetings, close to four meetings, and they brought it down to I think this is version four of the report. There was one consistent systemic problem with the report in that there was tremendous conflation with RSSAC, the advisory committee versus root ops.

I think it took quite a bit of … It took a workout for the RWP to draw that distinction for the examiners to understand that they were going down the wrong rabbit hole here, if you will.

So, it took at least four meetings. It was cleaned up quite a bit, so that they [inaudible] understood that their focus was to comment, review the advisory committee that is an artifact of the ICANN board and that root ops is a completely separate body outside of ICANN.

So, that was the thrust of our focus was just bringing separation into that issue. There were other comments as well. Brad, do you want to add other stuff that we went into?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. First, I'll add to your first comment just really quick, in the sense that in my opinion, and I believe in the review party group, that there was a systemic problem or a conflation between RSSAC and root ops.

We still believe that there is a lot of that in the document as published today. So, we were not in full agreement between the independent examiner and the RWP at the time of publication. And it was clear we were not going to get there.

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes.

BRAD VERD: Go ahead, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: I was just going to add that when the examiners were brought in, they were told that they were going to review the advisory committee from the perspective of form, function, and dynamics and how well we were functioning and so on and so forth. They were not going to delve into content. That was outside of their scope. And they delved into tremendous content. So, we had some back and forth with them on that as well. We had to do a lot of course correction for them. Did I miss anything else, Brad?

BRAD VERD: Well, just to give you guys a little bit of context around the amount of change that happened from the original report to the one that was published was I think the original report had somewhere around 65 findings and the one published is somewhere around 41 or 42. The original report was some 15 pages longer than the one published. So,

there was a lot of stuff that we spent an extraordinary amount of time on with the independent examiner, to the point where it has pushed back some of our other work because it consumed all of our time for longer than we had expected.

With that, Wes, your hand is up.

WES HARDAKER: Yes. First off, I'd like to extend my thanks to those of you who spent that much time. I had no idea that you were consumed by that much and I can imagine how much it did consume your life, so I appreciate all of your time and energy. Thank you very much to all four of you, five of you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Five.

WES HARDAKER: Five, thank you. The question is based on your statement that came to my mind. If the initial writing was that blur between RSSAC and the root ops, is that another symptom of our failure to separate that for the [inaudible]. I think we [inaudible] the last two years. We've talked about the [tutorials] over and over and over trying to explain the differences. If the reviewers couldn't even get it, that's really concerning to me. In the discussions you had with them, were they clearly that confused as well?

TRIPTI SINHA: Wes, if I may respond, Brad, if that's okay.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, go ahead.

TRIPTI SINHA: Wes, you're absolutely right. That was one thing we tried to emphasize to them. A lot of their findings were about root ops and we said to them that – they were very confused. In fact, if you recall when we embarked upon this review, they asked if they could attend root ops. Brad and I said, "Why do you want to attend root ops? That's a completely separate entity." But, nevertheless, we did right by them and Brad sent the request to root ops and it was declined. And because they were not asked to review 12 other entities that comprise root ops.

We were taken aback by the confusion. Their findings should be that there's clearly confusion between RSSAC and root ops and that distinction is not being understood in the community. I'm not sure that we were successful in telling them that that's what their findings should be and not for them to delve into root op issues, if you know what I mean. That was a systemic problem, a huge problem, for us during the first phase of this.

BRAD VERD: Liman, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. Adding on to what's been said here is I was surprised that even though the people in the independent examiner are, in my view, highly experienced in this field and I have the highest regard for the individuals and still they were confused about this. That tells us something about the amount of work we have in front of us when it comes to PR. If not even those people can figure this out, or have the right notion, then we have a huge problem to deal with. So, that's one thing.

The other thing is that I was also surprised to see many of the findings they have stem from collecting opinions from other people. I would've expected that they would look into our procedures, they would read our procedures document that would see how they work and they for themselves would make an assessment on whether we actually function well and they would look to how we interact with the bodies within ICANN.

I was a bit surprised to see that they did a lot of the assessments on what other people see and interpret without having – the other people don't have the focus to assess. They only have the focus to be interviewed and give general opinions. That's not the approach that I would've chosen if I were the independent examiner. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Liman. Adding on to what Wes – you were saying that if the perception is like that, then we still have work to do. Yeah, I think we do. I think we as a group have to have a discussion about I don't want to say how we talk, but kind of how we talk to other people in the community. We need to clarify our statements that if you're talking as a

root op, you need to start it like, "As a root operator, this is the answer." "As an RSSAC, as a policy, this is the answer."

I don't think maybe we do that because we assume – we can switch hats, but other people maybe don't see us switch hats. They don't understand it. That was just some of my thought there. Liman, is your hand up again or is that an old one?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Old one.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah. With respect to the root ops distinction, that also leapt out at me from the report. I think we have a slightly bigger issue there. It's not just with the reviewers and it goes back to what I said about being mead against expectations from the broader community.

I think a lot of the time making that distinction that's so important to us, we failed to convey why it's important. What ends up happening is it just sounds disingenuous. It sounds evasive.

BRAD VERD: Yeah.

SUZANNE WOOLF: And being able to clarify why it's important to us, which is that it protects our credibility when we speak about certain things, we've got to get better at that message in some sense and I think having the reviewers be confused about it and conveying that the community is confused about it is a really important message for us.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Suzanne. Paul?

PAUL VIXIE: So, I'd like a recap on one minor point, which is what they were told. In other words, what was it that met the standard for [inaudible]. I'll just throw out my reference platform, which is root ops exists largely for symbolic reasons because we have existed before ICANN and we don't want to disband. If that's what we said and they didn't get it, then I don't understand.

If, on the other hand, we're not willing to say that, then anything else that we said would necessarily sound pretty screwball because we are neither fish nor foul in the template of other ICANN supporting organizations. We are the one that is like this unless you count IETF as the [PSO].

BRAD VERD: Okay. Any other comments?

PAUL VIXIE: I'm sorry. That was a question. I'd like to know what is the [inaudible] what we said that they did not understand?

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry. I'm not following the question. Was there a comment earlier where somebody said disingenuous that you're referring to that I'm not putting the dots together?

PAUL VIXIE: Sorry, I'm wresting with this mute button. Forget about disingenuous. Yes, that word was used, but it's not important. There is apparently consensus among the people who have observed the entire flow between us and the review team, including the document, that they did not understand the distinction between root ops and RSSAC.

What I would like to know is what executive summary were they given? In other words, what was the elevator pitch for why both organizations exist? I would just like to know what statement they heard that they didn't understand.

BRAD VERD: I don't know. I was not in all of the interviews that they did with some 60 some odd people.

TRIPTI SINHA: Brad, if I can ask a clarifying question to Paul.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Go ahead, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: Paul, if you're asking what was the elevator pitch they were given when they were contracted by ICANN, we were not there when they were given the contract. However, we do know that they were told that they have to review the advisory committee and its continuing function. If you read the first three bullets in the report, that was their scope. But, the actual elevator pitch given to them? I have no idea. Brad will get onto the next item where we had a meeting with Theresa to actually question exactly that. How did this go awry so badly?

PAUL VIXIE: Okay. So, my takeaway is that we did not provide – we, as an organization, we as root ops, we as RSSAC, did not provide a distinction. We did not tell them what to think about why those organizations exist, so any misunderstanding they got either came from us as individuals when they interviewed us or came from ICANN. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Paul, I think that's accurate. When you read what their mandate is, it was to determine whether RSSAC has a continuing purpose at ICANN. If so, whether the structure, the operations, is desirable and whether RSSAC is accountable to its constituency stakeholder groups, organizations, and stakeholders. None of that in there covers RSSAC. I mean, covers root ops, sorry.

I think as they went through their process … I can only speak for my interview. I know in my interview I had to course correct them numerous times and say, "That to me is out of scope, and not really in the line with what you're supposed to be asking. You're asking me root ops questions." Those are things I did in my interview. I can't speak for all the rest. We, as an organization, is what you kept calling us as RSSAC, I don't believe we as an organization were given an opportunity to give the elevator pitch until we saw the assessment and then we provided our feedback from the RWP.

Actually, let me correct that. We gave our assessment when we did our self-review and provided that to them well in advance of them performing the assessment.

TRIPTI SINHA: Yeah. Brad, to add, when the RWP had its kickoff meeting with [in trial], they were very clear what their mandate was and they went over three to four bullets. At that time, they said this is the review of RSSAC.

BRAD VERD: Correct.

TRIPTI SINHA: But, then they went off the rails. They lost scope and mission creep occurred. But, it was not just that. There was tremendous confusion in their heads.

EN

BRAD VERD: Alright. Vixie, your hand is still up. Paul?

PAUL VIXIE: Just struggling with the technology. I'll take it down now.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Thanks, Brad. I think Liman really started to point out the important distinction in my mind. If I was going to go about conducting a review of an organization, I'd ask myself two primary questions, the first of which is: is the current purpose being executed well? Liman said reading 000 and is RSSAC doing its job following procedures?

The second part of that question is: is the current purpose correct? In other words, are the things that we should be doing on our table or are there things on the table that we [shouldn't] be doing? That would be a good review.

BRAD VERD: Can you mute your phone, guys? I hear keyboards.

WES HARDAKER: But, then the review goes off the rails, as I think Tripti's wording has put it well, where they just went around and asked a bunch of people,

"What do you think about RSSAC?" without framing the [resulting] question to everybody.

I still think that the results are valuable. It's good to know all those opinions and it's good to collect that information and it's good to know that we're not getting that message out clearly. But, at the same time, it feels like the review didn't meet what I would expect out of an organizational review, which is: is our organization acting correctly? If we are meeting in behind closed doors, privately, a lot of the time which we are, so is SSAC. How would you review SSAC? Would you go ask everybody, "How are their meetings going?" Nobody can watch them. Nobody is going to have that proper opinion. They should've framed the distinction between root ops and RSSAC to most of the people they talked about in order to get a properly educated opinion.

TRIPTI SINHA:　　　　Wes, just to let you know, when we did the back and forth with them, we very clearly expressed to them that they lacked the discipline and rigor in drawing that distinction when they had their individual conversations. It was so obvious in versions 1, 2, 3. It still exists in the current version. In fact, there's one particular. I think on page 45 I know there's one paragraph where they refer to RSSAC as an oversight body. I corrected them on that said we are not an oversight body and they refused to budge on that. So, there's still a lot of problems with this report.

BRAD VERD: Alright. So, given what we've heard here and the discussion, it seems like it's a valid discussion with some output that we need to put together. We have a time scheduled in San Juan to continue this discussion and come up with should we see fit, come up with a response to the public consultation, just so everybody understands because I didn't quite understand it.

This is [up for] public consultation, not public comment. So, what that means is – because I didn't know the difference, and maybe you guys don't and maybe you do, but I'll share anyways. The public can e-mail in comments, feedback. It's not made public on a webpage or a mailing list for everybody to see it, so the comments go to MSSI and then are forwarded to the review work party and [in trial] who is the independent examiner. So, any comments made are for the independent examiner and not necessarily for the public to see, if that makes sense.

But, I still think it's important that if we as a group need to correct course, then we should do that via feedback. We'll do that in San Juan. Anything else on the review right now? Oh, I have some dates. The comments in the consultation period are due by March 23rd, so we're on the clock to get this done. We'll work on that in San Juan. Great.

Kevin, you've got your hand up.

KEVIN JONES: Yeah. Just a quick question. So, given the distinction that you just made, are you also compensating whether we should be making a public statement about the report before the review period ends?

BRAD VERD: Oh, yeah. I think that'll be part of the discussion that we have in San Juan. That is certainly an option, and as was pointed out to me a little bit ago, the SSAC has done that in the past. I think it was SSAC or somebody did that where rather than sending in a comment, they made a statement about the review. That is certainly an option that if the group wants to go down that route, we can certainly do that.

TRIPTI SINHA: Brad, I just want to point out that Terry Manderson in the chatroom has made that same request as well.

BRAD VERD: Okay, great. Sorry. I'm not monitoring the chat. Apologies. Wes, your hand is up.

TRIPTI SINHA: And Liman.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. Thanks, Brad. One quick point of clarification for the process. Typically, when I think of somebody being audited, I expect the auditee not to make things like public comments, that we really should be the source of the audit and the more we interact with it, the more we are seen as poisoning the result. Is there any perceived notion?

BRAD VERD: It's funny you bring this up. I actually asked the same exact question of the group, I mean of the independent examiner because it was confusing them both, Tripti and I, and a couple of other people on the work party and what was stated was this is the ICANN way. So, before the independent examiner makes its recommendations that go to the board, which is like the final report, they give the community a consultation period, which can affect the recommendations.

TRIPTI SINHA: Wes, we made it abundantly clear to MMSI and Theresa when we met with her that we were so uncomfortable with the level of our involvement, it just is so unorthodox for the party that is being reviewed to be as involved as we were. But, they had no guardrails and they was tremendous mission scope. We didn't know how else to correct them. So, your point is well taken and we made it very clear, repeatedly, to MMSI, Theresa and our own RSSAC staff, that we were not very comfortable with the level of involvement that we had.

WES HARDAKER: Right. Well, some of my question is, going forward, if we're in public comment period, I would think it would be seen as sort of a negative for us to post public comments that refute the arguments and the findings. There could be a perception problem there and that's really what I was asking about. Would there be negative opinions?

BRAD VERD: I don't want to jump the agenda. We have coming up in the co-chair update report, Tripti and I had a conversation with Göran, which led to a conversation with Theresa about this. We can touch on that when we get to it. All these things that you're pointing out around negative perception and whatnot, we talked extensively about with Theresa and our experience with the review.

WES HARDAKER: Okay, thank you.

BRAD VERD: Tripti, were you going to add anything else?

TRIPTI SINHA: No. I thought I saw someone else's hand go up and down, but I can't remember who it was.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Moving on, let's jump into the root service evolution document. So, on February, Tripti went over the performance monitoring function and the strategic architecture of policy function. I hate to do this, but in my going back through the document, I found a couple of things I wanted to talk about in the strategy and architecture piece, and then we'll dive into the designation removal and finance function.

I hope everybody has read the document and spent some time on it. I didn't see a lot of comments. I added a lot of comments that were my thoughts, so let's just run through them.

So, starting off in 8.11 under strategy architecture. I felt like we were missing a bullet here. Even though we referred to it, we really didn't call it out, which was this new bullet that was define a minimum performance level of the root server operators. I just felt that was missing. We talk about it. We reference it. But, we didn't specifically call it out as to in the scope of work. Any thoughts on that? Any disagreements?

So, moving down to bullet four in the document, or bullet five if you include my new bullet, we referenced this publishable in the future – correct and publishable in the future. I really kind of struggled with this because it implies a number of different things that maybe some of you are doing. Some of you are validating. You guys are pulling out a copy of the root and validating that it is exactly what is on the distribution server before you publish it. I'm not sure. But, that's what that kind of implies to me.

What I think we were trying to get is I made a suggestion in changing that to ensuring the data integrity of the entire contents of the root zone that is obtained from the root zone maintainer and subsequently publishing it to the appropriate service cloud. I think that is what the intent was in some different words. The words that are there are very kind of subjective and up for interpretation. Any hands? Any thoughts on that? No hands. Alright, I'll just leave that and keep on going. I'll explain myself.

The footnote, which kind of comes with that last comment, the footnote again is really a subjective matter that I really struggled with. if you change the bullet to the suggested terminology, I'm not sure we need the footnote. If we keep the footnote, let's just run through the challenges I had with it.

Bespoke, that word to me is just a little too [inaudible] for this document. We need something a little bit more [funnel], so I challenge that. The sentence is ambiguous that says root server system. This is the contract reader in me. We haven't defined root server system anywhere, which I talk about later. We actually refer to root server system, DNS root system, root DNS system. We actually refer to it in a bunch of different ways throughout the document, so we need to fix that.

Lastly, or third I should say, I have a challenge with the correctness and publishability. Again, this implies this broad judgment that the root operators are taking and I'm not sure that's the goal of the implication here.

So, that was my thought. I think if we change the top bullet maybe we don't need the footnote and all this can go away.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That was a good catch, actually. I'm struggling the same way as you do. I don't want to be as a root server operator be responsible for the correctness of the zone.

EN

BRAD VERD: Right, but that's what we're implying here, or at least when I read it. When I tried to read it as somebody who wasn't in the thick of this, like how is somebody outside going to read this, that is really up for interpretation and I'm pretty sure we don't want that.

Moving on, since there's no hands up, 8.1.2, second bullet. We have satisfactory. Again, a subjective word. I really just struggled with that one. It seems like we should change that to minimum level of performance.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: How's sufficient?

BRAD VERD: For a sufficient root service.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It was just a word that popped up [inaudible]. I'm not advocating it strongly.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I made a suggestion there on the side. I actually changed the bullet. I said [inaudible] bullet is define and articulate measurements from the end user perspective to ensure root operators are meeting a minimum level of performance. That was my suggestion. Satisfactory, to me, again was subjective and up for interpretation, depending on—

EN

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: A required level of performance, just because minimum sounds …

BRAD VERD: That's fine. We can change that.

TRIPTI SINHA: A required level, which would actually imply that there is a set of requirements that have been articulated.

BRAD VERD: I just added that. I added a comment to my comment and I will do the same on the new bullet right where I said define minimum level. Define required level. Required performance level.

WES HARDAKER: I like it.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Wes. So, moving down to the footnote. Footnote 10 I think is just a good example. [inaudible]. I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Say a minimum required performance level, performance on what score? Is this a technical performance? What kinds of things are we measuring? It seems like we wanted to point to RSSAC 1 or something like that.

BRAD VERD: Yes. You are correct. I think what I was trying to say in 8.1.1 with the new bullet was in the scope of work, they would define what that is and then you're executing on that in the [below], right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. I'm just pointing out that leaving it dangling lets the people insert whatever assumptions they might have.

BRAD VERD: What do you mean dangling? I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Without a "these are the requirements" at least in preliminary form, since we have RSSAC 1.

BRAD VERD: I think that's a really good point. Either we get that done with what the requirements are or it becomes a recommendation. In our advice, one of the recommendations in addition to creating these different functions and whatever else we come up with, we're saying that we need to define the requirements.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

BRAD VERD:	In the footnote, I highlighted root DNS server system. This is just an example of all the different things that we refer to as root server system, root DNS server system, root DNS. We call it a bunch of things. This is just something that I think when Tripti and I go back to the document, we need to kind of police and make sure we're consistent here. I just added a comment as a reference point, nothing more.
	Jumping down into 8.2, this first bullet just felt like commentary. I kind of just wanted to get rid of it. Obviously, it's up to the group, but several different options were considered in defining how the SAP function would be manifested. The ultimate agreement was … It just seems like that isn't necessarily needed. It dilutes what we're trying to say here.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	My recollection of the discussion in the room was one of the things we came to the conclusion about was that the SAP function in the future could easily operate like RSSAC is operating now.
BRAD VERD:	Yeah. That's what the bullets say.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Well, no, I don't know that's how it's worded. I think probably the intent of the wording was to say what I said, which is as the SAP function gets fully defined in the future, RSSAC might be a good model for how we think it could operate along with caucus.

I don't know that I would want to remove it because I think that that conclusion – unless that conclusion is well-written somewhere else, that this sort of framework is actually a good model for how the SAP ought to be [inaudible] in the future. We also talked about adding more members, right? Which is interesting [inaudible] review as well.

BRAD VERD: Right. Again, this is a group document, so it's up to what the group wants. My comment would be we thought of several different options in every different function in every different scenario, but we don't state that. Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. I'm starting to ask myself how this specific document or the final outcome of this document, how do we intend to use that? Is this going to turn into a recommendation or is it a report of what we've done or what? How we formulate these things actually depend on that.

BRAD VERD: [inaudible].

LARAS-JOHAN LIMAN: I wouldn't want to be too specific in saying that this is the [ultimate] agreement, because if it's going to be input to a wider discussion, then we shouldn't have an [alternate] agreement at this point. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Yes. Tripti, please chime in here. This document is leading to recommendations. This document is going to be advice given to the board, and in the advice will be recommendations. One of the sessions we have in Puerto Rico is to start that discussion around what the different recommendations are. We have a number just right off the bat, which is create the SAP, create the designation removal function, create the architecture function. There's a bunch of real easy recommendations that you can pull from the document just right off the bat, and then there's some very subtle ones that intermix in it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hold your horses. This is not what I envisaged at all. What I envisaged is to give to the board that we suggest that you start a discussion and here are some [inaudible] to discuss around. Maybe we need a function like this. Maybe we need a function like that.

TRIPTI SINHA: I agree with Liman, Brad. We're not going to be very prescriptive. This is at a very high level, we're advising them and these are our thoughts. Then this ICANN process kicks off which will engage a broader community.

BRAD VERD: Agreed. I agree with the broader process, yes.

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: My view of it is the outcome of this, what [inaudible] should be that we've tried to take a first look at the problem space and we've identified the problem centers or problem clusters that we need to think about. We have thought a bit about them and here are our thoughts. We now think that we need to have a wider discuss in a wider audience. That's my view of how this process should go on.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Maybe I'm using the wrong words. I'm not sure where the misalignment is happening. I believe we're saying the same thing.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If you don't think we're contradicting each other, then I'm fine, too. I thought before earlier on that we were on the same page. It was just some words you chose that made me wonder. But, you obviously haven't, so I'm fine.

BRAD VERD: There is a section 11 in the document that's called recommendations that's blank right now.

TRIPTI SINHA: Brad, I think what happened is just the way you worded it right now when you said we're going to tell the board go create the architecture group. We're not going to be that prescriptive. I think that's where the confusion occurred just now between you and Liman. It's more these are our initial thoughts. We've spent a fair amount of time on these

issues the past two, two-and-a-half, years and this is our advice. Then the board will take it from there. But, I think the way you were explaining it was very prescriptive.

BRAD VERD: It was not meant to be. This is, as I believe we've stated all along, this is us providing a framework to the board. This whole discussion, if we go back years and years and years, was somebody is going to either prescribe to us how to solve this problem or we need to make a recommendation how to solve it and start the … I believe the words I used maybe two or three years ago was drive the conversation. If that was the wrong word, I'm sorry. It's not meant to be prescriptive as to "this is what you will do" or "this is what …" But, you do want to give them a recommendation saying this is the trajectory that we recommend you go in.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: We need to involve other people and we cannot give them a product that is already cooked and packed. We can suggest, but we are only a small fraction of the Internet community, so we need to have more and wider input. So, I think the advice we should give is on the process and we should start by saying we've identified the following situation. We have looked at the various pieces and we now suggest the following process, where the process should be we advise that you create, for instance, a cross-community working group that takes the following input and evolves that into a model that we can all agree on or at least come to some kind of consensus about. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Again, I will say yes I agree. If I'm using the wrong words, I apologize.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Brad, just before you move on, in the chatroom there's a question from Fred and I'm trying to understand if the question is related to this discussion or is it related to the previous review.

FRED BAKER: Well, what I was thinking about is kind of a little bit of both. We need to make the point apparently that RSSAC is not the root ops. I was wondering whether a paragraph in this document would be worthwhile in terms of pointing out the difference and then framing the rest of the document in the form of this is the ICANN piece of that puzzle. Kind of asking where do we make a statement? Should we make a statement that would clarify this question of the difference between RSSAC and root ops?

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Thank you, Fred.

BRAD VERD: That's a good point. We'll add that as an action item.

FRED BAKER: And understand that in my mind it's a question. That's all it is.

BRAD VERD: It's a good question, and obviously based upon everything we've talked about, it's one that needs to be addressed.

Moving on, this was just a side note. This is an action item that I made for RSSAC caucus. We refer to the caucus quite a bit in this document, and based upon maybe from what we've learned from the assessment and whatnot, maybe a few sentences about it might help early on in the document, much like something about root ops. I made a note of that here as I read it.

Then, I made a comment here about given the latest assessment, do we want to review this wording? It says RSSAC is composed of representatives from every root server operator as well as liaisons from the root zone. We're essentially saying RSSAC is so well-suited for the SAP function. If you put this next to the assessment, it says something a little different. I'm making huge assumptions there. That was more of a mental note that I made.

Again, I was trying to read this as an outsider and it says RSSAC has a track record of proactively addressing the strategic architecture of policy questions related to the root server system. [inaudible] if someone in the community were to ask, for example, do we have them, I just wanted to make a note there.

Going into 8.4, maybe this is me being too prescriptive in my writing and I'm fine if people tell me not to. This terminology seems like it was in a passive voice, in as expected, rather than what I was thinking – Liman, again, I'm not married to any of this. The suggestion was to say in our model the SAP function will be. Or in our model that we're suggesting because that's what we're doing. I made comments about that on a bunch of different places where it's just kind of in a passive voice rather than just kind of stating things. We can jump through that. That was all I had there.

If we jump into section 9, because I don't see any hands up, section 9 was designation and removal. My first comment here is about the word identities. I felt that we should use something different here as not to conflate the 13 identities that are in the root zone. It just seemed like a word that we should change, given all the confusion going on here. That's all.

Section 9.1, given the authority to determine. Jeff had a comment saying this will be a word that makes my board of directors vote against this. Can we us suggest or advise? Is suggest or advise a problem? I kind of agree with Jeff here. I don't think determine is the right word. If you keep going through the document, we kind of answer that question because if you jump into the bullets, the bullets are all about recommending. So, let's just jump ahead before we address this. Jeff, I promise we'll come back to it, okay?

TRIPTI SINHA:　　　　　　　Brad, Fred's hand is up.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry. Fred, go ahead.

FRED BAKER: Well, maybe you want to go back to this later, but my understanding of the model we were suggesting was that these various bodies put together a recommendation, which [inaudible] the executive body and the only one standing at the moment is the ICANN board. Some executive body says, yes, let's do that. So, they're not in the position of selecting. They're in the position of enacting a recommendation that has been made.

BRAD VERD: Again, not to over simplify, yes, I agree with what you're saying, but to clarify it, it would be the recommendation would go to the board and then the board is not unilaterally empowered. They have to then go to the community to come up with what that process is, which I think is what Liman said earlier, also.

FRED BAKER: Right. So, I think this is the big substance behind Jeff's concern is unilateral action.

BRAD VERD: Agree.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

BRAD VERD: Really, what I'm trying to get to is if we go through the following bullets, you'll see that we use recommend in the following bullets and it seems like we should use recommend here rather than determine. So, my question for Jeff and for you, Fred, is does that alleviate your stress and concern over that word?

FRED BAKER: It goes a long way toward alleviating mine, but I'll let Jeff speak for himself.

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. If Fred buys into it, then I'll just let him talk first when we're trying to explain it because we're trying to explain it to the same people.

BRAD VERD: Why don't we run through the bullets real quick and maybe that will help in explaining it. Does that make sense? The first one in bullet 2 we say that the [PMA] function to evaluate such applicants on technical, financial, continuity, and risk, planning, commitment, and ethos. Applicants must be evaluated by the [PMA] function.

We call [that] in section 7 earlier the non-technical mentions of the [PMF], but we don't actually define ethos anywhere, what the measurement is. So, why don't we put this here, maybe this is an action

item that needs to be done – either needs to be done by RSSAC now or it needs to be somewhere in a recommendation somewhere that this still needs to be done. We definitely refer to it and we have nothing to refer to right now.

Third bullet we say recommend. The question I read is recommend to whom? Again, reading this as an outsider, are we saying recommend to the ICANN board? And if you connect this one with the previous comment from Jeff and Fred, we're not determining. We're recommending. If you put all those pieces together … Then [inaudible] next bullet, we use [function to] determine whether existing a root service operator should be removed, it's really to recommend because we use recommend everywhere else.

Then we actually do it in the very first sentence of the paragraph following the bullets where we say in this model, although the designation [inaudible] function has the authority to recommend the designation of new operators, it doesn't perform the … We essentially answer that question. We use different words throughout that entire section that I think is a bit confusing. I think the word we're looking for is recommend. What do people think of that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Makes sense to me.

BRAD VERD: Fred?

EN

FRED BAKER: We're having a discussion offline.

BRAD VERD: We don't need to answer it this very second. We can come back to it. But, that was my takeaway in reading it and I just wanted to share my thoughts because [inaudible]. Hopefully, they addressed your concern.

FRED BAKER: It isn't just a matter of picking the words, but the words sort of add up and become a thing. Remembering where this started, Terry and I were both involved on this group and I kind of felt like it should be an RSSAC only decision and he had at least a draft that made it sound to me like it was almost entirely an ICANN decision. So, I think not having this be a unilateral thing, but rather requiring an awful lot of input is where our concern lies. That's why I kept putting back in super majority or three-quarters vote or make sure [inaudible] minority opinion. I wouldn't want to see it cleansed and go in and say you guys do whatever you want; we don't care.

BRAD VERD: Agree. I don't think that happens by changing the word to recommend.

FRED BAKER: Understood. There have been a lot of changes and it's a slippery slope and it'll change [again].

BRAD VERD: Oh, I know. As you come back and read it, which is exactly what I did on section 8, as you read it again, you see [inaudible]. I understand. Well, I shared my thoughts there. Let's keep on going.

Manifestation. Doing this section, I just need to give a preamble. Doing 9.2 and 9.3 really created heartache in my head as I read it as somebody from the outside. The reason being is because we're talking through he manifestation of the designation and removal function and we talk about the members of it, but we do that before I know what group A and group B are and we don't define group A and group B until the next section in the stakeholders. So, it was really confusing in the order in which things arrived. I know why they arrived in that order because we said for each of the concept papers, here are the four questions. Go answer all these questions. I kind of just share that train of thought because it was confusing to read it.

So, jumping through manifestation, operational procedure. We say the committee will be bootstrapped as part of the implementation of the evolution of work, but after finishing its operational procedures, it will enter into a sleep mode.

So, here, in order to create the operational procedures, we need to create the committee. I'm just logically thinking this through. So, a committee has to be created of the members to create the operational procedures before they can go into sleep mode. If you agree with that, then some of the previous comments contradict this. We talk about the formation – I forget where it was. The formation would be [inaudible] as it's already formed. There was a wording somewhere that certain triggers would create the formation of committee, when in reality the

committee is already created. It's just in a [inaudible] mode, so it's like in a sleep mode as the document calls out. So, we just needed to make sure that we were consistent in that. As I read it, we weren't. Hopefully, people can see that. I just added some editorial comments. We don't need to talk about them. And some grammar, commas that needed to go away. I [inaudible] of a word that needed to happen there.

Then, as we keep going, Wes and Jeff were talking through this two-thirds super majority. I think you guys reached a happy place on where you wanted this, right Jeff, with the super majority?

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah, I'm happy with that.

BRAD VERD: Then, I made a comment, and Jeff, you responded. I'm fine leaving this here. It just felt, as I read it, it just felt a little out of place. But, I understand your desire to keep it there.

JEFF OSBORN: It's not [inaudible] privy, but I think it's important to have it hung there.

BRAD VERD: Understood. I wasn't trying to remove it. Again, as I read it, it felt like a comment that needed to be made about what was being said rather than in the body of the document, but that's fine.

I highlighted stakeholders in 9.3, again because in [line] 2, we talk about the groups before we've actually shared what the groups are. That was really confusing and maybe 9.1 and 9.2 need to be maybe written in a way that's a little more clear. Or, there was a crazy thought that I just typed down. Maybe it's easier just to change manifestation and stakeholders in all of the sections, and that would solve this problem and maybe not affect other problems, but I haven't looked at that yet.

In 9.3, the last part of that I would remove, as we're referencing a concept paper. This is the culmination of all the concept papers, so this just seemed like something that was there early on that probably shouldn't be there in the final edit.

Naela, moving down, she had clarification on the IANA functions operator which was added.

Then, we jump into relation to other functions. Again, this is the passive voice that we talked about earlier. If it's prescriptive, apologies. That was not the intent.

Third paragraph of relation and other functions, I changed the word from carries to will carry.

The third paragraph again, last word of the paragraph where we say we'll have the final authority [inaudible] recommend. Again, it leaves the reader hanging as to whom we are making the recommendation.

TRIPTI SINHA:　　　　　Someone has to put themselves on mute.

BRAD VERD: I think that's Liman. Can you put yourself on mute? Then I have just a grammar fix.

So, those were my thoughts on the designation removal function. [inaudible] can see all my comments. I was pretty verbose in sharing them.

Then, jump into finance. There really weren't many comments, but let's run through the few that are here. Wes, you had one saying I doubt we can clearly state without offering evidence and proof. Do you want to give any comments or thoughts on that, Wes?

WES HARDAKER: That comment is old enough now. I have to remember the context. One sec.

BRAD VERD: Okay. So, we talked through model strengths, the bullets there. Again, there were no comments on any of this. Model improvements. That's the finance function, and then we're down to recommendations which is blank. Any further thoughts on finance before we close this portion? We do have a few things left on the agenda and I want to be aware of people's times.

WES HARDAKER: I'll just clarify my comment really quickly, Brad. I think that paragraph sort of starts off explaining why we need to deal with this now. It doesn't really match the rest of the document, which is really more the advice going forward and this is describing history and things like that. I'll have to think about it in greater detail to provide a real recommendation as opposed to a complaint [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Okay. Maybe you can address it in San Juan.

WES HARDAKER: Will do.

BRAD VERD: Liman, you had your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I do, just a quick one. Can I suggest that we all think about general terms about what the advice we want to give to the board should be, so that we have a personal notion of where we want to bring this forward. I think it can make it easier to have the discussion in San Juan.

BRAD VERD: Yes, that is one of the sections in San Juan where we start talking through recommendations. That's what you mean when you say advice, right?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, and I mean that we actually think about it beforehand, so that we already have a clear thought about it when we arrive.

BRAD VERD: Yes, I hope everybody is doing that.

TRIPTI SINHA: Brad, just to add also I think this has been stated before, but we did a lot of wordsmithing today, but several sections will be written to ensure that we're speaking at the right tone and at the right level. Actually, to also pull in what Liman was just saying which is these are our initial thoughts and this is our assessment of the situation, taking that approach to the writing. This will look different as it begins to solidify.

BRAD VERD: Okay, great. As far as the engagement goes, just so people know that Tripti and I are sitting down with the other SO-AC leaders and we will be sharing a quick presentation on this, just talking through what's going on and where we are. This goes back to the timeline that has been shared with you guys in the past we've seen many times. We're a little bit off schedule, given the assessment and how much time it took that we didn't see coming, but I think we can easily make it up or get back on the tracks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Brad, if we could just explain why we believe we're a little bit off schedule, because if you look at this timeline, we're right on target. I think where we're off schedule is the writing was supposed to happen. After every meeting, we were going to revise the writing and then bring style to it, and that hasn't happened yet because we were taken aback by the amount of time we had to invest in the review, so just explain the writing is what is behind.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Well, let's jump into the ICANN 61 schedule. I will add in the ICANN 61 schedule, Tripti and I are meeting with the SSAC leadership rather than having an RSSAC-SSAC meeting because SSAC schedule didn't allow for that meeting and we will be sharing with them the evolution work that we are talking about here.

Carlos, are you going to go through the schedule for ICANN 61?

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. Hi, everyone. I'll be quick since this will be circulated to all of you as well. I think earlier we shared just a general outline of the different sessions. Working with the admin team, we've assigned specific topics for the different sessions.

Saturday and Sunday will be dedicated to this draft advice, essentially focusing on the different sections in more detail. Saturday there's also a tutorial. Andrew and I will be leading that tutorial. In the evening, we've arranged for a dinner and we'll provide transportation to the restaurant.

Kathy will be sending more details, but you'll have this on the agenda here.

Everyone is staying at different hotels afterward, so you'll be on your own for getting home, but we are transporting everyone from the convention center to the restaurant.

Again, Sunday will be dedicated to the evolution work.

Monday, fairly light day for the RSSAC. There is a tutorial. Andrew and Steve will be leading that.

Tuesday is a mix of RSSAC work sessions and some open sessions and joint meetings. Whenever there's an open session, we provide the remote participation link since that will be different than the closed sessions.

As Brad noted, unfortunately the scheduling didn't really allow for the joint RSSAC-SSAC meeting, but leadership of both groups will be meeting at some point during the week.

Then, Wednesday, wrapping up the work sessions, there's the organizational review sessions run by the examiner. We're waiting to confirm the room for the work party to coordinate the response. The usual reception with the various technical groups. There will be a shuttle. We're just waiting to confirm the location of that.

Thursday wrapping up with the joint meeting with the board.

So, you'll receive all of this and then, as a reminder, Kathy sends daily e-mails during the meetings as well. Any questions about the schedule?

Alright, thank you. Brad, back to you.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you. Let's jump into the work item. Anycast instances, that's been closed. Harmonization of anonymization, lots of work has been going on that on the mailing list. Liman, any quick update you want to share?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No. Actually, I would like to ask, Andrew, I saw that there was talk about doing a final write-up in the beginning of February. I know that something has been shared onto Cloudflare [inaudible]. What's the current status there? I haven't seen anything since.

BRAD VERD: Andrew is typing. Maybe he's not with us. He says in the chat session the document is being worked on and a new version is being created.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, thank you. That's all. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: [inaudible], Duane is not on the call as he is in transit. It looks like there was no update there. The FAQ, Andrew? Can you not talk Andrew? The FAQ was published on our website I think today by Andrew. It's been on the mailing list. You guys had lots of input on that. Thank you for all that.

Any questions around any of the existing work items right now? Andrew has put the FAQ link in the chat, so you can see it. I see no hands up. Let's jump on to any other business.

The chair updates. Tripti and I had our I think quarterly call. Maybe it's prior to every ICANN meeting. Maybe it's not quarterly, so maybe three times a year. Göran has a conference call with all the SO/AC leaders individually. We had our call with Göran a couple of weeks ago.

A couple topics. It's not a very long call. It's like 30-40 minutes. The topics that came up, Göran had a couple of things that he wanted to message. The first was on GDPR. It doesn't directly affect us right now. He spent a bit of time talking through the WHOIS policy and how it's affecting ICANN. We spent a little bit of time on that.

He talked about the budgets, the ICANN budget, and how their spending is and how they're trying to be more aware of where the money is being spent and make better choices – not better choices, but make sure they're getting value of where things are being spent.

There was a question about the flattening of the budget because of saturation. Göran noted that we see China as flattening but we see growth in other areas. So, there was a little bit of discussion about the budget. Nothing too exciting.

Obviously, we talking about ICANN 61 that was upcoming.

TRIPTI SINHA: We talked about the reviews, Brad.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. I'm not there yet. We talked about ICANN 61. In that discussion that came up, it was now a repeating question. Göran asked about DDoS attacks on the root server system and what's being done to mitigate them. The action item there was Tripti and I would go back. We know we've been asked that question from the CTO office. We've been asked that question from Cherine, the chairman of the board. It's on the agenda for discussion in the root ops meeting, but that is clearly a concern and ICANN is asking for help with their narrative on that.

Then, we jumped into the reviews. We talked about the SSR2 review and the RSSAC review. We talked about the SSR2 review, where it was and what was going on. Not much going on, not much to talk about. We didn't talk about much there.

Then, we had a quick discussion around the RSSAC review and expressed some of our frustration around that. At that point is when Göran said that he would engage Theresa Swineheart who is responsible for MSSI, who is responsible for all the reviews, to reach out to us.

Tripti, is there anything else from the Göran call that I msised?

TRIPTI SINHA:

I did want to share with everyone, and I think this is what Wes was alluding to and Paul Vixie as well earlier when we had the discussion about the review. We did let Göran know that we have great concerns now in how reviews are being done. I'm all about being fair to ensure

that we're doing right by all entities involved. Yes, I'm very disappointed with the review, but I want to make sure that the examiners were given the appropriate instruction to do what they were supposed to do.

We did tell Göran that this review went awry. However, ICANN needs to take some responsibility. As Paul said earlier, what was the elevator pitch? We didn't use that word, but what were they told to review? How did you instruct them? What did you contract for? We have a good sense, but we were not there when it was all put together.

Our meetings with them, it appeared like there was a hidden agenda somewhere, and I told Göran this is just not good, that kind of a message that's being percolated, even if it's subliminal that there's an agenda here.

So, these have to be squeaky clean and above board and that's now how this has come across. That's what prompted him to point us to Theresa.

SSR2 also is having very serious problems, and then of course in the course of this process I've learned a couple of other reviews are also having issues. The reason I'm hesitating right now is because I'm reading a comment from Fred saying the examiner is online and I don't think they are. We had actually checked into this.

I think ICANN has got issues with reviews right now. I'm not laying blame on just examiners. I'm not sure. ICANN is doing a good job providing them with scope and guardrails and they could do a better job.

BRAD VERD: Following on to that, that was our call with Göran which triggered – he said Theresa would be reaching out to us. We had a phone call with Theresa and her team a couple of days later where we talked about nothing but the review process, our experience.

It was at this point, Wes, where we talked about the negative perception that we certainly didn't want to derail or stop anything. ICANN needed to follow its process. We needed to publish this document, get it out there, but it was kind of damned if you do, damned if you don't type of thing.

We spent a lot of time talking about our experience with the examiner. We asked about were they diligent in their line of questioning saying we're talking about RSSAC and not root ops, let's make sure we stick to it.

TRIPTI SINHA: If I could just add the one thing that disappointed us was they included a lot of quotes in the review, as you've seen, and by golly they removed a lot when we went through it. It came across like they wanted to be inflammatory and make it a sensational read. In my 30-plus career, I've sat through numerous audits and reviews and I've also been part of review committees and the way I've operated and my committees have operated is that you take the comments that you get by interviewing people and then you aggregate it and distill it to information that is instructive. Something that's constructive and instructive.

We couldn't understand the rhyme or reason in why they were inserting all kinds of inflammatory comments in the report when they were adding no value. Hence, our sense that there was an agenda.

There were multiple failures with this particular review, in my humble opinion. And I think we're seeing a pattern in other reviews as well. SSR2 has gone off the rails. There are other issues with ALAC and so on and so forth.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Tripti. Any comments or thoughts given what we shared here? I see no hands. Our last bullet on the agenda is the May 2018 workshop. Kathy, you have a question or something to talk about.

KATHY SCHNITT: Great. Thank you, everyone. Just real quick, May workshop is the 1st to the 3rd. I'll send an e-mail after the call today which will have a form that just helps us with logistics. It's just going to be the basic are you attending and what support you need, whether it's hotel, travel, and so forth. We tried to dumb it down as best as we can to make sure that we get the information we need and make it as smooth as possible for you. So, that's pretty much all I got there. Any questions?

BRAD VERD: Any questions for Kathy?

KATHY SCHNITT: Thanks, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Alright, thank you. Is there anything else that's not on the agenda that we need to cover? We're one minute other. Seeing no hands and hearing nothing, is there a motion to adjourn?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Alright. Thank you, All. Thank you for a wonderful meeting. Have a wonderful day and safe travels to everyone to Puerto Rico.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Brad.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, all. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]