TRIPTI SINHA: Moving on, who's here from the University of South California ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker is here.

SUSAN WOOLF: And Susan is here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Welcome. Thank you, Susan. Please mute, I'm making another request to mute, please.

CARLOS REYES: You may want to check your speakers, I think the feedback is coming from your line.

TRIPTI SINHA: No, I've got everything muted at my end. I don't believe so. Alright, moving on to [inaudible].

HOWARD KASH: Ken and Howard are here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hello, Howard and Ken. Department of Defense?

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.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson and Kevin Wright are here and we've on Press to Talk as well so there's no muting speakers.

TRIPTI SINHA: Oh, I see, so you're not able to mute?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Correct, we're not doing anything through the Adobe Connect Audio or anything like that, we're also on Press to Talks which means we have press to talk so it's going to be silence until we press to actually talk.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. I'm still hearing a feedback. From Verisign, who's here from Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad and Matt.

TRIPTI SINHA: Welcome to both of you. WIDE? Hiro, I think you're online but I don't hear you. I do see him online. Moving on to IANA Functions Operator.

NAELA SARRA: Naela here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, welcome Naela. Root Zone Maintainer?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Welcome Duane. IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Daniel here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Welcome, Daniel. ICANN Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh here.

TRIPTI SINHA: CSC Liaison, we know Liman's here. RZERC, Brad is here. SSAC, Russ? Russ, are you here? Alright, I don't hear him. From Staff we've got Mario, Andrew, Carlos, Kathy and Steve Sheng. Is there someone -- Okay, Russ Mundy's note says, he's dialed in. By the way, I still here a feedback, I implore you, whoever is not muted please mute. Is there someone would like to announce themselves.

JEFF OSBOURNE: This is Jeff Osbourne, I'm here at ISC, I repeatedly have been getting thrown off of Adobe Connect so I'm dialed in.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, for announcing yourself Jeff. Anyone else? Anyone from Cogent? Alright, moving on. Let's move on to a quick review of the agenda. We'll start with our regular administrative items, approving the minutes from the May meeting and then moving on to an update from the Caucus Membership Committee. We've got a discussion about four potential applicants.

Then we'll get an update on the RSSAC Organizational Review from Carlos, our comments were submitted and others we received. We'll get an update from Carlos on that. Then we'll move on to approving RSSAC SSCAS ZZ, we'll have a motion on the floor with discussion and the subsequent vote on it.

Then we'll move onto a discussion of work items, an update from the Harmonization of Anonymization Procedures from Liman, packet sizes from Duane, prioritizing future work items from Andrew, KSK Roller Over plan from Steve and RSAC 000 Version 4 from Carlos. Then Carlos will continue with the discussion on ICANN 62 schedule and then we'll move on to a discussion of the ITF102 RSSAC Caucus agenda discussion.

Then we'll have reports from your co-chairs and all the liaisons. Then here's a call for -- we do have two other items under any other business, the nomination period for the two liaisons to the CSC as well as the --

and then of course we will also announce the votes on RSSAC XX and ZZ. Would anyone like to add any other items to A or B? Alright, hearing none. I heard a beep, did someone dial in? Would someone like announce themselves?

RUSS MUNDY: This is Russ, I tried again with another call to the same number. I think I'm hearing audio this, am I being heard?

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes, you are being heard and I believe everyone is muted because I'm not hearing a feedback anyone, so thank you.

Let's run the agenda now. Let's move right into administration. Andrew, I'm going to turn this over to you.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thanks, Tripti. All of the action items from the May 3 minutes have been completed. There's nothing really to report there. On the March minutes, which still haven't been done because ICANN had to move away from Adobe Connect, now that we've using Adobe Connect again I should be able to produce the March minutes for our next meeting. That's all, back to you. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. May I have a motion on the floor to approve the May 3rd minutes please?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Wes put a motion on the floor, Ryan Stephenson.

TRIPTI SINHA: Did I hear Wes put a motion?

WES HARDAKER: Yes, Wes and Ryan did.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, Wes and Ryan and who seconds this, I thought I heard Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I seconded it, yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Thank you all. Is there a discussion about the minutes? Okay, all those in favor?   I am assuming the silence says everyone in favor. Anyone opposed? Anyone abstaining? Alright, the minutes have been approved.   Moving on to a discussion about potential RSSAC Caucus Members. Matt, I'm going to turn this over to you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sorry to interrupt, Liman has his hand up.

TRIPTI SINHA: I'm sorry, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just to quicken things, if you have a motion on the floor it's seconded and there is no discussion, it automatically moves, it passes. You don't have to call for a vote.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, thank you for clarifying the rules

MATT LARSON: The Membership Committee brought on two new members to the committee, special thanks to past members both Jim Martin and Paul Vixie for participating in the Membership Committee. The two new members are Dave Lawrence and Alejandro Acosta. We convened our first meeting a couple weeks ago to review five candidates and submitted applications to join the caucus. One applicant we had questions about and ask for clarification, we hadn't heard back so we will not include that candidate in the discussion here, which leaves us with four other applicants.

Two of the applicants actually are with existing root operators, both Ken Renard and Nichole Boscia, one NASA and from ARL. We reviewed both applications and enthusiastically support their mission for the caucus. The two other candidates were a gentleman Amir Qayyum, and I apologize if I'm pronouncing this incorrectly, and Ehtisham Khalid. Alejandro had worked with Amir Qayyum before and recommended him based on past experience. They both come out of Pakistan, they

both have applications that we believe to be good and being able to contribute to the caucus.

The unanimous recommendation of the Membership Committee was to move forward with all four of the applications. I'm happy to answer any questions or review them further but otherwise I would suggest that you just move forward with all four applications.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Matt. Are then any questions for Matt about these applicants? Ken is currently representing us from ARL, do we have any questions of Matt? Alright, I see no hands going up, so I'm going to move on to putting a motion on the floor. Do I have a motion on the floor to approve these applicants to be RSSAC Caucus Members?

WES HARDAKER: Wes moves to approve all of them.

TRIPTI SINHA: Do I have a second?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson does.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Thank you, any discussion? Hearing none and as Liman just clarified, the motion passes. Nicole, Ehtisham, Amir and Ken have all been approved to the RSSAC Caucus Members. Matt, over to you.
MATT WEINBERG:	We'll go ahead and send out those notifications to those candidates. The other point of business is something that we talked about in our call was, going through the existing caucus and trying to do an audit of existing caucus members and comparing that to participation in either a working group or an actually RSSAC Caucus Meeting. We know for sure there are some RSSAC Caucus members that it does not appear they have participated at all with RSSAC.

What we want to do is cross reference participation with the actual list with the goal of reaching out to the people who have not participated at all over the years and confirming whether they still eligible and ready to participate in the caucus because we believe that maybe the caucus needs a little bit of spring cleaning. We'll have more information about that in the next call. Our goal is to present that information for the next call. Any questions? That is our update, thank you. |
| TRIPTI SINHA: | Thank you, Matt. Actually, there is a question for us in the chatroom from Fred, will there be an RSSAC Caucus Meeting Sunday afternoon at ITF102? Yes, there will. The answer Fred is, yes there will be. There's going to be a discussion about the agenda on this call as well. Moving on, let's move on to agenda item number five, which is an RSSAC Organization Review Update from Carlos. Carlos, over to you. |

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti. Quick update about the Organization Review. On Sunday the Public Comment Proceeding on the Draft Final Report closed. As you know last week the RSSAC voted on its own statement which was approved, with that submission it's joins -- there were a handful of other submissions and I'm going to provide the link in the chat now, I'll also email it for everyone. There were a handful of submissions in response to the Draft Final Report from different ICANN groups.

The next step, the Independent Examiner will finalize their Draft Report and they'll publish the Final Report, which includes the Organization Review by the end of this month. After that, the process essentially continues with the dialog between RSSAC and the ICAAN Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee. Nearly at the end of the Organization Review period and as I said, the Public Comment Submission are in the chat and I will share those as well. Back to you, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: Are there any questions about the review? Alright, hearing none and seeing no hands go up, I believe there is none. Thank you for that update, Carlos. Let's move on to agenda item six and seven. These are the two documents that we've been working on for a while now, this is RSSAC 0XX and RSSAC 0ZZ. The intent is to approve today but before move to the motion I'd like to first start with a discussion and then

explain how the votes will be conducted. Is there any discussion about either document?

Alright, hearing none, the way we plan to do this vote is I'll ask for a motion, it will be seconded and of course a discussion. Once the discussion is closed the vote will be conducted via a Doodle Pole and it's open for everyone to see. Carlos, you will email the ballot, the ballot will contain both vote on RSSAC 0XX as well as RSSAC 0ZZ. Carlos, will you email that right now?

CARLOS REYES: Yes, it just went out right now.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, good. Then at the end of the call I will announce whether it has passed. For those of you who are not online and don't have an interface, you can announce your vote at the end, just before we announce the results. I see a question in the chatroom from Fred, he says, "Was discussing the business constituency comments perhaps in Panama?"

Fred, this is with regard to the previous item and I don't see why not, we can put that on the agenda for Panama for sure. Why don't we table that discussion for when we come to a discussion on the ICANN 62 agenda? With that said, are the rules clear? Liman's hand just went up; Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: What the line of reason for this complicated procedure? Why don't we just do it a normal way?

TRIPTI SINHA: You mean the normal way as in the way we typically vote on things?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Have a motion, have it seconded, if there's no discussion it passes.

TRIPTI SINHA: That's a very good point. One of the reasons we did this is because we were not sure who was going to be on the call and who wasn't and we've been doing a lot of votes online on documents but you're absolutely right, there's no reason why we shouldn't conduct a vote the way we normally do. Carlos, can you remind me…

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm happy to go forward with this but bare it in mind for the future that we don't have to make it more complicated then it is.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Alright, Carlos can you remind us what the logic was behind this?

CARLOS REYES: Typically, documents have been approved via Doodle but it's up to the Chair's to decide.

TRIPTI SINHA: I wouldn't mind going to route of what Liman proposed. Is anyone opposed to that? Alright, hearing none, let's take the approach that Liman is suggesting. I'd like a motion, there was no discussion on this, so I'd like a motion on the approval or RSSAC 0XX and RSSAC 0ZZ, do I have a motion? [CROSSTALK].

I'm sorry, everyone spoke at the same time, I could not tell who was putting the motion on the floor.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Wes and Ryan motioned it again.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you, and Liman, I see your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Is the motion for one document or for both?

TRIPTI SINHA: For both. Do I have a second?

CARLOS REYES: I second the motion.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, there is a motion on the floor, it's been seconded and the motion is to approve RSSAC 0XX and RSSAC 0ZZ, is there any discussion? Hearing none, both documents have been approved. Thank you everyone.   Moving on to work items.   Liman, over to you on harmonization of anonymization procedures.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. We have received a report quite a while back and just read it last week again. It is a pretty decent coverage of the various options. The thing that it lacks is clear directive. We did ask for proposal for a single way to do it and also for guidance on whether it should be conducted or not and those are actually lacking from the report. That said, there are a couple of options we can take here.

The first one is to toss it back to them immediately and say that no we really want you to this. The second option, which I favor is to say yes, we will publish this document and we might give you a second task to do this, this approach has the benefit that we won't be medaling with the result from the caucus and I kind of like that. If there are others in the group who are really unhappy with the content, we could toss it back to them and ask for further work. There has been very limited participation in this work party.

Paul Hoffman, John Heidemann and possibly one or two more people and that's not really a wide group of people and that tells me that there isn't a whole lot of interest for this specific topic which means that it might not be as important as we thought it was.   My personal

conclusion for that is that we should publish the report. We have some guidance on methods.

Nobody seems to be really interested in aligning this, so my personal take is that each operator can pick and choose whether to do it and which method to use because if there was interest, more people would have subscribed to the work party and helped to hash this out. I propose that we publish the document as is. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Are there any questions for Liman about this?

BRAD VERD: I have one. Liman, I'm sorry I'm not up to speed on the most current document, I'm just curious, did we reach a point where it's a recommendation or is it just the guidelines for the three different options?

LARS-JOHNAN LIMAN: I take is that they have actually gone through a set of methods and they presented the various drawbacks and benefits of these various methods but they are not recommending a specific one I believe.

BRAD VERD: Alright, great thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Any other questions? Brad, your hand needs to go down. Alright, so Liman, will you take the lead in putting the report together?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Putting the report together? We do have a document, what type of report?
TRIPTI SINHA:	Taking to the next step? Closing it out as a report?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	I'm sorry, I don't see what I really need to do? This is the document from the caucus, it's supposed to be rubber stamped and I thought that what we do here is to rubber stamp and to be honest I thought it was on the agenda to be approved today but if it isn't I'm happy to do it at the next meeting. For the delay I'm not really happy with but sure, no problem.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Liman, it doesn't have an asterisk next to it. When something has to be voted on, I don't believe we were planning to vote on it today.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	My fault, I thought that was kind of taken care of more automatically but I understand, I'll do that for next meeting.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Moving on to Duane. Duane an update on packet sizes.

DUANE WESSELS: You may remember during our last meeting I expressed some concern about this work party not making progress and so we had a little bit of a discussion on the work party call a few weeks ago and basically the work party agreed to continued and finish this work.

I made the point that we need to get to the point where we're actually writing the document now and so a couple of work party members were identified to begin writing this report and finalizing it. I haven't seen that writing yet but I had to trust that that is going to happen. I don't think we have a next meeting scheduled yet if we do it's probably in Montreal.

TRIPTIO SINHA: Thank you. Any questions for Duane? Hearing none, Duane, are you done? I am assuming he is. Moving on to prioritization of future work items from Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thanks, Tripti. On May 9th there was a survey sent to the caucus, those are the results of the survey there. This is about future work items for the caucus and I'm also going to post a link in the chat which has a little bit more explanation about each one of these future work items. From the results of the survey it looks like item three has received the most votes, this was a ranking survey where members of the caucus could say

I want this first, this second, this third and then Survey Monkey put together this graph based upon all those different values.

Based upon results of the survey, research geographic diversity of root servers option number three has the tallest bar, that's the winner. I guess now we should have some discussion about actions items and next steps, given that that's the result of the survey.

TRIPTI SINHA: Andrew, I don't see anything displayed, if you have something displayed I don't see it and two, Wes's hand just went up. Go ahead, Wes.

WES HARDAKER: It's the Adobe Connect room so I do see Andrew's graph, I'm not sure why you're not. I think one of the questions that we had in the past is not which one we should do but rather which ones, plural, we should do and my recollection is we sort of had this defective number that we threw around of three work items to be the top level that we should do at once given staffing levels needed and effort and thinness of pretty much everybody.

I think one of the questions is, now that we have these results, which I do find that they're actually -- the top three are all similar, which shows an overwhelming direction of we need to better understand resolution to the root server. What do we want to do going forward? How many active work parties do we want? I think that needs to be discussed.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Wes. I still can't see it rendered on my interface. Let's continue with the discussion while I try to figure out what's going on with my interface. Any other questions or comments on what Andrew just presented? One discussion is to take off a work party for sure on, did you say it was item number three Andrew? I can't see anything at my end?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah, the item that received the most was three and then I believe the second was one and then the third was six. In that order it's three, one, six.

TRIPTI SINHA: Kevin and then Steve, I don't remember whose hand went up first but we have two hands Kevin Wright and Steve Sheng.

KEVIN WRIGHT: Thanks, Tripti. I'm just noting that that one and six are very closely related, so we should probably take some consideration into that, maybe combine them or something.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Steve did you have your hand up?

STEVE SHENG: From the Staffing perspective, now that we've finished the governance models, we do have cycles. One thing I would like to caution is

sometimes the RSSAC caucus work started but they lacked interest and direction at sometimes. I think to address that we could pick three but make sure that -- to have a very good, very solid statement work drafted and also, select a good chair for caucus so that we make sure there's a good chance the work will finish. I think will be my recommendation.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Steve. Susan.

SUSAN WOOLF: Just to -- Steve said most of it. I think that work party actually was just short of critical mass, just short of gaining momentum. I think with a slightly more careful plan such as Steve is suggesting it could make progress and we could end up with a result out of it if we do it again, so I support trying to restart that effort on a slightly tighter plan.

TRIPTI SINHA: Susan, which effort did you refer to?

SUSAN WOOLF: The any cast, the one that Steve just spoke of is needing a little bit of additional thrust to move forward.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alight. Thank you.

STEVEN SHENG: I wasn't pointing specifically to any cast but I think in general some of the caucus work lacks traction, it's not just the any cast, we see from the other work party as well. But generally, tighter scope, more careful planning up front. I think for now we have the staff resources, let's work together to make this successful. Thanks.

SUSAN WOOLF: Yeah, I think you're right and I think that actually item three is a good place to try to demonstrate that thesis. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, where we are is that the top votes went to three, one and six. Andrew bear with me because I still can't see the bar graph on my interface and apparently four is up there as well and Kevin Wright just suggested that one and six are similar enough that they could potentially be combined and that be put under consideration. The discussion, should we move forward? The Staff does have spare cycles now so we could devote a fair amount of resources to this work if we were to spin off potentially three work parties. What are your thoughts on that?

STEVEN SHENG: Tripti, I wasn't suggesting three works parties, but we can start three topics and see which ones come back with the SOW of which two and then we start there, that would be my recommendation.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, so you're saying let's take the top three and put statements of work in place and then start with one of them?

STEVEN SHENG: Yes, that will be my recommendation.

TRIPTI SINHA: You feel the Staff can handle one? Thoughts on that, please.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sounds like a good idea.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, any other questions, comments? Shall we proceed with writing statements of work for the top three and then take it from there and see which one bubbles to the top and assign resources to move forward with one of them?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Actually, going back to the combining one and six we need to address that as well.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If someone takes on to write a statement of work, ask that person to do one and six together or maybe a small group of people and see if it makes sense to combine them.

TRIPTI SINHA: I'm going to call for volunteers now. Who is willing to write and take the lead on writing a statement of work for number three and anyone else who would like to join that group, who would like to take the lead on number three? Number three is researching geographic diversity of root servers. Any volunteers?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would be willing to do it but not on my own.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. [CROSSTALK]. Let's hold on, we've got three willing volunteers; I might want to spread the leadership around. Liman and Susan, can I pair the two of you together?

SUSAN WOOLF: For project three, the geographic diversity?

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes.

SUSAN WOOLF: Yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Fred, if you don't mind, can I nominate you for one and six with maybe others?

FRED BAKER: With others, yes please.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Wes said he's willing to help. We've got Fred, Wes anyone else? I'm going to be a name out there, Kevin Wright, you actually called the similarities between the two, can I put you on that group?

KEVIN WRIGHT: Yeah, I can help with that one.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you. Liman, did I just see your hand go up? Liman, it says you're on mute.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry, I do have my hand up but it can wait until you are done with all the assignments.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Then I see Terry says he can help on one and six as well. Brad says, I think we can reuse some of the data from the early any cast work party that was shelved for topic three. Terry, I'm going to assign you to the Fred, Wes group as well. We've got two groups, group number one is Liman and Suzanne, they're going to write a statement of work for number three.

Group number two, Fred, Wes and Terry and Kevin Wright, so we've got four there, they will look at both one and six, look at similarities and come up with appropriate statement of work. Sound like a plan? Alright, hearing no opposition. Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's a general question in this context. These are topics that kind of received lots of votes from the caucus members. It would seem like a good idea to involved the people who actually vote for the specific topics in the process at an early stage. I'm kind of careful because I don't really the context for the voting, if it was supposed to be anonymous, if it is anonymous, if we do have the names and so on. I'm very sensitive to that. If there is energy in the caucus regarding these issues then we should try to harvest that and make use of it. I would like to -- I'm asking, is there a way for me to reach out to the people who voted for number three and ask them for input on the process?

TRIPTI SINHA: Carlos's hand went up, I believe he has a comment. Carlos, go ahead.

CARLOS REYES:	Thanks, Tripti. Liman, I think that's a very good point. My suggestion would be, now that we have these groups, we can make an announcement to the caucus list and say, if you want to work on these items reach out to these people. I don't know to what extent Andrew collected that type of information about participants but I think that approach strikes a good balance.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	You're quite right, thank you.
TRIPTI SINHAN:	Alright, I'm going to leave it to the working parties to reach out to Andrew and Carlos to see if they could further fortify these working groups with caucus members. In the chatroom I see Ryan Stephenson will also join Liman and Susan on number three. Would we like to put together a statement of work for number four, since that was not too far behind or do you think we're over committed at this point?
UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	I think let's start with where we are and if in a couple of months…
TRIPTI SINHA:	Okay, why don't we wrap this one up, I believe we're at a good place. Thank you. Let's move on to the next agenda item which is Steve, over to you on KSK Roller Plan.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Tripti. The Board passed a resolution on the 13th of May asking the SSAC and RZERC to provide the Board with advice on the CTO office update plan for continuing the root KSK Rollover. The deadline set for input is 10th of August, going to share this is with the RSSAC. I know in the past there's some discussions on the RSSAC list of making some contributions. Like to defer back to Chair on how and whether RSSAC will actually participate and how you would like to participate in this work? From a Staff's perspective, we're happy to support any work you charter on this. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Steve, this is with regard to are input, RSSAC's input?

STEVE SHENG: Yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: I think the Board asked for SSAC's input as well as RSSAC's input, correct? You're referring to that work item?

STEVEN SHENG: Yes, that's correct.

TRIPTI SINHA I think we were very distracted with RSSAC SSAC and ZZ and so now you're putting that back on the table for would we like to provide feedback?

STEVE SHENG: Yes, that's correct.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thoughts on that please.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think it's actually -- it sounds stronger then would we like to. The Board requests our input so we should definitely step up to that and I think that the appropriate way to do it is to design a work party within the committee to do that. I would be willing to participate in that.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Liman. Who else would like to join this party? Russ, I see your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Tripti. Yeah, I would happily join this party. I was going to also include in my SSAC liaison report that SSAC is also running a work party to put together a response to this request.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Russ will join the group with Liman. Wes, your hand is up, are you volunteering as well?

WES HARDAKER: Well I probably I can, that's true, however my hand was actually up to make a point of this being a very technical issue, I would suggest that we incorporate people from the caucus and I realize that's harder because normally that's a longer process but the reality is I think we ought to form a technical small committee to create a response that includes the expertise from the caucus. Maybe without the level of formality that we normally do but starting at the caucus work party.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Before I get on to that, I see a plus one from Brad. Brad are you plus one to volunteering, your volunteering and I see a plus one from Ryan, Ryan what's your plus one for?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Wes's comment.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Liman, your hand is up now.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hearing Wes's comments I would -- you're quite right. My previous statement within the committee was more down to the timing issue then to whom to involve but I think that Wes is actually quite right. We should involve the caucus if we have the administrative means to do in time.

TRIPTI SINHA: Steve, remind me, what is the deadline on this, when is it due?

STEVE SHENG: August 10th.

TRIPTI SINHA: August 10th, so there isn't a whole of time. Why don't we take this to the course of action and the action is, Liman, Wes and Brad have volunteered to be on the work party. Why don't the three of you go away and put together a plan and see how you can solicit without encumbering this in some bureaucratic manner involving the caucus, make some recommendations, send it to this list and proceed from there. One approach might just the three of you write it and send it out for further comment to the caucus or solicit volunteers. It is on a tight timeline. Does that sound like a plan?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It does.

TRIPTI SINHA: I'd like to declare one of you to be the lead on this, Liman, since you volunteered first, would you be willing to take the lead?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Me and my big mouth, yes.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Alright, thank you. Any other comments on this discussion? Russ, go ahead.
RUSS MUNDY:	One quick comment about the approach that SSAC is using that RSSAC might find helpful. We asked our admin folks if they would look at the due date of when the comment needed to be completed and proposed a schedule backwards if you will as to what needed to be done when and that has allowed us to be a little bit more aware of what our schedule needs to be. I just offer that as something SSAC did that RSSAC might find helpful.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Thank you, and Russ, I neglected to say that you're also part of this party, I'm sorry, I just realized that. Carlos, your hand is up, did you want to say something?
CARLOS REYES:	I was just going to say I'm happy to work with the group to plan backwards as Russ suggested.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Thank you, Carlos. The team once again, Liman is taking the lead on this and we've Russ, Wes, and Brad and Carlos is offering to provide Staff support as well. I think we have a plan going forward. Thank you. Hearing no more comments on this, moving on to RSSAC 000 version four, Carlos.

CARLOS REYES:
Thanks, Tripti. Roughly this time every year we begin the process of reviewing and revising the operational procedures. We'll go ahead and start that process now. We've allocated some time in Panama to have discussions about what can be modified. Staff typically keeps a list of things that come up over the year but we can address that in Panama. In Panama we decide who would like to take the lead. I think Kevin Jones has done it in the past but we can discuss that further in Panama. I just wanted to flag that for everyone.

TRIPTI SINHA:
Thank you, Carlos. Before I move on to agenda number nine, I'm going to move around a little bit and this to agenda 12.B where we were going to announce the results of our vote and I know I might lose a couple of you in a few minutes, I think Fred said he might lose power. I want to say a few comments since we voted a little differently today, I may as well make those comments right now.

First, I wanted to thank all of RSSAC, each and every one of you, this was tremendous work that we did, it took us about two and a half years to get to where we got to and it's highly appreciated. I think even the last few weeks several comments came in, people were looking at the document with a find tooth comb and sent in some -- caught all kinds of subtleties, so I really thank you very much. I think the documents come together very well. It will be published. It goes first to the Board and there's a waiting period and then it will be made available online.

We will see where we go next. I think when -- the next topic is to discuss the ICANN 62 schedule and we might end up getting some meetings with the Board, we don't know yet. I think there's something on the agenda but it depends on what their comments are when they read in its entirety.

Any questions or comments about this? Alright, hearing none this is a good segway into ICANN 62, Carlos back to you again.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti. Just quickly, as you know ICANN 62 is coming up pretty soon, it starts on June 25th and it runs to the 28th, it is the shorter of the policy forum. I'll share the schedule on the chat for everyone. The schedule has also been published, if you are attending the meeting you can download the app and reference it there too. I'll quickly go over it. It's four days, Monday we allowed everyone to participate in the DNS workshop and tech day, historically that hasn't been possibly given the various work session but since we have some room with the schedule we thought it would be nice if you could all do that since someone of you already sneak in and out of the different workshops as well.

Tuesday the Organizational Review Session, that's the first session in the morning, this is when Intrel will present their final report and they'll explain why they did the public comment submissions. Then we have RSSAC work sessions, one is a prep session for the various joint meetings and other activities and then after lunch there's a joint meeting with SSAC. That afternoon there are two cross community sessions, both focusing on GDPR and then we'll have and RSSAC dinner

that evening as well, more details will be shared as we get closer to that.

Wednesday, to Liman's point earlier about the vote on the harmonization document, given the focus on SSAC and DZ in the past month, we thought we'd carve out some time to specifically go over that document in Panama if necessary or any other caucus work items, so we can do that the first session.

Then we've also carved out sometime over some of the future work items, depending on how the two groups that were just formed, there may be an update or caucus members can participate as well in this session. If you remember at the workshop, RSSAC agreed to open all of its work sessions, so if there are caucus members in attendance that's a good opportunity to talk about the work items.

Work session four, the Leadership of the NONCOM will be giving and update and then we can also talk about updates to the Operational Procedures. There is some FYI session, the auctions proceeds cross community working group is meeting and then there's a cross community session on the final report from the CCWGN Accountability.

Thursday, we have the usual RSSAC Info Session, that's when RSSAC presents about its recent work. Then we have some time that we've allowed for the ICANN Board to attend and ask questions about the Governance Model, so that is Thursday before lunchtime. Then we have a session to wrap up. Any questions about the schedule?

TRIPTI SINHA: I do have two questions. Session number four, you say Nominating Committee and RSSAC 00 Version Four, essentially that work session is broken into two section, the Nominating Committee will come and do its thing and leave and then we do RSSAC 00, correct?

CARLOS REYES: Correct.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Then, RSSAC work session five, I guess somewhere, at least our edification, if you want to say that this a joint meeting with the Board because that's not clear, when you just look at this.

CARLOS REYES: It's technically not a joint meeting because the ICANN Board -- the guidelines for the policy forum is the ICANN Board should not be having any meetings, they should be working with the groups. But yes, I'll note that the ICANN Board is invited to this. For purposes of the schedule, we can't say that it's a joint meeting.

TRIPTI SINHA: Can you call it a working meeting with Board, is that acceptable language?

CARLOS REYES: That's fine. Yeah, we just don't want to give the impression that the ICANN Board is meeting with RSSAC because the other groups may ask questions and we don't want to invite that type of scrutiny.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay.

CARLOS RYES: We can open it up. It's just a little easier to request private things and then later open them. The reason we did is the previous briefing that RSSAC gave the Board a year ago in Johannesburg was private. I'm glad you brought that up because I wanted clarify that with group.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Also, previously the topic had not been publicly released yet, these documents will b published at this point so my recommendation would we should -- unless the Board members that might want to attend think it should be closed, I would say it should be open.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any thoughts on that from this group? I see Russ's had is up, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Tripti. It does seem to me that since the intention is to have the documents out in public form by this time, hopefully there's also been the briefly sent to the SO and AC chairs and we'll certainly be talking about in the RSSAC SSAC meeting. It certainly seems that it's

appropriate for this meeting to be open and that even though the focus might be questions interaction with members of the Board, it seems like it would be a good place to hear what the community might say also.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, for you input Russ. Liman, I see you hand up and just before I turn it over to Liman, there is support from Liman online as well as support from Terry.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was just going to restate my support here. I was just about to say the same thing Russ said. We should invite people to a wider communication. If there is a reason to limit to the Board then that's fine but if there's not the invitation should be extended to the wider community to have a dialog but maybe during one of the sessions just like this, so we can focus on the interaction with the other groups in one session. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, just in response to what you're saying, in our RSSAC information session we always give an update on documents that have recently been published and this document will have been published, so we will certainly be giving an update at the RSSAC information session on Thursday, that of course is for the entire ICANN community. I just wanted to let you know, that will also be happening at that session.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	If I can respond to that. Yes, but that's a different thing to me. The published document doesn't invite the audience to have a dialog with us. I would like to see or I propose that we have a session that is titled Dialog with Community Regarding the New Proposal.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Okay, I see. I think Russ said, will the SO/AC's get a briefing? Brad and I do attend an SO/AC meeting on Sunday, so they do around the table, everyone gives and update, so they will be getting a brief update from us at that meeting as well. Of course, we have the joint SSAC meeting where this will come up for discussion too. Liman, very good point. Wes, over to you now, you've got your hand up.

WES HARDAKER:	I very much agree with Liman's point. I think one of the stated goals that we've always said in the past with the Panama is that we would try and after publishing the report interact with as many groups and AC and SO's as possible and not only that, when this document gets announced to the SO/AC working group chair list, that we should be prepared to have joint sessions with anybody interested in doing so.
	If anybody wants to give us feedback or has questions, that to me is the highest priority item that we can stick on, in that way, I'd almost suggest that one of our earliest meetings of the week be a presentation or Liman's open discussion forum where we can start the dialog early in the week and allow people to come up to us in the hallways and stuff afterwards if there are any. Silence's great but we need to provide them the opportunity to give us feedback.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Wes. I was going to propose we go ahead we go ahead with that direction and I notice that Carlos is a step ahead of us, he's already changed the agenda, he's calling it Community Dialog, it's open now and it's a discussion on a proposed and governance model, which is RSSAC SSAC, it must have a number by now.

The other suggestion you're making Wes, is to see if it can be moved up a little. I'm going to leave that kind of maneuvering within the schedule to Carlos and Steve. All very good suggestions, thank you all. Any other discussion on this? Alright, hearing none back to Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti. I wanted to address about a speech about moving it earlier in the week. We could swap it with another work session that we already have scheduled. If everyone's looking at the schedule, for example we could swap it with work session three. I just want to make sure that this group has time to prepare. We really can't do anything else on Tuesday, so is Wednesday okay?

TRIPTI SINHA: I'm good with it.

CARLOS REYES: Okay. We'll rework it. The other question I had, I guess to follow up on Russ's point. Russ, is the joint meeting with SSAC still closed?

RUSS MUNDY: That is the plan at this point, unless there is a desire to open it up. If we keep it closed it keeps give us a option to speak more freely about some of the internal activities, in particular end cap is what's in my because there are some things that SSAC might want to share about end cap that aren't general community knowledge.

CARLOS REYES: Okay, thanks Russ.

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Supporting Russ, I think the agenda should drive whether it's open or not. Asking Carlos, it sounded like it's easier to start out closed and to open it up later then to go the other direction. I suggest we keep it closed until we know the agenda for the meeting.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Thank you. Carlos, back to you.

CARLOS REYES: That's it on ICANN 62. We'll work on the changes we discussed and I let everyone know when that has been updated.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Alright, thank you very Carlos. Moving on to agenda 10 now, which is the RSSAC Caucus Agenda at IETS102, Andrew.

CARLOS REYES:	Tripti, I'm filling in for Andrew he had to hop off for another call. As Fred asked in the chat earlier, there is a caucus meeting taking place on Sunday July 15th at 3:30 local time and I'll share the agenda here in the chat, Steve already did, thanks Steve. It's a pretty standard agenda. We go over the cadence of the caucus meetings, reminding everyone, we'll have an update on the Organizational Review and then we have eight publications that RSSAC has completed since the last caucus meeting, so walking through those and inviting discussion.
	Then we'll talk about the work parties and the work products underway. At that point hopefully, they're some sort of update on the two future work items that we discussed today as well and then any other business. A pretty standard agenda. Andrew will be there on site and Kathy as well. Any questions?

PAUL VIXIE:	Hi everyone, I'm an hour late and I apologize for my tardiness.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Thank you, for joining Paul. Carlos, are you done?

CARLOS REYES:	I am, thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Let's move on to agenda number 11, which is a report out from the chairs as well as the liaisons. I'll go first. This an update on -- as you know the co-chairs have been meeting with all the executives of all the operators and this was our last meeting and with was [inaudible] and three executives from [inaudible], Dave Barret, Larry and Jane if I'm not mistake, did I get those right?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Dave Bennett and Jill.

TRIPTI SINHA: These executives came to the ICANN DC office and Brad and I and Carlos met with them and I must say it was an outstanding meeting and I'd like to say Kevin Wright and Ryan Stephenson, you work from some very, very good people, they were extremely supportive of both of you, I just wanted to pass that on to you.

It was an outstanding meeting. They understood exactly at the right level the kind of work we're doing, the kind of attention it's going to get and they offered nothing but support for what we're doing and they understood exactly why this evolution was necessary. They asked some very good questions, clarifying questions. These were very experienced people who work at very high levels and Dave works with the likes of the -- the technology needs of NATO members and so forth. I have nothing but good things to report back. Brad, would you like to add anything?

BRAD VERD: No, I think you got it. It was an excellent meeting and they caught on really quick what was going on and the challenges in front of us.

TRIPTI SINHA: That's the co-chair update on what was the last meeting that we needed to have. We ended on a high in terms of those meetings. With that said, are there any questions?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Do you want to mention anything about the meeting with Board in Vancouver?

TRIPTI SINHA: Had we not mention them? We haven't, okay. Alright.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think there was a written report.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, sorry, no we went on from that to working on the document. Absolutely. The Board was having it's retreat in Vancouver. I think they hadn't officially embarked on their agenda, we might have been one of the first agenda items. Basically, we went through that slide deck and then there was a back and forth amongst the Board members and we

did not get any concerns what so ever, if anything my take away, this is a long time coming, we're really glad that we are where we are.

Cherine was happy with the approach we took to providing him a methodology to getting to the number that he wanted to get to. I would say individual comments made by Board members basically saying it's time to formalize this. In fact, I must say that, I think it was George who said that he felt that the root operators, if there was the equivalent of a Nobel Prize for operating DNS root servers, each operator should get one because he says we've done nothing but -- been very faithful to the service and we get nothing for running the service yet we do so very faithfully, he was full of praise.

They thought this work was tremendous. They understood that it took a long time for us to get here and we all come from different angles and we're all different beasts. We put this together very nicely. They were anxious to received the final copy, which they will get now, now that we've voted on the document today. They're anxious to proceed with next steps.

This clearly in my head was a priority and with that said I'm going to turn it over to both Brad and Kaveh, because Kaveh as you know being a member of the Board, probably heard the after chatter which Brad and I didn't here. First Brad, if you could say a few words and then turn it over to Kaveh. Brad.

BRAD VERD: I think the meeting went very well, it was very well received as Tripti pointed out. There was lots of discussion about -- there were your

typical questions about money, how do we fund this? Again, that was addressed with our proposed model, which I thought was received well.

There were some good questions from Board members but a lot of the comments were more rhetorical and again, in full support of everything we were doing. People were very, very pleased. Kaveh, was there any after chatter after we walked out of the room that was worth reporting on?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, there wasn't anything, they were very happy with the report and what you produced. There were some questions asked during the presentation and some after but none of them were things that we -- we had discussed all of them, questions about money, we had discussed in the workshops. I think everything that was asked were actually addressed in the actual advice, which they will see after it's published. No, in general it was received very positive. I also sent the reply to the regional report sent by Tripti and Brad.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Kaveh. I see Wes's hand is up, Wes go ahead.

WES HARDAKER: I'm kind of curious if -- sort of expected sticker shock with respect to the notion of funding in the first, especially given ICANN's recent concerns with the long term financial goals of running ICANN itself. Was that discussed at or is there a general feeling given by the Board members, that they're in for a real struggle to try and figure how if they really are

supposed to fund this in the future they're going to or is it just not on the table yet?

TRIPT SINHA: Wes, they did not exhibit any sticker shock of anything. They were pleased that we were finally making an attempt to attach numbers to this operation. The only thing we got guidance on was, Sherine said and I think all of you say that, is that he felt like we were ahead of ourselves in suggesting how to implement and so he said, look let us first absorb this material.

They're probably going to do a back and forth with us on clarifying things and then at that point discuss implementation because now the ball is in their court and then they'll come back to us and then we could suggest ideas on implementation. That was the only thing that they felt that we were a little be ahead of ourselves and they said that doesn't need to be stated yet. No, I didn't get a sense that they were in sticker shock at all. Brad, did you pick up on that?

BRAD VERD: No, I don't think there was any sticker shock. I think we had talked to them a couple times about this ahead of time. There was, again, talk about money but a lot of our conversations switched it's going to cost X amount of dollars to what's the level or risk that the Board is willing to assume. That kind of really resonated with them. I don't think -- I didn't see a sticker shock, I think it more like, we need to think about think, which is kind of what you expected.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any other questions? Alright, before I continue to run agenda, Paul joined us late and we did sort of change the rules on ourselves while the meeting was running. I would like to give him an opportunity to verbally support the vote. Paul, are you on?

PAUL VIXIE: I'm here, yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: Would you like to -- the motion happened earlier during the meeting. I'm giving you an opportunity.

PAUL VIXIE: I can I hear what the final state of play was? What was the motion?

TRIPTI SINHA: The motion was to approval RSSAC 0XX and RSSAC 0ZZ and it was approved. We had a quorum and it was approved. [CROSSTALK]. Could you state that again because there were multiple people speaking.

PAUL VIXIE: Sure, what was Brad saying?

BRAD VERD: Just saying that it was approved with discussion. It was unanimous.

PAUL VIXIE: Okay. I wish to add to C Roots voice to that unanimity.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you very much Paul. It is appreciated, it will be noted, thank you.

PAUL VIXIE: Thanks very much.

TRIPT SINHA: Alright, I'm going to move on to 11B, an update from Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Nothing happened in between because after the Board retreat no discussion, so I don't have any update.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, thank you Kaveh. I'm going to start rushing through the agenda now, we've got nine minutes. Moving to the liaison from CSC, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just very briefly, the CSC is still doing two things. It's working on a new generation of the charter, which allows to amend processes in a smother way then having to go through the full negotiation of a new contract, that's one step.

The other step is to actually make such changes but that will have to follow the change of the charter and that is to make it simpler to address problems that may occur, for instance, when we see that there is a service level expectation that is not sensible, that it is possible to modify that, that's actually happening.

On the PDI side, there was a case where a large registry made a change to its systems for a lot of TLD's that they're handling and that kind of came of a large batch to the verification system, it lagged a bit but that's also nothing to worry about. Things are normal, things are going ahead. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Liman. Brad, an update on RZERC.

BRAD VERD: Nothing has changed since our last meeting. Two quick things that are on an ongoing within RZERC that I covered last month is the proposed review of the root zone provisioning system and the KSK roll, the same question that was SSAC and RSSAC was asked to RZERC also, those discussions are happening but nothing to report back here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Daniel Migault, IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Maybe the only thing I can mention is that co-chairs are going to met the IAB on Sunday July 15 during the IAB session.

TRIPTI SINHA: That is correct, yes. The co-chairs of RSSAC, Brad and I have been invited to present at the IAB meeting on July 15th, Sunday. Thank you. Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: Thank you, Tripti. The only thing I wanted to mention here is for PTI it's budget time again, so this will be us developing out budget for FY20, which starts in July 2019. The bylaws call for PTI to develop its budget and have almost set before ICANN starts its budget, so our budget can roll into ICANN.

The bylaws also call for PTI to socialize its priority with the community and to get input from the community on what it's priorities should and develop its budget. This will be front and center for PTI during ICANN 62 in Panama, we'll be talking to basically all customer based, saying here are priorities, what do you think we should be working on, help us prioritize. Please, stay tuned it will be happening Panama. If you have specific items that you think we should be working on, by all means, this is the time to give us that input.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Naela. Update from Duane on root server maintaining.

DUANE WESSLES:	Nothing really of substance to report, although I will mention a bit of trivia. One, TLD that has transitioned from RSA to ECDSA.CV successfully did an algorithm roll within the last week or so.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Thank you. Russ Mundy, SSAC.
RUSS MUNDY:	Thanks. Just a few quick items. For those that are following the end cap work that SSAC's doing, we have a new co-chair, it's Jay Daily, Jim Gavin will continue, so those are the two folks that are in charge of that work party. The SSAC KSK work party is underway, nothing specific that's reportable at this point but we are meeting weekly. The item that I have is a question about the timing for when XX and ZZ will be published? If I remember correctly they were going to be published prior the meeting, do we know what the timing will be on that yet?
TRIPTI SINHA:	Yes, it first goes to the Board, this evening, today it will be packaged, it gets a number, it goes to the Board and there's a 48-hour waiting period if I'm not mistaken, Carlos correct me if I'm wrong.
CARLOS REYES:	That's correct.

TRIPTI SINHA: Yeah, it's a 48-hour waiting period and then it gets published at that point. Today's Tuesday, by Thursday, certainly by Friday it will be published.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, great, thank you very much. I will send a note to the RSSAC list with a proposed agenda for our joint meeting but at this point is presentation discussion about the XX and ZZ, then the briefing by SSAC on the end cap status and discussion and KSK roll over response join discussion. Does anybody have any problems or comments with that or things to add? I'll send it out later today then in an email. Thanks folks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Moving on 12A, Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti. I just wanted to remind everyone, I announced this to the caucus but there are two liaisons positions that are currently up for reappointment per the cycles, one is the RSSAC liaison to the NOMCOM, there's a nomination period open for that and the RSSAC liaison to the CSC, both are on the same timeline, the periods close on July 2nd. Once we receive all the materials we'll prepare those by the 3rd, so that this group, RSSAC has it one week ahead of the next call on July 10th and those will be up for a vote then.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Carlos. Once again, I'd just like to go over 12B, the motion to approval RSSAC 0XX and RSSAC 0ZZ was approved unanimously by every voting member of RSSAC and there is a 48-hour waiting period, in other words they get numbered today and Kaveh as our Board liaison then forwards both documents to the Board and at 48 hours it get's published on the RSSAC ICANN website. It should be open to anyone and everyone.

Once again, thank you everyone for all the hard work that was put into this for the last two and a half years. Before you adjourn, any last comments, questions? Alright, hearing none, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]