

---

BRAD VERD:

-- that is upcoming. Then we'll go through the work items, we'll have a discussion about the Anonymization Process work, Packet Size work, the RSSAC response the KSK rollover question from the Board, and then we have two statement works that we've started work on we want to talk through. And then lastly, we'll talk through 000 changes, our procedures document. Then we'll touch base on the caucus meeting that's upcoming this weekend at the IETF. There is a RSO Identification topic that was brought up by Terry and Tripti.

Then there's an update on the Organizational Review. We'll have our reports from the Co-Chairs and Liaisons. We have one Any Other Business Item, it's just the RSSAC Appointments and then we'll adjourn. Is there anything that needs to be added or changed to the agenda? Hearing nothing and seeing no hands, we will move on to the administration piece.

Just real quick, normally would we review the minutes and vote on the minutes, Carlos had sent an email out yesterday stating that a transition between Staff, there are no minutes to approve so next month we will approve two months worth of minutes, that's not an oversight it's purposely not here on the agenda.

We have some liaisons to talk about. RSSAC has a liaison to the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee that essentially provides oversight over the IANA Function. Lars has served in that role for the past two-year Liman or more?

---

*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.*

---

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: No, it's two years, normally they have a rolling term of three years but in order to get them staggered they started out with a few two-year terms and I was one of them. The next time it will be for three years.

BRAD VERD: Great. This term is for three years. There was a call for volunteers, Liman has generously volunteered again. There have been no other candidates, so with that, I would be looking for, is there a motion on the floor to approve Lars Liman as our CSC Liaison via acclamation?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I put a motion forward.

BRAD VERD: I heard a motion... great, okay. Congratulation, Liman.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Thank you, thank you for your confidence.

BRAD VERD: Absolutely. Moving on. Liaisons in NomCom. In our procedures document we, RSSAC have added a term limit of three years to our NomCom Representative, that's been in the procedures document for a while and Alejandro turned out at the end of this session I think, ICANN 62, I think so.

We did a call for volunteers for NomCom, we did not receive any interest, we tried a couple different times, so Tripti and I talked a bit and we came up with a solution that we wanted to present to the group and

---

get some feedback and that was, to extend Alejandro's term by one year and then basically have another call for volunteers this time next year, hopefully starting a three-year term. Any thoughts or questions on that? Lars, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Usually the other strong advocate....

BRAD VERD: Can everyone mute their phone on their computer please.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Usually one of the stronger advocates within the terms but we have the chairs and we have no volunteers and we have a person who wants to continue to work who is also I know now very, very officiated in the NomCom. I think the most important thing is that the person is, so to speak, reviewed after these terms and if the case is that we have very strong support for him to continue, I don't have a problem with it. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Just to recap Liman because there was a bad echo there, I think you are in support of Alejandro being extended a year but under normal circumstances you want somebody new in there once they term out but given that he was so well received and he added value to the NomCom based upon the feedback we've gotten from them, you're in support of that, is that correct?

---

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Yes, I'm in support and the important thing is that we actually do a review, so if we have a majority or people who want to support him here and now, then it's fine because then we've actually vetted him once again and if we support him I'm perfectly happy with that.

BRAD VERD: Great. Any other comments or thoughts on that proposal? That thought process that Tripti and I had?

KEVIN JONES: I actually like the idea of extending Alejandro but I'm I guess questioning why we would just limit him to just the one year? I'm almost feeling we should be allowing him to run for the full period as opposed to just doing the one year.

BRAD VERD: There was a lot of discussion between the Admin Team on that and here's how the discussion went because that came up, we should just renew him for another term. If you guys remember, when NomCom was in with us both [AUDIO BREAK] is that there are no term limits on their representatives and I corrected them here in Panama and said no, that we do have term limits, we impose them and given that concern of somebody representing a group in NomCom indefinitely, we wanted to try to avoid another three-year term and hence the idea of extending it a year and then looking for new volunteers this time next year. Does that make sense?

---

TRIPTI SINHA: Brad, you cut out for some reason, I don't know why but I lost half of what you were saying but I think what you were saying is that the NomCom had a concern about people who were sitting on the committee without terms. The one way to look at this and I'm somewhat agreeing with what Kevin is saying, is that we're almost doing a review of Alejandro, so it's not like we're just allow him to serve indefinitely.

We've got tremendous positive feedback about him and so if this group decides today that have hey, why not give him the entire term I'm okay with it because it's not like we're blindly approving a three-year term. He has been vetted, he's been re-vetted and we did not get any other volunteers.

BRAD VERD: Kevin, do you have a follow and then Carlos has his hand up.

KEVIN JONES: I was just going to say I'd also agree with Tripti, I missed part of what you said but yes, that's part of why I'm raising that, either way whatever we decided I think this is pointing to the fact that we might want to consider putting something in 000 about this, whether it's a one year extension or a three year but I do think modifying something to be a one year kind of sets precedence and so that's why I'm questioning why we would not just allow that full term to be carried out.

BRAD VERD: Carlos.

---

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. I just want to clarify one thing. The way 000 is currently structured in this section, the RSSAC liaison to the NomCom may serve up to three consecutive terms of one year each, so that's how Alejandro ended up on the NomCom for three years and the reason it's structured that way it is is because technically every year there is a new NomCom because there is a new set of Director's and other appointments that each NomCom has to make every year. This proposal is basically he gets one other term, rather than having to step down to reset us eligibility. It's not a three-year term, it's just that that's the option.

BRAD VERD: Any other comments or questions there? Just a follow up...oh, I'm sorry, Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Yes, in the absence of other comments I would like to motion that we put Alejandra therefore one more year as initially proposed, that's the proposal from my point.

BRAD VERD: Is there a second for the motion? I'm sorry, is there any discussion?

TRIPTI SINHA: Now that Carlos has clarified language of 000, I'm perfectly fine with what Liman just proposed, if that's a motion, I'm willing to second it.

BRAD VERD: Alright, there's been a motion that -- there's not discussion and I think I heard Ryan.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yes.

BRAD VERD: Ryan and Tripti has seconded. Alright, so given that, just to confirm, we don't need to vote on that now since there was no one else to vote on and the motion has carried. Carlos will notify Alejandro and NomCom?

CARLOS REYES: Yes, I'll do that.

BRAD VERD: Your hand is still up Carlos; did you need something? Okay. Moving on to the RSSAC Membership Committee, I'm going to turn it over to Matt.

MATT LARSON: I want to give you guys and update about where we're at with regard to membership things. The first item is, we'd had mentioned this before, there was one candidate who applied for the caucus, his name is Dr. Abdulkarim Oloyede, I apologize if I don't pronounce his name right, he's from Nigeria. The Membership Committee talked about him last time, we had questions about his application, specifically he had made comments about having never worked on a DNS server, things like that so we asked for clarification on that.

Unfortunately, I think he missed our email asking for clarification and then he subsequently sent a, I'll call it a less than professional email to Carlos about why it was taking so long to get this done. I wrote him back and explained that we were trying to seek clarification, he then

---

apologized and answered my questions. We subsequently did a little more digging on the candidate and found some unfavourable articles about him at his university with charges of nepotism and corruption.

Really a larger question I have to the RSSAC as whole is, one I guess, has anyone ever been out right rejected, is there precedence for that and two, what are the political implications I guess you could say, of saying no to a candidate? We have not formally recommended yes or no on this candidate, we're going to meet in probably in a week and make that recommendation so that we're ready for the next RSSAC meeting. Really the question as whole and maybe some of the people who have been on it for a long can answer better is, what if any precedence do we have for saying no to a candidate?

BRAD VERD: I see a bunch of hands coming up. Tripti, go ahead, you're first.

TRIPT SINHA: Matt, having served on the Membership Committee three or four years ago, to the best of my knowledge, we have never said no to a candidate who applied because everyone seemed to pass mustard and all was good. What you just shared with us, I find this very disturbing, I think there's no place for unprofessional behavior. Sounds like you haven't even met the individual, it was just through email, so I think one, there's no place for unprofessional behavior and two, if you've done a background check, that gives me pause. I would proceed cautiously here, so that's my feedback to you on this.



---

MATT LARSON: Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Liman.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: I'm possibly cautious on the other side. I agree with Tripti that I don't think we ever have rejected anyone in the past. I would phrase the question like this, it's actually two-fold. The first half is, what type of damage could such person do inside the caucus? Would he cause disruption to the work and be socially impossible there? If so, what are our options for tossing him out of the caucus again?

There are POLITICAL implications of denying someone upfront but if you take someone in and then discover that they're misbehaving and then throw them out, you have at least a solid case if anyone wants to question your decision. That's the angle I'm coming from, I'm not recommending strongly but I think I'm leaning towards taking him in and see what he does. Most people in the caucus do absolutely nothing. If he starts doing a lot of things and turns out to misbehave then -- before letting him in carefully check out what opportunities we have, what means we have to throw him out again. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: I put myself next in the queue. While I don't disagree with you Liman, here's my challenge with that. One, we have a Membership Committee for a reason, they're supposed to review candidates and make recommendations and if the recommendation -- if our standard is that

---

we just accept everyone, then I'm not sure what value the Membership Committee is giving us.

But, to add to that, the Membership Committee has gone through a bunch of work trying to help the caucus be more affective for everybody and I believe with the survey and the questions, the goal here is to weed out some of the people that are in the caucus doing nothing and so I hope the goal isn't to just add others. That would be my comment. Tripti, go ahead.

TRIPTI SINHA:

I was going to say half of what Brad just said, that it defeats the purpose of a Membership Committee, what's the purpose? It's not like the RSSAC, where we are all appointed by our home institutions, it's really not up for debated, we are appointed but the caucus, the reason why we have a Membership Committee. The second thing I was going to say is, we already have the warning signs and I don't think we should ignore it.

What I would suggest is we seek some kind of advice, I don't know if we can speak ICANN Legal and just say, "Look, this is an unusual situation, someone who would like to join this group, we've got some signals that are being sent out that give us pause, what recourse do we have? How do we handle his?" I would agree with what Liman, it could become politically inflamed but before we say yes or no at least seek some council on this because it would be terrible if you brought someone on board who then became a huge problem. That's my advice.

---

BRAD VERD: Liman, before you jump in I'm, Matt has a quick comment back to Tripti.

MATT LARSON: Tripti, it's funny that you said that because Dave Lawrence who is on the Membership Committee posed that exact same question, which was, what if any advice would ICANN Legal have to say about the implications of basically rejecting a caucus application.

BRAD VERD: Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: You made good points. I think I'm willing to take a bit of flack from the community for doing but in that case, let's make sure that we have proper documentation for the decision we take. Make sure that all these inductions are listed somewhere so they build up a case that we can present. Seeking advice from ICANN Legal, fair enough. It's not really pressing for me if you want to do that, I'm perfectly happy. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Matt, it seems like action item is for the Membership Committee to work with Staff to talk to Legal and get some feedback and maybe share with us what you find.

MATT LARSON: Yup, we really need to finish this off. In defense of this applicant, he applied back in March, which was right around the time when we were re-constitute the Membership Committee with new members and then

---

we had RSSAC meetings that delayed, that was part of the issue there, so we certainly want to bring this to closure as soon as possible. We'll go ahead, with your help Brad I'll reach out to ICANN Legal and Staff and Carlos can help as well and we'll have hopefully answers for everybody for the next meeting, if that's okay with everybody? If anybody by the way knows this candidate we're all ears; again his name is Dr. Abdulkarim Oloyede from Nigeria.

A couple other points of business, there were two other applications that came in recently that the Membership Committee will be discussing in our meeting probably next week, they are, most of you probably know them; they are [inaudible] and Yoshitaka Aharen from [inaudible], so we plan to discuss them at our next meeting and we'll have a recommendation for the next RSSAC call as well.

Finally, and we've mentioned this before, Carlos, now that he's [AUDIO BREAK] caucus.

TRIPTI SINHA: Matt, you're cutting out.

MATT LARSON: Can you hear okay right now?

TRIPTI SINHA: Now we can but we lost you, at least I did for at least 30 seconds.

MATT LARSON: Just to repeat, we have two candidates that we will review in our next meeting and have those ready for the next RSSAC call as well.

---

Finally, with Carlos's help we're going to audit the list of the existing RSSAC Caucus list against both working group participation coupled with participation at RSSAC caucus meetings and what we want to do is be able to paint a picture and say if an RSSAC caucus member has not participated in a working group, has not participated in caucus meeting, has shown really no participation what so ever for a certain amount of time, we want to really talk about the idea of cleaning up the caucus a little bit. Hopefully more news on that by next month as well. Any questions?

BRAD VERD: Liman, is that old hand or a new one? Old one.

MATT LARSON: Okay, that's all I have to report. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Matt. Next on the agenda is the IANA Naming Functions Review, Carlos to you.

CARLOS REYES: A few weeks ago, Brad and Tripti received a letter requesting RSSAC to appoint a representative to the IANA Naming Functions Review, this is a new review that's required in the bylaws after the IANA Stewardship Transition. This review is a little different in that it is not an organizational review which RSSAC just underwent as you know and it's not one other specific review that is mandated by the bylaws, such as the accountability and transparency Review or the Consumer Choice Consumer Trust Review.

---

This is a separate type of review but RSSAC is required to make an appointment per the ICANN bylaws. We received the materials about commitments and the scope of the review, I will send those materials out. There is a template, expression of interest form that the potential applicant will have to complete and I'll send it out to the RSSAC. The request is for an appointment by the end of August, so that gives us about two months to plan, no actually a little over a month and a half. If possible, we can aim for a vote on the August teleconference that we have normally in place. Brad, I don't know if you have anything to add or Tripti since you received the letter?

BRAD VERD: You're starting to sound like you're in a tunnel Carlos, like the last 10 seconds there but no, I don't have anything to add, Tripti, do you?

TRIPTI SINHA: No.

BRAD VERD: Any questions for Carlos about the IANA Functions Review? Seeing none, we will move on. Work Items, so the first item in our Work Items list is the Recommendation for Anonymization Process for Source IP Addresses. When we left Panama there was some changes, Liman, you were going to work with Paul Hoffman and get some verbiage added to the document and I'm sure where that stands right now, do you have an update on that?

---

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: No, I haven't received any updates from Paul either. I think I will try to work with him during the IETF next week because I'm convinced that he will be there in Montreal. I think that's the best path forward, so that we can hopefully have a document for the August meeting.

BRAD VERD: Great, so we'll plan on having this on the agenda for August for voting, correct?

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Yes.

BRAD VERD: Alright, perfect. Any questions from anybody on that? Moving on, Packet Sizes, Duane, do you have an update?

DUANE WESSELS: There is nothing really to update. This work party has not met since our last meeting but there is a meeting of this work party next week in Montreal, which I will not be able to attend unfortunately.

BRAD VERD: Alright, thank you for that. Any questions for Duane? Next is an update on the RSSAC's response to the proposed KSK Rollover. Wes sent an email out to the list yesterday and he shared the document, he says he still has some changes to make but is planning to have this wrapped in the next couple of days. Please, look at the Google Document and add any comments, there's a number of comments in there, please add any input. This is also on the agenda for the caucus meeting in Montreal. I

---

think Wes will get up and just kind of share our statement what our response will be. Suzanne, you had a hand up?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yes, Wes asked me to point out particularly that there is a specific point in the document with a bunch of comments but he doesn't feel consensus is resolved on exactly the question of possible additional traffic to the root servers should be addressed in the document and there's particular interest and feedback on that point because he felt and frankly I agree, that should be consensus not just of the work party but of RSSAC, how to address that in the document? Should it be mentioned? How should it be framed there? That was a particular point he was requesting people pay attention to.

BRAD VERD: Alright, thank you for that. Please everybody go, take a look at that and provide input so that we can meet the timeline. Moving on, Draft Statements of Work. Service Coverage of the Root Server System, Liman you had lead on this.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: We did a bit of work there though...

BRAD VERD: Now I can hear you, Liman.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: We haven't done any work since the meeting in Panama, we did a bit of work there though. Let me do a last overhaul of this and we can talk



---

about in the caucus meeting, between those of us in RSSAC who are there. I could present it at the caucus meeting as well as upcoming working, that's probably a good thing to because then we can have input from the audience.

BRAD VERD: Andrew added the Google Doc for the Statement of Work to the chat.

LARS-JOHN- LIMAN: I'll polish it a bit and present it to the caucus as upcoming work.

BRAD VERD: The agenda for the caucus meeting is pretty full, Andrew, do we have time to add this or is it already on the agenda?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It's not on the agenda. We do have a future workout and survey but that was just the results of the survey, we haven't gotten to actually talking about the statements of work with the caucus yet. We could probably put it in the Any Other Business if there's time after Wes talks about the KSK Rollover Plan. I'll put it down there under Any Other Business.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Actually, we did the survey and we got a result from it and that result led to decisions within RSSAC regarding which items to move forward with and I think that result was reported to the caucus, it probably has already been reported in email but I think that bringing that forward during the meetings is actually a good idea. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: That's that topic when talk through the survey Liman, much like we shared in Panama.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: That's good. Why don't you put a short two minute for each of these work items to just present what's going on there instead or A or B?

BRAD VERD: Okay. The second item was Studying Modern Resolver Behavior and Wes, again, in his email stated that this is still in -- t's in its last call and the Google Doc was in the email that was sent out yesterday by Wes, so please, provide input there. Any questions or comments on those items, the statements of work? Seeing none, we'll move on 000. Carols.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. There was a brief discussion on Panama on 000 about some items that I've been tracking and that we've discussed as Staff as well. What I'm going to do is get together with Kevin Jones, since he's been the leader for that, the previous two cycles of revisions and then hopefully with Kevin we can mock up some text start that process so that you have something to review. There's really no timeline for this but obviously we try to be efficient with it. This is usually when we make revisions anyway. I see Liman's hand is up.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Just a proposal unless you already have, can you kind of fold the situation with Alejandro and the NomCom and that extra thing into the

---

---

revision, some extra text regarding that so that we can do this with a clear conscious and literature?

CARLOS REYES: Yes. That scenario wasn't really accounted for in the text, we can modify the text. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Alright, any other question around 000?

TRIPTI SINHA: Are you turning it over to me for my part?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, go ahead.

TRIPTI SINHA: I did want to suggest some changes to RSSAC 000 potentially, depending on what this group decides. As most of you are aware, I will term out as Co-Chair December 2018, at the end of this year. Having been your Co-Chair for four years and Co-Chairing with Liman and with Brad, I wanted to share my experience with you because I know several of you, I mean I'm hoping are looking to run for leadership positions within RSSAC, so I wanted to share my experience with you and also suggest some possible changes in the future.

First, let me talk about my experience, it was tremendous having Liman as my first Co-Chair and then Brad but looking back I feel the Co-Chair model, when it was first put in place, it was put in place to get some

---

activity going, it followed the first review of RSSAC and if I'm not mistaken, I was not here at the time, so those of you who were here please correct if I get my facts wrong. I think it was after the first review you made some changes to what is now called 000, to install two Co-Chairs and my experience has been that this is not a particularly good model.

I think it served us very well, where it's brought us today but when you look at the other SO/AC Chairs within the ICANN Ecosystem, we are the only AC that has a Co-Chair and we when you have a Co-Chair model it's very confusing for the Co-Chairs because you don't know who takes the lead on a discussion, it's very confusing for the Staff, it's very confusing for the other SO/AC Chairs. Personally, I feel it was put in place to fix a problem, I think those problems have been fixed. This is now an active AC, Advisory Committee, we're plugging along well, so my advice to you is going forward, we modify 000 to now have a Chair and Vice Chair.

I would like to leave you on those thoughts to think about it, so that the next election, which is going to be at the end of this year, we look at not voting for a new Co-Chair but instead, consider a Vice Chair. There are lots of procedural issues that we need to consider should this group decide to do that.

By the way, another reason you want to do this is also it's very expensive, when you have two Co-Chairs you're now funding travel for two, we're the only SO/AC group and remember these are enduring committees with the ICANN Ecosystem, it's not a taskforce where when you put a taskforce in place, a temporary committee then you have Co-Chairs, that's a whole different ballgame, there it makes sense but for enduring committees such as the RSSAC it does not make sense to have

---

---

Co-Chairs. There are a couple of different ways we can skin this cat should you all agree to go this route.

First there's a timing issue, this needs to be done in time for the election. Two, this really needs to go before the Community for public comment and there needs to be approved by the Board should all of you agree to go to the new model. One way to do this is I wanted to put this out there so that you can all think about and at the next call arrive at some decision. Brad ran to be a Co-Chair, his terms ends in December 2019, so what you can do is allow him to just run out his term all the way to December 2019 and not fill this other Co-Chair position.

In the mean time, modify RSSAC 000 to put in place Vice Chair, this next election at the end of the year would be for a Vice Chair and then the modify the bylaws further to just install two Chair and Vice Chair in 2019 December. That's my advice, I'm sharing this with you as my experience. I've had two very good Co-Chairs to work with but I do not think this a good model. Now I open the floor for any comments and questions. Liman and Brad, both you have served as Co-Chairs with me, feel free to add commentary.

BRAD VERD: Any questions for comments for Tripti?

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: I'm not opposed to the idea. You text didn't quite make sense to me. It came out as we would have only a Chair for 2019 and then come 2020 we would have a Chair and Vice Chair, if I understood that correct, I

---

disagree somewhat because I think then we should try to put a Vice Chair in place already for 2019.

TRIPTI SINHA:

No, maybe that came out wrong. No, I'm saying let's vote for a Vice Chair this year as opposed to a Co-Chair and then next year just do a clean vote for a Chair and a Vice Chair in December. Absolutely, we do a Vice Chair this year, maybe I didn't phrase that properly. Also, you probably want to think about Vice Chair -- most typically you don't always have a Vice Chair becoming the Chair when they are done with their term and I know when I've talked to SSAC their current Vice Chair who is Julie, when I spoke to her she said she had no desire to run as Chair and their Vice Chair doesn't become Chair.

I support that model because there are folks that would like to be in leadership position but not necessarily the Chair position, so let's not necessarily assume that a Vice Chair automatically becomes a Chair. I think this group needs to deliberate those pros and cons. That's why I'm suggesting, go ahead and install a Vice Chair this year, you've still got some time, think about what makes sense and then next year put in the Chair, Vice Chair model but Liman, absolutely we should put in, if this group agrees, a Vice Chair this year.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN:

Sounds good, thanks.

BRAD VERD:

Any other comments or questions for Tripti?

---

TRIPTI SINHA: I was going to ask Steve to share the process should everyone agree to this model. Steve, do you want to share what the process is to make these changes?

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Tripti. Because the ICANN Bylaws says the RSSAC has two Co-Chairs so therefore any change by RSSAC needs to require a change to the ICANN Bylaw, which will resume its normal process, public comment, Board action, all these can take time, can take several months. I think if the RSSAC decides to do that Staff can work on the timeline and the detailed process and each step how those changes happen and who's responsible for those. That's my input Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: I see Terry has his hand up, go ahead Terry.

TERRY MANDERSON: I'm a little bit blindsided by this discussion because there was nothing I guess -- did I miss something on the agenda or was this a last minute add and agenda bashing?

TRIPTI SINHA: This is -- I'm just sharing this with you because we do have to vote quite soon, in about two or three months for a Co-Chair right, so I'm just putting it out there, we're not making a change because we're putting it out there for your thought. As we were discussing in the Admin call earlier, that we do need to give all of RSSAC at least a month or so to think about it and hash out the pros and cons. I don't know when we would be a good time to put it out there, Terry.

---

The first time you're going to be blindsided by this because I don't know when else to share this. I have had informal discussions with Liman and Brad about this and that's when Staff said, "I don't think we can just make the change in 000, we have to actually take it all the way to Community and the Board." They were just doing their due diligence. By no means am I saying do this, I'm saying think about it and then RSSAC needs to be decided. I hope that answers your question Terry.

TERRY MANDERSON:

I appreciate that. You're just kind of leading into the discussion. I think that I'd really like to see the caucus involved in this discussion as well. Yes, that's going to expand the timelines -- I have a sense that the caucus was quite behind the concept of having two Co-Chairs based on the history of RSSAC.

Essentially from day one, when a number of us started to write the RSSAC Reformation document that then eventually went to the Board and a committee was created to affect the bylaw changes, it actually had two Co-Chairs at that point, it was a very early on construct. I'm reluctant to start a discussion within just this group of people, I think it should be more widely distributed with a position paper for comment through to the RSSAC caucus.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Terry, thank you, this is exactly the kind of response we want from within RSSAC, you've got history in saying, "Well, let's include a wider group." This is perfect. Absolutely. We need to do what's the right thing but I did want to add one more thing. The SO AC Chairs are beginning to meet more frequently and a lot of this was spurred by the



---

SSR2 Review and so now we have frequent meetings and recall I think into another distinct group within the ICANN Ecosystem and I must say, it's been a little bit difficult because we're the only SO/AC group that has Co-Chairs and we get on a call and they're asking me, "Is Brad going to vote on this? How do you both vote on this?" And we may not have connected on an issue.

It really becomes a little awkward for the other SO/AC Chair's who don't know who to turn to. It's a little bit awkward and Brad and I may have different opinions on certain issues and we may not have time to arrive at consensus between the two of us, I just feel this is -- I'm just giving you my feedback, I wanted to share that with you as we deliberate this. I see Liman's hand is up. Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN:

I have two comments. First, to you last thing here, is that we probably could get around that by being a bit clearer inside RSSAC and between two Co-Chairs who is responsible for what? If you consistently send one person off to the SO AC meetings and you can give that person the mandate to speak on behalf of RSSAC there you get a more consistent picture and then you have other responsibilities for the other Co-Chair, by actually formalizing that a bit we could probably work with that, that's not an argument for keeping the Co-Chairs just something on the other side of scale here, to create a bit of balance.

The other one is, if we do write a petition, which I think is good idea, I'm quite happy to bring my part of the history to that paper because it's actually an important part of the fundament why we created these two Co-Chairs. I was a member of the Review Work Party for the previous

---

RSSAC review and I was also in the entire machinery for creating what lead up to the reborn RSSAC. I do have some input to that document. I'm not doing to draw it all out right here but there is history back there that can be put it out and you are quite right Tripti, we did put these Co-Chairs in to have certain situation. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you. Other comments, questions? Terry, just to relay your concerns, no decision has been made because we can't make these decisions on our own, we're just simply putting it out there and I think a position paper on this is perfect, including the caucus makes sense. In the end, the RSSAC may decide, no we'll stick with the current model. Ultimately, we have to arrive at consensus, I'm just giving you my feedback. I personally feel a Chair Vice Chair model works better and I just wanted share wisdom with you as I term out. I saw Suzanne's hand go up. Suzanne.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Sorry, that was accidentally.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Other thoughts, comments? I guess not, so Brad, I'll send it back to you.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, Tripti. Moving on the agenda, we have the Caucus Agenda for Montreal, Andrew, do you want to cover that?

---

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I just posted a link to the Caucus Agenda for Montreal for IETF 102, it's also in the Google Doc, I will quickly run through it. Everything is arranged for the meeting; the meeting is at 3:30 local time in Montreal. A slight change from previous meetings, we will be using Me Echo as opposed to Adobe Connect or Zoom, this is the first time that RSSAC Caucus has used the same facilities as the IETF in terms of Me Echo, hopefully things will go well. Tripti will be leading. We'll do some administrative things, review the agenda, move on to caucus engagement. We'll get an update for the Membership Committee. Tripti will take us through the RSSAC Organizational Review.

Then there have been eight documents, I think that's a record at eight documents since the last RSSAC Caucus meeting, we'll go through those probably focusing heavily on the model and RSSAC 37 and 38. Then we'll go over current work parties and work products, three of them and all of these people know that they're speaking. Then we'll quickly go into Future Work Item Survey, I think we'll display the graph of the survey results. Then what I'm going to add here based on discussions today is the two statements of work...

TRIPTI SINHA: None of us have access to the document.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'm sorry. I'm fixing that right now. Can people access it now?

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes.

---

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay, good, sorry about that. I'll start down at the work parties and work products. There's three current work parties and work products and then we'll talk about the future work item survey and then based on the discussions in the meeting today, we'll add two items there for the Statements of Work, so Wes and Liman can talk about the two Statements of Work that will soon go to the caucus and then under Any Other Business, if we have time, Wes can walk caucus members through the RSSAC Advice on the KSK Rollover Plan. Then we'll have adjournment. Are there any questions or comments or proposed additions to this?

DUANE WESSELS: I guess just to make sure there's time on the agenda for Wes's KSK Rollover Plan Document, I mean that's something we definitely want input on and there's a deadline right.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay, there's a lot on the agenda but yeah, we could move it up under current work.

TRIPTI SINHA: Yeah, Duane I understand what you're saying but one concern we have is that the KSK Rollover Plan could eat up all the time, so we're trying to balance it out so that we're able to cover enough of the other material as well. Why don't we just take this back Andrew and take Duane's input back and see where we could appropriately position Wes's item, so that at least we covered enough of the other agenda items?

---

BRAD VERD: Two things, one is the current work items, I thought about brining this up earlier but I thought this was the right time to bring it up, the SOW's that are being created have not gone to the caucus, correct?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: That is correct.

BRAD VERD: So, by adding them here we will be taking them to the caucus essentially for the first time, first question, is that where we want to do it and then just on a quick add on, the KSK stuff is already at the caucus, it's already been shared with the caucus, it's been mailed out and we've asked for input on that. Hopefully the KSK stuff, it's not the first time they're seeing it or heard of it in this meeting because it's already been sent out. That might help with that topic.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Brad, good point with the fact that KSK has already been shared, that's actually helpful. I would argue that it is a good idea to break the other topics to the caucus in this way because it could possibly at least avoid a divide by doing this in a friendly fashion, we meet in a room, we bring it forward in a casual form, saying this is not cooked yet but this is what we're working means we're sharing things with the caucus instead of cooking up something complete and the toss it over the fence to them, which kind of creates this divide that I want to avoid. That's an argument for doing it at the meeting. Thanks.

---

BRAD VERD: And I don't disagree with you Liman, I just wanted -- when we made the agenda for the caucus that was why it wasn't on it because we haven't done this before and that wasn't the original plan. I just wanted to point out that this would be where the caucus would be seeing it for the first time.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Fair enough.

BRAD VERD: Any other questions around the agenda for IETF 102?

TRIPTI SINHA: I have a question for Andrew. Andrew for agenda item 1, call to order you have attendance reminder, what do I say during that reminder?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: We typically have clipboards with people's names on them that they can circle and then if your name isn't there you're requested to write your name on it, so I'll be passing around the clipboards and Cathy will be there as well, so we'll both be passing around the clipboards.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, great, thank you.

BRAD VERD: Alright, anything else? Moving on. RSO Identification, which was a topic brought up in Panama but Terry and Tripti. I will hand it to Terry first. Go ahead Terry.

---

TERRY MANDERSON: Thank you, Brad. Sometime in 2017 we made a decision to not talk about letters and it was an informal decision, we don't have it minuted anywhere, we haven't made a public statement that this is what we're going to do, we just started to do it. I think it behoves us to make that more formal and I'll give you a very simple example of why I think that. I've seen firsthand benefits in doing this.

It actually has changed discussion that ICANN has had with a particular government and the people within that government, such that a simple statement can be put if you take away the letters, then there's no problem, we don't need one. I'm certainly paraphrasing but I think it would be advantageous for us to make the statement that we are doing this and why we are doing this. Whether we do this in minutes or whether we actually this in a document, I'm completely easy and certainly happy to work on both. Tripti, do you have anything to add?

TRIPTI SINHA: First I want to say I agree with Terry 100% on everything he said. If you've noticed, even in Panama when we did our public session, I forget the gentleman who speaks French, when he said, "When are you going to make a decision to hand out a new letter?" The response basically that we gave him was, "We no longer think letters, we're looking at the overall capacity of the system." And that is what we need to address, is what is the desired capacity and how many operators can deliver on that capacity?

I think it's extremely important that we send that message to the global community, it does fix a lot of issues. This was an internal technical

---

identifier, I'm not sure how it came out into the public -- got installed in the public's physic the way it did. I think we [AUDIO BREAK] --

BRAD VERD: Tripti, are you there, you just cut out?

TRIPTI SINHA: Can you hear me now?

BRAD VERD: Yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: I did an initial draft for Terry because he needed it for some internal documents, so we've got a straw man, I say we continue to tease it out a little bit more and put it in our minutes. I think it will get minuted today for sure this discussion. I say we formalize it.

BRAD VERD: Any other comments or questions for Terry or Tripti? Any objection with moving forward with this effort? I don't expect any. Alright. Tripti, Terry, you guys will move forward and work up a draft on something?

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes. Terry, I'm assuming you're okay with that, partnering with me on that?

TERRY MADNERSON: I am, definitely.



---

BRAD VERD: Great. Going down the agenda, RSSAC Organizational Review Update, Carlos, do you have anything to share?

CARLOS REYES: Just a quick update. As you all may recall in Panama the Organizational Review is wrapping up and Interisle delivered their final report, I'm about to forward that to the RSSAC list, it was sent to the Review Work Party last week. You'll receive that, not a lot of changes really from the Draft Final Report. That concludes the portion of the Organizational Review that involves the independent examiner. From here on out it basically turns into a dialog between the ICANN Board and RSSAC.

The Review Work Party becomes the Implementation Work Party and they'll be working with Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board to first develop feasibility Implementation Report, basically they'll look at the recommendations and decide what is feasible and ultimately the OEC will review it and it will go to the Board for approval. That's a very condensed summary of the process but there were only I think six or so recommendations and we discussed in Panama, the RSSAC discussed in Panama, some of these are essentially overcome some of the work of the Governance Model.

There are a few steps here, we'll be tracking that and I know Duane, Tripti and Fred were also working a separate letter about the RSSAC experience with this Organizational Review. I will pause there. I see Liman and Tripti have their hands up and I'll hand it back over to you Brad.

BRAD VERD: Go ahead, Liman.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: I have two questions actually for Carlos. The first one is, is this dialog handled directly between RSSAC and the Board or is the part of the work party because it's ICANN Staff, is that involved in the dialog as well, that's the first question. The second question is, who takes the lead for creating this Implementation Report?

CARLOS REYES: Two good questions. Basically, Board assess, Steve, Andrew, Mario and I, we have a call tomorrow with the MSSI Staff to work out basically they're going to give us an update about how this works in terms of who supports and which groups take the lead. We'll have a little bit more clarity tomorrow but it will procedure very similarly in that the Review Work Party which is now the Implementation Work Party, will have to respond to the requests from the OEC to develop that implementation report. Obviously, you have our support and the support of the MSSI staff as well through that process but we'll have a clearer sense of things tomorrow.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: I believe you don't know at this point who takes the lead for doing the work?

CARLOS REYES: Meaning Staff or the group itself?

---

---

LARS-JOHN LIMAN:                    Meaning who gets shot at when the report is delayed?

CARLOS REYES:                    The Implementation Report would have to come from the Work Party, so in this case Brad, Tripti, you, Huro and Kava, but like I said, you'll have our support and then the MSSI team as well to help with that.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN:                    Thank you, I'm not worried about the support, I'm just worried about who initially be responsible for delivery. Thank you so much.

TRIPTI SINHA:                    Now I have two things, I'll start with number two. Carlos, you said there's a meeting tomorrow, I don't have anything on my calendar, what meeting is this?

CARLOS REYES:                    No, no, it was just an internal call. The MSSI Team reached out to us so that we have an understanding of how the work will proceed.

TRIPTI SINHA:                    Us meaning Staff, right?

CARLOS REYES:                    Correct.

---

TRIPTI SINHA: You made me panic because I have a different meeting tomorrow morning. As Carlos mentioned earlier, Duane, Fred and I are working on a letter, it's about our experience and also, we're going to make recommendations on how ICANN should modify their review process. Expect a draft from us, we're going to schedule a meeting next week to finalize this draft letter and send this to you. I just wanted to add to what Carlos was saying. That's all, thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Tripti, we will look forward to that. Any other comments or questions around the Organizational Review? Seeing none, we will move on the Liaison Reports. From the Co-Chairs there's really nothing to report since we met last, we were all in Panama and we gave you an update of our meeting with Cherine and since then there's nothing else to share that I'm aware of. Tripti, do you have anything to add?

TRIPTI SINHA: Just to remind everyone that your Co-Chairs will be speaking to the IAD on Sunday at IETF. This presentation was organized by Daniel Migault and I see he is online now.

BRAD VERD: He left, he joined us and then he had to leave. The liaison report from the Board, Kaveh.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Quick question to Tripti and Brad. Do you happen to if the meeting IAB is an open meeting for observers?

TRIPTI SINHA: My understanding is it's closed. I did have that question earlier and my understanding it was for the IAB and the Co-Chairs but I could be wrong, I don't know for sure.

BRAD VERD: We've reached out to Danelle for the logistics and we'll find out.

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Please let us know. Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF: It's an agenda item on the normal IAB Sunday afternoon meeting and those meetings are not normally open and I haven't heard that this one is.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. That's for that clarification. Liman, your hand is still up or is that new or old? Moving on to the Board Report, Kaveh, anything to share?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, no news since Panama. Just for your information, tomorrow Board Committee will meet and by then we will have identified from the Board to follow up to RSSAC Advisory leading the Board. As soon as we have that name identified I will send a note to the RSSAC.

---

BRAD VERD: Great. Any questions for Kaveh? Alright, moving on CSC Liaison, Liman, anything to share?

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Nothing has happened since our last meeting and the CSC usually meets around the 15<sup>th</sup> of every month. Nothing to report.

BRAD VERD: Alright, thank you. From RZERC point of view, I was actually not able to attend the RZERC meeting in Panama due to conflicts but they continue their response to the KSK question from the Board. It is going to be very middle of the road, nothing stating yay or nay to anything. They're also working on the response to the review of the Root Zone Maintainer Contract. Any questions around that? Russ, looks like you've joined us, any update from SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Nothing since the meeting but I did want to again, express my appreciation for the good attendance and participation in the joint meeting. I had a number of very positive feedback from members of SSAC about the usefulness of the meeting. In addition to that, I did get a number of private comments about 37 and quality of the work and how valuable the work itself was. Very positive feedback at this point. That's about it. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Thank you for that Russ. Liman, you have something to add?

---

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: Just a comment. Thank you so much Russ. I am a strong advocate for continuing these meetings. I think they bring good value. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: I would second that. Moving on, IAB Daniel had left, he said there was no update. IANA Functions Operator is not here. Root Zone Maintainer, Duane anything to share?

DUANE WESSELS: No, nothing to share at this time.

BRAD VERD: Alright. We're on to item number 10, any other business. RSSAC Appointments for 2018, Carlos. I'm sorry, hold on Carlos. My computer is slow, Liman you have your hand up, nope. Ryan, you have your hand up.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yes, will there be an RSSAC workshop this fall?

BRAD VERD: I don't have an answer to that right off the top of my head. I would plan on one but I don't know for certain right now. Is that a fair enough answer Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA: I was going to say the opposite. I'm not sure we need one this fall but who knows, we should probably wait a couple of months before we can answer that questions. I think after Barcelona there will be clarity on

---

how the Board wants to proceed with 37, so I think at that time we'll have a better sense.

BRAD VERD: Ryan, did that answer your question.

RYAN STEPHENSON: That will work, thank you.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Carlos, over to you around RSSAC Appointment.

CARLOS REYES: As you all know when the RSSAC was reconstituted in 2013 there are groups of representatives that are appointed every year. The cycle for this year or the group for this year is the representatives from ICANN, IFC, Netnod and Verisign. I'll be reaching out to those representatives just to confirm the executive point of contact, we'll be sending out the letter from Brad and Tripti, just to get that process going. If possible, if timing works, hopefully we can get this done in the next few weeks, in time for the Board to vote on this in September at their workshop, if not, it can happen in Barcelona, we just have to do it before the end of this year. I'll reach out Terry and to Fred and to Liman and to Brad.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you, Carols. Any questions around the upcoming appointment? I see no hands. Is there anything else that we needed to add to any other business? Seeing nothing and hearing nothing, that adjourns our meeting. Thank you all very much. Have a wonderful day.



---

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**