

---

TRIPTI SINHA: Is Geoff on?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Apparently not yet.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Alright. Moving onto NASA. Anyone from NASA? Moving on. Netnod? I see Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, Liman is here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hello, Liman. Moving on RIPE NCC?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh is here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi, Kaveh. University of Maryland, I'm here. Moving on, USC/ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker is here.

---

*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.*

---

TRIPTI SINHA: Welcome, Wes. Anyone else? Suzanne? Hearing none, moving on.  
[Army] Research Labs?

HOWARD KASH: Howard is here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi, Howard.

KEN RENARD: Ken is here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi, Ken. Moving on to DOD.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson here. And Kevin Wright is on another call, so he won't be participating in this RSSAC meeting.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. From Verisign?

MATT WEINBERG: Matt Weinberg.

---

BRAD VERD: Brad Verd.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, Brad and Matt are both on. WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: This is Hiro Hotta.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi, Hiro. Welcome.

HIRO HOTTA: Hi.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, our liaisons. Moving on to our liaisons. Naela, are you here from IANA functions operator?

NAELA SARRAS: Yes, this is Naela. I'm here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Oh, hello, Naela. Root zone maintainer?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

---

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi, Duane. IAB? IAB? Daniel? Okay, I don't hear him. ICANN board, Kaveh just announced himself. CSC, Liman announced himself. RZERC, Brad did as well. SSAC? Russ, are you on the call? Alright.

Moving on to staff, we've got, according to the roster, Andrew, Carlos, Steve, and Mario. Are all four of you on the call? Can you confirm that please?

CARLOS REYES: Yes, this is Carlos.

STEVE SHENG: This is Steve. I'm on the call.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Andrew is here.

MARIO ALEMAN: Yes, this is Mario. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: And I think I heard Carlos and Steve. Someone just dialed in. Who is that? Could you identify yourself, please?

---

STEVE SHENG: Tripti, that would be me, Steve.

TRIPTI SINHA: Oh, that's you, Steve. Okay. We have a big agenda in front of us and many items to vote on. Do we have quorum today? Staff, can you tell me if we have quorum?

CARLOS REYES: Hi, Tripti. This is Carlos. Yes, we have quorum.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Good, good. Let me review the agenda. We've got our standard administrative items. We've got three sets of draft minutes to approve from the 6<sup>th</sup> of March meeting, the 12<sup>th</sup> of June, and the 10<sup>th</sup> of July. Mario e-mailed these minutes to us a couple of weeks ago, so we'll approve those minutes. Hopefully, everyone has had a chance to read those.

Then, a discussion on potential new caucus memberships, which Matt will run us through those. We did request ... RSSAC got a request to send somebody to the IANA naming functions review committee and we received one nomination for that. Then, we move on to work items. Plenty of work here in this area. We will be approving one, two, three, four different items. We'll have Wes, Liman, and Duane walk us through work items, two of which are ready to be approved today, and then draft statement of work also will be discussed by Liman and Wes. Then, Kaveh will share with us a leadership structure concept paper that [inaudible] proposed on the last call.

---

Then, also identification. Terry and I had been working on this paper, which we will walk you through that as well. Then, updates to a 000 by Kevin and Carlos. Then, Carlos will walk us through updates on the organizational review. Then updates from our report, from our liaisons and co-chairs. Carlos, I cannot scroll down the agenda. Can you give us control? Yes, thank you.

Then, there's a selection process to the RZERC has been added as any other business. Would someone else like to add an agenda item? Alright, hearing none, let's start to run the agenda. Someone just joined the call. Who was that?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Suzanne.

TRIPTI SINHA: Hi, Suzanne. Welcome. Alright. Let's start with the draft minutes from the 6<sup>th</sup> of March, the 12<sup>th</sup> of June, and the 10<sup>th</sup> of July. Mario, I'll turn that over to you.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Tripti. I have distributed the previous meeting minutes from 6<sup>th</sup> of March and the 20<sup>th</sup> of June and the 10<sup>th</sup> of July via the mailing list. We have no action items and all of them have been completed. So, once actually these minutes be approved, we'll be able to send them and publish through the RSSAC caucus. If you have any questions, please let us know. Thanks.

---

TRIPTI SINHA:                    Alright. Are there any questions about these [three] sets of minutes? Hearing none, would someone put a motion on the floor to approve the minutes?

RYAN STEPHENSON:            I'd like to put a motion on the board.

TRIPTI SINHA:                   Thank you, Ryan. A second, please?

WES HARDAKER:                Second.

TRIPTI SINHA:                   Alright. Wes seconds it. Anyone abstaining? Anyone not for? Alright, the minutes are now approved. Thank you. Someone else just joined the call. Could you identify yourself?

RUSS MUNDY:                    Yes, Russ joined the call. Having problems with crashing machines and Adobe Connect. Sorry.

TRIPTI SINHA:                   Okay. Thank you, Russ. Moving on to item 4b. Matt, we'll turn this over to you for new membership to the caucus.

MATT WEINBERG: Hello, everyone. The membership committee is now meeting monthly, or at least talking monthly, the [review application]. We have five applications to talk about today. I sent out an e-mail on July 31<sup>st</sup> with the five statements of interest that I want to review today. I can say, in short, four of them are I think pretty easy, but we'll go through them. The first one we can talk about.

The first one is [inaudible] [Shitaka RN]. He already works with WIDE as an end root operator. I personally know him through Root Ops as well. The membership committee reviewed his application and agreed unanimously that he should be included in the caucus. So, if anybody has any questions, I'm happy to answer them, but otherwise, I would suggest that we proceed with him.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any discussion on [inaudible]. Is that what you're waiting for, Matt?

MATT WEINBERG: You know what I'm going to do? I'm going to do the four easy ones together. I apologize if anybody disagrees, but I find this easy. Let me just go through four of them and maybe perhaps we could just do – I can answer any questions.

The second candidate is [Kazinoray Fujuwara]. Many of you probably know him through talks he's given in the community at DNS OARC and DNS OP. He's very involved in the community. He gave a good



---

statement of interest. We, again, agreed unanimously that the RSSAC should consider him for the caucus.

The third candidate was [Ben] [inaudible]. He works at [inaudible] Net Labs. Also involved very much in the community. Many of you probably already know him. It seems like a straightforward yes for him.

The fourth candidate is Jason Castonguay. Jason actually used to be on the RSSAC caucus when he worked with the University of Maryland. He now works at Verisign. He's a colleague of mine. For what it's worth, I personally work with him and recommend that he be included.

So, those are the four candidates that I think are hopefully relatively easy to proceed. Are there any questions on any of those four? With no questions, do we have a motion to approve all four questions?

WES HARDAKER: I move to approve all four.

RYAN STEPHENSON: I second it.

MATT WEINBERG: Okay, we have a second from Ryan. Okay. So, those four candidates we'll move forward on. The fifth candidate, we brought up on the last call as well. His name is Abdulkarim Oloyede. He's from Nigeria. He's a professor at a university. There was some question about he was a little bit frustrated with the length of time in which his application was

---

taking. Part of it was due to the transition within the membership committee. Part of it was due to we asked for feedback and he missed the e-mail where we asked for feedback. We Googled his name, found sound potentially unsavory articles about him and there was question about whether we should talk to ICANN lawyers about what to do, since we've never actually said no to someone. We talked about the candidate a little bit more internally, and what our recommendation was is that we ... I think saying no to a candidate is going to be potentially challenging. That's item number one.

Item number two is articles that we find on Google are not necessarily fair. He'd have to defend himself. In fairness to him, he should be able to defend himself to any accusations. I don't want to get into this tit-for-tat discussion about whether it's true or not true.

What we recommend is that we do move forward with this candidate and then see if the candidate actually participates in caucus working groups or meetings or other possibilities to help out. If the candidate doesn't help out, well, we're actively working right now on trying to clean up the RSSAC caucus of members who haven't helped and this candidate would go that path.

So, that was the membership committee's recommendation is to move forward with this candidate and see what happens with regard to his contributions to the RSSAC at large. The floor is open for discussion.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Liman, you have your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I just want to support the idea, approach that Matt is suggesting here. I would even like to put a motion on the floor to actually include him in the caucus. Motion for.

TRIPTI SINHA: Could you hold off on that, Liman? I think Ryan has his hand up as well, so we'll [inaudible] the discussion first.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Actually, Liman, you took the words right out of my mouth. I would say let's go ahead and give this person a chance and move forward with it.

FRED BAKER: I have a procedural question. We have a motion on the floor regarding the first four candidates. Are we adding this guy to that motion?

TRIPTI SINHA: Just to go back to [Robert's] rules, I don't believe there was a motion on the floor because only the chair can make a call for the motion to be put on the floor. I think we were a few steps ahead of ourselves, technically there. First, let's finish the discussion on this. Is there any further discussion on this candidate? Liman, your hand is up still. Is that an old hand or a new hand?

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well, it was an old hand, but let me say it this way. I obviously need to read up on [Robert's] rules, because that doesn't match [inaudible]. I'll be quiet.

MATT WEINBERG: Let's get through the any other questions or discussion about the candidate and then we can talk about whether or not we want to move forward. Are there any other concerns, questions, thoughts, anything we want to talk about about the candidate? Okay. So, I'm not getting anything. We have two motions to move forward. One from Liman, one from Ryan. I'm proposing that we accept that motion. We would need someone to second it.

TRIPTI SINHA: I'll second it.

MATT WEINBERG: Okay, thank you, Tripti. We will work with Carlos on setting out those notifications to all five candidates. We have since received one more statement of interest, although we have not met yet this month to discuss the candidate, so we plan to have that call here later this month and we'll be ready to present that statement of interest to the RSSAC for the next call. That's all we have for membership committee, unless anybody has any questions. Thanks, everyone.

---

TRIPTI SINHA:                    Alright. Fred, I know you had the question about the motions. Are you good with where we are?

FRED BAKER:                    Yeah, I'm fine.

TRIPTI SINHA:                    Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Matt. Moving on to – hold on. Liman, is that an old hand or a new hand?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:            Sorry.

TRIPTI SINHA:                    Okay, thank you. 4c. We received a call for nominations to the IANA naming functions review committee. When we sent out the call, Suzanne Woolf was the only one who self-nominated. So, we are going to move forward with that appointment. We didn't receive any other interest. So, I'd like to call for a motion to put her name forward. Is there any discussion about this first before I call for the motion? Alright, hearing none, do we have a motion to approve Suzanne as our [inaudible] representative?

FRED BAKER:                    So moved.

---

TRIPTI SINHA: This is Fred putting a motion forward. Second, please?

KEVIN JONES: I second.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Is that Kevin from NASA?

KEVIN JONES: Yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Thank you, Kevin. Anyone abstaining from this vote? Anyone not for it? Alright. So, the motion is passed. Suzanne is our representative on the IANA naming functions review. Thank you.

Moving on to work items. Lots of activity here. I'm going to turn this over now to Wes. A discussion on RSSAC statement regarding the upcoming KSK rollover plan. Wes, over to you.

WES HARDAKER: Thank you, Tripti. I'm sure most people are very familiar with this document by now. It is a statement in response to the board's request that we provide input about ICANN's upcoming KSK rollover plan and whether it should be, I guess, [inaudible] in general. Specifically, the document really sort of states some affirmations or reaffirmations that we serve the IANA root, that we don't see any changes in issues with

---

packet size, that we will continue to support OCTO in monitoring. We'll do DIDL captures and then we'll work in cooperation with IANA, OCTO, the RZM, and the RSO as the events occur. And we define four things that the board should consider: potential increase in traffic and misconfigured resolvers and review published recoverability plans.

We do not make any negative statements in terms of reasons why we think the roll should continue to happen. In conclusion, we don't specifically state that they should do it, but we state that we don't see any issues with doing it.

I should add that there were a number of things that we removed over time. The document [inaudible] a bit larger and we did narrow our scope down to positive comments that fit within our remit of RSSAC. So, it's ready for publication and I think everybody that's contributed opinion and now it's time to make that motion to make it happen. So, I guess back to you to make that call, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: So, any discussion about this? Alright. Hearing none, I'd like to thank Wes for shepherding this and I'd like a motion now on the floor to approve this document.

RYAN STEPHENSON: I'll go ahead and put a motion on the floor.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Second, please?

---

FRED BAKER: I'll second that.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Fred. We have a second from Fred. I'm assuming there's no discussion. Anyone abstaining? Anyone not voting for this? Alright. So, the statement is approved. Once again, thank you, Wes.

Moving on to recommendations on the anonymization process for source IP addresses. This is something that Liman was shepherding. Liman, over to you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. We had this document up before and this current one is just minor modification. Paul, who was the document editing and the work party leader, was asked to rephrase some of the recommendations to be more in line with the requests and to explain, to some extent, why the recommendations don't really match with the requests. There have been some changes to the document.

I think we're not going to be able to drag this on much further, so we'll either have to take it as it is or we will have to abandon it and do some other way, and I think that second or third [inaudible] would be unfortunate.

So, I recommend that we adopt this document and publish it. It could possibly lead to more work later on, but I think we need to get this out. Thank you.



TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. I'm going to open the floor for some discussion. Liman, I have a discussion. You seem somewhat hesitant. Does that take away from moving it to approval today?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: One of the problems is I've only glanced through it. I'm on a vacation. I [inaudible]. I haven't really had the time or the inclination to go through this in detail, but I see the changes that Paul has made and I think the draft [inaudible] last time. So, I'm okay with this.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you. Any other questions or discussion items on this? Hearing none, seeing none, will someone put a motion on the floor to approve this?

WES HARDAKER: Moved.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Wes. Second? I'll go ahead and second this one. Anyone abstaining from it? Anyone opposed to it? Alright, consider this document approved as well. Thank you, Liman, for shepherding this as well.

Moving on to item 5c, which is packet sizes, Duane, over to you.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks, Tripti. So, the packet sizes work party I believe met in Montreal during [ICF]. I was not there. In fact, I was on vacation and I didn't see any notes or anything from that meeting. Maybe somebody from staff was there who could say a little bit about [inaudible].

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. I could say a little bit about the meeting. We had a meeting in Montreal. Basically, the outcome was to continue with the work and [Robert Story] was going to contribute some text. I think he actually has already contributed a bit of text into the document. that's the basic outcome of the meeting. There's another meeting plan for August 20<sup>th</sup>. That will be an online meeting.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Unfortunately, I'll have to miss that one, as well. Thanks a lot, Andrew. I guess that's it, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. So, do you have a sense of how much more work this is going to require?

DUANE WESSELS: Well, I don't really. What the work party needs is people to sit down and start writing. [Robert] has volunteered to do that. He's really been kind of the only one. I think he has stood up and started writing on [our]

---

document. There's been some code that's been written, but [Robert] has been the only one doing the document.

I don't know. Andrew, did you get the sense, from the Montreal meeting, were other people joining and helping him or is he still kind of the only one?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I still get the idea that he's basically the only one who's committed to writing. Yeah, we'll just have to see if [they're] producing text.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Tripti, to answer your question, I don't feel like it's a lot of work, but I feel like it's taking a long time because people are not stepping up.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. So, in terms of content, you've got the material. It's just really finding the time to begin to put your thoughts to paper now, right?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Alright. Thank you, Duane. Moving on to 5b, these are the draft statements of work that we've been working on. Once again, I'd like to turn this back to Liman. On the [service], coverage of the root server system, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I don't really know where we are on that one. Wes, we wrote some text. Do you know what's the status on this?

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, just to tell you where we are, the item has a star next to it on the agenda, which means we're ready to approve it. We've got a link to it. It looks like a fairly well put together statement of work. So, we're ready to approve it today.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Liman, this is the statement of work that we worked on together in Montreal with, you worked with me on.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right, yes. My recollection of the document is that it was a good document. I was okay with it at the time. So, if nothing else has happened since then, I'm fine.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Is there any discussion on it? Alright. Do I have a motion on the floor to approve the statement of work for this particular item?

WES HARDAKER: Moved.

---

RYAN STEPHENSON: Second.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Thank you, Wes and Ryan. Anyone abstaining from this? Anyone not for it? Alright, so statement of work is approved. Andrew, please go ahead and do what you need to do and I guess we now shepherd this or move this forward to the caucus, correct?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Correct. Staff will work on that. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, thank you. Moving on to studying modern resolver behaviors. Wes, you have the floor again.

WES HARDAKER: Okay. So, one of the things that we discussed in the past is getting a better understanding of how resolvers interoperate with the root server system. A lot of this actually came from not knowing how the KSK roll was going to go and realized that we don't have a good handle on [a lot of metrics]. So, the scope of the work would involve providing recommendations for further work on the DNS protocol to help optimize deployment and things like that, to provide recommendations for configuration changes to operators and craft advice to ICANN constituencies and the board and then document all analysis and findings. And the tasks suggested for performing this work include analyzing resolver traffic, analyzing code bases, performing simulations,

---

and then analyzing how multi-resolver systems like Google, Quad9, and [inaudible] interact with the root.

We proposed the work party leader would be me and the RSSAC shepherd would be Fred. I think we said it would take a year in order to do the work. [inaudible] body of work. I think there's a fair amount of interest in getting it done. So, the [inaudible] is ready to be approved, hopefully a new working party. I'll turn it back to you.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Alright. Any discussion on this from anyone? I just had one slight comments. It's purely an editorial comment in the [inaudible]. I was comparing this statement of work with the one we just did approve for Liman and I noticed that this particular one actually states who the shepherd is and who the work party leader is, the roles. I think it would be nice to start including that in our SOWs. I just wanted to comment on that. It would be nice if we did that to the other one as well, just to include the party leader and shepherd. Any other discussion, comments? Go ahead, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Is that really the correct way to go? I would argue that the way [inaudible]. The appropriate process would be to create a statement of work, then solicit a shepherd and a work party leader.

TRIPTI SINHA:

You're absolutely right. Procedurally, you are correct. Wes, I see your hand up.

WES HARDAKER:                   Go ahead, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:           I have a suggestion to make and that is that we have a webpage that lists all of our [inaudible]. I think we do somewhere. And that we list there who is the work party leader or the shepherd. So, it's not included in the actual document, but it's referred to in a table [inaudible] work.

TRIPTI SINHA:                You are correct, because the leader oftentimes is not from the RSSAC, most of the time. Thank you for pointing that out. I think the way we approved Liman's statement of work was correct. For this one, Wes, let's go and approve this with the deletion of the roles, but let's include the roles, as Liman just said, in the webpage where we're tracking this work. Wes, as the leader of the statement of work, are you okay with that?

WES HARDAKER:                Thank you. I had my hand up as waiting. I guess two things. One, I think that's fine. It would make sense that we don't visibly include it in I guess what's being voted upon. In terms of what I think that we should do, I actually think if we defined a leader and a shepherd in advance most of the time because that really shows that the work party has a chance of success. So, if we just blindly publish a statement of work without knowing ahead of time who's going to lead it and is there anybody willing to take it on, that would be of concern. So, I'd be much more

---

---

comfortable proposing statements of work and effort that I believed had a chance of success rather than we're just going to sit on the floor.

So, procedurally, I'm not positive the right way to do that. For this one, I'm not concerned about it and I'm fine with going forward and removing that section from the document as we approve it.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Why don't I propose something? For expediting the approval of the statement of work, let's remove the role section. Andrew, as a discussion item for the future, I think we should settle on some proper process for when to assign the leader and a shepherd. Alright?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. That's clear.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. So, is there any other discussion on the statement of work itself? Alright, hearing none, do I have a motion on the floor to approve [inaudible] modern resolver behaviors statement of work?

RYAN STEPHENSON: I'll go ahead and put a motion on the floor, please.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Ryan. A second, please?



---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Liman seconds.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Liman, thank you. Anyone abstaining? Anyone not for it? Alright. The statement of work is approved. Thank you, Wes. We have an action item for this one to discuss what would be the right time to insert leaders and shepherds. Thank you.

Moving on to 5e, this is the concept paper regarding the RSSAC leadership structure. On the last call, I suggested that we consider moving from a co-chair model to a chair, vice chair model. And since that discussion, we put together a concept paper. Just [inaudible] discussion, Kaveh is going to facilitate the actual discussion on this topic. This was something that I had initiated on the last call. I had spoken to Liman as Brad as my co-chairs. I served with each of them as my co-chairs and there was synergy in our thoughts regarding this topic. So, we put thoughts to paper and I'm going to turn this over now to Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Hello, everyone, and thank you to Tripti. So, we have sent the concept paper last week [inaudible]. I would like to shape this conversation in two parts. First, let's discuss if we like this model or not and how we want to move forward if we like it, or if we don't, do we want to stay with current model or not? And then, if we think we like it in general, we have a proposal on how to move forward. But, I think, for the first part, let's focus on if we like this model.

---

In order to do that, on [inaudible], RSSAC is the only group in ICANN that has basically a co-chair model. Other constituencies have a chair and vice chair. There are three reasons that have been laid out in the concept paper why chair and co-chair model is not efficient and a chair, vice chair will be better.

First of all, [inaudible] here who runs meetings is also [inaudible] staff and ICANN organization or committee. Brad and Tripti were very effective in that, but I think [inaudible] they had a close relationship. They had chat groups. They are in the same time zone. Same city, for a matter of fact. So, that's a benefit we have right now, but we don't know what will happen if they have a chair in a different time zone, for example.

Another part is it's not clear who is [inaudible] on behalf of RSSAC. So, again, not that we are not aligned, but community gets used to things [inaudible] way of getting messages. And I think it's better if through the chair, it's better to have a consistent face representing RSSAC. So, that's one of the other reasons.

So, finally, the co-chair model is obviously more expensive for RSSAC because we travel with both chairs at a time and then there are other related stuff, where usually the chair and vice chair, normally we would use the chair, except if the chair is not available, then the vice chair would receive that travel [inaudible].

So, this is the reasoning. I'd like to take discussion or arguments about that. Anyone is opposing this model or is there any reason we don't like

---

this model or if anyone is strongly for it and they want to advocate it, please raise your hand. Liman, please.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. I am not opposed to this model. I've said it many times before the co-chair solution was put in place in order to solve an actual problem we had. So, going back to ... Now that we have procedures that work, going back to the classical model of a chair and vice chair is fine with me.

There are two things that I think we need to do in conjunction with this. One is to think about the current system with staggered terms that we have. We now have two co-chairs and we have staggered terms, which actually makes for good continuity. So, the chair who is staying on for another year can carry forward the institutional members of [inaudible] for the chairs.

If we're going to chair and vice chair, we may lose that staggered term and we need to find other ways to carry forward that institutional memory.

The second thing we need to do is to specify how work will be divided between the chair and the vice chair. I think it's a good idea to have the entire group think about this beforehand, so that the people who are nominated [inaudible] for election actually know what they're getting into. So, that is one [inaudible] ourselves and the people serving in these positions actually know what is expected from them. Thank you.

---

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much for your point. I have few comments on that, but Fred, go ahead, please.

FRED BAKER: So, I have a question about the expense side. It seems to me that it would be wise to have the vice chair present in any meeting that the chair is present, so that we can carry institutional [inaudible] to the next meeting which [inaudible] chair. From that perspective, I think it's in RSSAC's interest for ICANN to support travel for the vice chair. If we do that, then the [inaudible] argument is no longer valid.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay, thank you.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I apologize. Is anybody else hearing Fred break up?

TRIPTI SINHA: I was just going to say, Fred, it's very hard to hear you. Could you speak into the phone or mic, please?

FRED BAKER: Okay. I thought I was. Is this better?

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes, much better.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, my question or comment is that I think following on Liman's comment on institutional memory, it seems like the vice chair might be managing the next meeting in the absence of the chair, so it's wise to have the vice chair present in any meeting that the chair actually chairs. Which says to me that I think it would be wise to have ICANN cover the travel for the vice chair.

Now, if we do that, then the arguments that were made about cost are no longer valid. We're now covering the cost of two people.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. So, a point of clarification, Fred. Assuming that we remove that part and we say, okay, both chair and the vice chair are supported by ICANN for every meeting, then with those two rationales, are you okay in supporting of the proposal or no?

FRED BAKER: Yeah, it's fine. It's fine.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. Just wanted to know that. Thank you very much. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Thank you, Kaveh. I'm not in any way against this rearrangement and I like Liman's notion of trying to maintain organizational history that does get hard as boards change. Often, in the past, when I've served on other

---

boards that have had turnover, we've always tried to make sure that there's at least a board member or two, that two overlap. That gets difficult to a lot of the time to make sure that it happens if there's complete flip, which is possible.

One possible way around that is to elect somebody for two years and the first year they'd serve as the vice, and the second year they'd serve chair, so that we always get continuity that way. That means that somebody has to be signing up to act as chair in the long run, though. So, it may change the impetus for doing so, [inaudible] minor role, but it's less of a commitment.

In terms of supporting it in the long run, I'd really, of course, before we actually move there, I'd like to see a list of what the responsibilities of each of the two positions would be, because clearly, we're making a change that would require separation.

I'm not convinced that this is the only solution to the problem. I'm not against it, as I said, but there are many other organizations where there are multiple chairs that run things. The IETF is full of them, for example. And yes, it requires a lot of communication between them, but that's why there's mailing lists that actually ... You can write to both of them at once and there's not confusion in those cases.

As to who speaks on behalf of RSSAC, I would expect that the vice chair had better be fully informed [inaudible] chair. Again, if the vice chair has to step up when the chair is gone, there is still an issue of making sure that there's a single voice.

---

And in terms of the co-chair model being more expensive because both chairs have to go to everything, if well-communicating, well-organized chairs could separate out costs, they both don't have to go to everything.

I'm not saying that this solution isn't one that would work for these [inaudible], but I don't agree that it's the only solution. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much, Wes. Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Yes. Sorry, I wasn't sure I was next. Wes covered most of what I was going to try to say, except I was also going to suggest SSAC is probably the closest of the other SOs and ACs to what RSSAC has to do in terms of the roles of leadership and outward-facing interaction with the community and so on. Perhaps we could get some clarification from the admin team.

The way SSAC is currently structured is there's a chair and a vice chair, but they always appear to be dividing the workload and the travel and so on pretty evenly and just coordinating closely with each other and the admin team, so I would be curious just for some data on how that's managed both in budget terms and in coordination terms.

---

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Suzanne. I think that's a smooth transition to Russ first because he can provide us some insight from SSAC as well and then I will ask [inaudible]. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Kaveh. I actually was going to provide additional comments on Wes's comment that a vice chair be elected essentially for a two-year term with the expectation to become the chair in a subsequent amount of time.

This is generally the model that the NomCom uses, but it's structured so that even though the expectation that – I forget the term they use. They got a term for it in the NomCom realm. I'll call them chair in waiting is actually not finalized or definitized until close to the time for the turnover. So, it is a way of accomplishing that continuity of corporate memory without formally having a hard commitment to it at the time of the first selection.

Since Suzanne just mentioned SSAC, I'll add a little bit there. That is that, yes, I quite agree that the roles performed by the chair and vice chair of SSAC are fairly distinctive and one of the reasons for that distinction has been, at different times, there's a different, I'll call it, set of emphasis going on. I have no comment on the budgetary part, since I've not actually been in either role, so I haven't seen the dollar impacts or how they handle those. Coordination is done via the admin meeting, which is structured slightly different than the RSSAC admin meeting, but it is a weekly meeting with in-between meetings, if needed. If there's timeliness issues that have to be handled.



---

At the current time, the biggest I think organizational differentiation between the two roles is that the SSAC vice chair, by definition of our procedures, is the chairman of the membership committee and the membership committee in SSAC includes voting members, which are selected from the membership and three people from the leadership team, which are non-voting members. The vice chair is in charge of that and that's a fairly sizable amount of activities that go on on an ongoing basis.

The other thing recently that the vice chair has been de facto in charge of, and that is the sort of upkeep and maintenance and care and feeding of the procedures manual itself. So, that's my two cents worth on how SSAC differentiates the roles. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much. Are there any comments you want to add or is there any insight you can provide us, as Suzanne suggested?

STEVE SHENG:

I think from the travel perspective, usually the vote from the SSAC perspective, both the chair and the vice chair get funding to travel to ICANN meetings. From the chair perspective, there is a separate slot for the chair and the vice chair slot is usually taken out [from the] slots otherwise allocated to the committee. But, they usually, both of them attend meetings.

Another I think important thing to add is, from the SSAC perspective, the chair is tasked to call consensus to determine whether there's

---

consensus in the committee on a certain matter. Sometimes, those are tough calls. I think that's the only thing to add what Russ has already said. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much. So, let me try to distinctify a bit. From what I hear, and I personally also agree, [inaudible] is not something that [inaudible] I also think we will need, given if they have a chair and co-chair – sorry, a vice chair. We will need travel, to fund the travel. So, my suggestion is to remove that point first. Is anyone against that? From the rationale in the concept paper. Hearing none, I remove that.

The second part is we had a good point, which I heard support about, which was we need some kind of overlap between the selection of the chair and the vice chair. How [inaudible], we can discuss. But, assuming that they can make that happen, there is always an overlap between the election for the chair and then election for the vice chair. Is there any objection to move forward with a proposal and try to form it a bit better on the mailing list and hopefully get two votes? Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thank you, Kaveh. I just have a comment there and that is ... Can you hear me? Hello? Are you hearing me?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yes, I can.

---

RUSS MUNDY:

Thank you. The comment that I'd like to put in here is that in Wes's statement earlier, he talked about having ... That there were other mechanisms, other approaches, for how to achieve this type of overlap and I didn't know if he or others on the committee wanted to hear more about that or wanted to ask if he could write down what some of those were, if we wanted to get a little more illustration of what that might be prior to making this change. In particular, with respect to overlap [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Sorry if I wasn't clear. What I was suggesting was I wanted to see if there is no objection to this new form of making sure that if they have an overlap and if they don't include the costing as part of the rationale, if there is no objection to that, then they can keep it in mind, take that to the main list. Obviously, we should hear [from the list] and explore other possible models. But, if we don't get consensus there, at least we know there was [inaudible] about this, so we can pursue this one. That's all I wanted to get to. Definitely, we should hear that. I see that [inaudible]. So, either on this call or later on in the mailing list. Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Kaveh. I was just going to say – and I think you sort of said that. We start a document. It looks like there's no opposition to moving towards this model, especially now that you've taken off also the funding aspect, which makes a lot of sense. [inaudible], for lack of a better word, our future concept in the form of a document. I think Liman brought up an excellent point about overlap and so forth. So, just

---

begin to tease out the details in a document. Also, if staff could begin to look at, I think SSAC is probably the closest to the RSSAC. Look at their model and maybe pick out a couple of other SO/ACs and look at their models and define the role of chair and vice chair very well the overlapping structures. Then everyone just take a stab at the document.

One thing I did want to say, Russ said that the admin team was a little bit different from RSSAC. I don't think it's that much different other than what you pointed out about the membership, but the RSSAC admin team meets every Tuesday, every single Tuesday of the year. We also meet in between should there be a need, and we also have in-person meetings in the DC office.

So, I think it's very, very similar to the way the SSAC is structured, so I would just recommend that we take this as an action item to begin to put these thoughts in a document. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Tripti. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Thank you, Kaveh. I think part of the confusion is that this document sort of has the beginnings of a proposal. My understanding of what we're doing here today is that there's really just a continued discussion on should we turn this into and spend the effort to define something more formally? I agree. I haven't heard any opposition. I've heard concerns and things that we need to do, including my own, to make sure that when we actually do need to get to the point of making a

---

decision that the right effort has been put into it, things like that, and the right outcomes are addressed and things like that.

I guess without hearing a whole lot of dissention, it makes sense to let the work continue to go forward and hopefully volunteers will step up to actually turn it into the required things in order to change the bylaws and in order to make this actually happen, if that's going to go forward. My point was that, before I would vote yes, I would definitely want to see a very more well-defined structure, but I would expect that [inaudible] didn't think it was coming.

One other point of consideration is that – and I'll throw this out there and probably start more discussion, but do we want members of the caucus involved because the reality is if we are trying to turn more and more work over the caucus, they might have an opinion on how RSSAC is done. I say that with a hesitation because, to a large part, the caucus actually isn't involved in how RSSAC operates procedurally. But, that doesn't mean they shouldn't or that doesn't mean that they shouldn't have a voice in it. And it would certainly help [inaudible] some of the concern in the recent review and things like that, to increase openness. So, I'd like to hear people's opinions on that. I'm [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much, Wes. I [inaudible] first point. I definitely [inaudible]. That's exactly how we want to do. We want to [inaudible] first. Just a concept [inaudible]. it's not a [inaudible] or anything like that. Russ?

---

RUSS MUNDY:

Just a quick response to Tripti's comment about the similarities between the admin panels on RSSAC and SSAC. I think the biggest single difference that most people don't really notice is that the admin panel in SSAC or admin committee, although it's made up of particular people, any SSAC member is invited to participate in any and all – and in fact, it's encouraged, and when there's work parties going on, is often strongly requested to be in the admin committee meeting.

As I understand it, generally the RSSAC admin committees are in fact closed meetings. To me, that's the most notable difference in how they actually operate. I think they do the same sort of things, but whether or not the bigger group of people are invited and encouraged to join and participate. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Yes. I [inaudible] continued desperation of this subject, but I want to make ... I want to note the distinction between not opposing a proposal and feeling the urge that this is something necessary. I don't mind that we look into what the possible future might look like if we are to go that way, but I don't really feel the urge. I haven't seen this problem with co-chairs. So, let's continue to explore and see where we end up.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Okay. Fred?

FRED BAKER:

So, I'm commenting first on Wes's comments and then on Liman's comment. I think it would be wise to include the caucus in this

---

discussion and development of procedures, if nothing else because the document that we just produced about evolution of the RSSAC says that we would have people from various other walks of life and I suspected a number of them would, in fact, come from the caucus. So, I think having the caucus involved would be a good thing.

To Liman's comment, I co-chair a working group in the IETF. I have one co-chair now. I had two for a couple of years and there were three of us that chaired the working group. We had no problem operating as co-chairs and coordinating our viewpoints before making public statements and that kind of thing. As a matter of fact, I have a phone call on Friday coordinating with my co-chair. So, I really don't see the issue with having a co-chair.

Now, if you want to go to a chair and vice chair model, that's fine. I'm not imposed. But, I don't see an impetus.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Okay. Thank you very much, Fred. I would like to add my personal comment as well, which is I understand that. Actually, there is, for example, for the board technical committee of ICANN, I am going to propose to make it a vice chair model because that's [more effective]. But, I should say that it's really dependent, personally, I have never chaired any IETF working group, but I have been active in different roles in the IETF. It's a completely different ball game. Not that one is better or harder or more complex than the other one, but it's a completely different type of traction with people and traction with the community.

---

Within ICANN constituencies, within the chairs themselves, they are actually public [recruits], so it is a very different dynamic. Just wanted to point that out.

Based on what I heard, my suggestion is, first of all, we don't go through the second part of the paper which was possible proposal on how to implement. I think we should, for now, just table that part of the discussion.

On the first part, we have heard some comments. I think Terry also made a very good point. It could be very good if staff gives us a [inaudible] analysis where the SSAC model excels and where [inaudible] problematic. I think it's good [to get] feedback from staff. With that and with this concept paper, I think it's good to [inaudible] ask staff to start a discussion in the RSSAC list and to answer two questions.

First, let's decide if we want to discuss it in the caucus or not. Second, before even trying to discuss it with caucus, if that's the consensus of the group, decide if this is the way we want to go forward, or as I heard, possibility we might want to table it [inaudible] or if Wes or any others have any other idea on how to solve these issues.

If there is no additional comment to that, then I would ask staff to do basically three points and finish [inaudible]. Seeing no hands, I will hand it back to you, Tripti. Thank you very much.



---

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Kaveh. We've got another 28 minutes left, so I'm going to rush through the remaining. Moving on to 5f, this is about a draft paper that's been put together about RSO identification.

Terry and I took the lead on this. I must say, this is the first time Terry and I have worked on something together and it was absolutely effortless. Terry, it was very nice working with you. He originally discussed this with me I think it was Panama where I put some thoughts together, put it into a Google doc. He then edited that. We turned it over to staff and it's been turned over to you. Duane has added his thoughts as well. Hopefully, you've had a chance to look at it.

With that preamble, I'm actually going to turn it over to Terry. Terry, would you like to run the discussion, please?

TERRY MANDERSON:

Sure. Thank you, Tripti. As we know, we changed the way we talked about root servers within RSSAC itself. We obviously introduce ourselves now as part of the organization. We are slowly adjusting our documentation going forward not to talk about letters.

This paper, or this intended RSSAC number document, really codifies that and makes some advice to the broader community to say that, from here on, we will talk about the root server organization in a general sense, and in a technical sense, we will still use the label as it is in the root zone, and if necessary, the IPv4 and IPv6 addresses, so that we get a clear distinction about when we're talking about a technical aspect and when we're talking about an organizational incident.

---

There are three general reasons why we're doing this. The first is that talking about letters has [inaudible] led to misconceptions about root services and certainly their architectures.

Secondly, it fails to clearly identify the organizations that operate root services and provides them with, I guess, the kudos for doing so. It also presumes that we maintain some status quo in terms of any future review in terms of root server naming. The RSSAC [inaudible] caucus has made initial investigation into that, so it would probably be good [inaudible] to maintain a fixed position going forward.

Admittedly, you probably only had a few days to look over this document, since I guess moving forward, there is still going to be room and time to review. Personally, I would like to see the caucus involved and the caucus have an opportunity to review this document before it becomes an RSSAC numbered document [inaudible] procedural issue.

So, with that, I'll open up the floor to any discussion, if you have comments or concerns. Wes is first off the [inaudible].

WES HARDAKER:

Alrighty, thank you. Unfortunately, I missed the discussion in the last meeting because I was in a meeting at the time, so I missed the background on it. I know we have been moving forward on this sort of model in our own discussions and how we voice ourselves publicly. I'm fine with trying to put a document together. I agree with you that I think the caucus needs to be involved in this. I kind of worry about scope creep with this type of thing because there's a number of interesting aspects to it, one being it almost pseudo suggests that we should be

---

renaming [or reusing] letters, too, and it doesn't actually ever make that statement, nor do I think it's intended to. But, you kind of come away with this takeaway of we're supposed to get rid of letters, let's make usc.rootservers.net or something like that.

There's a number of wording issue that I kind of have with the document and [inaudible] suggestions. So, I would actually like to pull this back and say if we're going to do this, let's think about how we classify. There's multiple things that go on here. There's who is actually operationally responsible and those are all the organizations that we refer to by name. There is the identifiers that are used that are static that don't change, which [inaudible] letters. The document actually suggests that maybe we should use [a.rootservers.net] every time we talk about a particular incidence which makes sense. It also suggests possibly using [inaudible] addresses, which I heartily disagree with, actually.

There's other weird statements in there, like let's seek out, collect a letter from many RSOs. I think that's in reference to people running Internet exchanges and things like that, needing each letter in order to build a collection. I don't know. So, it seems to me like the solution is being [churned out] rather quickly and that the problem ... The larger problem hasn't been defined and that that ought to go forward as possibly a caucus document or something like that, actually become a real work effort.

---

TERRY MANDERSON:

Thank you, Wes. It is coming out very quickly and I agree that I think we might need to slow down a little bit and to clarify some of your points that you've raised.

In terms of the wording, certainly in terms of the intent, some of those intents weren't actually meant, such as we only talk about [a.rootservers.net]. So, I think there is certainly room for wordsmithing there and for clarifying what is actually intended. I think next was Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Hi, there. So, one thing that came to mind as I read the paper was how it goes from lets have a number of different servers – 13 of them – to let's have an Anycast root and the easiest way that we can scale the root is to simply add more Anycast instances.

I wondered if someone could walk away with that, have as a takeaway, then it would be okay for one organization to simply run a thousand instances because that would meet the needs of having lots of servers around it.

We've talked quite a bit about one of the strengths of the root server system being the diversity of operation and the diversity of operating systems and so on and so forth. It seems like it would be good to have a clarifying statement in the thing about this doesn't mean that we're moving away from the diversity model. We still think it's a good thing and here's why. But, we simply don't want to be the constraint by the letters.

---

TERRY MANDERSON:

Understood, Fred. Good point. I think there is some scoping need in the start of this document to say this is about a documentation and a communication effort, not a technical change. I think maintaining our position in terms of diversity, and in fact, some of the – I'm trying to [inaudible] how to describe them. Some of the reasons for our work should be brought into this from some of the work coming out of 037 and 038. Thank you, Fred. It looks like Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Terry. I was just going to say that Fred brings up a very good point, which is I think we should insert in the document that the diversity of the system will be maintained. I think that is a very good point, Fred.

You said we're doing this so the system is not constrained. I believe that's an incorrect statement. It's not constrained. It's led to misconception in how the system can be grown. I think that's what we're trying to fix as well, is that the system capacity can be grown, but we don't need to add a letter or a new identifier to grow the system. That's what we're trying to do, but I think you made some excellent points.

So, I would recommendation ... As you said earlier, Terry, this was just sent to the group a couple of days ago, so I think people should start to add more comments to it as well to further chisel the document. Then, of course, send it over to the caucus as well for further input. Thank you, Terry.

---

TERRY MANDERSON: Thank you, Tripti. Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Yes. I just want to reinforce what Tripti said, possibly with some different words. We need to think very carefully about exactly which message we want to send here. We want to make sure that the document contains exactly that message and nothing else because this could be something that people take and run with and interpret in any way, like a religious document, that extreme care is needed here.

TERRY MANDERSON: [inaudible] words. Now it looks like the queue is empty. It sounds like next steps are obviously take this back to the list and I'll ask you all to review, make some suggestions. I will circle back with Wes on some of his concerns directly. I think I've already captured in notes that I have Fred's comment, as well as Tripti and Lars' comment so I can add those into the document as we go. Then, we can come back perhaps at the next RSSAC conference call and see how we're traveling and whether we're willing to, at that point, send this on to the caucus for review. Does that sound reasonable?

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes, it does.

TERRY MANDERSON: In which case, thank you, and moving on.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Terry. I'm looking at the clock and we've got 16 minutes left, so I'm going to rush through these items. Quickly, over to Carlos and Kevin Jones on 000.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti. Just to quickly start off on this item, staff has been collecting wordsmithing issues or continuity issues in the [inaudible] procedures document. I have a redline version that I'm going to show Kevin for his review. At that point, Kevin will take a look at the document and then decide when to share it with all of you for any other substantive issues. So, that's the update there. Kevin, I don't know if there is anything you would like to add, but I'll make sure that happens this week.

KEVIN JONES: I have nothing else, Carlos. Thanks.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Kevin. Tripti, since the next item is mine, I'll go ahead and move on to item six, which is an update on the organizational review. As you all may recall, last month we mentioned that the next step is the feasibility assessment. I am taking the first draft of that and will send it to the implementation work party this week. As a reminder, the implementation work party is the exact same group of people from the review work part. So, Brad, Tripti, Kaveh, Hiro, and Liman. After they review that first draft, that will be shared with all of you.

---

---

The feasibility assessment essentially just is exactly what the name implies. It's RSSAC's own assessment on how feasible it would be to implement the recommendations from the report. A lot of the rationale for RSSAC comments on the recommendations have been documented already in previous statements, so I'm just basing the draft off of those documents. Again, that will go out this week for the implementation work party to review. I'll pause here to see if there are any questions about the organizational review. Hearing none, I'll hand it back to you, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you, Carlos. Moving on to agenda item seven, which is a series of reports from some of us, I'll start with the co-chair update on a request that we got from the GNSO. I will, in turn, turn this over to Steve Sheng. If you recall, we sent this over to you and we did receive comments from Fred and Suzanne. There was a concern that we've been dinged for not participating. But, the way we viewed this is we felt this was somewhat out of scope for us. Also, the fact that we gave it serious consideration – if you send in your input, we felt that we were actually engaged in this particular piece of work. So, I'm going to turn it over to Steve Sheng now.

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you, Tripti. Hello, everyone. The [inaudible] committee had a discussion last week and I sent out essentially three bullet points outlining the proposal why RSSAC declined participation in this effort.



---

The first reason is really the EPDP is regarding the WHOIS servers for gTLD registries. Its charter is to confirm whether or not the temporary specification for gTLD registration data adopted by the board as consensus policy. This is to address the General Data Protection Regulation coming out of the European Union.

Within that context, the RSSAC role is to advise the board and community on matters relating to the operation, administration, security, and [inaudible] of the root server system. The [inaudible] committee took a deeper look at where the WHOIS service would or could be affected. Really, there are only two areas, if any, the RSSAC would be concerned about. One is the WHOIS service for root-servers.net zone. The other is the IANA WHOIS service [for TLDs].

In the former instance, the registrants of those domains are legal persons and does not appear to be affected by GDPR. With regards to the latter, the IANA WHOIS service is considered out of scope for the EPDP working group.

So, essentially, the only thing the RSSAC concerns of those services will not be affected or have any impact by EPDP, and therefore the RSSAC would decline participating in that PDP, but will consider providing input through the established public comment [inaudible] in case things really go off the rail, and even from technical perspective, does not make any sense.

So, that's just kind of the rationale for responding to them. I haven't received any feedback. I'd like to take some feedback on the call. And if

---

there's no other feedback, then the [inaudible] committee will prepare the communication to formally decline participation. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any questions? Hearing none, please go ahead and prepare the letter and forward that. I'd like to thank Fred and Suzanne for providing some input on this. Thank you very much. Moving on to ... Did someone say something? Moving on to liaison updates. Kaveh, anything from the ICANN board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No. There has been no change or no movement. Just to say there is an ICANN board [inaudible] to 16<sup>th</sup> of December, which no one [inaudible].

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Thank you, Kaveh. Moving on to Liman, anything from CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No. Pretty much nothing. There are no major actions going on there. We have the monthly report from the PTI, but it's so slow that both the July and the August meetings were cancelled. So, nothing to see here. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Thank you, Liman. Brad, RZERC?

---

BRAD VERD: Nothing really of substance to share. There's still debate within RZERC on some of the verbiage in the response to the KSK question from the board, but that's ongoing. That's all.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you. Russ, anything from SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: The biggest activity of recent has been trying to finalize the response to the board on the KSK roll question. There's still a hope that in fact we'll have a viable answer to that by this Friday when it's requested. But, we're working on getting the specific words nailed down and trying to get everyone involved to agree to the content. I don't think there will be anything of any surprise, even though we haven't really gotten to the specific content. We previously had said that I would be the courier between the RSSAC and the SSAC on this and there's nothing in the SSAC document that would have any significant disagreement with what the RSSAC document said and I expect the SSAC document to be shorter than the RSSAC document. So, that's where we are.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Thank you, Russ. I don't believe Daniel ever joined the call. Daniel, are you on the call? I don't hear him, so let's move on to IANA updates. Naela?

---

NAELA SARRAS: Thank you, Tripti. Just two quick items. We have surrounding the customer satisfaction survey, we have the annual customer satisfaction survey opening in September, so that will be coming out to all those that used IANA services in the last year.

Another thing we're adding this year, or a new thing that we're introducing, is we're starting what's called a post-ticket survey. So, anytime any customer interacts with us on a specific request, we'll be sending a post-ticket survey to quickly gauge how the service was and if there's any areas of improvement. We're doing that in stages and we're most likely starting with the naming community first to capture that input, and then of course expand it to the protocol parameters and the number communities.

Also, we're finalizing our KSK rollover, IANA operations. The PTI president will be finalizing a plan at the end of this month with the partners and everything is being prepared for the KSK rollover for October. From the IANA side. And that's it. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright. Thank you, Naela. Duane, any updates on the root zone?

DUANE WESSELS: No. Nothing else to report. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Alright. So, under any other business, we do have an update from Carlos on the selection process for RSSAC's liaison to the RZERC. Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti. A quick update here. We received a letter from the RZERC about the appointment process and how the admin met to clarify next steps. So, as we move forward with that, I will be conducting the call for nominations on the caucus list for the RSSAC liaison to RZERC. This is pretty much the same process that we just conducted for the liaison to the Customer Standing Committee (the CSC). As you know, the incumbent is Brad, so he is eligible for reappointment for another term. So, that notice will go out to the caucus mailing list, just so you're aware. Probably today or tomorrow.

TRIPTI SINHA: So, Carlos, the request that we received from RZERC was simply a clarification on our appointment, the length of our appointment, correct?

CARLOS REYES: Correct.

TRIPTI SINHA: Right. Okay. Any questions for Carlos on this? Alright. Any other business? Hearing none, I'm going to adjourn this meeting. I think we've all got other stuff to go to. Thank you very much, everyone. Meeting is adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**

---