
BRAD VERD: Let's get started. Let's call the meeting to order and jump into roll call. Cogent? Is anybody here from Cogent? I hear silence. Moving on, ICANN.Org?

MATT LARSON: Matt is here.

BRAD VERD: Okay, great. Thanks, Matt. ISC?

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker.

FRED BAKER: Fred and Geoff are here.

BRAD VERD: We got Fred and Geoff and I think Wes wants to be with ISC now.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, it's early. Sorry.

BRAD VERD: I get it. So, Fred and Geoff for ISC. NASA?

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.

KEVIN JONES: This is Kevin.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Kevin. Netnod? Looks like Liman hasn't joined us yet. He did send apologies. He was going to try to join but wasn't sure if he was going to be able to or not. We'll see if he joins later. RIPE NCC? Kaveh, are you with us? No, okay. University of Maryland?

TRIPTI SINHA: Tripti is here.

BRAD VERD: Good morning, Tripti. USC ISI? Wes.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Suzanne.

BRAD VERD: Alright, Suzanne and Wes. US ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard is here.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Ken. US DoD?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson and Kevin Wright is here. Good morning.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Ryan. Hey, Kevin. Verisign there is myself.

MATT WEINBERG: Matt here as well.

BRAD VERD: And Matt Weinberg. Then, WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro Hotta is here.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Hiro. Liaisons to the board. Kavah, he has not announced himself yet. Liaison to CSC is Liman. He has sent his apologies but will try to join. Liaison to RZERC is myself. Liaison to SSAC. Russ, are you here?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, good morning.

BRAD VERD: Good morning, Russ. Liaison to the IAB? Daniel, are you on the call?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes, I am.

BRAD VERD: Hello. Thank you for joining. Daniel, there's a lot of feedback on your line. If you could mute it, that would be great.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay, so you hear me.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman just joined.

BRAD VERD: Welcome, Liman. Great. We will update the attendance sheet. We're going through it now. Liaison to IANA?

NAELA SARRAS: Good morning. Naela here.

BRAD VERD: Hi, Naela. And then our last liaison, liaison to the RZM?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

BRAD VERD:

Hello, Duane. Then from staff, we have Carlos, Andrew, Steve, and Mario. Did I miss anybody? Anybody on the call that we didn't touch with?

Alright. So, let's move on to item three, agenda review. We'll cover a number of administration topics. We'll go through the minutes. We have an update from the membership committee. We'll go through the organizational review and actions going on there. We have some RSSAC appointments that are happening. Then we have the liaison to RZERC selection update. We've got ICANN 63 to talk through. Then, there's a request from the fellowship program that we will share with everybody here. We will then move on to the work items. There's a topic in here, future workshops, that we'll cover. Then our liaison reports.

In any other business, there is an update here from Liman about a meeting that took place in Estonia last week that had root governance as one of their topics that somebody was at. So, we'll cover that. Is there anything that somebody would like to add to the any other business section? Don't see any hands. I'm not hearing anything. We will move on.

We'll jump into the administration. Draft minutes from August 7th. Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN:

Thank you, Brad. Hello, everyone. This is Mario for the record. I would like to just confirm that everyone received the minutes actually that

were distributed on the mailing list from the 7th of August. We actually had no pending action items from the previous teleconference meeting, but we do have a pending action item from the teleconference minutes. The only action item that we have pending is Terry Manderson to share the RSO identification document to the list and request for inputs. I believe that this is a topic that will be discussed actually later during this call. If anyone has any other questions, just let me know or contact me. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Any questions regarding the minutes from August 7th? Any discussion? Is there a motion on the table to approve the minutes?

RYAN STEPHENSON: I'll put a motion on.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Ryan. Is there a second?

RUSS MUNDY: Russ.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Russ. Any opposed? Any abstaining? Great. Minutes are approved. Moving on to 4B. Actually, before we go to 4B, Liman I know that you are in less than ideal conference call situation. Seeing that you have an item that is last on the agenda, I would like to offer you either

we could move it up or we could ask for an update in writing, whichever one you feel more comfortable with.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. If I could do that update in writing, that would be much better. I just tried to get access to the Internet here. I didn't see [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Right. Okay. So, update in writing is great. If you're on the call, we can talk about it briefly. If not, I'll give people a quick description of what happened.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Great, thank you.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Back to the agenda. 4B, RSSAC caucus membership committee update. Matt, to you.

MATT WEINBERG: Thanks, Brad. There were three statements of interest that came in over the past month. The membership committee did pull their monthly meeting a couple of weeks ago and talked about all three applications. Those applications are in the agenda with links to their original statements of interest. We reviewed all three. We can go through each one. [Casey] seems like the easiest one to have ever dealt with. I'm sure many of you know him already and there was enthusiastic approval to

move forward with [Casey]. I'll just go through these one by one here. Obviously, the author of DNS [Vis] and very well-entrenched in the community. This is an easy one for us. Our recommendation is to move forward. So, if there's any questions or we'd like to talk about this application. Okay. So, can we get a nomination for him to move forward?

BRAD VERD: Is there a motion on the table to approve Casey for the RSSAC?

RYAN STEPHENSON: I'll put a motion on the table for him.

WES HARDAKER: Seconded by Wes.

BRAD VERD: Thank you.

MATT WEINBERG: Thank you. The next candidate is Peter De Vries. Peter actually did some work with [inaudible]. Ryan, you know him personally, right?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yeah. And if you don't mind, if I could speak on Peter's behalf.

MATT WEINBERG: Please.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Peter is one of our what we call subject matter experts with DNS. He's one of our primary researchers within our agency defense information system's agency in regards to DNS. He does a lot of ... He's worked with Russ Mundy. Wes, has he ever worked with you? Not really sure. But, he's extremely knowledgeable and performs a lot of research with the service. So, that's basically what I could tell you about Peter.

RUSS MUNDY: He's a shoe in in my book, too.

MATT WEINBERG: Thank you. And the membership, can we also recommend that we move forward with his application? Are there any questions? Otherwise, we'll move forward with a nomination.

BRAD VERD: No questions, no hands. Is there a motion on the table to approve Peter De Vries for the RSSAC caucus?

FRED BAKER: So moved.

WES HARDAKER: I second.

BRAD VERD: Fred and Wes, thank you.

MATT WEINBERG: Thank you. The third candidate is [Moget Batra]. He submitted an extensive statement of interest that was well-written and included all the activities that he has participated in, including IETF and ISOC and ICANN meetings. He's very well involved in the community in India as well and our recommendation, again, was to move forward with this application. Are there any discussion points?

BRAD VERD: Seeing no discussion, no hands, nothing on the chat room, is there a motion to approve [Moget] to the RSSAC caucus?

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

BRAD VERD: Alright. Is there a second? That was Fred, I think, right? Thanks, Fred.

MATT WEINBERG: Thanks. Finally, I can just briefly say [inaudible] others in the past we're looking at cross-referencing attendance records with the actual list of the caucus. We talked about that in our latest membership committee

meeting and we're making progress on that and I'm hopeful that we'll have something ready for the next meeting. That's it.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, Matt. Moving on to 4C, this is the RSSAC organizational review update. The first topic we have here is the advisory the RSSAC has written on the organizational review. Tripti, did you want to give a quick recap of that advisory?

TRIPTI SINHA:

Yeah, sure. As all of you know, we went to our second organizational review and we provided extensive feedback during the process. But, we did decide many weeks ago – I think probably a couple of months ago – that we would provide some input to ICANN on how they should improve the process.

So, three of us – Fred Baker, Duane, and I – came together and put together the content which has subsequently been reviewed by you. I'd like to thank Fred and Duane in partnering on this.

The crux of this advisory is essentially telling them that they need to provide some better definition around organizational reviews and what the intended result is to ensure that there is some level of oversight during the process and also to test the outcomes, the validity of the outcomes.

So, we chose to write the letter not about [inaudible] because I think we had provided extensive feedback on that during the assessment and recommendation phase. So, our feedback will go to Goran, Cherine,

Theresa who is the head of MSSl and [Khalid] who is the head of the Organizational Review Committee within the board.

If you look at the document that's in front of you, we start with saying that there should be some more structure in how the identify reviewers. They should define organizational reviews and there should be a set of guiding principles and we list five of them – transparency, attribution, objectivity, professionalism and evidence, and also that there should be some form of oversight within ICANN of the process. Then we do provide some recommendations.

So, I think everyone has had a chance to review this document. Do you have any questions? Hearing none, back to you.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you, Tripti. With that, is there a motion on the table to approve the RSSAC advisory on organizational reviews?

TRIPTI SINHA: Wes's hand is up, I think.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry. I didn't see that.

WES HARDAKER: That's okay. I couldn't [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: I retract the last comment and I give the floor to Wes.

WES HARDAKER: So, I keep thinking about – and there was a lot of discussion in the document. Overall, I'm really happy with the document. It's quite good. But, actually, if somebody could scroll to the two paragraphs on accountability and transparency, I will state my piece about these two paragraphs because I'm still unhappy with them and it sort of dawned on me yesterday why. These two paragraphs basically—

BRAD VERD: Wes, you said accountability and transparency. Do you mean transparency and attribution?

WES HARDAKER: Yes, I'm sorry.

BRAD VERD: Okay.

WES HARDAKER: These two paragraphs, especially immediately after our review kind of come off sounding like we're unhappy with a lot of anonymous quotes, which we are and absolutely we should be, and we're looking for a shake down. We're looking for names that we can go talk to these people and give them the what for.

So, in fact, yesterday I was listening to a story about the Ecuadorian President, actually, outing the name of one of the [inaudible] protestors that ended up closing down this anonymous protestor's blog because his life started getting threatened and all kinds of stuff. That's, of course the, extreme case. But, it's presumptuous of us to assume that people won't ever be intimidated by a group within ICANN, ours or others.

And not everything can have [inaudible]. One of the things I think we state, and it's important that we keep it, is that if at all possible, all of the reporting done in efforts like this should be accountable to [inaudible].

There are times, however, where that's simply not possible because you need to convey interpersonal relationship stresses and things like that. It's again presumptuous [inaudible] that anonymous quotes are never used. I'd rather us be able to say something like, something more concrete to what I just said, that quotes should hopefully never be needed and should be attributed, if at all possible, when they are needed. But, we recommend that there are times where anonymous quotes may be needed to convey interpersonal relationship stresses, and that when that is the case, multiple quotes should be used so that there's at least sufficient backup. Quotes from multiple people should be used.

There's no perfect way around this, but I'm not sure that the two paragraphs there now really [inaudible]. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Wes, I'm sorry, the document has been out there for over a week. You're adding a comment now. Are you just adding commentary or are you suggesting that we change this?

WES HARDAKER: Well, I attempted before the last week. I added some comments to those two paragraphs and there was some wording in the Google Docs reporting mechanism, stuff like that. I don't know if everybody on the call read that commentary or that discussion, and at the time, I was left articulate about trying to find out exactly why I had objections. It's taken me a week after this document has been stabilized to better phrase my objection to those two paragraphs. And I think that the concepts of those two paragraphs are good. I just don't think that they're quite right now. So, whether it's commentary ... It's too late to propose wording changes for this call. We've agreed on a [inaudible] stability, although we've made changes before that we've agreed to change I guess to go forward. The point of [inaudible] conversation around it is [inaudible] any last-minute changes.

I don't have text written now to proposed a direct replacement, unfortunately, because it's only within even the last hour that I've really come up wording that might work. But I think I'm in a minority, too, so if other people agree, then speak up.

BRAD VERD: Duane had his hand up, so if you're done, we can refer to him.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: Duane, go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, thanks. I just wanted to respond to one thing that I heard you say, which was that it's [inaudible] that we wanted to ... I think you sort of implied we wanted to take statements that were made and then follow-up with people and talk to them about it.

In my writing of this paper, that was not really my goal. It's not what I had in mind. What I had in mind was that a lot of what we do in ICANN is, to a certain standard of transparency. In particular, now for example, for the most part, RSSAC meetings going forward are open to participation from outsiders. I felt like this review was not held to that same level of transparency. When it's not, people make different statements than they would have made if they were held to that normal standard of transparency. Do you know what I mean?

WES HARDAKER: I'm not sure if I should respond, but I do understand, Duane. I know the point behind it. I agree with the principle that we're trying to set forward. That's important, that if possible, which is why I said in the second portion of my sort of proposed wording would be when possible that quotes should be attributed, but we recognize there are rare cases where they may not be able to.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I think that's sensible. I think, again, as with our meetings and other things, the default should be for transparency, but in certain cases, it may be necessary to have anonymous quotes or whatever. And I don't think that the last review ... I think it was flipped.

WES HARDAKER: Absolutely.

DUANE WESSELS: It was the opposite.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. It was wrong, too.

BRAD VERD: Go ahead, Fred.

FRED BAKER: I very much agree with Duane. It wasn't my intent, or Tripti's as far as I know, to go [go and hassle] anybody. But, I would suggest that a way forward on this would be to have Wes suggest text and we can talk about that. We should be able to agree to this in e-mail and to [inaudible] something like that.

SUZANNE WOOLF: It might just be, if I may, it might just be a statement from an individual can be evident when attributed to a name and supported. I'm not sure whether attributed to a name is necessary there.

BRAD VERD: Wes, your hand is up.

WES HARDAKER: Thanks, Brad. So, the second sentence in transparency is [inaudible]. Comments made by [inaudible] may not survive to the final report, which I would even argue that we should state they should not unless they have to be. But, those that do, should be traceable to their source, whether an interview, paper, or [process]. That means that ... That's basically saying anonymity should never be used. It's the "never" that I disagree with. I have tried to state that I think we should ... Transparency should be a goal absolutely all the time, but there are cases where that won't work to deal with certain problems. That's why we have an ombudsman and other processes because protecting anonymous quotes when serious issues are at play is important.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Sorry, I just got confused with some of what you said there because you said that we should change may not to should not, and then you went on to say but those that do should be traceable. You can't have one or the other.

WES HARDAKER: No, I didn't say that.

BRAD VERD: Then I misheard you.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. Fair point. Let me try my previous again. Our ideal order of preference would be first no quotes at all. Only fact. Second, attributed quotes. Those are the best ways to achieve transparency, those two. But, we recognize that there are times where anonymous quotes may be necessary because of fear of quoters. When that's the case, multiple people should be referenced. Multiple quotes and opinions from multiple people should be used rather than just a single [inaudible].

Unfortunately, there are times where we're talking about RSSAC processes – or excuse me, not RSSAC. ICANN processes – and not everything in processes can be nailed right back down to how a particular group within ICANN actually operates solely based on printed material. There's a lot of ... I was using interpersonal earlier, but the reality is ICANN is very much a talking body. There are people walking around having interactions with chairs of working groups, members of working groups, and there are certain things that you can't take down to completely objective facts that are like there's no URL for it. And we have to support documenting them.

I think our current document does sort of state that. If you need to do quotes, they should be attributed. I was just trying to make the case that there are even more extreme situations, which I hope our group

and no group ever fits, where anonymous quotes will be necessary to prove most likely a pretty serious problem. Did I do any better, Brad?

BRAD VERD: I think it's just I wish these discussions had come up on the mailing list a lot sooner than right now.

WES HARDAKER: As I said, they did come up in the document. I failed to articulate my concerns as well and I recognize that this is late and I apologize for that and we can go forward and move to a vote and approve without my concerns being addressed. That's up to the group.

BRAD VERD: Tripti, your hand is up.

TRIPTI SINHA: Wes, I feel like you're going against the established rules of how we approve a document and it [inaudible] and this has happened before where there's a last-minute comment made and it derails our work. I'm not sure I fully understand what you're trying to say and I thought whatever changes had been made by Fred and Duane while we were debating this addressed your issues. And then it went into the stable document phase and now to bring this up just is so unorthodox. So, I don't know how to proceed, but Brad, back to you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Thank you. With the [inaudible] Wes, I kind of agree on your part. Now, you bring up an issue that may be important and I think that the way to deal with it is to put this to a test to see if majority of the group thinks that that is important enough to [inaudible] document. And by doing that, that's actually to bring it to a vote for adoption. We will then see if the majority of the members still think it's worth publishing [inaudible], then it will be published. And if not, then it will be withdrawn and we can continue to work on it. So, it's actually rather simple. The process, for me, is rather simple. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Liman. Anything further? Liman suggested taking a vote on moving the document forward with a formal vote or taking it back for editing. Are there any thoughts on that?

TRIPTI SINHA: I like Liman's suggestion. I think we move forward with that.

BRAD VERD: Alright. So, is there a motion on the table to hold a vote on whether to move forward with the formal vote or send it back for editing? I think I worded that right.

RYAN STEPHENSON: I'll put a motion on the floor, on the table, for a motion to vote.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Please don't complicate it. The point is: does the group want to publish the document?

BRAD VERD: Sorry, Liman. You broke up there. I think you said it was very simple. Does the group want to publish or not?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That is correct. Do we want to publish the document? If it turns out that we do not want to publish the document, then we can continue from there and have a second argument about what to do with it, whether to drop it entirely or to continue with it. The first [inaudible] does the group want to publish the current standing document? That's it. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Okay. I agree that's what we're trying to get to, but there is ... I'm trying to think of a procedural way to get there.

FRED BAKER: I think Liman's suggestion is actually a good one. If we vote to publish the document, that kind of closes the discussion. If we choose not to publish the document, then either we're dropping it or it has to be edited and we can choose to interpret it as taking editing instructions.

BRAD VERD: So, it sounds like we're going forward with a formal vote, then, to approve the document for publishing as it sits in its current state.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, please. Thank you, Fred.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Thank you. Sorry for my misinterpretation. Well, then, given that discussion, we will hold the vote. Is there a motion on the floor to approve – let me get the title right – the Advisory on Organizational Reviews?

FRED BAKER: Sure. I'll make that motion. I'll move that.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Is there a second?

TRIPTI SINHA: I'll second.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman second, please.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Tripti and Liman both seconded. Alright. Normally, we [inaudible] got to do this with, given the contention. Are there any opposed to publishing the document as stated? If so, please acknowledge.

RYAN STEPHENSON: This is Ryan Stephenson from DoD NIC. I would really like to see ... I understand that it was last minute, but I kind of would like to see further inputs and a little bit more work done on this. And if, Wes, you need any assistance, please let me know.

BRAD VERD: So, you're opposed, correct?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yes.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. We're done discussing. We're just voting now.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Okay. Sure.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Ryan. So, that was an opposed. Are there any other opposed votes?

WES HARDAKER: Yes, [inaudible] oppose and would be willing to work on the text as well.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Wes. That's two. Any others?

KEVIN JONES: Kevin Jones, NASA.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Kevin, NASA. Any others? Alright, so three opposed. Are there any abstentions?

MATT LARSON: Yeah, this is Matt Larson. I abstain.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Thank you, Matt.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is Liman [inaudible]. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Liman. I'm trying to do a count in my head. Carlos, can you give me a count on where we stand if we have three abstentions, three

opposed, and based upon the attendance here that leaves one, two, three, four ... Is that right? Do I have four yeses?

CARLOS REYES: So, three opposed and two abstentions. That's five. And there's a total of ten operators present. So, assuming the others are for it, that would be five-four. So, it wouldn't pass at this point.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Great, so we've answered that question, then. The document will ... Was somebody trying to say something? No? Okay. This will go back for editing or non-publication. I assume it's going to go back for editing and be resubmitted to the group. But, with that, we'll move on. Carlos, can I get the agenda back up, please?

CARLOS REYES: Yes. I apologize. Wes has his hand up.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: I apologize again for bringing an issue so late to the table. What I would suggest, what I propose, is that I will work on text in the next, say, two days. I will work with I think both Ryan and Kevin agreed to help, or at least Ryan.

KEVIN JONES: Yeah. I'm willing to help, too.

WES HARDAKER: Okay. So, if we can come up with something that works, we'll put it to the group and we can do an electronic vote in two weeks or so, as I think Liman or somebody else originally proposed.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you, Wes. We'll look forward to it. Again, agenda 4C, second item, draft feasibility assessment and initial implementation plan. Carlos, do you want to give a read out on that?

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. Hi, everyone. Quick update. If you recall, the next step in the organizational review is for the RSSAC to propose an initial feasibility assessment and implementation plan to the ICANN Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee. So, the review work party, Brad, Tripti, Kaveh, Liman, and Hiro have a draft. We worked on this. I worked on it with them about two weeks ago. That will be shared shortly with RSSAC for your review and then we'll go through the approval process to send that over to the OEC. So, please, watch your inboxes for it.

Unfortunately, the document doesn't really lend itself to Google Docs just because of the template, so it'll be a Word document. So, if you

could just work with me on tracking, making sure that I have your edits, if you have any But I'll be tracking that document for the group.

I don't know if anyone from the review work party has anything to add, but that's the update. Back to you, Brad.

BRAD VERD:

Thanks. I would just add to that topic that this is the document where all the recommendations are called out and we kind of address them or try to address them on how we see going forward with that. So, if everybody could please take some time, read it and provide input, it would be really helpful. I know the RWP has spent some time on this and we've made lots of input to it. We think we've covered things, but fresh eyes are always helpful. Alright, moving on. Agenda 4D, RSSAC appointments update. Back to you, Carlos.

CARLOS REYES:

Thanks, Brad. Hi, everyone. Quick update. As you know, the RSSAC is divided into basically three classes with about four operators rotating their appointments every year. This year, the appointments that we're tracking are from ISC, ICANN Org, Netnod, and Verisign. We have heard from three of the operators. The deadline is this Friday, so once we have their intentions, I will prepare the paperwork for the ICANN board to confirm them and you'll receive a notice with all four of them. Just wanted to let you know that that is in progress.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Carlos, can I add something?

CARLOS REYES: Yes, of course.

TRIPTI SINHA: Roughly about a year ago I had shared with the [admin] committee and with several of you that at the end of my co-chair term, which is December of this year, I was not going to return to RSSAC, so there would be a new primary representative and of course the existing alternate. But now with the board appointment, I will be leaving even sooner. So, end of Barcelona is when I will step down and you will have a new [inaudible] from University of Maryland. So, Carlos, I'll send you all the information this week.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti.

BRAD VERD: Alright, moving on, 4E is liaison to the RZERC selection update. Carlos, again, with you.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks. Quick update. The deadline for candidates is this Friday. As of right now, Brad who is the incumbent, is the only person who has expressed interest. So, depending on the timeline, I'll work with either Brad if he is the only candidate or we'll have to initiate a selection process if there's another candidate. But, that's on track as well.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. Any questions or comments? No? Okay.

FRED BAKER: Well, so I do have a question.

BRAD VERD: Go ahead, Fred.

FRED BAKER: So, we're selecting you, Brad, to continue for another two years or selecting someone for your slot.

BRAD VERD: No, no. This is liaison to the RZERC.

FRED BAKER: Oh, okay. I missed that. Okay. Cool.

BRAD VERD: That's a yearly appointment.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. I didn't [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: It's all good. Any other questions or comments? Alright. 4F, this will be a big one. ICANN 63 planning and our draft schedule. Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: Thanks. As you know, ICANN 63 is approaching again and we have a draft schedule that we've been working on with the admin team. A few things are still falling into place, mainly in the second part of the week, which is some work sessions and the joint meeting with OCTO. But, as we work to finalize the times for those, in the meantime, we can get started on the questions for the ICANN board.

You'll see a document there. We received two questions from the ICANN board to RSSAC. One is the standard question about priorities. Then the second question is about how to balance the need for effective policies with accountability, transparency, expectations, and ICANN resources. So, that's a pretty complicated question, but it's captured there.

Brad, I think if the group wants to add any questions for the board in that document, we can track that. Those are due to the board by October 1st. Brad, I don't know if you have anything to add.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. This is the normal prep for an ICANN meeting where board asks us questions and this is the call for questions from RSSAC. Are there questions that we want to ask the board and/or separately SSAC or OCTO? So, we need to start thinking of those questions. We need to document them because we have to get them to the board in time to

meet their deadline and also to allow the other groups time to prepare for whatever our questions are. So, if you have those, please provide them. We'll send out e-mails in the coming weeks to remind you that we need your questions. Is there any that anybody can think of right now that we should certainly talk about? Ryan, your hand is up.

RYAN STEPHENSON:

Yes. This is just to the board and then also for the overall ICANN 63 planning. Whether the board has made any final decision about RSSAC 037. Maybe the chairs could even answer this or maybe Kaveh could answer this.

Also, I remember we've kind of developed a plan to socialize RSSAC 037 out to the various advisory committees and supporting organizations. Will we be doing that ICANN 63 or is it just going to be the normal work sessions and so forth? Hopefully, that makes sense. Thank you.

BRAD VERD:

I think it makes sense. Are we going to go through the schedule here, Carlos, or are you just going to share it? [inaudible].

CARLOS REYES:

Yeah, we shared. It's been shared and I can see a few people on there now.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I don't think there's an active socialization plan of RSSAC 037 and 038 for Barcelona. Right now, we're waiting on the board. Obviously, if there are other advisory committees that have questions or concerns, we'll certainly address those in our meetings or one on one with chairs and come back and report on it. Tripti, do you have anything further?

TRIPTI SINHA: No. I think you captured it all. We're just waiting for ... I think when you cover your report on the discussion with Goran, I think that will answer Ryan's questions. Yeah.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. We haven't been directly asked any questions from the other SO/AC chairs. Just comments stating great work. So, no specific questions thus far.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Any further questions around ICANN 63?

CARLOS REYES: Just one quick thing. Russ typically takes the lead on RSSAC/SSAC. Obviously, Russ feel free to initiate those conversations. Mario, Cathy, and I worked behind the scenes to make sure that there was time on both group's schedules, so we kept you out of that because scheduling

can be complicated. But feel free to run with the document that I started for you, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Great. Thanks, Carlos. I'll do that and send something to each of the groups.

BRAD VERD: Great. So, we have action items. Emails will be forthcoming looking for questions. If you don't have any now, please document them and share them with us. Moving on to 4G, ICANN fellowship program. Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. I'll be brief with this. Some of you may recall roughly a year ago the ICANN community started some conversations about the effectiveness of the ICANN fellowship program. That then evolved into basically a consultation with the community from ICANN Org about how to improve the fellowship program and there's a new proposal to restructure the program and give it some more definition. As part of that, there is a call for volunteers. One volunteer from every SO and AC to join a selection committee. And this selection committee would review applicants for the fellowship program. It's a two-year commitment. It's not mandatory on RSSAC to do this, but in our discussions with the co-chairs, we thought given the workload on RSSAC, this may be an opportunity to share with the caucus. There may be some caucus members that may be interested in this.

Then, separately, as part of the restructure for the fellowship program, there will be a formal mentoring component to it. So, at some point, there will be a request for a mentor from RSSAC as well. Again, the thought is we would share that with the caucus to see if there are any members who might be interested in that.

I'll pause here to see if there are any questions, but the intent is for staff to share that with the caucus and to see what interest we get.

BRAD VERD: No comments or questions?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman, if I may.

BRAD VERD: Please, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I will just [inaudible] support for this [inaudible] first heard you talk, I said, "Oh, no, that's overcomplicating the process," [inaudible] complicated process [inaudible] but to ask the caucus to do that is actually a very good idea.

For the mentoring part, I think that is more important and I think it is a good idea to have it in caucus, but if that doesn't turn out well, then we should put ourselves to actually be mentors for fellows. My personal [inaudible] but that's actually well-invested time. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Liman. Fred, your hand is up.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. I'm involved in a similar activity in the IETF. The Internet Society sends from policy fellows which are regulators, and some technical fellows which are usually operators to IETF meetings. I've been involved both on the selection side and the mentoring side in that context. I'm not sure I'm volunteering to be the guy on the job, but I think I'd like to talk with him or her, basically because I have some experience in doing that kind of thing.

BRAD VERD: Great. That would be a great resource. With nothing further, we'll look for that to come out from staff to RSSAC and the caucus.

We are on item five, work items, in our new work parties. First one is service coverage of RSS work party updates. Andrew, I think you're going to be leading most of these.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. There were two new calls for participation sent to the RSSAC caucus a couple of weeks ago. One for the service coverage work party and the other one for the resolver behaviors work party. Those have since closed. The calls for participation have closed. For each work party ... Let's see. For the service coverage work party, we've got ten people signed up and for the resolver study work party we have nine people

that signed up. We've got some GDPR compliance things where we have to get people to agree to join a mailing list. We're going to get that sorted and we should have a mailing list set up this week and then we can send out a Doodle for the first work party meetings. And then the first order of business for those work parties will be to pick a leader. And then according to the operational procedures, if that leader is not an RSSAC member, then there will be a shepherd as well. That's the quick update on both of those work parties.

I see the next two items are for me as well, but I'll pause here in case people have questions about either of those work parties.

BRAD VERD:

Any questions or comments for Andrew? Why don't you go ahead and take it again, Andrew, regarding ...

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

I will go on then. The packet sizes work party met on August 20th. It was a rather sparsely attended meeting. I've been having some conversations with the work party leader, George Michaelson. He's not entirely sure that the work party needs to continue, so I would expect an e-mail from him to the work party list soon kind of kicking off that discussion, see if there's interest in this work party continuing or maybe just shutting down. That's the update there. Does anyone have any questions on that? No questions on that.

RSO identification. That's a document that ... Unfortunately, [Carey] isn't on the call. He sends his apologies. But that was a document I was

working on with Terry. The intention is to get it out to the RSSAC, but it's not quite there yet. Still working on it. So, that will be sent to the RSSAC when it's ready. And that's it. Back to you, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you so much. I have some edits that I'd like to do on the identification one, also, so I look forward to that coming out from Terry. 5E, RSSAC leadership structure concept paper. This has Steve or Carlos next to it. Is there one of you guys who can speak to that?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. Let me get started and Carlos can add. Kaveh is not able to join the call today. We had a discussion at the last RSSAC meeting on the concept paper and there are several revisions proposed, so we accepted those, [inaudible] taking out the funding issue of the rationale and also added the SSAC leadership structure in the appendix. So, that's where the document is now. Any quick thoughts on this revised [inaudible]?

BRAD VERD: Doesn't look like it.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. One thing we were thinking is the discussion of the concept is still kind of a bit abstract and there's not enough material for people to respond to. Hearing from the conversation there were some saying they don't mind [inaudible] structure and others expressed there's not enough details. So, one idea staff were thinking is we draft some – not

we, but probably the update the RSSAC [inaudible] procedure. We draft some language. Perhaps Kevin can help, can [inaudible] draft some language specific to the effect if RSSAC were to move to a chair/vice chair model, what are the responsibilities of the chair and what are the responsibilities of the vice chair? Then, have those more concrete language in front of the RSSAC again for discussion. Perhaps that would make the discussion more concrete when RSSAC has text, specific text, to respond to. So, that's a suggestion. What do people think?

BRAD VERD:

I think that follows suit with what we've done in the past with taking concept papers where we gather our thoughts and then we sit down and make something out of it. I think it would be helpful to have draft language that we could see to have a better discussion.

STEVE SHENG:

Okay. Thanks, Brad. Any other thoughts?

BRAD VERD:

Any other comments? Alright. Well, that's a good segue into our last item five agenda topic which is 000. Kevin and Carlos I think are working on updates.

KEVIN JONES:

Carlos and I have produced a working draft on some of the changes and we made note that the language that was just discussed for how we would potentially change from co-chairs to the chair and vice chair

would also need to be added to that. So, we will continue that discussion and try and send something out soon and make sure that's out in advance before the next meeting.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Thank you, Kevin. Any questions or comments for Kevin?

STEVE SHENG: Just one last point on the leadership structure. I think RSSAC agreed on this already, but I just want to explicitly confirm again. There is no way those changes can be made for this [inaudible]. So, what's in the concept paper is we'll continue to discuss this idea until RSSAC reaches an agreement, but in the meantime, for this year, to elect a co-chair in December of 2018 to serve only one year. And then [inaudible] changes in place, then both co-chairs will finish their terms in December 2019 for the new election and if the RSSAC in the end do not agree to change, then the co-chair elected this year will be extended one-year term for the usual [operational] procedure. I just want to reconfirm that with the RSSAC.

BRAD VERD: I would have to go back to the minutes and double check that. I don't know that off the top of my head. Any other comments? Alright, we're getting there.

Agenda topic six, this is future workshops. I had this added to the agenda. I wanted to start a discussion here and then maybe not ... We don't need to come to any answers or anything today, but have this be

the beginning of a discussion that we can pick up in Barcelona when we're face-to-face.

The question came up are we having a workshop in the fall? Obviously, everybody knows that we said no. No workshop in the fall because we finished RSSAC 038 and we're waiting for feedback. So, that came up. Then the topic came up do we still need workshops? What are we going to do with that?

So, I started kind of brainstorming, thinking through things, and I wanted to share some thoughts with everybody and start a discussion. My idea is that there's a lot of work that RSSAC has in, let's call it, in the hopper or in the parking lot. One, because there's resource contention. So, we can only have so many work parties going on at any given time.

Two, I think there's a lot of technical work that needs to be done or could be done in advance of any feedback from the board on 037 and 038. We talked about all those technical things that need to be defined and written. Whether or not or however the board comes back on 037 and 038, I believe that any work done on those on the technical nature will be of value.

So, my thought was that we could identify some of those and maybe take workshop time face-to-face, work on those, open the workshops up to the caucus and start moving the needle on some of that stuff. I wanted to get feedback, see what people thought of that idea, if there were other ideas. What do we want to do with the workshop time and the workshop budgets and whatnot moving forward? Any questions or thoughts? I see none.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm having a hard time following this. Apologies from my side. I have to [inaudible] at least for a bit now because I need to navigate an airport. I'll try to log back on. But, good question. Happy to have it discussed [inaudible]. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Thank you, Liman. We'll look forward to talking with you in Barcelona. Russ, your hand is up.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. Thanks, Brad. I think both of the areas that you've suggested are certainly worth talking about to decide if it's reached the workshopable state. But, clearly, the things associated with 037, there were a number of things, as you note, that were put sort of "well, we'll talk about those later" and it sure seems to me that later has arrived. Whether or not they follow exactly the plan that's been laid out or something different, the technical details, I think you're right on, have to be worked up and generated in more depth. So, I think that's a very viable suggestion.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you, Russ. Any other comments or thoughts? I don't see much. We will put this on the agenda for one of the work sessions in Barcelona. So, we'll look forward. If you guys could [inaudible] on this, spend some time thinking about it, come up with your own ideas or something else. Let's talk though it and come up with a plan or idea on how we plan to address our workshop question in 2019.

We're onto reports. So, these are the liaison and co-chair reports. I'll start with the co-chair report. The only thing that has happened since our last meeting is that the co-chairs had a call with Goran. It's our normal phone call that he does with all the SOs and ACs prior to the ICANN meeting. So, this was normally scheduled stuff.

He shared with us a couple of things. One was his term as CEO extended by a year. So, he has three-and-a-half years left now on his contract. On top of that, there were two goals that the board gave him. Now, the board gave him a bunch of goals, but two of his goals related to us specifically. First and foremost was he had to come up with a crisis communication plan for coordination with the root server operators. He had to develop and exercise that plan. He stated very openly that he didn't want to reinvent the wheel and if something already existed he was more than willing to leverage that. So, just to let people know that that's coming and to take it back to your teams, specifically your operational teams.

Then, the second one was he was given a goal from the board specific to RSSAC 038 and figuring out the governance plan and how to move things forward. He just stated that he wanted to be very cautious moving forward. He wanted to respect the independence of the root server operators and he also wanted to respect the proposal given to him from RSSAC as he didn't want it to change or morph into something that we didn't see or want coming. That pretty much summed up the call and he looked forward to seeing everybody in Barcelona. Tripti, anything to add?

TRIPTI SINHA: No, I think you covered it all.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Any questions?

RYAN STEPHENSON: This is Ryan. I apologize. I don't have my hand up.

BRAD VERD: Go ahead, Ryan.

RYAN STEPHENSON: When he meant crisis communication plan, what did he mean by the word crisis? Is it a root server operator were to go under or there's a crisis within the root server system, like a DDos attack? What's [inaudible]?

BRAD VERD: My interpretation ... He didn't specifically say, but my interpretation was that this was an operational thing, meaning DDos attacks, something happened, there's an outage or whatnot. Not the idea that we've talked about in the policy side on how do you address it if one were to just disappear type of thing. This was an operational plan.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Thank you very much for clarifying. Thank you, sir.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Any other questions or comments? Alright, we'll move down the list here. I'm sorry, did somebody say something?

FRED BAKER: Well, I started to.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry, is somebody speaking?

FRED BAKER: My question comes back to what's the definition of a crisis. How would this differ from send an e-mail to Root Ops? Why would the crisis be coming from ICANN? I would think, if anything, Root Ops would be telling ICANN we had a DDos or whatever it was.

TRIPTI SINHA: If I could chime in.

BRAD VERD: Please, go ahead, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: Fred, I think when Goran said that, he was putting on an operator hat. I think he was coming from the angle of L root because he does wear two hats as the CEO of ICANN and also as an operator. So, I think the board

... He says the board instructed him to come up with a crisis communication plan. But, you ask a very good question which is shouldn't this be done by Root Ops? Perhaps the right thing for Goran to do is to then follow with [inaudible] to Root Ops. But I'm just trying to give you the context and why it came to him. At least that was my understanding.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. I don't want to pre-judge. I have lots of questions myself, but we'll see what the request is and we will respond with all these types of questions. We share it with you guys, so that you can think about these questions and be ready when it comes.

TRIPTI SINHA:

And we did share this with Goran when he did ask that question. We said this is not a question for the co-chairs of RSSAC. This is for Root Ops and we will funnel this to Root Ops. We did actually say exactly that to him on the call.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. We said this was purely operational.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. That's fine.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Moving on. Kaveh is not here to report from the board. Liman, I don't know if you're in a position to give any update or if there is any update for the CSC. Okay, it sounds like he's moved on.

RZERC, myself. The only update here is that RZERC gave their statement to the board for the KSK roll. Everybody should have seen that. That was the major output from RZERC. I don't have anything else from there unless there is a question.

SSAC, Russ, anything to share?

RUSS MUNDY: Nothing of particular direct report at this point. I did want to let folks know that SSAC will be having their workshop at the end of this month, and unlike RSSAC, we don't normally put out a report on the content. I don't know if that will be the same this year. But I will bring back relevant items, one of which I kind of expect to be the results of the SSAC discussion about the interactions between the various components of ICANN, in particular the way that the KSK rollover question was handled and the whole process associated with that. So, hopefully, we'll have some useful feedback that I can bring back to RSSAC which might or might not affect how things impact RSSAC in the future. That's it. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Russ. Daniel, anything from the IAB? Maybe Daniel is not with us.

DANIEL MIGAULT: No. I put in the chat I have nothing to report.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Great. Thank you. Sorry, I didn't see that.

DANIEL MIGAULT: No problem.

BRAD VERD: Alright. IANA Functions Operator. Naela, anything to share?

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah, thank you. Two quick things. One is around annual surveys. Our customer service will have the annual one [inaudible] month in September where we survey all customers that used the IANA services in the last year and ask how their experience was. Then, another thing we're introducing in the next month or so is an after-ticket service. So, each time the service is used, what was the experience like? So, that's on the surveys. Then, the IANA budget is being finalized, submitted. It will of course follow all the budgetary processes which includes a release for public comment in the next I believe month or two, so that's one place to look for community input at that point. And that's it.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you, Naela. Any questions for Naela? Alright. Moving on. Root zone maintainer. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Thanks. I'll just briefly mention that last week there was a meeting between Verisign and ICANN and [inaudible] relating to the KSK rollover. So, assuming that it [inaudible] move forward and the board approves [inaudible] how we've actually [inaudible] rollover on October 11th, where people will be, what time things will happen and things like that. So, that meeting took place last week and it went very well.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you, Duane. Any questions for Duane?

TRIPTI SINHA: Just a quick. If you remember, last October 11th, we were all I think in a workshop together, if you remember, and we were concerned that the KSK rollover was going to happen. So, anyway, just going down memory lane.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Well, this year it's interesting because it's very close to the DNS OARC meeting. So, some of us will actually be in Amsterdam on the 11th.

TRIPTI SINHA: I see.

BRAD VERD:

Alright. That concludes our liaison updates and we move on to any other business. We only have one topic here which was the ICANN [inaudible] I think is how it's called. I'm not sure. It is just here. Liman is going to send a written update. This was added. It was identified by the admin team. It is a conference that was being held in Estonia and the only reason it was really brought to our attention was because there was a session that was labeled The Future of Root Governance. There were a number of ICANN members there, either on the panel or in attendance, and our own Liman was on the panel, so we asked for an update. So, he will provide that in writing later. I really don't have it ... If there are any questions, I'm happy to try to address them, but I was not there.

Alright, no questions. Is there anything else that we need to cover in any other business? If not, I see no hands, I see nothing in the chat. I will thank you for your time and we will adjourn the meeting. Thank you so much. Have a wonderful day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]