UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	-- and his name is not correctly spelt in the roster to the left, there's no C in Patrik.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Okay. Carlos, could that be corrected, please? Patrik's an apology and Liman is on the call. From RIPE?

KAVEH RANJBAR:	Kaveh is here.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Okay Kaveh, is Daniel on the call?

KAVEH RANJBAR:	No, I believe he won't join.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Okay, thank you. Daniel is an apology. From ICANN, Matt.

PAUL PAUL VIXIE:	Can you hear me?

TRIPTI SINHA:	Welcome Paul. From Cogent we have Vixie. From ICANN?

MATT WEINBERG: Matt is here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Matt, welcome; and I believe Terry is an apology. From WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, welcome Hiro. IANA Functions Operator?

NAELA SARRAS: Naela is here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, welcome Naela. Root Zone Maintainer?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

TRIPTI SINHA: Welcome Duane. IAB Liaison? Daniel, are you here? Okay, I don't hear anything. SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY:	Russ is here, good morning.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Good morning. Liaison to the Board, Kaveh is here. Liaison to CSC, Liman is here and Liaison to RZERC is Brad and he is here. From Staff we've got Andres, Carlos, Steve and Mario. Am I correct, are all of you here? Thank you. Carlos, can we display the agenda on the main screen please?
HOWARD KASH:	This is Howard Kash, I joined a little bit late.
TRIPTI SINHA:	From ARL we have Howard Kash on the call as well. Carlos, could you adjust the attendance on the left-hand panel, from ARL we've got Howard Kash well. We've got a full house today. We have just about everyone, I don't think Daniel's connected yet.
	I'd like to start by first welcoming our new members, not everyone is on the call but we have Keith from NASA, as I depart I'd like to welcome you. We've got several changes in representation, from ICANN Matt will be taking on a primary role from January 1 and Terry will be the alternate from NASA we've got Keith and Tim. Is someone saying something?

MATT WEINBERG: Yeah Tripti, this is Matt. My understanding was that change in roles was effective immediately, not January 1st, for ICANN.

TRIPTI SINHA: Oh, I see. Okay, you mean from ICANN?

LARSON: Yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, Carlos, that's need to be corrected then because the earlier roster showed January 1, so affective immediately Matt is the primary and Terry is the alternate. Replacing me is Carl Royce, I don't believe he is on the call but he will replace me on October 25th. Jerry will remain as the alternate for the University of Maryland and Netnod, the alternate now is Patrik and he was unable to join us. Welcome Keith to your first RSSAC call.

Let's do a quick review of the agenda. We have numerous administration items, your standard approvals from last calls meeting and caucus membership updates and ICANN 63 planning and updates on the co-chair elections and then we'll move on to discussion on our pending items on the RSSAC Organizational Review, then discussion of work items and Liman sent an email yesterday which we will discuss that at length and then of course, updates on reports from the liaison.

Then any other business, Brad will discuss the next phone call. Before we run the agenda, would someone like to add something to the call?

Alright, hearing none, let's start with item number four, which is the draft minutes from the September 4th call, Mario, over to you.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Tripti this is Mario. I have distributed on the mailing list the latest draft minutes. I believe some of you have received and some of the new members I could forward that to you. I can actually just update from the action item from the previous teleconference, we just have one pending, which is RSSAC to discuss the RSO Identification Document during the next teleconference, which is this one.

The rest of the action items that you can see on the draft minutes have all been completed. I have also fixed one small typo on Lars-Johan Liman, that's just to the name and from the rest of that I have not heard any other feedback. Thank you, back over to you Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Mario. Does anyone have any questions about the minutes from the September the 4th call? Alright, hearing none, do I have a motion to approve the minutes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: As so motioned from Liman.

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, thank you. A second please?

KAVEH RANJBAR:	Kaveh, second.

TRIPTI SINHA:	Thank you, Kaveh. As always, I like to start with anyone abstaining? Anyone not for the minutes? Hearing none, let's assume the minutes are approved. I just wanted to note that Daniel Migault just joined the call, if that could be updated please, thank you.

Moving on to the RSSAC Caucus Membership Update, I'm going to turn this over to Matt Weinberg now.

MATT WEINBERG:	Thanks, Tripti. First of there were no new caucus applications this past month that were discussed, so news on that. There was something that we did talk about, going to enlist Carlos to help explain it because he's probably going to be able explain it better than I can. Carlos, can you talk a little bit about the ICANN Fellowship Program Selection Committee?

CARLOS REYES:	Thank you, Matt. Hi everyone this is Carlos. A few months ago, the ICANN Organization purposed some changes to the ICANN Fellowship Program, where the community would be more involved in the selection of fellows. Every supporting organization and advisory committee was invited to appoint one representative. After discussing this with the Admin Team and raising this month with the RSSAC, we agreed to take this opportunity to the caucus.

We conducted basically a call for applicants, we received five names and the Membership Committee reviewed those statements of interested. There's a provision in RSSAC Operational Procedures that basically asks the Membership Committee to consider appointment for new groups that are not currently captured in the Operational Procedures and the thinking behind a few years ago when we implemented that, was that the Membership Committee would be in the best position to evaluate applicants from the caucus itself. I'll defer to Matt to give an overview of the two candidates that the Membership Committee discussed but that is the background.

MATT WEINBERG: Thanks Carlos. There were five applications like Carlos. There were really two applicants that were most thorough and showed true interest and rose to the top of consideration by the Membership Committee. Those two candidates were Amir Qayyum and Naveed. Both applications were good and came with some amount of referrals as well. We actually reached to Nav and asked him because he was our first recommendation, our first choice I guess you could say, that we wanted to recommend here and there's also an ICANN Mentorship Program spot that's opening up, is that right Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: Correct. As part of the Fellowship Program, there's going to be a mentoring component and that will happen later next month.

MATT WEINBERG: We spoke to Naveed and asked him if he had a specific preference for being on the mentorship side or just on the Fellowship Selection Committee? He expressed interest in the Mentorship Program because he's done that in the past as well, so with that we want to recommend Amir Qayyum as the nominee. His Statement of Interest is included in the agenda that was sent by Carlos. That's where we landed, was recommending Amir Qayyum.

TRIPTI SINHA: Does anyone have any questions about this particular nomination of Matt please?

MATT WEINBERG: Hopefully it's pretty straightforward. The Statement of Interest we all thought was good and that's where we landed.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, no hands have gone up. We need a motion to appoint Amir Qayyum, right Matt?

MATT WEINBERG: Yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, so do I have a motion to approve Amir?

PAUL VIXIE: I so move.

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

WES HARDAKER: I second.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Wes. Anyone abstaining? Anyone not in favor? I'm assuming everyone else is for the appointment. So, Amir Qayyum is the ICANN Fellowship representative for RSSAC. Thank you.

Moving on. Carlos, would you like to just go over the RSSAC appointments please.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks. Tripti more of less gave an update earlier but I'll quickly review everything. We have four operators that are part of the reappointment process that's here. If you recall, there are three classes of RSSAC members, roughly four operators for each. For this year we had ICANN Org and that switched Matt mentioned is actually effective immediately, so we'll go ahead and update the website for that. Matt Larson is the new primary and Terry is the alternate.

The other operator, part of your reappointment process is ISC, there was no switch there and then no switch from Verisign, so Brad, Matt, Brad and Jeff remain the same. Netnod was the fourth and Netnod has

replaced their alternate with Patrik Faltstrom. Then apart from those four, we also had two other things, one from NASA, both the primary and the alternate representatives have changed, so welcome Keith and Tom.

As Tripti mentioned, Carl will replace here affective October 25th when she steps down from the RSSAC. Everyone has been added to the list at the request of the various operators and we'll go ahead and fix the website with the ICANN Org change.

TRIPTI SINHA: Carlos, would you like to share the discussion we had about some form of orientation for the four new members coming in?

CARLOS REYES: Sure, very good point Tripti. Because there are several new faces and we haven't really had this many new faces in a while, I'll be working with Mario to offer a light onboarding, a light weight onboarding. We're preparing some documents for our new members and we'll probably have a call with them in the near future, then offer them the opportunity to ask any questions of that Admin Team as well.

Again, this is relatively new, we haven't had this many new members in a while but we wanted to make sure that they were aware of operational procedures and the calendar and other administrative items related to being part of RSSAC, so we'll be working on that.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Carlos. Moving on -- were there any questions about this, of Carlos, anyone? Alright, no hand is gone up. Once again, a very warm welcome to the new members.

Moving on to item 4D and I'm going to turn this right back to Carlos again. This is an update on ICANN 63 planning. Carlos, back to you.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti. Sorry everyone, just one final point about the appointment. For the four that were part of the cycle, ICANN Org, Netnod, ISC and Verisign, I'm submitting the paperwork for the resolutions to have the ICANN Board confirm those appointments. I forgot to mention that.

On to ICANN 63, as you may have seen yesterday, the public schedule for ICANN 63 was published. Everything is confirmed now in terms of the various RSSAC work sessions. Mario and I will be updating the document, the spreadsheet, the Google Sheet that we have for all of you to track all of this, with remote participation and all that various information.

One thing to keep in mind is every RSSAC session is open except for the meeting with SSAC. That's in line with RSSAC discussion and decision earlier this year to make everything open by default now, that's in place for ICANN 63. The RSSAC dinner will be on Monday, look for details soon about that. Apart from that, just stayed tuned. We're working with the Admin Team to develop agendas for each individual session and we'll share that as that comes together. I'll go back to Tripti and I think we're going to go over the various joint meetings now.

TRIPTI SINHA: Right, thank you Carlos. So, as you know we typically have a joint meeting at the ICANN Public Meeting and one is with the ICANN Board, so I'm going to turn it over to Brad now, as he will run the particular items. Brad.

BRAD VERD: Hello everyone. There was a call a couple weeks back for questions for the ICANN Board, for OCTO and since then obviously we have and SSAC meeting and ALAC has requested a meeting with us in Barcelona. I didn't see any questions come from anybody on the list. Staff and I didn't see anything. I drafted a number of questions and put them on the Google Doc, which has been out there for a while and I wanted to get peoples feedback on the questions.

The questions are based on the resolutions that were made recently by the Board. Kaveh shared those resolutions with us in email and if you go and read the larger resolution, there's much more then what Kaveh shared, it's actually a pretty long read. There were a number of questions in my eyes that were raised and I put a couple of them in the document. I wanted to -- a series of people have seen these, if they've read them, if there's any feedback from them?

The first one is questions for the Board. Obviously, they've asked two questions of us that we need to be prepared to answer and these are the canned questions we get every time. What are your main priorities? The second one, how should ICANN Multi Stakeholder Model of

Governance Policy Development evolve the balance? Neither of these are too surprising.

My questions to the Board that I've shared here with the group that I wanted to get feedback, really kind of drive around the scope of the resolutions and their impact on RRAC 37, which obviously hasn't been implanted yet. Then a little bit of clarity on some of the commentary that they have within the resolution. I guess the first question, have people read this? If they have, are there any questions or thoughts that you want to share?

Obviously, the questions to the Board were due yesterday, we missed that and we'd like to get it to them as soon as possible. I'd like to have some dialog on this, some feedback. If there is no feedback and everybody is fine with it, we'll send it as is but we'd certainly like feedback before the end of the week if you have any. Any questions on the one for the Board? The links are there in the agenda, so you can pull up the Google Document.

TRIPTI SINHA: Kaveh, go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Brad thank you. Just as a point of clarification, I normally just share the result part of the Board resolutions because they're long but the rational section, which is normally in the minutes but I have never shared them. Just a clarification. Comment on the questions, I've read your comments and generally I agree with them. I don't see any reason to make any

changes and I think they're fair questions. It's good to get clarification both from OCTO and from the Board.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Kaveh. Please don't take my comment as slant against what you shared, I just wanted people to understand where the questions were coming from. There's a link to the resolutions in the Google Document or actually in the question, so you can link to it and see the full read.

Moving on, going to the questions to OCTO, essentially the four questions that I proposed to the Board, I essentially proposed to OCOT but kind of rephrased them so that they're not going -- the questions to the Board were to the Board, I'm not asking OCTO what the Board's thoughts are, so I'm asking them more as to what they're interpretation of the scope is and then can they explain how the Board was informed on some of the Board's comments, as I assume OCTO is informing them. Essentially the same four questions that I sent to the Board were rephrased specifically for OCTO on the OCTO questions.

Again, I don't see any hands or comments. Liman, there are no questions from ALAC. ALAC has requested that they have a meeting with us to go over the governance of RSSAC 37, the governance proposal, which essentially is the same slide deck that we did at the last ICANN meeting that was open to all ICANN, I think we'll just present that to ALAC directly.

KAVEH RANJBAR:	Thank you. I was referring to the agenda we have in front of us, there is a link, joint meeting with the ALAC, that link doesn't work. I don't know what was behind it, I imagine it was questions.
BRAD VERD:	I'm sorry the link doesn't work for you, it does for me. The only thing on the agenda is RSSAC 37, unless we have specific questions for ALAC that we want to ask them but there have been none proposed yet.
KAVEH RANJBAR:	Okay, thank you.
BRAD VERD:	And same with SSAC, Russ, I'm deferring that to you. I'm not driving for questions, I assume you're going to do a call for questions and share that with people back and forth.
RUSS MUNDY:	Yes, thanks Brad. That's the plan. I have four agendas that I'll talk about at the liaison report time, we can discuss further then if that's okay?
BRAD VERD:	Okay, great we can talk about it then. Alright, we'll I guess that's all I'll share on the questions for ICANN and OCTO, please review them, please provide feedback in the Google Document. As I stated, we'd like to get this done by the end of this week since we've already missed the requested timeline or deadline from the Board.

TRIPTI: Matt, has a question.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry.

MATT WEINBERG: Yes Brad, when is your deadline for feedback? When do you want to send these to the Board and OCTO respectively?

BRAD VERD: Well, I'm asking for anybody here to give feedback by the end of the week. I'd like to have everybody agree on what we're sending to the Board so we can get it to them either on Monday or shortly there after the end of this week, is that reasonable?

MATT WEINBERG: Yup, thanks.

BRAD VERD: Tripti, back to you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, any other questions for Brad? Alright, no other hands have gone up. For item 4D three, Russ said that he would discuss that during his

	Liaison Report. Carlos, did you want to say anything else regarding the ALAC, the joint ALAC Meeting?
CARLOS REYES:	Nothing to add Tripti, as Brad mentioned, ALAC just asked for a briefing on the Governance Model from RSSAC 37.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Alright, thank you. Moving on to item 4E and this is the Co-Chair Election Process, Carlos is going to run us through that again, Carlos.
CARLOS REYES:	Thanks, Tripti. As you know, we're currently in the nomination period for the upcoming co-chair elections. That nomination period opened on 17th of September, so it will close on October 17. On October 10, a week from tomorrow I will be sending out the notice for the meeting that's going to happen in Barcelona on October 24 for that election. I'll send the timeline again so that everyone has it but I think just to keep in mind the nomination period closes on October 17th. Back to you Tripti.
TRIPTI SINHA:	Any questions for Carlos? Yes, Liman's hand has gone up. Liman, go ahead.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Thank you. I noted on the mailing list that Fred Bake was nominated and has accepted the nomination. Are there any more nominee's as of now?

CARLOS REYES: Good question Liman, as of right now, no.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Any other questions? Thank you. Alright, let's move on to item five and this is regarding the recent RSSAC Organizational Review and these are two items that are up for vote. On the last call the advisory that's been put together by the group on the Organizational Review, Wes has some changes and I believe those changes were worked on and a stable document was sent out to RSSAC.

                       Are there any questions about that document? I think Carlos was going to be sharing that on the screen right now. Alright, there's the advisory, are there any questions?   Any discussion about this particular document?

WES HARDAKER: Just a point of clarification.   A number of us worked on that text, including Suzanne, Kevin and oh now, blanking on the other person, Ryan, I think Ryan

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Any questions about that? Alright, the goal today is to vote on this document. Just to remind everyone, this will become an RSSAC

numbered document and it's also public comment period underway currently for feedback on reviews and on the last call we discussed submitting this to that as well. With that, preamble, is there a motion on the floor to approve this document? Is there a motion?

WES HARDAKER: I guess I'll make the motion, this is Wes.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you Wes. A second please?

STEPHENSON: This is Ryan Stephenson, I'll go ahead and second please.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you Ryan, a second from Ryan. Anyone abstaining from the vote? Anyone not for the vote?

MATT WEINBERG: Tripti, ICANN abstains.

TRIPTI SINHA: ICANN abstains, thank you Matt. So, ICANN is abstention, anyone not for the vote? Assuming the rest of us are for approving this particular advisory, this advisory is now approved. Typically, it attached a number and gets sent via Kaveh to the Board and this will also be submitted as part of the public comment period. Thank you.

Moving on to -- Carlos, can we display the agenda again? Let's give him a minute, he's going to redisplay the agenda.

Moving on to the second item under this agenda, which is Feasibility and Assessment and the Initial Implementation Plan. This is a document that was also recently worked on and a stable document was sent you. This is for approval as well today. This will go to OEC, which is the Board's committee on Organizational Effectiveness. Any discussion on this particular document?

I'd like to thank Wes and Suzanne who worked with the Work Party and the Admin Committee on this document a couple of weeks ago, so thank you for all your comments on this document. Any further discussion? Yes, Liman, go ahead. There's an echo there Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, let's try this instead. There we are. This is not a comment on the content of the document because I support that but just an idea to actually attach an RSSAC number to this document as well, to publish it in our normal series because otherwise it will be lost in history somewhere and I think it will make easier to find it in the future and reference if it has an RSSAC number. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: So, Liman, we had this exact discussion on the Admin call and eventually yes, there will be a number but right now it's a feasibility assessment, so it goes OEC and there's typically a back and forth until there's finally agreement on the implementation plan and I believe that one then get's

number. I'm going to actually turn this over to Carlos to provide feedback on this because he guided us through that process. Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti. Liman, as Tripti mentioned, we had this discussion, the only reason from the discussion we're suggesting to hold off on a number, is that this is the initial plan. As Tripti mentioned, there's going to be a dialog between RSSAC and the OEC to agree on the actual implementation. That was the suggestion but again, we can discuss that now.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm perfectly happy with that. That's a very good solution. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Liman. Brad.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I just wanted to add that we have president for that. Carlos, what was the document that we talked when -- we did a back and forth and then the final document ended up getting a number?

CARLOS REYES: Right, thanks Brad. The Review Work Party also had a dialog with the Independent Examiner before that was finalized in RSSAC 036, which is the actual RSSAC input into the report. This is essentially a parallel process just with the implementation.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, thank you. Any other questions about this? Alright, the plan is to vote on this. Do I have a motion to approve the Feasibility and Assessment Initial Implementation Plan?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So, moved by Liman.

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, thank you. Do I have a second?

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker's seconds.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Wes. Anyone abstaining from this vote? Anyone not for it? Alright, with that said, the remainder are approving this. The Feasibility Assessment Initial Implementation Plan is now approved. Thank you all.

Moving on to item six, we'd like to allocate a good amount of time to have this discussion, as this is caucus related work. We'll start with updates from Andrew on Resolver Behaviors and Packet Size and then I'll turn it over to Liman for RSSAC Work Party update and you probably all read his email from last about RSSAC Caucus Engagement. With that said, I'd like to first turn it over to Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thanks, Tripti. Quickly just a quick update on two RSSAC Caucus Work Parties, the first is the Studying Modern Resolver Behavior Work Party. This work party has not yet met, it will meet for the first time tomorrow at 2pm UTC, that's the only update on that work part.

On the Packet Sizes Work Party, the update there is that the work party leader, George Michaelson has sent an email to the list and I believe Duane has also responded to it, proposing that the work party be shut down due to lack of interest. That's the only update on that work party. I guess Tripti, that's the end of my update. Maybe now is a time to discuss George's email but back to you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Andrew. I'm going to turn this over Liman. Liman, if you could start with an update on the RSSAC Work Party and then take the into the broader discussion about RSSAC Caucus Engagement.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Given that you want to have that discussion here and now but you put in the agenda in a spot where I assume you would like to have it. As I mentioned in my email yesterday which was written in a state of frustration I will admit. We had our first telephone conference yesterday and it was sparsely populated we can say. According to Steve and Mario, we had 10 people show and interest in participating, five roughly turned up for the telephone conference of which one actually continued to have a conversation. It was very much, me, myself and I and the help from some support staff and then one more person. We didn't make a lot of progress.

The connection was made to the previous work party and what we ended up doing was to ask people to look at that previous document and to send in some ideas for headlines or headings for an upcoming document, so we get some issues around which we can carry on a discussion. It was hard work to drive the audience to that point and we'll see what the uptake is from here. I'm not very positive in my forward looking here. But, that's at least the current situation.

That leads me into the message I sent yesterday. Now, this is the second time I'm shepherding something if I remember correctly and in both cases it's been very hard work to get something happen in the caucus, which doesn't rime well with the fact that we receive criticism for bad outreach and not making contact with various people who are interested the work or RSSAC. I'm starting to feel that this is not the good way forward because it lacks result.

I think it's a good idea or it was a good idea but it turns out that it doesn't work very well. I think we might want to start looking for something else. This is a discussion that happened, that is taking place in the shadow of RSSAC 37, which is the longer goal or the starting point for the long-term goal of reshaping the entire root server administration. I realize that if we're going to start to modify the caucus, there will be possible a stop gap solution and there might be a long-term solution further on.

The first question is, is it worthwhile to do something about this at this point because we expect to have a totally different system in place -- pulling a number out of the air, four or five years from now? Or, do we think that we can do something about the current caucus that we get

some more energy into it and more discussions and actual participation? I'd also like to try to find the connection points between the people who claim that there's no outreach from RSSAC and who criticize us for the ways in which we conduct work and then people who are on the caucus, where's the mismatch?

There are people that say you don't do this and you don't do that and then there are people who don't do things, so how does it all fit together? I don't really understand that. What are your comments around this problem? The floor is open.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Liman. Brad, go ahead.

BRAD VERD: I'll kick it off. I'm in violent agreement with you Liman. In my 10 years as co-chair, I have heard throughout the entire 10 year, engagement, engagement, engagement, we need to do more to engage the caucus and I feel like we have done -- we've gone above and beyond trying to engage the caucus and I don't know if you guys recall any of my comments around the -- there's been a couple of times recently where I've asked the trend of work parties not coming to a competition is concerning.

The Anycast one, we've got the one that you just started, we're taking about the packet size one, we had the naming one that ended with no real conclusions other then we need to do a lot more but yet when we try to do more work, there's nobody who wants to do it. That is really

frustrating and I am not sure how to -- I think the term you used was, invigorate the caucus, I'm not sure how to do that. It's frustrating, I think it would interesting when the Membership Committee is about to correlate, do their data that they said -- I know they're busy working on -- that they're going to correlate members of the caucus to who's come to meetings and who's participated in the work parties and my fear is that you're going to see a long, long list of people who have done nothing, that's my fear and I don't know how to resolve that. That's my two cents.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you.

PAUL VIXIE: This is not the first community-based engineering and policy group that has demonstrated this behavior. At heart, there is physiological mismatch, where people hear that this is being discussed, thing involving name server science are being discussed and they cannot imagine a world in which that happens without them but in fact they don't have time and that's real common. In fact, sometimes not a caucus or a work party that has that problem but actually the working group itself will have that problem. It takes a strong hand to grab people by the elbow and guide them to what they actually do want to do but are too over committed for other reasons to do.

We are I think not providing that, in other words, the apparent tension between people who don't do anything and the same people complaining that we don't give them anything to do, is real, both can be

true. I saw Liman's half in jest, have not in jest suggestion that we just get out of the caucus business and outsource, that would be mistake I think, we can discuss if anybody wants to, if anybody took it seriously. What I think is going to be necessary is to provide leadership in the work parties to make sure that people really do perform or that they admit that they're not going to, one of the two outcomes is fine.

Certainly, the Membership Committee, which I use to be on, should be looking at participation and saying, "Hey, you haven't done anything, so we're not renewing your membership." Or even sort of get that message out at the halfway point of a caucus members term, to say, "You haven't done anything, if this continue you won't be renewed." Just a shot across the brow but ultimately, the way I interpret Liman's observations here is that there is a physiological problem in the type of the worker we are attracting and that we are not offsetting that problem with our own behavior. Thank you. Liman, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. It's mostly in response to Brad said. I would like to say that I think that Paul is also quite right, we seem to be in violent agreement here. First, the ORACK think was in jest, it was just an attempt at looking at the broader problem, is the caucus the correct vehicle? I think we either need to reshape the interaction with caucus somehow because what we have today is not working or we need to disband the caucus and replace it with something else, not necessarily something with ORAK but something that has different properties then the current caucus.

I'm trying to find a way forward here and I'm hearing some interesting suggestions. Asking Paul, do you think that steering people by the elbow is the way that works? I've always felt that the energy has to come from inside somehow, do you have examples of other communities where your approach actually does work? I'm curious, I'm not persuasive, I'm just curious? Thanks.

PAUL VIXIE: I do have an example Liman and it's us, it's you and I. During the time you were a working group chair inside the DNS apparatus of IUTF, we had a lot of none motion and it was because at that time also you did not provide that kind of elbow grabbing and ultimately your replacement did, mine was one of the elbows that had to be grabbed in order to get me to do what I said I wanted to do and that worked. So, I am -- I don't intend to paint myself as idyllic in this, it is in part because of my own experience and because of my past experience as with you as a working group chair, that I know that in the absence of that energy it's not going to happen.

Let me caution you with sort of an alternate reality picture, if you leave it to the people who are passionate and who don't have jobs, they have nothing more important to do and they love the sound of their own voice, they're going to be all over this, you're going to get a very bias result. You will not be reaching consensus, you'll be reaching exhaustion. I really think it is the leader's role in this type of technical policy group, to make sure that we have broad participation, even if that means, doing a little bit of coaching. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can I respond to that? Your memory is better than mine but thanks for reminding me. I think we're seeing the two ends of the scale here where either you have inertia which you fix by trying to add energy from a charismatic leader, or you have too much energy or people heading in the wrong direction but that usually sparks a counter force of people trying to counter people going in the wrong direction. You end up with a choice of either you have someone to steer by adding energy to inertia, or you have someone steer by holding back horses. I don't know which one is better. Just an observation. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Liman. Brad, you're next.

BRAD VERD: Sorry, I actually raised my hand because Matt is not in a position to raise his hand and he wanted to step in.

MATT WEINBERG: Paul mentioned one thing about the Membership Committee looking at the caucus about engagement participation, we are actively working on that. Carlos is helping to cross reference both participation at meetings along with working group participation with the caucus, with the goal of us being able to paint a clearer picture of which caucus members are actively participating in RSSAC. We hope to have that done here in the next month and be able to report back on that information. That's it.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Matt. Suzanne.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you, Trupti. Just to a couple of points, I want to sort of reinforce the idea that it does require both more active engagement us but also, I like the idea of closing the loop on who's actually participating and just providing any kind of feedback to what people are and are not doing. If part of the problem is that they're feeling unloved and not important, maybe closing the feedback loop will be helpful.

To Liman's specific question of whether this is worth addressing before we've implemented the governance changes, I think it is. I think particularly if it's a matter of paying a little bit of attention and changing our procedure a little bit because I have the feeling that the governance changes are going to take a long time and be difficult in ways we maybe hadn't anticipated and I would hate to see -- having the caucus and getting engagement from a broader technical community then just us was really critical to the previous reorganization, I think it will continue to be and I think actually if making minor changes in our procedures will engage the caucus more, I think that's a victory that would be good to have sooner rather than later. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Suzanne. Wes.

WES HARDAKER:	Thanks, Tripti. I pretty much agree with everybody. Very frustrating, we always run our public sessions, we've had very little feedback, we'd had some, it's been better at times and worse at times. It's challenging to hear feedback including in the review that we need to spend more energy towards the caucus and more public outreach and that we're private closed, yet we get zero, not zero, we get little work effort that actually occurs.

A couple of thoughts though; one, I don't know that looking for people that are not participating and then kicking them out possibly is a solution. There's two areas we can go, there's positive reinforcement and negative reinforcement. I don't know that reducing our body to just those that have done any sort of work will serve as motivation to people to do more work. I don't know and maybe it will, I don't know.

Then the second one is of course, we need to get opinions from the caucus at large in order to figure out what they think might be and maybe the right thing to do is turn over more -- ask them, what do you think would work? What is missing? Why aren't you able to participate, is just time? Which I think is a likely candidate. Is it lack of recognition? It was brought up during the review that because the documents end up being labeled as RSSAC, they're not labeled as RSSAC Caucus documents that they're confusion with respect to that. I don't know. I don't have an answer either but I only have more questions but it sounds like this would be a good public discussion where ever we're going next, I've already forgotten, Barcelona, if there's a time slot available. This has to be a wider discussion then just this group.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Wes. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Tripti. A couple of observations. One in terms of the tracking of who does what and how much and so forth. This is something that SSAC has done for a number of years and when an individual is observed as not providing as much contribution as they might, then they usually are contacted by the SSAC chair and have a discussion. That doesn't necessarily mean they're going to be not renewed but it makes the people -- it gives the people an awareness of what's expected, it also gives the person a chance to say, "Oh, gee I've had illness or whatever." This is something that SSAC has done for a length of time.

My observation is that it has had very mixed effectiveness, in some cases I think it's been very helpful with some individuals, in others I don't think so much so. I also like to make a general comment in terms of caucus -- I honestly don't remember if the meeting where we -- it was an open meeting, I believe it was listed as caucus meeting at ICANN 62, where we talked about the KSK Rollover Document and I will say that that was I think at least a reasonable amount of input that we got from caucus members.

I don't know if other agree with that assessment but it might serve as an example of how we might do things going forward with respect to the work we do with the caucus. Those are the two main points I wanted to bring up. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Russ, I think the ICANN 62 meeting that you were referring to, gosh, my memory might be failing me but that might have been the joint SSAC RSSAC meeting where we discussed the KSK Rollover.

RUSS MUNDY: No, it was definitely not the joint RSSAC SSAC meeting it was a separate either RSSAC public meeting or an RSSAC caucus meeting, I don't really remember which one it was but we did a specific review of the document that was being put together, that Wes was the lead editor on for the response to the KSK Rollover. It was a good lively discussion. The reason that I'm certain that it was not the joint meeting was there was another SSAC meeting going on at that time and I sent some private jabber notes to folks in SSAC that are also RSSAC caucus members and one or two of them hot footed over to join in the discussion about the response.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay. Wes's hand is up again. Wes, go ahead.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, it was a public meeting. We took a predominate amount of time from the meeting and it was a good discussion. We had participation mostly from SSAC really, people who happened to be on the caucus, Joe Addley in particular I think spoke a lot at that meeting. We did get a lot done. That was definitely an example of where we did get some participation.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Wes, I'm looking at the chat and Steve Sheng and Andrew both seem to think this was the RSSAC caucus meeting at IETS. Daniel Migault.

DANIEL MIGAULT: The thing I just wanted to say is, if we want to discus this aspect, how to engage the caucus at the next ICANN meeting, it might be good that we raise some comment from the caucus to discus feedback, rather then gathering the comments during a public meeting because I'm not sure the caucus meeting can be represented by the people attending an ICANN meeting.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Daniel. Any other comments? Daniel, is your hand up again?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Andrew can you please mute. I was going to ask to bring this back around to the packet sizes work party. With regards to the packet sizes work party, there has been a suggestion by the leader to close the work party down. I guess as staff, I would just like a little bit of guidance on how the committee would like to proceed on that? Should staff proceed to shut that work party down and archive the unfinished work? Would the committee like to do something else with that? Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Andrew you are correct, we need and action on that. Any comments on how we'd like to proceed with work party that Andrew is staffing?

DUANE WESSELS: What I suggested on the work party list was that we should -- there should be something explaining why the work party was shut down, there should be some description of how far we got or how far we didn't get and why the work was shut down, not just that it was shut down.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you, Duane. Liman, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is more or less the same proposal that I had in my email with the billboard, where we have a list of work parties and their status and if they're closed down, why there are closed down and so on.

TRIPTI SINHA: Who is the shepherd for this work party Andrew?

DUANE WESSELS: I am.

TRIPTI SINHA: Duane, could you take the lead on putting together a paragraph or two, a page?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you. Russ, your hand is up again.

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, thank you. I wanted to just offer a suggestion that has come out of some of the worked that occurred in SSAC and that is the way that the work party mail list tends to be structured is that only people who are listed as members of the work party can assess the work party mail list archive and in some instances I think can be an impediment to the broader engagement, whether it's of RSSAC caucus members that aren't officially part of the work party or the RSSAC members themselves that may not be members of the work party.

It seems like it would be very useful, especially in the case such as this where a work party was probably going to shut down, that the archives themselves, mail archives would be available to all members of the RSSAC caucus, you could review them later for whatever information you could gleam out.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Russ. In the interest of time I'd like to bring to closure this discussion on the RSSAC caucus related work items and the general discussion. There are a couple action items here, one is on the packet sizes work party, Duane has the action item to put together a one pager

that explains why it's being shut down before it's officially shut and on the broader issue, clearly this is a very important topic, it deserves to get the 20 plus minutes that it got for discussion.

I think this should be a priority for this group and I think Brad and the future co-chair in partnership with Matt as chair of the Membership Committee, should probably look at this broader issue. I'm going to leave to Brad and your future co-chairs to schedule meetings and take some action on this. With that said, any other discussion on this topic? Alright, hearing none, I'd like to turn this over now to action item 6D, which RSSAC 000, Carlos, over to you.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Tripti. On the agenda next is RSSAC 000. Given the change in representation from NASA, this works needs an RSSAC effort I guess. Kevin Jones had been working with me on this for the past two years. Every year we would review 000 and make changes to propose to the whole group here. If anyone's interested in working with me and picking up where Kevin left off, please reach out to me.

Basically, we have a red line version of various changes that staff has experienced in the last year of working with the Operational Procedures and then this version also captures the proposed changes that RSSAC move to a chair, vice chair model. Thanks, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Carlos. I'd just like to add that, I know Kevin's not on the call but we'd really like to say thank you to Kevin, he did a lot of heavy lifting

on this. Much, much thanks to Kevin and whoever follows in his footsteps has some big shoes to fill. I'd like to now turn it over to item 16, which is Future Workshop, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Thanks, Tripti. On the last call I brought this idea up so that people could think about it and come up with some thoughts and that is -- there was a discussion around future workshops and what to do with them and my suggestion was to take the workshop time and spend it on work that needs to be done and could be done in advance of RSSAC 37 as well as opening up the workshop to caucus members and spending time on that at the workshops.

It seems like we do most of our heavy lifting when we're face to face, so it'd be great to take advantage of that and use that time wisely. I raised this here again or bring it your attention. We will be talking about this Barcelona and we did not have a fall workshop. If we were to agree to have a spring workshop, the planning on that usually begins at the end of the year, beginning of the new year, that is not far away, so we need to come to a consensus on where we want to go with the idea of workshops. Liman, is your hand up?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, it is. I think your idea is actually quite good. I love the idea of bring the caucus into it. I had an alternative approach in mind and it just dawned on me so I haven't thought it through properly yet. An alternative could be to co-arrange with the SSAC workshop. Not necessarily to have all sessions in common but there is a certain overlap

between SSAC and RSSAC and we could have a few sessions in common and we would also get the social arrangement of actually mingling with the SSAC people, would possibly be beneficial.

That was an alternative approach but I do like definitely your way of engaging the caucus, that's a really good one. Suddenly two good things to choose from, I don't know which one to choose. Yes, I would suggest going that path forward, your path forward Brad I think and to work on further developing RSSAC 37, that's a good idea. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: The SSAC does one workshop a year, that's what we felt previously, we just did ours for this calendar year last week. I think given the advance notice in planning, it might produce some good and useful results. I'm not embraced this ever and thank you Liman for the suggestion, I can do that at a future SSAC meeting to also judge the interest. We can discuss it in our joint meeting if you like, if that would be useful.

I would like to say in support of the suggestion Brad made that there are some really still large looming absents of specific details in RSSAC 37, in particular the architectural aspects and these are in some ways the hardest and I would suggest just pick an area to look at, that might be a good one to start with, as we want to have more details in the architectural and strategy section. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Russ. Steven Sheng, you're next.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Tripti. Regarding the side by side workshop for SSAC and RSSAC. I just want to note that there's an overlap of staff support for SSAC and RSSAC, so having the workshop side by side very challenging for use to support. That said, you might want to entertain the idea, hold it closer to the SSAC workshop, one after another but we just want to set the proper expectations here in terms of staff support. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Steve. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you, Steve. I quite suspected that that would be case. Your comment comes as no surprise to me and I fully respect that. A side comment, if we're going to do another workshop, I think a good idea would be too leave room for work to happen in smaller subgroups, so that we don't do everything in large setting because we can also make great progress by working in small work parties or two, three, four, five people who can sit down and draft text and discus through things and bring resulting ideas to the table and so on. To have these groups, I wouldn't call them exercises, just group efforts, I think is a very good way to bring issues forward. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Liman. I'd like to add that there is tremendous interest in the community with regard to RSSAC 37, so I would agree that if you do pre RSSAC 37 work you will likely get quite a bit of interest and this might be a way to invigorate the caucus in some way. This probably will eventually lead to some goodness in terms of all the apathy that we've encountered. I think this is the right way forward. Any other comments, questions on future workshops for Brad?

Alright, hearing none let's move on to agenda item seven, which is the report outs. I'll start with co-chairs. Essentially nothing has happened. We had our last call with Goran before the last meeting, so we gave an update on that. Nothing significant has happened since then. Brad, is there anything that I'm missing here?

BRAD VERD: No, nothing new since the last call.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, so with that said, I'll turn it over to Kaveh for an update from the ICANN Board.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Nothing happened after the two emails I sent, so I don't have anything new to add.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you, Kaveh. Liman, CSC updates.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. The CSC had a meeting gap over the summer but we actually had a meeting in mid-September, which was a fairly long one. I'll try to see here what was the main thing. The main thing I feel is that the CSC is now getting into actually looking at -- it's implementing the necessary changes in order to amend the situation we have. We have the situation that the PTI operates under a contact, which is fairly detailed and it contains a lot of -- it's determining their SLE's, service level expectations.

The problem is that from a couple of months of operations or a year and a half, it's obvious that some of these detailed thresholds are inappropriate, so we need to change them. The current way to do that is to just modify the contract which is a very heavy operation. We're looking at trying to design a much more light weight operation for making minor changes to small service level expectations. That will require changes to the charter for the CSC and also the documents that govern the current way things operate.

There's been a work party that has worked on producing a proposal for that and we are now so to speak, putting rub to the road with that. There is now actions for the support staff for CSC to more or less bring these proposed changes further down the line, meaning approaching the warden and so on and approach the various parties that are parties to the contract, mainly the ccNSO and GNSO and their councils and so on, to actually approve and authorize these changes to the governing documents, so eventually further down the line can make these changes that we need to make.

For heavier or more thorough changes to the system there will be more cumbersome discussions but that's a good thing I think, we should be able to make major changes to these things lightly, smaller changes we do need to make because the world changes and so on and we charge at the first approach, first guess at these service level expectations wasn't 100% correct, changes need to happen. I say that this classification of small and large changes is actually quite good. I guess that's where are.

We also had a few small changes in the membership of the CSC but I don't think that's something that you are interested in. I have been reappointed by you RSSAC, so I would remain there for another term as the RSSAC representative but we have lost Jay Daley who was one of the ccNSO appointed people, he's now replaced by Brad Karr the UK operator. Also, one of the GNSO representatives, Carl [inaudible] has been represented by Gaurav Vedi, which I believe is with Verisign, is that correct Brad? Apart from that, no major changes.

BRAD VERD: No, I don't think so.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Liman. Any questions for Liman? Alright, hearing none. Brad, an update on RZERC.

BRAD VERD: Nothing of substance to share. There's some ongoing discussions, I think next meeting I'll have some more content to share but nothing right now.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Tripti. If folks would click on the link that's in the agenda for the joint meeting, that's the main topic I wanted to just mention today. I've included a quick four items in there and especially since Brad asked for responses on the Board questions by the end of the week, that seems like it's a reasonable target to collect input on our joint meeting from RSSAC folks and I'll send the similar content over to SSAC and if anybody wanted to note anything at this point, that's fine, we can do that.

The proposed agenda is relatively straight forward and if folks want to change feel free, add, subtract the KSK Rollover observation since Matt Larson is an RSSAC member and David Conrad is SSAC member, I will send specific invites to hopefully get them at this meeting together. Then the work plan discussions from each of the groups for 2019 and then we in SSAC have been informally advised by the Board that will be asked about the security impacts of SAC 37 and SAC 38 and I would very, very much like to have a joint discussion about what that means, particularly seeking any thoughts from the RSSAC side, that would be helpful to SSAC in discussing this topic.

Those are the four items that I had at this point. Any other thoughts or comments or we can go on and try to include any changes by the end of the week. Anybody have any comments at this point? Okay, I'm not seeing any. Back to you, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, thank you, Russ. If you do have any additional comments, send them directly to Russ, please. Moving on to updates from Daniel on IAB.

DANIEL MIGAULT: We don't have anything to report from the IAB.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, thank you. Naela, any updates from IANA?

NAELA SARRAS: Yes, thank you, Tripti. Quick updates from IANA, there is PK but it is now out for public comments, that will finish its budgetary processes and join the ICANN budget to the end of this year. Then the survey is underway now, we're asking people to comment on input on the IANA service they receive.

                        Another item we're working on is the KSK Rollover, basically preparations on the operational side for the rollover. Yesterday we contacted all the TLD operators and said this is happening on the 11th, if you have changes please send them now, to drum up changes. That's it, I can't think of anything else I want to update this group on. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Naela. Any questions for Naela. Alright, seeing no hands, moving on to Duane. Duane, any updates on the Root Zone?

DUANE WESSELS: Also, just to say that we're ramping up for the KSK Rollover. We're now in phase E of the rollover plan. A number of uses are getting together next week to make this happen.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Duane. Any questions for Duane? Alright, hearing none. I'm going to turn this over to Brad, who's going to discus the next phone call. Brad.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Tripti. We had a bit of a discussion around the next phone call which is November 6th, the first Tuesday in November, which is also when IEFT will taking place and a number if you will probably in Thailand, which will be 10 pm local time. The question came up, should we look at rescheduling, it starting to get into the holidays that people are taking off for Thanksgiving and other times this time of year. We kind of were all over the place and we wanted to bring it here to the group and see what you guys wanted to do.

There were a couple of options. One was, keep on the 6th obviously. The other one was move it to later in the month but then that gets closer to the first of December, keep that in mind or the first week in December which would be our first meeting in December.

The other one was to roll it back and have a meeting in Barcelona when we are there but obviously that's close to this meeting and there might not be a lot on the agenda. The forth option was to postpone, basically

cancel the November meeting and pick up December. Any thoughts from the people here as to what was convened or what worked?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Just my personal preference. I would prefer to have it where it sits because I'm not going to Bannock, so it's rather convent for me but I'm quite open to basically all the other alternatives. Moving it one week doesn't clash with any Swedish holidays. That said in good respect for Thanksgiving, I 'm quite open for moving it somewhere. Even for moving it.

TRIPTI SINHA: Alright, before I turn this over to Daniel, I think -- will someone mute please. I think Vixie was trying to say something, I thought I heard his voice, Paul?

PAUL VIXIE: Thank you, I didn't put my hand up, I should have done that, I'm sorry. I think my answer is going to depend on the importance of the agenda. I would like us to be seen meeting if there a reason and cancelling if there is not. If we have to move it in order to met because the agenda demands that we meet, let's move it but if the agenda is essentially weak enough in it's affect on our mission that it can be postpone then by all means, let us postpone it.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Tripti, if I can just comment on that really quickly. When the Admin Committee talked about this, we thought that it was so close to Barcelona that agenda might be pretty sparse because we will have all met in Barcelona, we will have covered a number of topics and it's the week following so there might not be much content.

TRIPTI SINHA: Brad to add, I think there will be a problem meeting a Barcelona to at least conduct a vote for sure for the co-chairs, you're right. I think Vixie's input may still stand, which is, if there is no agenda, substantive agenda then you could cancel. Three hands gone up and we're almost close to 11:30. Daniel, real quick.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I would prefer not to have that on the 6th during the IETF. I agree with Brad, Tripti and Paul, if we cancel. Personal opinion.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Daniel. Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: Exactly what Paul said and exactly what we heard from Daniel. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA: Okay, thank you. Any other hands? I thought I saw someone else's hand go up. Brad, I think you've got the information you need to make a decision on the November 6th call. With that said, it's 11:30 Eastern Time…

BRAD VERD: Actually, Tripti, before you break I have one other thing. Really quickly, before you adjourn the meeting, I just wanted to personally and on behalf of everybody here, this is Tripti's last meeting, so I wanted to thank her for her leadership, her energy and her hour years of service. I look forward to working with you in future endeavors.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Thank you, very much. With that said, the meeting is now adjourned. Thank you, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]