
BARCELONA – RSSAC Work Session 1
Saturday, October 20, 2018 – 09:00 to 10:15 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

BRAD VERD: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to ICANN 63 Barcelona. This is the first RSSAC Work Session. Let me review the agenda here real quick. I just had it in front of me. I'll give you a quick readout of a meeting I had with Cherine here in Barcelona. We'll review the full ICANN schedule, and then we'll spend some time preparing for the four meetings we have: one with ALAC, one with SSAC, OCTO, and then our normally scheduled board meeting. That's the plan for this hour. Is there anything else that we should cover? Any suggestions? Anything that is not on the agenda? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing.

This morning I had a breakfast meeting. Oh, I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Should we just go around the table if we have people listening in?

BRAD VERD: Yes. Let's do quick introductions around the table. Before I do that, Tripti sends her apologies. She has other commitments with the board, and we will see her sparsely I think. So that's why she's not here right now. So we'll start down there, Wes.

WES HARDAKER: Thanks. Wes Hardaker, USC/ISI.

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.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro Hotta, WIDE and JPRS.

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard representing the Army Research Lab.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson, Department of Defense.

CARLOS REYES: Carlos Reyes, RSSAC support staff.

BRAD VERD: Brad Verd, RSSAC co-chair and Verisign.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar, RIPE NCC.

JEFF OSBORN: Jeff Osborn, ISC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Lars Liman, Netnod.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik Faltstrom, Netnod.

BRAD VERD: Since it is such a small venue, can you introduce yourself? Just say hello.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello. I am [inaudible]. You can call me Jason. I'm from Taiwan's ISP Chunghwa Telecom. We do host an L-root instance, so hoping to [inaudible] can help. Thanks. [inaudible] my pleasure.

BRAD VERD: Thank you so much and welcome. Is there anybody in the room that we should...? Okay, great.

All right, so this morning I had a meeting with Cherine. Tripti was present. So was Kaveh. We just kind of talked about anything. There was no real agenda. It was just any topics that anybody had.

First and foremost, Cherine wanted me to bring back to the RSSAC his apologies for not having a response yet on RSSAC 37 and 38. He was very apologetic and said that it is one of their top priorities and it's unfortunately been caught in the mix of a bunch of other priorities in the last couple months. But it should be remedied here in the very near future, so we should be seeing something. So he wanted me personally to come back and say he's very, very apologetic and looks forward to getting that done. Did I miss anything there, Kaveh?

Then the conversation went on just to what's going on, what do we need to talk about? We spent the majority of the breakfast talking about

essentially the same issue that our questions to the board bring up, which is kind of this role, the relationship in the technologies here at ICANN. What I mean by that RSSAC, SSAC, and the TEG and OCTO and how they share or don't share information to work fluidly. So we talked a lot about that, and he took a bunch of notes and agreed that was an issue that he should take to a bigger audience, I guess, and start that discussion. Is that fair, Kaveh?

So that was kind of breakfast, and then everybody had to run to meetings. Go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yes, and just a bit of [update] that was also discussed in the morning about the BTC because, for the ones who might know, about a year ago or maybe more than a year ago I proposed creation of the Board Technical Committee within the board because ICANN board didn't have a technical committee and I was also chairing that.

But we had a board workshop in Brussels about a month ago and there I basically stepped down as chair. I'm still a member. One of my reasons was I saw there was a conflict because if I wanted to follow board's response to RSSAC's advice and its progress, as a chair of BTC I would have been a bit conflicted. We knew that initially and I had a vice chair which we thought we will switch roles when that happens, but in practice I found it really hard because there are a lot of priorities. So as a chair if I wanted to push for RSSAC advice, then people would say, "Oh, what about the SSAC?" NCAP, for example, what about [inaudible]. There is [inaudible] items on that list.

So now I'm not chairing that and I'm just a member so my main priority would be pushing for RSSAC advice and I wouldn't care about other priorities.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, just really quickly if I could add. Go ahead, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Quick question: who is chairing the BTC now?

KAVEH RANJBAR: The switchover will happen formally at the end of this meeting, but as far as I know it's Akinori. So Akinori basically will chair now, but formally he will be also appointed as the chair of BTC end of this meeting.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I'm glad Kaveh shared that with you guys. Essentially, Kaveh was in a really tough position where he needed to be an impartial chair and not show favoritism to any of the issues, but yet one of the topics that needed to be addressed by the BTC was RSSAC 37 so he couldn't be a hardnose and drive that. So on his own choice, his own free will, he stepped down as chair so that he can now drive 37. So thank you for that, Kaveh. Any questions about that?

All right, let's review the schedule. I'm sorry? Okay, people who walked in. I guess we'll start down here.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy, SSAC liaison to the RSSAC.

FRED BAKER: Fred Baker, ISC.

BRAD VERD: Just remember we need to talk to the mic because of the Adobe Connect.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Daniel Migault, IAB liaison.

BRAD VERD: All right, thank you. All right, next topic would be the overall schedule of the week, which is busy, so I will give it to Kaveh and then we can talk through it. Not Kaveh. I'm sorry. I'm looking at Carlos and I said Kaveh. Give it to Carlos. I'm clearly shy on sleep. I apologize.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. Hi, everyone. Hopefully by now you've been able to bookmark the schedule that we produced for everyone. It's a big grid. I'll just quickly go over the schedule.

Today, we're spending our time in work sessions just for this group, the RSSAC. As Brad mentioned, we will review the schedule and then focus on some of the joint meetings, going over those agendas. After that, we have a break.

Work Session 2, the agenda for that, it's a 90-minute session and it's primarily focusing on RSSAC000v4. If you recall, in early summer or late summer, September, Kevin Jones and I had the action item to update that document as if the RSSAC were to move forward with the chair/vice chair model. So most of the changes in that document now reflect that. So further discussions on that. So that's the next work session. After that, you have lunch.

And then in the afternoon when we come back for Work Session 3, we'll start to discuss an agenda topic that Brad proposed, which is what work can the RSSAC do in preparation for 037 and 038. So essentially pre-implementation work that the RSSAC can start already.

That is the work sessions for today. We have the How It Works tutorial later in the day. Andrew will be presenting that first half and then I'll present the second half.

Any questions about Saturday? Okay, your evening today is free after the tutorial.

Tomorrow, we have three work sessions for the Caucus. The first one in the morning will be primarily focused on a topic that Liman brought up on the last teleconference, which is engagement and participation in the work parties. Hopefully, we have some Caucus members here that can participate in that discussion. Mario has shared he agendas with the Caucus so they're aware of it, and they're also obviously on the public schedule.

The second Caucus work session, we've basically slotted that for the service coverage work party. It's not a formal meeting of the work party, but hopefully we can discuss the statement of work and the workplan for that particular work party to see if there is any input at this stage. Both of the new work parties are early in their work, but we thought it would be a good opportunity to directly engage with any Caucus members that are here in Barcelona.

Then the work session after lunch, a similar approach, which is giving an opportunity for the Caucus members to contribute to early discussions about the resolver study work party.

In the afternoon, there's a meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee. They reached out to us, to staff, asking for an update and a briefing from RSSAC on the Proposed Governance Model, so 037, and we'll discuss that today briefly.

Any questions about Sunday? Yes, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

What activity is expected from regular RSSAC members here? I understand that as a shepherd for the service coverage work party I'll play a role there. But apart from that, what else do I need to prepare and where is my active input expected?

CARLOS REYES:

This is a bit of an uncharted territory for us in that we're trying to see how many Caucus members show up. Hopefully, there are some. If not,

I think that will just feed into the conversation earlier in the day about Caucus engagement and participation, which this group knows has been a broader issue. At this point, I think we probably wouldn't want to necessarily move ahead with the agenda because certain people may be calling in and participate remotely for other items. So I guess we'll just have to roll with it tomorrow. Obviously, you've all seen the statement of work because this group approved it, so we don't necessarily need to rehash that. It's an experiment.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I'm sorry. Go ahead, Wes.

WES HARDAKER: One other thing to consider is the other part of the uncharted territory is that as in the past our work party discussions have generally been on closed lists and things like that, and now that we're having open meetings which is a good thing there's this notion of are the non-work party participants in the room observers or are they allowed to contribute to the discussion? My personal suggestion would be allow everybody to contribute. Everybody, I think, has an opinion. Even if they're not going to join the work party due to workload and things like that, I don't think that we ought to silence them in the room.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I agree with you, Wes. Again, it's a bit of a greenfield here, but I think whoever the respective shepherd is should maybe take those inputs from people who maybe aren't on the work parties and take it

back to the work party and say, “Here was a discussion that we had. It was open discussion.” Everybody has been invited to this, so the work party members could be here if they so choose, but this was an opportunity to get other data.

Carlos?

CARLOS REYES:

Any other questions about Sunday? And then your evening is free as well.

Monday there are two RSSAC related sessions. Obviously, in the morning if you’d like to attend the welcome ceremony, you’re welcome to do so. Then we have the joint meeting we SSAC. Oh, sorry, I forgot. Brad asked me to add the security and stability review team is having an engagement session immediately after the welcome ceremony. There’s a slight overlap with the joint meeting with SSAC but if you’re interested, you’re welcome to stop by. That will be in the same main room. This is that review team that was put on hold and recently relaunched. The RSSAC representative is Eric, correct? Eric Osterweil. I think he’s one of the co-chairs of the group. So they’re restarting their work. Yes, Brad?

BRAD VERD:

Just to add to that, given let’s say the visibility around the SSR2 stuff, it seemed important that they were restarting. There was a session, and I just wanted to put it on the schedule so everybody could see it. By no means would I say go to that over the SSAC meeting, but I did want it

on the schedule. I've also talked to Eric about maybe giving a readout to RSSAC once they get going, but this was a lot just to give more informative to let you know that the gears are moving again and things are happening.

CARLOS REYES:

Thanks, Brad. As I mentioned, after that we have the joint meeting with SSAC. Russ has developed an agenda, and we'll talk about that today in preparation for that.

After lunch, there is an RSSAC work session. The agenda for that is really looking ahead, having more focused discussions about the format and frequency of future workshops as well as preparing for the RSSAC info session later in the week and the Caucus meeting. So just going through the slide deck, assigning speakers, things like that. All the slides are ready. Andrew has been working on that, so we just need to make sure everyone is on the same page before those two sessions.

There is another tutorial that afternoon. Andrew and Steve will be presenting that. Then later that evening, we have the RSSAC dinner. It's at a restaurant in the shopping center across the street. Mario has been taking the lead on that, so he can provide us details about where to meet up and then we can walk over.

Any questions about Monday?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

What time is the dinner?

CARLOS REYES: At 7:30 p.m.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

CARLOS REYES: Monday. Okay, yes, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Carlos, just to point out there Monday night is heavily conflicted. There is the DNSSEC implementers gathering at the same time, and an hour later the SSAC dinner starts. So there are actually three social events on Monday night.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good for you, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: It wasn't my choice.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Actually, there are four because there's also music night [with the GM].

CARLOS REYES: Yes, Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. I also would like to mention that we have the tech day running all day. And in parallel with tech day for some weird reason even though they promised not to clash, ISPCP have a five-hour long technical thing as well with overlapping speakers, overlapping content, and the whole nine yards, which is a little bit unfortunate. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Carlos, is there any chance we could move the dinner to, say, Sunday when there's less conflict and you've said you were open? I know that's asking really late.

CARLOS REYES: We can try. One of the factors we considered for the dinner was Tripti's availability. If you remember, we typically recognize people when they leave the RSSAC, and this was the one opening she had. Not ideal, but it's up to the group. If we wanted to move it, I could reach out to her.

BRAD VERD: I'm pretty sure she couldn't make it if it was moved, just for the record.

CARLOS REYES: And we actually don't have the plaque here for her. It didn't make sense for me to bring it and then for her to take it back, so I'll just give it to her in person in Washington. But we did want to facilitate that for her.

BRAD VERD: I would just add each time we've done that in the past we've created heartache for the people who receive the plaque, so we chose not to do that this time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So maybe it should still go a second round because it might also be the case that her schedule has changed. It would be a little bit unfortunate if she cannot join on Monday. And then let me give you a suggestion from SSAC. We decide just because of this mess we never do that thank you thing at the ICANN meetings. We do that at the last meeting where we meet with the group sort of in private because it's easier to do. As a suggestion for the future.

CARLOS REYES: Yeah, we've experimented. We've done it at workshops and other events. Okay, yeah, I'll check with Tripti and I'll let everyone know. Go ahead.

BRAD VERD: And then I had Carlos put the tech day on here because it is the tech day and I believe that somewhere during there they're talking about the KSK roll which occurred a week ago. Again, I'm lacking sleep. That's why I wanted that on the schedule here just so that everybody was aware.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad.

Looking at Tuesday, Tuesday is primarily an external relations day I like to think about it. We have the info session in the morning. That's the overview of RSSAC and recent publications. We're going over that slide deck to assign speakers.

After the break, we have the Caucus meeting. Andrew has developed the agenda, but it's a pretty standard Caucus meeting: updates on publications and work parties.

After lunch, we have the meeting with OCTO. We'll discuss that shortly today.

Then after that, we have another work session. This one – lost my place in my agenda here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

[inaudible]

CARLOS REYES:

Yes, thank you, Liman. We'll be talking about the next steps in the organizational review. If you'll recall, in early October the group approved the Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan. That is now with the ICANN board Organizational Effectiveness Committee, so we can discuss that. They haven't responded yet other than to acknowledge that they received it, but there's some pre-implementation work in some of the recommendations that the group has agreed to move forward with that we can start planning for that. So largely administrative matters.

Any questions about Tuesday? Oh, and then after that, we have the meeting with the board, and we're going to go over the agenda. Yes, Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes, I saw that you have on your agenda that meeting with the board is 17:00-18:00. I think RSSAC meets 18:00-19:00 because SSAC is meeting 17:00-18:00. I just checked with Andrew, and he said that. I just got an e-mail from him saying that it's probably 18:00-19:00. But anyway, both groups have been told that it is 17:00-18:00, so that needs to be resolved.

CARLOS REYES: It is 18:00-19:00. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: The Google Doc I'm looking at says 18:00-19:00, but it's in the 17:00 time slot. That's where maybe it's confusing.

CARLOS REYES: Too many schedules. All right, any questions about Tuesday?

Okay, and then Wednesday, DNSSEC workshop. There's also a cross-community session on GDPR. Then we have the RSSAC meeting in the afternoon. I circulated that agenda, but it's a standard RSSAC meeting in lieu of the teleconference on November 6. In terms of votes, we'll have minutes to approve from the previous meeting; potentially a

Caucus member if the membership committee moves ahead with that, there is one statement of interest in the queue; and then the co-chair election.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Carlos, going back, it just struck me, the meeting with the board, is that open to open to observers or not?

CARLOS REYES: Yes, it's open.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And today there is the OCTO update on the RSSAC, correct? Do you have that? That's not an RSSAC session, but that's an open board 45-minute or 30-minute update from the OCTO to the board about 37 and 38 and what OCTO has done about it. Let me bring that up.

CARLOS REYES: The board workshop is open?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That piece of the board workshop about RSSAC, yes.

CARLOS REYES: Oh.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So it is today, Saturday, yes, from 16:00-16:30. That part of the board workshop is open. That's about RSSAC [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: So that conflicts with DNS root server work? That conflicts with the tutorial?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I won't be offended if you leave. At that point in the presentation, I'm just speaking about RSSAC.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, but we need a few people in the audience to answer questions afterwards, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This one, is it on the public agenda? It should be on the public agenda as well. It is not? Let me double check that.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, can you double check that before we add that? Thank you. And again, just as to why certain things are on the schedule, I asked Carlos to add the DNSSEC workshop and the GDPR stuff just given the visibility

of what's going on in the community. So I wanted people aware of what was happening in case you wanted to attend.

CARLOS REYES: One thing I forgot to mention about the gala on Wednesday, if you'd like to attend, you will need basically a ticket from the sponsor. You just have to pick that up at the sponsor booth at some point Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do you know what day they start making those available, because it's usually....

CARLOS REYES: Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Monday? All right.

BRAD VERD: I'd recommend going early. They usually run out of tickets, so just so everybody is aware.

CARLOS REYES: All right, Thursday there isn't any specific RSSAC session. There's the AGM in the morning. Community recognition, we've had several members of RSSAC leave in the last year, so there's a board resolution

and a brief ceremony where they're all recognized. I don't think any of them are actually in attendance, but their names are still called out so you're welcome to stop by for that.

Brad asked me to add the joint meeting between the ICANN board and the TEG. There's also a cross-community session at that time and then the public forum and then a reception to close the meeting.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, so nothing formally for RSSAC on Thursday, but it seemed like important things that we wanted to share with everybody. Any questions?

All right, let's see. Moving on our agenda for today, we will now jump into our joint meetings, which we have four of them, and prepare for each.

The first one on the agenda is the ALAC meeting which was requested from ALAC to review or to I guess inform them about RSSAC037 and 38. You're name is next to this. Do you want to talk or do you want me to just keep at it?

CARLOS REYES:

I just put my name, but you already gave the update. So basically we discussed this internally with the admin team and we agreed that we'll just recycle the slide deck that the group has been reviewed and previously approved. So I just updated the title slide for you.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, so the goal here was to not change any messaging. This was essentially the deck that was presented at the last ICANN meeting as an open session for RSSAC037 and 38, and we would just run through this with the ALAC and address any questions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do we know if they have any open questions and dialogue starting off? No? Okay.

CARLOS REYES: They specifically requested background information which is covered in the slide deck and then an overview of the governance model.

BRAD VERD: So sticking to our message, we thought that was the best approach and there's no reason to modify any of them. And I guess I'll run the slide deck, but please if there's input from others during the presentation, please share in the joy. All right, I think that one is pretty straightforward.

SSAC, we have a joint meeting with SSAC. Russ, do you want to...?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Brad. Yeah, we had a Google Doc at our last meeting, went over it very quickly, opened it for review and input, did not get further input. Do you have that handy, Carlos? If you could put it up, give everybody a chance to look at it here again. It is, I think, the only closed RSSAC

meeting this time. I think that the reason that I suggested that is I had not specifically asked SSAC if it was okay to have an open meeting. That's something I think we can just talk about in our administrative aspects.

It's a pretty simple, straightforward agenda. I think it can largely be covered by existing slides that people have. I know SSAC has a workplan for next year, and so I expect that's what they will be leading in that discussion. The workplan for RSSAC, I don't know that we have an existing slide deck. I think there's not really a set of things per se, but I wanted to bring it up here so we could be thinking about specifics. My sense is that there are probably other things that will come up. There are two SOWs for the Caucus to be looking at and doing work plus looking at any questions that come in, issues that come up relative to especially 37. At least that's my general sense as what is the focus of the next year for RSSAC.

And then the joint potential security impacts discussion, that was an issue that SSAC was, in fact, specifically informally advised that we were going to be asked to provide responses from security and stability input perspective on the document. It turned out I did have breakfast with Rod this morning, and he has heard nothing further about that so it might or might not happen in terms of something during this meeting. I have publicized RSSAC037 and 38 around SSAC several times and I've only had a couple of what I'll call light informal comments. At this point, I don't believe that I know of anything from the SSAC perspective in terms of security and stability issues related to the plan, but there might be something pointed out in the meeting.

That was the set of inputs that I put out, did not have any formal responses. I did have one informal comment from one person on SSAC and that was relative to one of the findings in the RSSAC review about RSSAC and SSAC developing a joint piece of work that would define roles for each one. My response was no one else has raised it from either group, so I think that we probably want to wait until we see what the final disposition of the report is and the person agreed. So it's not on the formal agenda. I don't expect it to be asked, but just a heads up in case somebody does raise it. And that's what I see as the main agenda.

But I do think it would be wise for us to jointly talk about do we want to have the future meetings of this sort be open or closed because RSSAC has very much gone to open meetings. SSAC continues to and I expect them to continue to have closed meetings. So if there are thoughts either way, I think it would be good to just have a short discussion about them at the end of the meeting if we have time, and I expect we'll have time.

Any questions, comments?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Potential can of worms here, but the last time there was a joint meeting there was a discussion about NomCom and how the liaisons from both groups are treated within the NomCom procedures. I was wondering where that conversation has gone because we haven't heard anything from Brad and Tripti's perspective.

support it. There just was too much happening. Now with 37 behind us, maybe we need to figure out what a normal workload or cadence looks like, and that would feed into a workplan.

CARLOS REYES: So this was one of the recommendations that came out of the organizational review. So if you're comfortable, we can slot it for that session where we're talking about implementation of some of those recommendations. That's Work Session 5.

BRAD VERD: That's the last day. That's after everything, right?

CARLOS REYES: It's on Tuesday.

BRAD VERD: Okay. I just want to make sure it's on somewhere that we talk about it.

CARLOS REYES: Russ, I just edited the agenda. Does that work for you?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, that looks fine. Thank you very much. Do you know, Carlos, if this URL is an open accessible at least from a read perspective? Okay, it's fine to send the URL then to the SSAC. Okay.

BRAD VERD: Regarding the NomCom discussion, we need to do that before the SSAC discussion. So maybe we do that during the 000. Yeah, okay. Everybody okay with that plan going forward? Make sense?

All right, anything else on the SSAC one, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: No, that looks great. Thanks, everybody, for your input.

BRAD VERD: Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Not on the SSAC one. Just clarification of the RSSAC session. I'm also sending an e-mail to the RSSAC list. Basically, it is open for observers online, so it's an Adobe room. The reason it's not on the public agenda is because the board – it's internal between basically OCTO, BTC, and the board. There's a report [inaudible] organization. It's just open to observers, and that has a different agenda. That's the board public meetings always have a different agenda. I'm sending that link so if anyone is interested, they can join remotely from 4:00-4:30 [inaudible]. Anyway, I will send my liaison report after the session. So if you missed that, you will get it [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Is that published anywhere?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No. My liaison report?

BRAD VERD: No. That this session or any other public portion available remotely in the board is available. Is that published somewhere?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I'm sending a link right now to the RSSAC list.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Will it also include the room number and so forth in which this meeting will be?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, it's an Adobe room. I will send [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Yeah, just again for clarification, it's not physical presence. You're not allowed in the room, I assume. It's closed. But you're allowed into the Adobe Connect room, which he is sending.

All right, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Quick question on that to Kaveh: do you know if SSAC, other than maybe through our liaison – this is the first I’ve heard of that – is aware of this and would it be a problem if I forwarded on the information to SSAC people that were interested? Especially since we’re supposed to have to be saying something at some point about 37.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. It is a public web page. I’m sending the link, and anyone can join. And also, I had mentioned this session happening on 5 October, an e-mail I sent 5 October to RSSAC. So I’m actually replying to myself sending the information. So it was also within RSSAC it was [somehow] announced. Again, it’s just an internal report, so I don’t expect much. I think it’s just as we also heard [inaudible] morning, I think the main theme would be not much has happened or small pieces. But just so you know, I think it’s good to be open and transparent.

BRAD VERD: All right, thank you, Kaveh.

All right, let’s move into the meeting with OCTO, and we have those questions.

WES HARDAKER: Hey, Brad, can I pause.

BRAD VERD: Oh, I’m sorry. Go ahead, Wes.

WES HARDAKER: No, it's okay. I am now concerned of are we going to get a good split between people going to the tutorial and people going to that. So I'm wondering, maybe we should raise hands to see who is going to what so that we make sure we have coverage in both places.

BRAD VERD: Okay, just to be clear, there's no going to it. You can have it up on your laptop. You can attend it via the Adobe Connect room only. So there's no physical attendance.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So you can do both.

BRAD VERD: You can do both, but if people were to leave the room to do the Adobe Connect, it would have the same effect of not being in the room with the tutorial. So I guess the question at hand is, are there people planning to not be in the tutorial? Is that a fair kind of like let's just jump to the point?

WES HARDAKER: Yes, or who is planning on staying in the tutorial the entire time of which I will.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm sorry. What is the problem with staying in the tutorial and muting the...?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Nothing.

BRAD VERD: I will say I might have a conflict. I'm still trying to work out whether or not I will be there, but I'm trying to be at the tutorial. I'm just not sure if I will be, so I'll just share that with the group. Okay?

All right, the meeting with OCTO, we've provided questions to OCTO which now were shared in the chatroom and provided. You can pull them up on the list or in front of you via the Google Doc if I can get this to work. All right, four questions. Do you want me to run through the questions? Everybody spent time reading them, understand the line of questioning here? I'll just real quickly.

First one: In OCTO's interpretation of the recent resolution from the ICANN board – I'm not going to say all that number – is the scope of the resolution the root server system as a whole or the IMRS? Which they call the ICANN managed root server - that's what it's called in their resolution – or otherwise known as L-root. That's the first question. It's kind of a scoping question. It seems pretty straightforward. Jeff?

JEFF OSBORN: I've been looking for a place to insert my comment. So if this isn't appropriate, I'll hold it and put it in later.

a receipt, an invoice?” I really feel like they were expecting to be told, “Here’s an amount of money we need.”

And so again, if I’m at the wrong place here, I’m sorry. I’m only a year into this meeting. But at some point, I think we need to talk about if there is an ask involved in any of the things we’re asking about with ICANN. We need to think about it more clearly and have our ducks lined up a little better. And if I’m out of line, I’ll back down. It’s just that was my feeling from the last board RSSAC meeting.

BRAD VERD: May I go real quick? And then I’ll give it to Liman. I don’t think it’s out of line. I don’t think it necessarily relates to this particular question.

JEFF OSBORN: We can wait.

BRAD VERD: No, I understand. I think if you were to ask me this question in the hallway, my response I think would be I think the best place that answer comes in – and I don’t disagree with you – but I think what happens is the board needs to respond to 37 and ask that question. “What is the price tag? Where is the receipt?” They haven’t asked that question yet. And then it’s on the onus of us for us to come up with what we think is and maybe these four things. Maybe there’s a study or this or that that needs to happen to come up with that. Because I will say I’m not a financial expert. Clearly, I’ve run operations. I’ve done some rather

large budgets. I could come up with a number, but I don't think that's probably the right way to go about answering that particular question.

So Liman was next, and then we'll come to Fred.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I think that's a very good question to ask. My personal interpretation is that it's the right question at the wrong point in time because in my view we've delivered a discussion platform. We don't know what we're going to do yet because this needs to be discussed in the wider forum. And until we have a clearer picture of what we need to do, it's very difficult to put numbers to it. That said, you can always do some groundwork. You can start to look at things and walk in parallel with the discussion to eventually have a budget for the final plan. So I'm not averse to actually do some work, but I think to try to do a final budget at this point in time is premature.

BRAD VERD:

Thanks. And I think that's what we tried to do with the document was give a groundwork of things that were empirical, things that were quantifiable easily. Fred, you were next, and then Wes.

FRED BAKER:

It seems to me that for us to act as if we didn't know that question was coming would be strange.

JEFF OSBORN: First, thank you for indulging me, and I’m sorry I got the wrong time for it.

BRAD VERD: No apologies.

JEFF OSBORN: I do think it’s important. Wes, one of the problems I had was I spent months thinking about the financing and then it was like, “Oh, and by the way, we need 15 staffers. Thank you.” [inaudible] I don’t think that’s where the funding is needed. So it’s not a matter of they haven’t defined it yet. It’s who needs the money and where and for what is at a pretty basic level. Unless I’m really missing something, I don’t think we’ve hashed that out.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, [inaudible], I think we have to be. We have to have some mental idea. I don’t know how we can get there, but just to give you a good example from the SSAC, and this is all in the public session, because the NCAP proposal was very similar for the name collisions. And actually, the board also asked for a number and SSAC came up with a number, which if I’m not wrong was \$3.-whatever million. And then everybody was surprised. So the people were kind of not ready and all of that.

I want to emphasize all of this – SSAC’s NCAP proposal or our 37 and 38 – they’re completely new mode of work for the board. There is not much

precedent, definitely not in this scale with the board. The whole model is not designed to handle this kind of stuff, so we are kind of overloading also the model because we are supposed to be an advisory committee by the definition. So we advise the board what to do but if they want, they would do proper financial planning. It will go to the budget. That's a two-year process, blah, blah, blah. But nobody wants to do that because that's not practical. If we want to follow exactly that process, it will take three or four years to even get to the starting point of doing something.

So people understand that. Everybody wants to be pragmatic, but it's all uncharted waters, completely new. So I'm not sure even if you had a number that would have been received. I personally agree with your reading of the room that, "[Oh, but there is a number]," but I'm not sure if we even had a number that would have made things maybe more complex. Because as I see and as you might have observed if you joined in the last ICANN meeting SSAC session with the board, for example, there was a bit of – there is a lot of confusion around that.

So I think right now we're in a good position. Internally if we want to have an idea, I think that's good, but to be prepared to have something to submit I think this is premature at the moment.

BRAD VERD:

Liman, and then I'll make a comment.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: A comment in support of your proposal is that it struck me that probably the financial situation around this needs to be part of the future discussions in a wider forum. So it would probably be good to have a ballpark number for what we're looking at right now so that people can say, "Oh, that's way too expensive," so we can say, "Oh, where do we cut?" and so on.

BRAD VERD: In closing of this particular topic I think, Carlos, maybe we add this to this afternoon, the discussion where we talk about potential work that can be done. Now I will just caveat that in saying that my idea of doing work ahead of time was doing work ahead of a response from the board as to what their actual ask is. So I'm not sure if you will be able to answer this question, but you could certainly maybe start to come up with some of the framework for it. So we can have more of that discussion then, if that makes sense. Fair?

All right, Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: You mean discussion on the mailing list, or is it a topic that we're going to bring through the different monthly meeting?

BRAD VERD: We are not going to solve this topic and/or the topics that we'll come up with of future work items that need to be done either independently or in support of 37. We're not going to solve that today. We'll create the

list, and then that will become a work list which will then go through the normal process which would be work parties and mailing lists and all that stuff.

All right, back to the questions for OCTO. The first question, as stated here, was really just a scoping question on the resolution. If you go in and read the resolution, it's very specific about the IMRS. But then it's very generic on a bunch of terms and things that they state around that statement that's very specific, which could be interpreted in a much larger scale or not. So that's all we're asking for here is clarity.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Just note that the thing here is we're asking OCTO to interpret how they and us may be given money, and we're asking them. This is like asking your brother who mom said gets the dessert. I'd check another authority.

BRAD VERD:

Okay.

All right, second question here is kind of an inherent conflict between things that we keep hearing, which is the observation and monitoring of the system as a whole and this much more distributed hyperlocal-esque. That's a word that was created. It was not in any resolution that has been championed by OCTO. We go back here that there are RSSAC/SSAC statements as well as the CDAR report stating clear indication that more monitoring needs to be put in place, and we're asking how we resolve this.

All right, third question. I'm not seeing any hands go up or any mics being lit, so third question, we're asking OCTO to explain the research that informed the ICANN board on this – which is in quotes which is a quote directly from the resolution – which is this “long-term outlook for the traditional approach appears bleak.” So we're asking what informed the board on that.

And then the last one much the same, we're asking OCTO if they can be more specific as to what “new technologies, advances, and methodologies” – which is a direct quote out of the resolution – are envisaged to enhance existing root server operator practices that are not occurring organically and require ICANN org shepherding.

Everybody good? Reasonable? All right. Anything else that we should add to the discussion with OCTO? We did not receive questions from them, did we? I did not see any. So this is our agenda.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Would it be too much of a detailed question – they've sort of changed internally the structure of who is taking care of OCTO and the root and there has been a little juggling of personnel and stuff. Is that too inside baseball to ask about?

BRAD VERD:

Ask for clarification? I don't know. Maybe not. We can certainly give them heads up and ask.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, like Terry’s role and Matt’s role.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, it has all kind of changed.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. I’m curious. It’s just whether it’s germane here or that’s germane over a beer, and I don’t know the answer.

BRAD VERD: I would say it’s germane here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. I would be curious.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Maybe, Carlos, you and I can draft something up and send it over to them to see if they’re willing to share that in the open forum or not.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can we throw in what are their current priorities that they’re working on? I mean, I had a lot of discussions at the last ICANN that OCTO seems like somewhat an invisible – it’s hard to tell what they’re focusing on and I think it’s one of those things that would be good for us to keep on touch with.

BRAD VERD: Certainly. Yeah, Carlos, so there are two additional questions that we can craft. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, it struck me on any initial feedback from the KSK rollover that pertains to root service specifically? I guess that's a yes or no question, so it's probably too early for them to have any but it just crossed my mind.

BRAD VERD: Really quick, Russ, and then I'll turn it over to you [inaudible]. Go ahead, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: That's the first item on the joint RSSAC/SSAC meeting is feedback from the KSK rollover. So if we want to ask it separately here, that's fine. But it is on our joint meeting agenda, and it's also in the SSAC workshop. So we can add it here if you like.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was more looking for feedback from the OCTO specifically.

BRAD VERD: I can add that yesterday there was the SO/AC leadership meeting with Göran and bunch of his executives and then Cherine and Chris Disspain came in at the last portion of it. And the feedback around the KSK was it went off without any noise. Now there were a couple of places in the

world that had a few issues, but it was strictly a configuration issue of ISPs that were quickly resolved. But I think, yeah, there were a few I want to say like towns that had issue but nothing of the larger scope that was anticipated. And I think a lot of that goes to the work that was done and the outreach that was done during that year delay that got the word out.

I think it's one of those things where it's kind of like when we signed the root. It was kind of like, "Oh, that was boring." And it was like, "Well, it was boring because of all the pre-work that had been done." It could have been really, really scary but because of all the work that got done that's kind of out of sight, out of mind, it was boring. And operationally, that's what you want is boring.

So that's the feedback we got yesterday. But that's a fair question to ask again here if you want to. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY:

I'd suggest if we want to ask a question from the RSSAC-specific perspective, we could ask when we're going to hear more about planning for future key rolls. Because that was something that the question was raised intermittently prior to the first roll, and they said, "Afterwards, afterwards, afterwards." So that might be a related question that we could throw in. I'm sure they don't have much to say yet, but at least let them know that people are thinking about when we're going to hear more.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: One other quick point of information. On Wednesday at the DNSSEC workshop there is a slot – you’d probably know the time – where they will be talking about they key roll. And there are two presentations. One is given by Matt Larson about I’m assuming it’s his perspective, and I’m giving one too. So it’s a panel discussion.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Then I don’t need to put this in this session with the OCTO if that’s already happening. So thank you.

BRAD VERD: Great. But maybe we take a note, Carlos, about the future. Yeah, great.

All right, anything else with OCTO? Carlos and I will maybe spend some time to wordsmith this a bit and then notify OCTO to make sure they’re okay with these additional questions since they didn’t have them in advance like the others.

Great. Let’s move on to the last one, which is the questions to the board, which should go quickly since these are very similar.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I throw one more injection? I’m sorry.

BRAD VERD: For OCTO or the board?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For OCTO just to close it off. So the panel that I was talking about will be 11:30 on Wednesday and it's actually titled "Post KSK Roll? And Plan for the Next KSK Roll?" Although I don't know how much Matt is going to talk about that. [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We're hoping to get some appropriate input about when we're going to at least hear about planning for the next roll because there's very little to nothing to say as a result of the current one. So I have not seen slides from Matt yet. Hopefully, we'll get them in advance.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This was presented twice by ICANN that I saw in the last week at OARC and then at RIPE. So the short answer is nothing happened and the longer answer is the argument I think is whether we roll in a year or two.

BRAD VERD: If I may. And again, maybe this is out of context a bit, and that is the message that came from Matt and from OCTO and crew at the DNS-OARC meeting was that we have the DPS. The DPS says five years. But it's pretty much, as I think was stated from stage, that this is the beginning of the discussion with the community to figure out how to do this going forward.

My guess is that would be the exact answer you would get from OCTO today. We need to have that discussion to figure out what it is going forward. Because the responses from the mic in the room, they were all

over the place from monthly to five years. Literally, they were all over the place, so there was no clear answer let's just say. So we need to figure this out. As a community, we have to figure this out.

Okay, board questions. We've got 11 minutes. So board questions. These will go real quick. The link has been put in the chat so you can see it. We received two questions from the board.

What will be your main priorities for 2019? And I think we kind of just covered some of that, which is we'll be talking through – we have the Caucus work item list right now that, again, was sent out to the survey of the Caucus which is how we chose the last two work parties. So we have the ones that are still in the queue.

Then we have all the potential work out of 37 that we'll talk about later and start maybe documenting bits and pieces that we could do ahead of time or independently of any board response on 37. That will become, I believe – correct me if I'm mistaken – our priorities for 2019.

And then there's the org review that will be finalized, and then we need implement whatever is finalized out of that review. Right now it's still a draft and there's going to be a dialogue with the board about that.

Wes?

WES HARDAKER:

Is the board aware of our potential plans to go to a chair/vice chair model and that will affect their bylaws, for example?

BRAD VERD: No. That's been in the room here. It has not been – I don't know – I have not shared it with the board. I don't know if Kaveh has. But, no, I don't think. To me, that's more of an administrative thing. Even if it requires a bylaw change on their side, it's more administrative than, "We need your input on this."

CARLOS REYES: Just as background, Wes, that's a good question. It's not a fundamental bylaw, so the Empowered Community doesn't really get involved in approving it. There's still a process to follow, but it's much easier than going through the new post-IANA transition mechanisms.

BRAD VERD: So if everybody is okay with that type of messaging, that will be kind of the answer. I think we'll craft that and go through that more as the week goes before the meeting with the board, but to me is kind of the root of the answer.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: May I know who will deliver just because I will run that meeting?

BRAD VERD: I don't know. We'll have to figure that out. Myself or somebody.

And then second question from the board was: How should the ICANN multi-stakeholder model of governance, policy development, process evolve to balance the increasing need for inclusivity, accountability,

and transparency with the imperative of getting work done and our policies developed in a more effective and timely manner and with the efficient utilization of ICANN’s resources?

This is a bit of a generic question that we’ve gotten a couple of times. How does the group want to respond to this question? I think, just again to put it out there, I think us working on our workplan based upon the resources that we have available. We can state what we’ve done in the past, which is we had a lot of resources focused on 37 and during that we realized we couldn’t just have N number of work parties going on also. So we started to manage our resources and we plan on doing that going forward even now with 37 over. It won’t be an N number of work parties. We understand what our resources are, and we understand how they work, and we’ll be as efficient as we can.

Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Do we want to add that we are trying to look at how to engage with a wider audience with the Caucus discussions and engagement things we have? So that is speaking to the balance of more inclusivity. But I don’t see that as using a lot more resources from ICANN. So that could be something that we want to say.

BRAD VERD:

I think to me yes. And I think it would be great if this could be a multi-answer from multiple different people within RSSAC to the board. So having somebody add that. I think the Caucus to me brings its expertise,

so hopefully the product that RSSAC is delivering is richer and not necessarily we need more resources because we have more people in the Caucus, much like you say.

All right, and then real quickly because we are running out of time here. Oh, I'm sorry? Carlos then Wes.

CARLOS REYES: Question for Kaveh. Kaveh, do you know if the board, the agenda for the meeting, do they first address the questions from the group and then the questions from the board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Normally, there are two slides. I think first is the board questions to the RSSAC [inaudible] but we can change them if you want.

CARLOS REYES: No. I'm just thinking in terms of time management where the conversation is more important from the RSSAC's perspective. That may inform how we want to structure this.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think because I know generally the questions from the board, except if there is any specific direction which in our answers I don't see any specific thing, I would prefer to either put them at the end or go quick. But either would work. None of these are going to make – the board

won't want, I don't think they will dig deep in these answers because they are pretty generic.

BRAD VERD: Wes, you had something to say?

WES HARDAKER: I was just pointing at Carlos' hand.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. I need all the help I can get. All right, questions for the board. These are essentially the same questions we're asking OCTO, but these are directed at the board because it was a board resolution.

So the first one, again, what was the board's intention to signal that each root server operator should similarly explore diversification and resilience models for zone distribution and resolution both on their own and in loose collaboration with ICANN org, other root server operators, and the community? That's the first part of it. Or was it the ICANN board's intention to scope these efforts to the IMRS and L-root operations only? And again, if the intention was the former, then what community or PDP activities within the SO and AC groups does the ICANN board envision to effectuate any outcomes of this work may impact the root server system as a whole?

So again, this gets back to the root of the question. Are they talking about the IMRS or are they talking about the root server system?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I'm willing to believe it's only me, but I can't look at that and not think it would help to know what dollars associated with if you're spreading it more means. That's how I read that.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Can we agree that we're not going to have that answer?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes.

BRAD VERD: Okay. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think it might be good if I [put] a bit of background to this whole thing because I think there is an underlying question. And actually, running the session I will bring that up. That's also what I already told the board that I will do. Because I think it's a leading question. It will lead to a good discussion about what is the role of OCTO and how we see it and how they see it. Because my understanding is, and I don't want to speak on behalf of them, but from the actions and from what they write which part of the details about the board resolution was what they wrote basically, is....

BRAD VERD: Just for everybody’s edification, when you say “they wrote,” OCTO wrote a lot of the resolution.

KAVEH RANJBAR: OCTO. That’s a general practice, correct? Within the ICANN, the related departments, yes, they write the proposals basically. The board discusses them, changes them obviously, and all the input goes to them. And then if they pass, they pass.

But a lot of detail, when you read the detail, the language suggests that OCTO wants to take a leading role in strategizing the whole DNS. Like how root works in general at a high level and all of that. And we have had this discussion with them. I have had this discussion with them on multiple occasions that if that’s where you see yourself as part of this organization or the ICANN org, then you need to be open about that and you need to talk. We need to bring this out and see how the community feels. Maybe they like it; maybe they don’t. But we really need to bring that issue on the table.

So a bit of background to the resolution. The resolution was also [like about] ICANN org to do this stuff. We discussed that with the OCTO and we changed that to ICANN org as the operator of the L-root, IMRS, should do this stuff. Because I said as a peer in such a group, any of us – I as RIPE NCC can also come out and say, “The whole setup of how DNS works right now, how the root works, all of that is not efficient so I want to go to IETF. Do you support me or not?” Even if you don’t, I can still go to IETF, do my stuff, and then [there are other things]. I’m pursuing other deployment models, blah, blah, blah.

I think that's fair. Many of us have done similar things in the past, and we keep doing those things. But if ICANN sees it a central role in strategizing where DNS goes, I think they should be open about that. So I think that's the core of this question. And not only this. The next one and a lot of the discussions we have. So I really want to make that an explicit thing. Maybe that's the thing that we want and the community wants, but we never speak about it openly, so I want to bring that up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

As usual, you put that so much better than I could have. Thank you. There's an existential question about RSSAC that has always existed which is there's some number of us who our organizations say, "We don't trust ICANN. Don't tell us what to do," and ICANN saying, "We'd like to have a better role." And I thought in the last year at some point we'd come to saying, "Well, if you want to have more of a role of telling what to do, then you better have a checkbook." And then that's the last time I followed what was going on. So if this is becoming more explicit, this is good because not speaking about this isn't helpful.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

From my point of view, I really want to know if – and I call it high-level DNS strategy, but I guess you all know what I'm referring to – my personal opinion is, at least my expectation is, ICANN org is a reactive organization in that sense. Should be a reactive organization. So we should tell them or the rest of the [board] should tell them, and then they should act.

Personally, I see they want to be proactive. So they want to say, “The root resolution, for example, model is not scalable so we need to go to IETF. We need to go do whatever we can to fix that.” And maybe that’s what the community wants, but to that to my knowledge has never been discussed, and that’s not the role of ICANN.

Actually, we have in a few instances where informally when this was discussed, OCTO has shown me parts of bylaws which suggest at least the way they interpret that they say, “Oh, we are in charge of this high-level strategy for DNS.” I disagree, but I think that’s a discussion we have to have and we have to be able to refer to in the later times. Because when it comes up or on a higher level or in [a shell] like this question, I never have anything to go back. The only thing which is there is that part of bylaws which actually starts with unique Internet identifiers but when it wants to explain it says DNS, which is very strange. That’s all I have and that’s very open to interpretation because it’s already conflicted in how it’s written.

I think we should have that discussion. Maybe we cannot conclude in that session, but that’s something that I really want to at least bring up, put on the table, and see where we go.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, if I can really quickly since we’re run out of time, I want to touch base on the second question which touches ground on what he gave you the context for, which is the second question leads right into this which is: There appears to be an inherent conflict between increasing

the observation and monitoring of the system as a whole and a much more distributed hyperlocal-esque solution as championed by OCTO.

Obviously, I say the same exact thing that we said last time about monitoring with RSSAC, SSAC, and CDAR. And then here comes the root of the question and that is: How does ICANN board intend to reconcile advocating for both? That's the first question. The second piece which I think really goes to what Kaveh was saying here which is: Is this a signal that the model proposed in RSSAC037 is insufficient to evolve the root server system?

Because if you go back to 37, we talk about the SAPF, right? Strategy, Architecture, and Policy Function. The strategic piece in our discussions – and again I want to make sure I'm conveying the right type of message here – in our discussions was that piece. That's where the architecture would be talked about or, I'm sorry, the strategy on where to go, how to evolve. And that's when we talked about that's why we were going to include all of our stakeholders in this new model and they'd be members of this SAPF to figure out how to move it forward. So the question is: Does 37 cover that, or is there something else? Like he's saying, which is OCTO's doing that.

Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

A very valid question. To me, what we did with RSSAC037 was to create a plan to evolve the current system. I've always envisaged that there will be a parallel discussion about how should root service be

performed in the general sense. And I'm perfectly willing to agree that the strategic part of the SAPF is a very good place to hold that discussion. But it may need to happen before that organization [is] put in place. So I'm not averse to have discussions about different systems in parallel to creating whatever becomes of 37.

BRAD VERD: In the meantime.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: In the meantime. And hopefully, they will kind of come together as a good result. And I think we should keep an eye on that fact so that it actually does come together in a good way. So this is a very valid question, and please keep it.

BRAD VERD: Quick.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Very quick, yes. General observation about 37 because many people did not read the guts of it, they think it doesn't cover that stuff because the title says "governance." I know it's known, but just to repeat that. I have experienced a few times that people say, "Oh, but you said you were only thinking about – I thought the document only talks about governance on who can be a root operator and who can't. So you're not going to think about strategy of where the system goes and all of this."

No. It is. It's in the document, but because the title says "governance" people immediately think, "Oh, it's not about that stuff."

BRAD VERD: All right, great. Clearly, this is going to be a fun discussion. Daniel, do you have something quick?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I just wanted to add that I think this is covered by 37, but the difference is that when we wrote RSSAC037 we were mostly focused on the root server operators. So evolution of the system was mostly involving the people evolving their own platform. When we talk about the local root, I think it's something that is still addressing the root server system, but it goes beyond everyone's platform. And it means that we will need some additional people than [one currently seeing] in RSSAC if we want to accomplish that.

BRAD VERD: Right. I think we're all in agreement here that 37 covers this, and this question is asking based upon the resolution, how do you reconcile what's going on.

All right, so we've gone over. Again, thank you for your time but, again, I think this will be an interesting discussion with the board just based upon what we're seeing here. So please be engaged.

Carlos and I will pull together the latest round of questions to OCTO. We'll send them out to everybody. Try to get your feedback right away because we have to get them over to OCTO.

And we will see everybody back here in this room at 10:30. Thank you. This is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]