BARCELONA – RSSAC Work Session 2
Saturday, October 20, 2018 – 10:30 to 12:00 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

BRAD VERD: Alright, everybody. Can we get started again? Sorry for the late start, we ran long on the last session. So apologies to people in the Adobe Connect room, and people here, for starting late. But we'll get right to it.

This is the second RSSAC work session, and we are going to be talking through our procedures document, as well as maybe a few other things. Carlos, do we want to just start really quick with the questions that we crafted for OCTO, or do we want to do that at the end?

Alright, so really quickly, our last session, we ended on maybe adding a few questions to OCTO. During the nine minutes that ran into a little longer, Carlos and I made a couple changes. If you guys could just quickly look at these. Let's just quickly run through them, because we want to get them over to OCTO as quickly as possible so that they have an opportunity to kind of say yay or nay to them. Let me jump to it here real quick. Sorry.

So we added number five, is what are the priorities of OCTO in the coming year. Pretty straight forward, I think everybody is okay with that one. Number six was the one that we kind of went back and forth on, Carlos and I, and we ended up here, which is, can OCTO share any

internal organizational changes regarding ownership and operation of both the IANA and the IMRS? Is that reasonable? Everybody okay with that?

WES HARDAKER: What's the background on IANA? I didn't hear any change [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: So, we found out yesterday – so I'm not sure, there's – one of the executives, the executive who ran the GDD – Carlos. Not Carlos. Geez. I'm just going to switch – look, I woke up at 3:00 AM. I've been up since 3:00 AM. That's my only excuse. So, the executive who ran the GDD, the Global Domains Division, left the company. I don't know if everybody heard that, Akram Atallah left the company.

So, with that happening, we learned yesterday that Göran moved the ownership of the IANA function to OCTO. So it's brand new yesterday, so that's why I added it here. It's not a secret. I guess it's out in the public, people have heard this, and there was Chatham house rules from yesterday, so I'm able to share that. But it was brand new yesterday to me. So, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: It's a subtle distinction, but it's not that it's under Dave, it's under OCTO.

BRAD VERD: Correct.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Wow.

BRAD VERD: So, that's why I wanted to ask about that. Is everybody okay with it? I mean, when I first crafted this, it was like anything relating to the root, but that seemed too broad, too nonspecific. Hence making it specific around IANA and the IMRS. Everybody reasonable with that? And then lastly, the last question, which I think is pretty straightforward. Initial observations from the KSK rollover, and then more importantly, I think, is what's the potential plan for future KSK rollovers? Just to start that discussion. Yeah? Everybody okay with those?

All right, if everybody is okay with those, we'll send these over to OCTO right away and see if they're comfortable with them also. Okay? Alright, let's jump into 000, procedures document. Carlos, I'm going to turn this to you.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. Hi, everyone. So, 000, as you know, every year, RSSAC reviews its operational procedures. We typically start that process at the June meeting, and then Kevin Jones for the last two or three years has spearheaded that effort.

We were able to finish up the draft before NASA changed its representation, so that draft was shared a few weeks ago. There haven't been any changes since then, but the action item that Kevin and I had

after the August teleconference was to update this to reflect the potential chair, vice chair model. So that's the bulk of the changes that you'll see in the draft.

There are a few wordsmithing things and other minor things that we've caught over time, but the bulk of the changes are related to the chair, vice chair model, and you'll see most of those changes pages five and six. And then we updated any references throughout the document.

There are a few questions that we'll also want to address, but wanted to see if maybe before we go into the actual wording, are there any questions about the – I guess the concept in general of the chair, vice chair model?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, so we should have a discussion around the chair, vice chair model and what people think, believe, whatnot. It was thrown out there, Tripti brought it up. I will add just a little bit of context I only figured out yesterday, which is other SOs and ACs have upwards of seven vice chairs. One has five, one has seven. I was surprised, but I found that out yesterday, so I just wanted to share that with everybody in this context. So, that doesn't mean that we should have five or seven, or everybody'd be a vice chair. But I'm just –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We need 11.

BRAD VERD: Right. As I understand that, a lot of that is for regional representation and whatnot. There's a lot of stuff that goes on there. But back to RSSAC and the current model which is co-chairs, and proposed model which is brought up by Tripti, which is chair, vice chair. Jeff, you look like you've already hit the button. Do you want to say something?

JEFF OSBORN: Just if real quickly you could say the difference between co-chairs and a chairman and a vice chair, because it's not intuitive. In one sentence.

WES HARDAKER: I can regurgitate what I heard. Would that be helpful? There is a perceived difficulty in two chairs for a couple of reasons. One, people didn't know who to come up to as opposed to always going to the chair. And two, I guess the travel resources got wiped out of that line [inaudible]. So there's a list of like four items, and it was just delegating responsibility. It made a chain of command as opposed to a duality, and that confused people when the rest of ICANN doesn't operate that way.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. So I'll just add, we're the only group that has co-chairs. Just to point that out. We are the exception. I hate being the exception, just [inaudible]. But we are.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [I'm not.]

BRAD VERD: We are. So, around confusion, it's kind of like in that room, that room being the SO/AC leadership room who speaks for RSSAC, right? And Tripti and I spent a lot of time making sure that we're on the same page. So it's a lot of coordination.

Not that that wouldn't happen with a vice chair. It's the stuff that we do on the backend, if that makes sense. In the meeting yesterday, which was the SO/AC chairs with ICANN's leadership, every So had their chair and vice chair there. So, it wasn't that the vice chairs are exclude. It's not. It's – I don't know, I don't want to say – I think a lot of it's optics, and then some of it would just be internal management type of thing. That's all. And us being the exception.

JEFF OSBORN: Just for what it's worth, I'd be a fan of the chair and vice chair rather than the co-chairs model. T here's been a mistake in American – this is parenthetical – VC industry, everybody wanted two co-founders of everything they funded. And they thought they'd have a replacement when somebody quit. But what happened is everything was a pre-arranged fight. So it's better when somebody is presumed to be the head, I think.

BRAD VERD: If I may, my job as co-chair is to share what you guys want me to share. Right? I'm a voice. Nothing more. Right? So, I have my opinion, but when I'm in that room, my opinion doesn't really matter. It's what

RSSAC wants. Being very clear. And so going back to your comment around the fight, there isn't much of a fight as far as – as you might have in an organization, right? Come here, we talk about what you guys want the message to be, and then I share it. So, it's just that right now, we have two people that can share that message versus one. Does that make sense?

JEFF OSBORN: It's much harder to have conflict between the message one person gives.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. The phone game, right? You end up with purple monkey dishwasher. Yeah, exactly. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I also [inaudible] that we did have a system with a chair and a vice chair, and the co-chair model was put in place as a temporary measure to solve a problem. That problem is passed, and I think we could go back to the chair and vice chair model.

BRAD VERD: Carlos, and then Fred.

CARLOS REYES: Something else to mention, one of the recommendations from the organizational review is for RSSAC to consider a succession plan. And

it's one of the recommendations that RSSAC has said, "Yes, this is something that we'll consider." So this isn't exactly succession, but it fits along that trend.

BRAD VERD: Certainly helps with the messaging. Fred.

FRED BAKER: Well, so, general comment, in the IETF, I am a co-chair, and that really hasn't been an issue. It's not a pre-arranged fight. It does mean that I have to talk to my co-chair, which I would do anyhow. But I just – they both work.

BRAD VERD: Correct. They do both work. I think nobody's saying that he co-chair model doesn't work, okay? But I will say this is no the IETF, and we're the exception. That's where I would just end – and it's okay. If we want to be the exception, I'm fine with that. I'll carry the flag. I'm okay with that. I just – the topic was brought up, we should talk it through. That's all.

RUSS MUNDY: My purely personal observation of how this organization works and other organizations that I've watched, this seems to work very effectively with co-chairs. And in fact, I was not a fan of that when it was first brought up, but I've seen that it has, I think, worked very well, and

in fact, I started some discussions in SSAC about possibly going to a co-chair model.

That hasn't really gone anywhere, but it, from a functionality perspective, seems to work, at least in my view, very well for RSSAC. I'm not strongly opposed to going back to chair, vice chair, but I observe that it functions very well here, and we ought to think carefully about it before we change.

BRAD VERD: So, Russ, if I can ask a follow-on, are you able to put any of that viewpoint into concrete facts as to why it might be better?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. Here's an area that I think is very effective, where at the time of when there's heavy ICANN obligations, it's not – especially, say, during the time of the transition, things were – there were all sorts of people stretched all kinds of different ways. You could have the co-chairs participating in two different groups, and each of them speaking as a chair and not a voice from the vice chair that maybe is the chair.

So, for heavy obligated times, it's, I think, been very effective. Where sort of routine, ongoing events where they expect the chair to be in place, if both co-chairs can't be there, one of them then is sufficient, and it indeed is able to spread the load between two different human beings and still be the chair. And that's what I see as the biggest two advantages, in load, heavy load times from an ICANN bigger

perspective, and from just a pure weight of responsibility on one human being.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, I'm actually very much for the chair and vice chair model, and the reason is if it was a decision-making role, then I would definitely go for co-chairs. But because it's representation, I'm very much for actual a chair. And one of the reasons – I mean, as [the rest was mentioned,] especially that that's the expectation within the system, that that's how people see your advisory committee, they basically associate it with one person, but also – and I have been in this situation in ICANN, things can easily get ugly, and having a chair is much better.

Because one of the things that people do first – and this has happened in SSR2 openly – immediately, they question integrity, and they will try – which, I'm not saying that's a bad thing, that's people try to figure out what is real intent behind any message. So they will try to point out any small difference between what a chair could have said or one of the vice chairs, and then they will make that the issue. They'll say, oh, they don't disagree. And it might be 100% wrong, it doesn't matter how much, how many times you deny that, there will be a lot of conversation around that. And that's just a waste of time.

The example from SSR2 which happened exactly a year ago in the public session with NCUC, there were – I am the representative from the board, but it was referred to multiple times that some people in the board, or parts of the board – and I was very strong and very clear that no, I am speaking on behalf of the ICANN board, there is no some

people, but there was like half an hour of discussion about that theme, even when we had a strong message.

So I think that's just making things much more clear to say, hey, we have a chair who's basically representing us. Obviously, we'll have a vice chair, and if needed, that vice chair can be present in any – if really needed, if there is too much work, yeah, they can be in a second place and represent RSSAC, but for day-to-day operations and in normal life, which is most of the time, I think having one chair is much better. Just changing this because there are some times which there is too much load, I think that's an overprovision and has more downsides than benefits.

BRAD VERD: Alright, so just really quickly, the changes to 000 are literally to give people words for thought. We weren't getting a lot of feedback on the topic of chair versus vice chair, so this was literally just a way of saying, okay, this is what we would – should the group choose to go to a chair, vice chair model? These would be essentially what would change in 000.

We're not saying we're going to change this and approve this today, we're just saying that this is what would change to effectuate a chair, vice chair model so that people could have something tangible to read and think through. That's why we did this, and we said that on the call a couple of times, that that was the goal. So. Carlos?

EN

CARLOS REYES: I guess the other point of consideration that from – we've observed from staff is ultimately, the way the leadership positions are scoped within 000, they're limited to the primary representatives. So you're talking about a pool of 12 people for the chair in this case. The vice chair isn't scoped that way, at least in the current draft.

So, that's something we wanted to raise. Kevin and I discussed it, and he said the group should figure out who would be eligible for each role.

BRAD VERD: If I could build on that, the co-chairs currently – and correct me if I'm wrong, I'm going off of memory because I can't tell you the last time I've read this paragraph in 000, is you have to be a primary representative for your organization in order to be a co-chair. An alternate is not viable or able to be co-chair. And I think what you're saying here is you could double the pool immediately if you said that vice chair was available to alternates type of thing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [We could change that.]

BRAD VERD: No. Fred, question?

FRED BAKER: Well, this is a general thought, but limiting it to the primary means that two co-chairs are going to be from different identities. They could be

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

from Verizon A and Verizon J, I suppose, but they're from different identities. And expanding the pool in that way means that you could have two people from the same identity.

BRAD VERD: I would imagine we'd put a caveat that says that doesn't happen. But you are correct based upon what I just said.

FRED BAKER: [inaudible] and my suggestion is that we add a sentence that is that caveat.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: In addition, the secondaries are under a much less strenuous approval process, where it's just a stroke of a pen at the member organization rather than being accepted by the board. So to some degree, I think it's kind of nice that it went through a process. If it's him and if it's me, we could have just changed the secondary and nobody even knew it. It just seems slippery.

BRAD VERD: Again, that was not to say that this is what would happen. This was, again, all for, you know, things to talk about. Yeah. Anything else, Carlos?

CARLOS REYES:	I think Jeff brings up a good point that this has been a perennial issue about why – and part of it is historical about why the board appoints RSSAC and SSAC members and the chairs of those groups. It's not the case for the other advisory committees. But part of it is just historical how these two groups started within ICANN.
	I don't know if it's something that both groups will want to address at some point and modify in light of 20 years of ICANN, but it's something that we've been thinking about in the background as staff, is, why are these two groups treated a little differently than the other advisory committees? So that's something to consider. But I don't think you're solving it here.
BRAD VERD:	Yeah, I don't think we're solving it here, but I think that this is a perennial issue that keeps coming up every time we talk about the Empowered Community, we talk about a number of different things, it always comes back to, well, the board appoints us, so therefore, we can't do that. And it turns out that they don't do that for other groups.
	So, at some point, I feel like this should be a topic that we address as a group. I'm not saying we do it here and now, I'm just saying that this keeps coming up. And I will say as a chair, shame on me for not pushing the issue sooner, but we had bigger fish to fry. But now that we've got maybe some cycles, I think this is one that we should talk about.
	And to me, it goes to the bigger discussion of the Empowered Community and what do we want to do there, leads into the NomCom

EN

discussion, which – there's all these things that are connected around this one topic.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I think this situation is actually down to history. When ICANN was created, there were these three supporting organizations, and then there were advisory committees. And ICANN has evolved over the 20 years. RSSAC is one of the pieces that hasn't evolved much, possibly together with SSAC. And you are quite correct in your observation that now the other bodies are not appointed by the board.

So one way to look at this could be to move towards a root server operator constituency rather than advisory committee. That would kind of change some properties, possibly in a good way, possibly in a bad way, but that would [probably be] a larger change, modification to the bylaws, which may have to go through the Empowered Community. But maybe that's the way to go.

But you should also think of it in the light of RSSAC 37 proposals and so on. So, there's a lot that kind of comes together in this question. So yes, this is something that needs to be discussed, and possibly, this could be subject for a workshop.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Actually, great idea for a workshop. Great discussion topic, I think. I want us to be careful as a group – and I say this as a chair who – [somebody who's trying] to facilitate stuff, I don't want us to not do work with the idea that 37's going to magically happen. Right?

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

I think best case, 37 is a ways out, so I don't want to not do something we should do waiting for that to happen. So if this is something we should do, then we should do it. We shouldn't wait for the board response and then some long implementation of 37, in my opinion.

WES HARDAKER: Fair enough. Yeah, I second that. That's very wise. One of the things that I did want to bring up during the conversation was post-37 implementation, which I guess is going to be later. One of the things I do think we need to talk about is what happens to RSSAC, and can we come up with a list of checkboxes that aren't fulfilled by the rest of those functions that might be developed? And is there anything left? And there may or may not be, but that's not really written well into 37 as it is now.

BRAD VERD: Fred, then myself.

FRED BAKER: My perspective on that is that RSSAC exists because ICANN asked for it to exist, and I believe that the ICANN board will still find that they want to be able to ask people questions and get answers. So, if we choose to call it the SAPF, that's our choice, but they will treat it as the RSSAC.

WES HARDAKER: That would be a checkbox that got filled, yes.

EN

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I think going to your comment, Wes, I think we all agree that we didn't quite know what would happen to RSSAC post-37 implementation. We all had ideas, we all thought where it could fit, like in the SAPF function, but maybe you've got a couple different hats, right? Maybe RSSAC stays and RSSAC is also a member of SAPF type of thing.

But I don't think we can answer that. We've got to wait to hear from the board on 37, on what to do, and then work on the implementation. And obviously, we'll have a say in that, much like the rest of the community, but yeah, so I'll just leave it at that. Again, I don't want 37 to dictate what we should do, because 37 is not implemented yet, right? It's in the hands of the board, we don't know what's going to happen, and we don't really know what 37 will look like when it is implemented. Right? That still has to – we've got to work through that. So, if there are things we should do, we should do them. Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: I was thinking of questions to sort of structure the review of 000. We didn't really address who would be eligible for the vice chair position. We sort of started talking about it, but I'm curious, does the group still want to scope it to primary representatives, or also open it up to alternates? So that's, I think, one of the first items we can discuss here.

BRAD VERD: So, I'll throw my two cents, because I've stated before as even on the chair position, I always thought 12 people is such a narrow number to draw from that we've been very lucky to date. And I would certainly want o consider opening the vice chair position to alternates, assuming that we don't have a double conflict. I don't think the chair and the vice chair should come from the same organization. But other than that, I don't see the harm. And I know that there is issues, well, if they're not a voting member, then how do they take such a powerful role? But that doesn't bother me.

BRAD VERD: Ryan, and then myself.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Ken, and then myself.

KENNETH RENARD: Just the idea that this chain of succession, you do the vice chair, then that would groom you for the chair position, is that disrupted by – is it on?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [It's on.]

KENNETH RENARD: Okay. Yeah, so the idea of the succession, if the vice chair position is grooming for chair, if you have the different qualifications, that sort of disrupts that.

BRAD VERD: Go ahead.

RYAN STEPHENSON And to further add upon what Wes was saying, I kind of sort of brought this up in the mailing list that there could be a limited pool of individuals that may be able to fulfill certain leadership positions within RSSAC, and by opening up to the primaries, for example, there may be some instances where the – I'm sorry, opening up to the alternates, there may be some instances where the primaries are maybe not available due to other commitments and so forth, whereas opening up to the alternates would just – you know, to further [inaudible] what Wes was saying, increase the pool that's available.

BRAD VERD: I'm going to – I've deferred mine three times. Then you, Liman. So, this is a perfect segue into my comment, which goes back to the discussion we had years ago around primaries and co-chairs, was that this was an important role. And we wanted the commitment of the organization for that person to be a co-chair, because there was a commitment in time and resources and everything else.

So, Ryan, with your comments saying somebody might not be available for time, that was the whole point. If you're not available for time, maybe you shouldn't be a co-chair. Where it was opened up was the liaison role. Remember, where we changed it, we changed so alternates could be the liaison to the board. That's where we changed it. That's when that discussion happened. Go ahead, Wes. Sorry, Liman, then Wes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I just want to mention that this, again, ties back into the thinking of appointment, who appoints who. And as you mentioned, the possibility to cycle people. So, again, this is just a web of things that are all tied together.

BRAD VERD: The legacy stuff that we try to keep in, it causes issues sometimes. So Wes, and then Fred.

WES HARDAKER: Co-chairs all the way down. So, I don't buy your argument that an organization cannot commit the time of a secondary representative.

BRAD VERD: My argument was nothing more than restating the conversation that we had years ago.

EN

WES HARDAKER: Fair enough.

BRAD VERD: It was not an argument. It was a [reinstantiation] of the conversation.

WES HARDAKER: Okay, fine, then I disagree with that entire premise of the previous argument. Because the reality is that if an organization says, "Look, I have two people and I want to do load balancing," like Russ was talking about earlier with two chairs, right? "I want to have one of them being primarily responsible for being a representative and the other one to help out as a vice chair." As long as the organization can commit that, then who cares?

FRED BAKER: Well, I think the succession question you raised is actually interesting. If the chair can only be a primary but the co-chair can be an alternate, and we now do a succession, then we now have an alternate being the chair. And now one way of doing that would be for the organization to say, fine, that person is now the primary. But there is something that would have to be teased apart there.

BRAD VERD: That's really interesting, because obviously, we, RSSAC, don't have the influence to tell an organization who can be their primary or secondary. Obviously, if we as a group all vote that whatever the procedures end up being, put that caveat in there and therefore the organizations know

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

that they have to make that change, then it could happen. But I'm not advocating for it, I'm just – you know, those are all things that we would have to think about that we currently haven't thought about. So Wes, and then Carlos.

WES HARDAKER: So, forget the can of worms, I'm going to throw an entire crate of worms, because technically, we do operate by Robert's Rules of Order, and if you read Robert's Rules of Order, the chair position in particular is supposed to be neutral and not engage in arguments and things like that. That doesn't really work for this organization, but one of the benefits of opening it up to alternates is that all of a sudden, the alternate's actually [not] somebody that's typically casting the final vote on an issue. So it actually brings less conflict with the chair being an alternate.

CARLOS REYES: So, Fred, what you raised is something that Kevin and I had a very long discussion about, the potential issue of having an alternate then suddenly succeed the co-chair – or excuse me, the chair. And that doesn't really fit with the scoping of the role limited to primary representatives.

Because everyone in the United States is now a constitutional expert, it sort of reminds me of when the country was originally founded, the president and the vice president could be separate parties.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And often were.

CARLOS REYES: And often were, correct. So if the chair, if there's a vacancy, that would just trigger an election. That would still be limited within the primaries. So the vice chair would still stay there, that's one solution if the succession doesn't really work.

BRAD VERD: This topic of chair, vice chair was essentially all the changes. There weren't other lingering changes that we should talk through or whatnot. Clearly, the bulk of the edits in the document are related to co-chair, vice chair. But are there other topics we should talk about and not get lost?

CARLOS REYES: So there's a series of things related to the chair, vice chair model. For example, staggering the terms. Should they be staggered, or should they be elected at the same time? Kevin and I discussed those dynamics too, because if they're elected at the same time, you're almost running as a ticket where you could have that type of dynamic within the group, so that's interesting. If they're elected at separate times, it doesn't necessarily lend itself to two people running together.

BRAD VERD:	And it does lend itself to – if it's a succession plan, somebody is versed on what's going on as a chair and what's happening. It's an easier transition versus just a hard cut.
CARLOS REYES:	Yeah. Right. So I think if we were to think about this sequentially, some sort of gates that this group has to discuss first, is who's eligible for each position? And then we can talk about when election happen and staggering terms, etc.
	Those are really the two main issues with the chair, vice chair model that needed discussion. There are a few other things that we can go through now or wait for a teleconference. I'll leave that up to you, but basically, we codify the electronic voting procedure, because it's something that we've done in practice, but it's never been in this document.
	And then there was a question about the types of publications that RSSAC publishes. Is there value in adding another type, which would be essentially correspondence? So that was a question from Andrew.
BRAD VERD:	Well, we're here until noon, so let's keep the discussion going about vice chair, co-chair. Co-chair, vice chair. Sorry. Fred, then Liman.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. As I said before, I'm fine with having a chair, vice chair model. That works. And I'm in favor of expanding the pool. That just seems

EN

sensible. So, along those lines, whatever. I do have a question about the role of the support staff.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Mic.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so there's a paragraph here that used to say that the co-chair would call for a vote in the event that two or more candidates are standing for election, co-chair will call for a vote. And it's modified to read "The support staff will call for a vote." And what does that mean? Does that mean that the support staff will send the e-mail, or that they will initiate the question of whether there's a vote?

CARLOS REYES: It's the administrative piece.

FRED BAKER: Okay, because deciding that they need a vote sounds like a chair decision to me.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, so based upon my interpretation – and there was no intent here to change that, but it would be the chair or the co-chairs calling for a vote, but that e-mail might come from staff.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, that's the kind of thing that staff is for. But making the decision, that sounds like a chair thing.

BRAD VERD: Whatever changes to the words, we can fix that, but that was the intent.

WES HARDAKER: Point of clarification, Fred. When you said you're in favor of expanding the pool, for which of the positions, or both, did you mean?

FRED BAKER: Probably for the vice chair. Chair, I don't think we've discussed enough for me to really form that opinion. I might be okay with it, but I'd need to think more.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, I just wanted to know what you meant. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Two points. If you only expand for the vice chair, the succession thing kind of crumbles together. So that's one point. The other one –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [I'm sorry, what's that?]

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If you expand the pool for vice chairs but not for chairs, you can end up with a vice chair who's an alternate who can then not become a chair if you want to maintain the succession.

BRAD VERD: Unless you specify in the procedures that in order for them to succeed, the organization would have to make them primary.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: Right? And if you put that in the document, in the operations document and everybody votes for it, then your organization is signing up for that. So there are – let's not –

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: There are ways around it, yes.

BRAD VERD: I'm not saying around it, that's just making – that would become our practice.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay.

EN

BRAD VERD: But we need to think of it like that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Fair enough. My view of the situation is that doing it that way – which would work, I do agree, but it seems overly complicated. To me, it would be easier to say just open up for alternates for chair position as well. and my point here is that we are a very limited number, we all have to her undertakings, day jobs to attend and whatnot, and I would like to expand the pool so that we can find the best person for the job. And that person doesn't necessarily have to be a primary in my view. We need a good chair, we don't need a good primary. So that's my view.

                        And one more point. For timing, again, if you want to maintain the idea of succession when the vice chair steps into a chair position, you will have to align the timepoints when you elect chairs and vice chairs, because otherwise, the staggered terms will make it very hard to step in.

BRAD VERD: Other groups have done this. I don't think we're reinventing the wheel. I think that's – not to say that's easy, but I think we could plagiarize from other groups that – reuse, let's say. Reuse what other people have done. But yeah, I agree, there are some details there that would certainly have to be – to make sure that the i's are dotted and the t's are crossed. Wes, you want to – you looked like – no? Fred.

FRED BAKER: Well, regarding the staggering question, let me stagger into the question. I think there's a question of precision, and this time around, whatever we do, the new co-chair, the vice chair, whatever it is, has an extra two months. And we have an e-mail discussion about that.

It seems like saying that it's staggered on two years and two years kind of thing is very different than saying, "and it has to start on the 1st of the year." We –

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: In the weasel wording or in the discussion that you just mentioned, we can say that that can be approximate.

BRAD VERD: Carlos – so, is that all we want to talk about with the co-chair, vice chair? I certainly want to make sure we cover these other topics, which I think are important, and changes that will need to get done as far as our obligation to review 000 every year. If the discussion for co-chair, vice chair goes on, we still need to make these other changes to 000. So, we should go through that.

But we do need to come up with kind of a plan forward for the co-chair, vice chair, and maybe the answer is we just come down to having an internal vote on what we want to do, and then based upon that vote, we could make the changes, agree on the wordage and all the specifics.

It's a multi-step process type of thing. I don't know, I'm just throwing that out there for a discussion point point of view. I'm just trying to think of how to move the ball forward.

CARLOS REYES: So I was going to suggest – well, first, it sounds to me that we're opening up the chair and vice chair positions to alternates as well. Is that kind of where –

BRAD VERD: I have a hard time with opening up the chair position, I'm just going to be honest with you. I would like to see commitment from the organizations that – this takes a lot of time. This is a huge commitment.

CARLOS REYES: So –

BRAD VERD: As a co-chair. And if you're a chair, it's going to be – I don't want to say more, but maybe a little bit more. And I would like to know that the organization has signed up for that. That's my opinion.

WES HARDAKER: Right, but – so my question back is, how does an organization do that by allowing that person to become a chair? How is that not committing your time?

CARLOS REYES: I would hate to answer the question with a question, but why is it so hard for the organization to specify somebody who's a primary? I don't understand that. I really don't.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We're all in the room. Is there anybody who thinks their organization would take more than ten minutes to flip the primary and secondary? Anybody?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Within the organization, maybe not so much, but the primary needs to go through the board. So, procedurally, it's –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That took the drive from Palo Alto to Redwood City last time I did it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, I'm a bit further away.

BRAD VERD: That's just my opinion as, one, from experience, and one, as my opinion from my organization, not as chair. So, again, I'm happy, whatever the group comes to, I'll carry the flag. I'm just sharing my thought. It sounds like opening up the vice chair, everybody agreed on that. My opposition was to the chair piece.

CARLOS REYES: Okay. I think what may be helpful is I'll extract these two sections from the document, create a clean version to reflect this discussion. I have a hard time reading some many tracked changes. So, I'll produce that clean version to reflect the chair and the vice chair positions being open to both primary and alternates, and I don't recall a specific resolution to the staggering conversation. I think, Fred, you made some points and there were a few other points, but I don't think the group agreed on how to address that.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, how do you guys feel about that? My view – and this is just – maybe this is a historical succession thing that's just stuck in my head, it seems like you'd stagger them so that when and if the chair finally termed out, assuming they were there for both terms, that the chair would be in a perfect position to step in. Not to say they would, no to say it would happen, but it just seems like that would be the most diplomatic answer. It also doesn't allow for the ticket scenario where you have a chair and vice chair, same timeframe potentially swaying the influence of the group or whatnot. I don't know.

RUSS MUNDY: One quick comment from SSAC historic perspective. We've operated with a chair, a vice chair from the – not quite the beginning, but very early in the history, and we have never had the vice chair step in to become the chair. Just as a matter of real-world practicality.

BRAD VERD: That's a good – thank you for sharing that.

WES HARDAKER: Is SSAC aligned? Are they elected at the same time, or are they staggering?

RUSS MUNDY: At this point, they're elected at the same time. And I don't rmemebr if that's technically in the SSAC process manual or if it's just turned out that it's worked that way. I'm not sure, but we're electing them at the same time now.

WES HARDAKER: Has there ever been a case where the vice chair wanted to become the chair? Because one of the issues with staggering is that if the vice chair says, "Well, now that the chair's stepping down, I actually want to take that position," but if there's still a year left in their term, then that doesn't really work unless they step down, [at which point] you have to elect a vice chair at the same time anyway.

RUSS MUNDY: So, that is certainly a potential scenario. There has been examples of coming close to that, but it never reached the formal stage where people that happened to be in the vice chair position talked about becoming the chair and basically, informal discussions said, well,

probably not. And so it was really a prior to any formal nomination and election process where that did occur.

BRAD VERD: If I may share a counterpoint to my previous argument –

WES HARDAKER: That wasn't an argument, that was a problem.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. Okay. So just to share other context, I have talked to vice chairs here in the community, some of which never want to be chair. They're happy being a vice chair, they're happy working in that group, they never want to be a chair, they never want to be up on stage. So, those are things to think about.

WES HARDAKER: I would expect that some wood, right? That we're never going to [get a 100% average] in motivation.

BRAD VERD: Absolutely. Yeah.

RUSS MUNDY: And in fact, that scenario has occurred also where someone who's vice chair of SSAC just didn't want to be chair. So.

BRAD VERD: Alright, so Carlos, we're going to extract that piece out, we'll add some context based upon the words we have here for the – do we agree on staggering or not staggering? Or does it matter? We've got to specify something.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Suggest not staggered.

BRAD VERD: Okay. We'll start there, we'll put it in the paper, and we'll see how the conversation goes. That seems perfectly reasonable. So we know that those change. There was a few other things I thought that came up [while talking to Fred] here. Any other issues? I can't think of it. And then we'll come back with a document – I'm sorry, go ahead, Ryan.

RYAN STEPHENSON: I think what Fred was talking about that you couldn't think of was maybe coming from the same letter. Was that –

BRAD VERD: That's right, yeah. We need to add that. it also raises the question – so let me add to the can of worms or the barrel of worms, Wes. What about liaisons? Right now, we haven't specific that, right? So right now, I am co-chair, I'm also liaison to RZERC. What if you had both representatives from an organization, one is chair, one is a liaison? Is that fair? I don't know, but that's a potential scenario now since we're talking about making sure the vice chair and chair are not from the

EN

same organization. I don't have a problem with it, it's just a question we should talk about here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: My view on that is that we do make a distinction between outgoing and incoming liaisons. And so far, we haven't really discussed whether liaisons would be eligible for vice chair position. We've only spoken about alternates. So my view is incoming liaisons are not eligible for chair or vice chair.

Chair or vice chair can be eligible for outgoing liaison if that's suitable. That's a case by case basis, I would say. Having the chair – if you go up to full chair, have that person be a liaison to some other group that also requires a lot of work may not be the wisest choice, but it's on a case by case basis. So, if you start from there, you end up with the question, can the chair and vice chair come from the same organization? And in order to do that, they would have to be alternate – main representative and alternate, and we've already said that that wasn't a good idea. So, to me, it kind of falls together pretty well if you view it from that way.

BRAD VERD: Great, so the only limitation there would be co-chair, vice chair can't be from the same organization. But you can have outgoing liaisons and the chair from the same organization, or vice chair – two separate things. Any issues with that? I just want to make sure we cover it in the procedures document.

EN

Okay, seems like we have a plan forward there. Carlos, can we cover the other topics? The ones that we nee to do regardless of what goes on with this, the co-chair, vice chair topic. And the things that you talked about like the – well, I'll just defer then. Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: I think in July or August when we were electing the liaison to the CSC, there were some charter changes to the CSC. There were some charter changes to the CSC about the term limits for liaisons. Originally, when the RSSAC drafted this, it was actually before the transition happened, so we were sort of anticipating what may be the case with the liaison terms.

Since then, all of that has been aligned, and there's a change here in the document in the section about the CSC 1.2, [currently 6.6,] that the term originally was three years. Since then, the CSC has clarified that terms are two years. So we just wanted to align that with the charter of the CSC. So that's one change I wanted to flag.

And then for the RZERC, this is something that Kevin and I discussed, currently, the term for RZERC is every year. Liaisons [with the] Root Zone Evolution Review Committee. So every year, we've done that. Kevin suggested, would it make sense to also make it two years so that someone in that role actually develops some sort of institutional memory? Because if they leave after a year or they're voted out, the RSSAC could be in a position where every year, they have to reintroduce someone to that group. So just a thought. That's definitely an item for discussion right now.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

BRAD VERD: So, as your RZERC liaison, I would add that I think a two-year term would be perfectly reasonable. I would actually argue a three-year term would be perfectly reasonable. And the reason I say that is that the RZERC group is a very – there's not a lot of work there, if that makes sense. It is a – we meet monthly, there's a mailing list, there's all that, but it is there for when architecture changes happen to the rootzone, and those are few and infrequent.

So, it isn't like – there's not much content there. It's important content there, don't let me – I'm not trying to dismiss that, I'm just saying the quantity is small.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's like rolling the KSK, important but infrequent. I'll fill in that – in my take as the liaison to the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee, again, this is – as opposed to your work, it's very ongoing, because we have these monthly reports from the PTI that we actually go through and look at and review and approve, or report from at least, make statements about. But again, it's not very cumbersome. It's not a lot of work. It's continuous, but at a very low level.

And I'm kind of torn between the view of aligning our appointments with the ones of the group and with what you say about institutional memory and stuff which is also very important. So I really see two things. And I guess we could go with the two-year thing for CSC, which is aligned, and with a similar two-year thing for RZERC, which is not

aligned, but it's less frequent than their appointment frequency, which kind of fits together anyhow.

In IP addresses – it's a short prefix –

BRAD VERD: I believe – correct me if I'm wrong, people who've been here. I believe the one-year term was – we kind of did that for all of our liaisons, didn't we? That was just like a generic, "Let's apply it," when we created this whole document. We've had operational experience now, we've played through it, and maybe one year – I will say that both us and RZERC missed one of the reappointments, because it was every year.

So the first reappointment for me didn't occur. It wasn't until like nine months later or maybe even a year later we went, "Oh, that didn't happen." So that's just something to keep in mind. If it's every year for all these different – if this is to grow any more, it becomes overhead that you've just got to think about. That's all.

And it wasn't just us, because RZERC actually had to initiate the question around the renewal of that seat, and they never did it either. So there was a failure on both sides. That has since been remedied.

WES HARDAKER: The irony being that people think we ought to roll the KSK more – once a year to make sure that we remember how to do it.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, that's a good point. Alright, any other changes? Go ahead.

CARLOS REYES: So in the original document, there was a line that basically called on RSSAC to develop a review process for liaisons just to make sure that they're effective. That was never really explained. So Kevin and I took a first stab at it, and we made it fairly – as simple as possible. Basically, we just say that the annual review will consist of a minimum a conversation between the chair and the liaison. The chair will then share the outcomes of that conversation with the RSSAC.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think it's very reasonable, because it provides a formal opportunity to get feedback, because I try to get feedback, but – and then the chairs are good enough, and any of you that I've asked provided feedback, but having that formal opportunity and a set time in a year, I think it would be very useful.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was just thinking about the frequency of this. I think it's a very good idea. But it would be kind of helpful if it happens some part into the timeslot so you get a chance to adjust. If I don't understand the expectations properly, I would like to know and get a chance to address it.

CARLOS REYES: I think terms also – or longer terms help with that, because if it's one year and you have to have an annual review, that doesn't really make sense.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No, it doesn't. So my point is we should have it like every three months, six months or something so that we – it should be kind of an ongoing dialog at the same time that you have – it's the same way you have evaluation talks with your employees: Maybe every six months or something as a strawman proposal.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I would say at least annual or mid-appointment year, appointment period, something like that.

BRAD VERD: Again, I think where some of this is coming from, just to give everybody context, is we have – I know of one liaison role that somebody plays is outgoing liaison that is not a primary or an alternate, right? So somebody from the caucus. And that is to the NomCom. And so we don't get them on the call every month to get a liaison readout. So there was a period of time here where we got no readout from our liaison, and that was shame on us, right? And we've since changed that, but that, I believe, is where some of this is coming from.

It's easy when we have a monthly call and the liaisons get up and give their report, right? Because you're kind of getting that input on a regular

basis. But if we have a liaison who is not a primary or alternate, then we have a problem. Well, I should say we've seen a problem.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: In our attempts to be more open, we now have – we invite observers to our monthly telephone calls, which is good. Would it be appropriate to [inaudible]?

BRAD VERD: Not to the monthly calls, no.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I thought we did.

BRAD VERD: I actually thought we had at one point too, but I was corrected. So no, to those calls, we did not.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Alright. Let me rephrase then and say that –

BRAD VERD: We do have a formal meeting at ICANN that is open to observers, which represents that monthly call. So keep that in – that was the balance that was struck.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Fair enough. So, would there be a problem to – this is a general question for the group, would there be a problem to invite our elected outgoing liaisons to our monthly meetings? You know, that could be going one step further into being open, and I think these are people we have decided to trust because we've put them as liaisons. So, as an idea.

BRAD VERD: Barrel of worms. You could take it one step further. And again, this is throwing stuff up on the wall and seeing what sticks here, but in addition to the liaisons, obviously – and this is not part of 000, but if we're inviting people to that call, it seems like there are some of the more important reviews that we have representation at that, quite honestly, I feel like we should be getting an update from, like SSR2, like ATRT3, where a regular input from them coming to the calls, I think, would be valuable to the group.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm not averse to that. And if you want to find a compromise where maybe not every but maybe every other, or – but in general, I agree with you.

WES HARDAKER: As a point of opinion, I agree. I think they ought to be at every one. It really doesn't make sense to try and juggle every other one.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was offering bait to someone who was opposed.

CARLOS REYES: So, as you might recall, there have been changes to the ICANN fellowship program, and every SO/AC group now is invited to appoint someone to the selection committee and then someone to the mentoring committee, which is new. They're both new. RSSAC did initiate that process for the selection committee, and we did have a volunteer from the caucus, so he's in that role now. Should we codify those two appointments in the document?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would suggest that we look for am ore generic text that we kind of – that we employ similar procedures for when – this seems to be a recurring thing that we need – something new happens and we need to [count it] in our process. So if we could find a general type of text to address this stuff would be better.

CARLOS REYES: So it's currently in there. We discussed this a few years ago. I think it's fine as it is. I'll give everyone a few minutes to read that paragraph.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I suggest that we add something so that we have a place to keep track of this. It should mention – I wouldn't use the word "registry," but a list should be maintained by staff with the various properties of these liaisons. You know, terms and whatnot.

BRAD VERD: So, we currently do that on the RSSAC page, right? Who our liaisons are. The ones mandated by the bylaws. Do we not?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's fine.

BRAD VERD: Do we want to do that there?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm just thinking [inaudible] the text.

BRAD VERD: Or do we want to do it a different place type of thing?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I don't really care as long as it's somewhere. And I think it should be mentioned in the text that such a place should exist. It doesn't have to mention which place, but it should be – if someone looks at, "Okay, where's the list?" And you can go and ask them [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Okay. So, it seems reasonable that this statement stay as is. I don't know if we need to specify in the operating procedures that we have a list, but it seems like we should take as an action item that we should

create that list of all the liaison – I mean, is that fair? Or do you want this – that statement amended to say, "We have a list, and here it is?"

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would prefer to see a statement, but I'm not adamant.

CARLOS REYES: I just added a sentence.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's perfectly fine. Thank you. Is that okay with you, Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah.

CARLOS REYES: So, as I mentioned, there's a new section that explains how electronic voting happens. We've been doing it as a practice, but it hasn't been documented, so I'll give everyone some time to read that new paragraph. And then there's something else right above that that I'll explain. Any questions about – yes, Wes.

WES HARDAKER: 72 hours over a weekend is always questionable, so would it be better to say three business days or something like that? That being said, I think we had 72 hours over a weekend in order to meet the ICANN board, so –

BRAD VERD: Can we just say like a goal or – I don't know how to word it, but –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 72 business hours.

BRAD VERD: Well, 72 business hours is, now once you put it in there, is a requirement. What happens if we have something that is time sensitive and we need to do it below that, type of thing?

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, preferably over business days or something.

BRAD VERD: Obviously, that should be the default, but somewhere in the document, we should allow for exceptions.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Do we want to make the voting private among the letters, or do we want to have it transparent among –

BRAD VERD: That actually is a second topic we'll get to after this one.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Actually, business days may be very different from one country to another. So, I think in terms of hours, it might be clear. One day might be off in one country, so [all that –]

BRAD VERD: I feel like we overengineer everything. Fred, go ahead.

WES HARDAKER: Never mind, I withdraw. Leave it at 72 hours. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Well, Daniel already made my point.

BRAD VERD: Thank you to the engineers.

CARLOS REYES: So, to Ryan's point, Kevin also suggested we clarify what voting happens for what types of votes or how voting is conducted for different types of votes. And this was a conversation, I think, earlier this summer around the document, but the suggestion from Kevin is basically that voting for publications is open ballot and voting for appointments or elections is secret ballot.

BRAD VERD: And if I may add that that statement represents what our practice has been. Nothing more. So we're not trying to dictate anything new, this is literally just putting down what our practice has been.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Are these the only two things we ever vote around? Do we need a fourth route here for other things?

CARLOS REYES: Well, there's administrative things like minutes.

BRAD VERD: You could say that voting for Are SSAC – voting for everything other than appointments and elections will be open ballot.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm perfectly happy with that.

BRAD VERD: Because there are other things, like we vote for minutes, like we might have a vote on vice chair, co-chair. You know, there are other things that we could and might vote on.

CARLOS REYES: So, the new sentence reads all RSSAC votes are conducted via open ballot, however, voting for appointments, elections – I'll work on the grammar.

BRAD VERD: Just a quick time check, we have ten minutes. Yeah, ten minutes. I'm sure people don't want to run into lunchtime like I did on your previous session.

CARLOS REYES: The next major – or the next topic is publication types, once I get there. Actually, no, sorry. Another practice that we've never documented before is the 48-hour preview for the board. So this is a new paragraph.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And the number 48 is aligned with other practices, is it? Or do other groups have different practices? Because then we should align, I think.

CARLOS REYES: Russ isn't here. I don't know if SSAC does that. I think it's something –

BRAD VERD: I think – and I'm going off of memory here, so please don't hold that – but I think the 48 hours came as historically what SSAC does. RSSAC didn't publish a lot of documents before, so to say that this was as historic artifact of RSSAC, I don't think would be accurate. I believe this was reused from SSAC.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I agree. And to be honest, I don't see the benefit of it. I think having it the other way around might be useful. For example, if there is sensitive data, sensitive information, then we might advise to – for example first give it to the board within – and give this much period of time, which might be different. So, I don't see that much benefit. We do this practice because I'm the one sending it to the board. I have never, ever received a feedback in the past two years about, oh, it's good that we received it earlier or things like that. So, I think not documenting it but – or at least documenting a process that says, "If required, RSSAC can mark documents to be –"

BRAD VERD: Something like we strive to type of thing? So it's like a subjective goal so to speak? Like in most cases, we'd like to give them 48 hours, but in some cases, maybe it's not necessary because it's something very benign?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

CARLOS REYES: I feel like this is sort of on the periphery of that web of issues with the role of RSSAC and its advice to the board.

BRAD VERD: Legacy.

EN

CARLOS REYES: So, add some sort of conditional statement, "If required?" Okay. I'll look at it, yeah.

BRAD VERD: I don't think it's required. It's not required today.

CARLOS REYES: Right.

BRAD VERD: It's not required today, we do this as a courtesy. So we just need to put something in there. But we can modify that.

CARLOS REYES: And then there were some suggestions from Andrew – a lot of RSSAC publications refer to comments and statements almost synonymously, so he just thought it'd be good to capture that. So just change the heading of that particular section. And then there was a suggestion from Kevin, should we consider adding some sort of correspondence as a type?

BRAD VERD: We don't have correspondence today, correct? This is a suggestion by Andrew? Is that what this is?

CARLOS REYES: Yeah. We don't have it as a type, but we have had correspondence. For example –

BRAD VERD: Oh, I see what you're saying.

CARLOS REYES: Liman, you had the exchange of letters with the IETF about the liaison role years ago.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah.

CARLOS REYES: Right.

BRAD VERD: I'm perfectly fine adding it. Again, I think this is overengineering where we try to codify every single thing. Ît just puts us – I mean, to me, it limits us and makes things harder. But I'm happy to do what we need to do here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'd like to propose that we codify the things that have some kind of special meaning. Advice to the board is something that has a special meaning to me. There are a few other things that have a special meaning, and then we have a catchall that says, "May issue other types

of statements and correspondence." And be done with it. I am very much on your page here with listing everything that we can, must or mustn't do. It doesn't work that way. But if something carries special meaning, it should be mentioned.

CARLOS REYES: So it sounds like you'd rather simplify this list to four.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes.

CARLOS REYES: Okay. I'll take that back.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And if you want to toss ideas, I'd be happy to help you.

CARLOS REYES: I have my action items.

BRAD VERD: Alright. So that's it for 000. Is there anything else that anybody wants to cover while we're here? We've got four minutes, three minutes. Go ahead.

CARLOS REYES: So, I have some more details about dinner [for] Tripti. She wrote to me and she is not available on Sunday.

BRAD VERD: But is on Monday.

CARLOS REYES: But is on Monday.

BRAD VERD: We should stick with the plan if everybody's okay with that.

CARLOS REYES: Okay.

BRAD VERD: Great.

CARLOS REYES: And then the other thing is there is the cocktail reception with the board, the board technical committee, SSAC. That is for RSSAC members, it's on Tuesday, and there will be two shuttles. So we'll share that information. But the shuttles will leave from the Marriott, and they'll bring everyone back as well. There's a shuttle at 7:00 and a shuttle at 7:30.

BRAD VERD: Alright. If that's it, we will adjourn this meeting, and we will see everybody at – sorry, I don't have the schedule in front of me – 1:30. Right back here at 1:30. Okay? Thank you. We're adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]