
BARCELONA – RSSAC Work Session 4
Monday, October 22, 2018 – 13:30 to 15:00 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

BRAD VERD: Welcome, everyone. This is opening day of ICANN 63. Day three for our work sessions. This is RSSAC work session. We've got a number of topics to cover here. First and foremost is the public sessions we have tomorrow, the RSSAC Information Session which is your normal, the one we do at every ICANN to tell everybody what's going on in RSSAC. Then we have the caucus meeting.

So, I want to run through those presentations which were shared on the mailing list, get buy-in, see who wants to take the mic on these things for tomorrow. Then, I think we'll go into future workshops, which I think quite honestly, could take up the entire hour, but let's get these first two administrative things behind us and then we'll talk about future workshops.

So, does everybody have the documents that were mailed around to you from Andrew or do we need to bring them up? I have the days here. They were mailed. So, the first one is RSSAC activities. Let me ask ... Go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Until that loads ... Because today there is the first public forum. There might be similar questions on what we heard from RSSAC, like the scope of the proposal or advice or things like that.

BRAD VERD: For 037?

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.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: For 037, 038. It might come up.

BRAD VERD: In the public forum?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: In the public forum.

BRAD VERD: I got it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So, I think I know the line and I think the SSAC session today was one example. If there is any feedback, please let me know. Or if there is anything specific you want me to say, please let me know. Generally, I take those questions ... Generally, public forum is very high level so we don't get into details. So, I give a high-level answer if it comes up and if they want more details, normally I send them to ... Let's come to RSSAC to work or something like that.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Right now, we're just waiting on the board. That's kind of the answer.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. Well, there might be questions about the scope, why didn't we didn't we go to the [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: I got it. Yeah. Okay. The information session is tomorrow 9:00 AM in room 113. Anybody not going to be there? Russ. Okay. That's fine. It conflicts with the DNSSEC workshop. Is everybody else going to be there? Wes, is that a no? The reason I'm asking is I'm trying to find out who's willing to talk at the mic and it sounds like you're not willing to talk because you're not going to be there.

So, RSSAC activities update. Again, this is the normal slide deck. Can you go back one? Publications, updates. What's that number three? I can't read it because of the lighting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Proposed governance model for the DNS root server.

BRAD VERD: Oh, we added that from the slide that I have that was sent out. Okay. Great. Alright. So, these are the five topic areas. Next slide. Next slide.

So, this is your generic RSSAC overview that we've done I feel like a bunch of times. Are we all okay with this? Any changes we want to make, updates? There was no feedback on the list, so I assume the answer is no. I just talk about it here. Alright, next slide. This is all next slide.

Some numbers got updated, obviously. Next slide. Caucus meetings. We have one obviously that will be immediately following the – I think. Pretty sure. Yeah. So, the public meeting ends at 10:15. At 10:30, the caucus meeting starts.

RUSS MUNDY: I had the days confused. My brain is already scrambled. It's Monday. DNSSEC workshop is Wednesday, not Tuesday. So, there's not a conflict with the DNSSEC workshop.

BRAD VERD: Oh, you're right. I'm sorry. I'm conflicted on reading the agenda I have in front of me also. Yeah. Anyway, these are the next caucus meetings. One obviously being held here as requested by the caucus and the next one is in Prague at IETF. Next slide. Next slide.

So, our publications. This is the – I'm sorry, can you go back? We've done the three publications since the last one. The advisory on organizational review, recommendation on anonymization, and then the statement regarding the KSK. Then, next slide.

We go into detail on each of those. In a minute. Let's run through everything. So, go through. Keep going. Next slide. Where are you? This is 040 we're talking about. Yeah. Next slide. That's a lot to talk about. How many slides is 040 now?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Two for 040.

BRAD VERD: Advisory on organizational review. We're going to have two slides on this. Okay. Then, 041, which is the anonymization piece.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That slide is unreasonable. It's [off mic].

BRAD VERD: We don't have to do it this second. Okay. next slide. So, we don't have any on 039 then, right? Well, go back to the previous, previous. Right here. So, we have 039, 040, and 041. Did I miss 039? I'm sorry, okay. Alright, so 039. Got it. Now I'm following. Keep going. 040, two slides. And 041. Big slide. Oh, two slides. Okay, next slide.

For everybody here, in the admin call, we talked about this. Even though 037 is not new since the last ICANN meeting, we thought that it was substantive to talk about it again. It wasn't just, "Hey, we're done. It's all gone," type of thing. There's still a lot going on here. So, next slide.

Again, this is just talking about 037. It's been out there. Board has it. Kind of give the update type of thing that we did in the SSAC meeting. Then the picture on the scooping. What else? Oh, and we thought it would be important to talk through the principles again since we think these are cast in stone. Alright, next one. This is just the recommendations. Okay. next one. Caucus work. Next slide.

This is just the organizational review that's going on. Has that gone to the caucus? This isn't caucus work, is it? Oh, RSSAC and caucus. I'm sorry. I'm clearly running out of gas. Alright. Organizational review. Next slide.

FRED BAKER: In the last bullet, model based on DE principles. What are DE principles?

BRAD VERD: DE principles. You've got to do the hand motion. Guiding principles or no?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It should be guided. Maybe it was supposed to be guided. I don't know.

BRAD VERD: I would just drop it. [inaudible]. "Duh Principles." That would be funny. Let's keep on going through this. Got that. So, now, this is the current service change, service coverage of the root server system. We're just going to run through this and we're going to go back and identify who talks where, okay?

So, service coverage and we have next slide. Resolver behavior. Next slide. This is a standard tools slide. Interaction. Oh, this is the standard transparency one. Transparency for root operators. Keep going. Feedback. Then, I think we're done, right? Yeah. Alright. So, can we roll back to the RSSAC 039 piece? This is current work.

So, I'm happy to open up, talk through RSSAC. Unless somebody else wants to do this. Please. By no means. I'm talking enough at the mic here. Volunteers, just speak up.

Run through the first section up until the caucus. Then, we get to recent publications. Is there any volunteers here who want to talk through the publications, 039, 040, and 041? For what?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For RSSAC 040.

BRAD VERD: Okay, yeah, because it was your ... You were the shepherd. So, the question here is do we want to go back and forth on the mic on a per-document basis or do you just want to take all three documents?

WES HARDAKER: Let's give all three to Liman. He's good at it.

BRAD VERD: Wow. Under the bus. That's amazing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

BRAD VERD: Okay. So, Liman will do the review of the organizational stuff, of the stuff that we've done recently, all three. Then, it's 037, right? Who wants to take on 037? I'm happy to do it if nobody does, but I'm happy to deer if somebody wants it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're doing so well.

BRAD VERD: Alright, so me for 037.

RUSS MUNDY: Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah.

RUSS MUNDY: I was going to suggest that we have somebody else do 037 because you and Tripti have done it a batch of times and it would be good to have another RSSAC member do the presentation, just as another voice that’s speaking to it.

BRAD VERD: I’m happy to take it. Leave it with me right now. Unless somebody really wants to take it, I’m happy to defer. I don’t want to have this – I don’t want to have a last thumb on the table competition here right now. So, unless somebody wants this. Does somebody want this? Otherwise, I’ll do it. Okay. I feel like I’m pretty versed at this. I can almost do it in my sleep. So, I’ll do 037 and 038.

Updates on RSSAC and caucus work. I feel like people will be tired of me. Who else wants this? So, this is you’ll be giving an update on the organizational review that’s where we are right now, like we’ve provided our feasibility study type of thing and what the next steps are. I think it’s fairly simple. Then we talk about the service coverage and the resolver behavior work that’s happening.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I’m happy to do more. I’ll be up there [off mic].

WES HARDAKER: Fred ought to talk about the resolver behavior study, right, Fred?

BRAD VERD: What room are we in? What's the setup? Is everybody going to be up at the table, people in front of us, or is it just ... Do we know the setup for the room tomorrow?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic]

BRAD VERD: 113, okay. So, there's a table and the chairs are behind us, correct? Behind and beside. Okay. So, everybody will be at the table. We'll have mics, so it won't be this switch back and forth, which is kind of odd to me because I feel like we've giving a report to the people who are sitting behind us.

[LARS-JOHAN LIMAN]: If that is the case, can I suggest that those of us who are about to speak actually sit up front near the projector? Because that means you can turn towards the audience instead of speaking like this towards the screen.

BRAD VERD: At least when I was in 116 and the other room, they've got handheld mics that we can use also, rather than ... The room has two handheld mics. For me, I like to stand up and walk around. I think I might just stand up and point at the slides and stuff. I feel more comfortable doing that than this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I feel exactly the same. I'm happy to stand and walk.

BRAD VERD: So, with that said, does anybody want to do the caucus work besides Liman? It sounds like you and I will be doing all this, Liman, unless somebody else wants to stand up, or sit. I mean, if we want to break that up, I'm fine with that, too. This is just an update. So, this is the public RSSAC update. This is we're getting up, we're sharing. We created a work party. Here's the genesis of the statement of work and here's what's going on. That's it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So, there might be the only question but not the discussion.

BRAD VERD: Not intended. Unless you guys want it. Unless we run out of time and there's time for Interaction. Clearly, we'll end with, "Are there questions?" Those questions, they might be about the work party, they might be about 037, they might be whatever. Does that make sense? This is the same meeting we do at every ICANN one. Alright. So, Liman, will you do the tools and transparency stuff or does somebody else want to take that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm happy. You usually talk to the tools stuff, don't you?

WES HARDAKER: I am common to do tools and totally. I can do it again if you want. I hate to throw Liman under the bus all the time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hi, Wes. How's it going today? I'd like to actually do the transparency portion, if you don't mind.

BRAD VERD: Great. Can you put – so that's for both the transparency RSSAC and transparency root server operators. It's a two-slide thing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

BRAD VERD: Okay, cool. And then obviously add for feedback, so it's really three slides. Cool?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good.

BRAD VERD: Alright. So, we've got names. You guys cool with that? Can you send out – Andrew looks not happy. Alright. Can you guys just send it out with names of who's going to do it type of thing? Is that cool? Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And also the very latest version of this. I tried to look at what was on the mailing list and it's not exactly what I see here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I just made some changes. Your change and then also that one fix. So, let me just upload that real fast and I'll show you the change.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Because the version I have doesn't have the 037, 038 in it which I know that we talked about at the admin committee.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The thing is that I would like to have it tonight when I get back to my room so I can read up on it and prepare.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, this is version six. The version we were just looking at was version five, so everybody knows. And I'll send those to the list right after we look at it. So, Liman, you're suggesting breaking up the five recommendations of RSSAC 041? It's now on two slides. And the other change, where is that? Is that 038, the DA? There is no 038. This one. Yeah. Upon principles of accountability. So, those are the only two changes in version six and I'll send this to the list right now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: If I may, the setup of the room is very similar to this one, but it's actually bigger. The audience is in back.

BRAD VERD: The seats are behind us, lots of seats behind us. I think there's like two rows of seats on the sides. We'll invite people to the table. It's a big table, maybe twice as big as this. And we'll go from there. Andrew, I can't find the caucus slides.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'll put them up. Do you want the caucus agenda or the slides? Because there's really just—

BRAD VERD: Just the agenda.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. The agenda is probably better.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, can you do that? So, the caucus meeting which is following the public meeting, you'll see some repetition in the agenda items because we'll review the work party items, obviously, because it's a caucus meeting, even though we just gave them an update on them. Yeah, perfect.

So, obviously, we'll have a call to order. We'll do an attendance reminder because we take attendance at the caucus meetings. We'll do welcome and introductions to everybody. So, we'll go around and introduce ourselves just like we always do. Depending on the size of the room or the number of people in the room, we'll get people who are not at the table, but maybe not. I'll review the agenda. We'll talk caucus engagement. I thought we were going to change this. This was caucus administration or something.

WES HARDAKER: It's called caucus administration.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. So, I'm looking at an older version. So, caucus administration. We will review the meeting times and we'll get an update on the ... Is the membership committee here? So, we need to figure out what that update is because Matt's not here. It's alright. I can reach out to Matt and find out what, if anything, there is. I don't think there's new people.

WES HARDAKER: Well, Carlos will be there and I think Carlos actually talked to Matt and prepared something. I had that conversation with Carlos.

BRAD VERD: There is some update. I just don't know what it is.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. But I think that's taken care of.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I'll talk about the organizational review, again, even though it was just covered in the previous meeting. I'll talk about the review here, kind of just give an update where it is, where we're going, what the next steps are. Then, we jump into recent publications. Again, this sounds just like the previous meeting. We've assigned names here, though. So, you're

at this one? Because, Wes, you've got a name assigned and I think Andrew told everybody ...

WES HARDAKER: I'm at them both because remember the DNSSEC workshop doesn't conflict.

BRAD VERD: So, RSSAC 039 is the statement regarding ICANN's update to the KSK rollover plan. You'll speak to that?

WES HARDAKER: I can, yeah.

BRAD VERD: Then, 040 is Paul Hoffman. He's here or not here? I'm sorry, Paul Hoffman on the old slide. I should be looking up here. Liman is doing this. So, Liman, you're giving the update on 040. I apologize. Then, Fred, you're doing 041.

Then, we go into the current work which includes packet sizes. Duane, you're on board. Tools, back to Wes. Service coverage, Liman. And then Fred to the resolver. Fred and Wes it says. I can't read. I think it's Wes. Then, we end with caucus work party engagement. So, this is the engagement piece where ... The question here is what do we ... How do we want to message this? In theory, this is the caucus meeting. There are caucus members there versus – maybe not here at these work

sessions. It will – my guess is the update from the membership committee. Part of that will be some of the data that’s being collected and pulled together as to who’s been in attendance, who’s contributed, who’s done the stuff. So, I’ll tie that in. I’m happy to talk to us speaking to the work party leaders and saying that – we’re asking them to be a little bit more assertive in getting people’s engagement and assigning roles type of thing. What’s the message we want to give here?

WES HARDAKER: I think the biggest one that came out of yesterday was that we are hoping – that our plan is to try and do all work now on the main mailing list and encourage everybody to participate and hopefully, with a wider visibility, we’ll attract more help.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I also think we should encourage or solicit input for how we can improve the engagement. What’s lacking here?

BRAD VERD: We do that every time. Literally, every meeting we ask that question. I guess what I’m after here is do you guys want me to say that we’re disappointed with the engagement thus far, therefore, we’re going to the larger audience or do we want to leave that out?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can we use the word surprised or something that doesn’t have quite that negative connotation?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We can just word it more like, hey, we tried that and it didn't work, rather than the blame. There's a neutral word out there and I just can't think of it.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. The neutral word is we have a problem with the way things are happening, so we're trying to change things up and see what works, but we want advice. What else are we missing? What else would help?

BRAD VERD: I actually like that more than the very passive-aggressive type of thing. I really want to be direct with this and say, "Look, we've got an issue here. We're not seeing the work that we expected or had hoped for, so therefore, as a result we're trying new things. We're trying different things. We're going to open these things up to the larger audience and people who contribute will continue to get the credit for all the work and we'll try to do this going forward." Then that leads into how do you guys want to – how can we help or how can we encourage and get more engagement from people on these work parties?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You could start off from the observation that we received criticism for not being open, so we asked for people who want to take part, and when we eventually get to the point where we expect the to take part, they don't.

WES HARDAKER: Well, but then again, that sounds like we're placing blame to the people in the room. "You're not doing anything." I don't think that's how we feel or that's how we want to feel. We want to say, look, there is an issue. We don't know why. We don't know why there's not as much participation. We simply want more. What would motivate you? How can we help?

BRAD VERD: Alright. Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: We also have slides. I'll quickly put the slides up. They just follow the agenda and they're meant to help the speakers. So, we'll just quickly run through those. I'm just going to run through these pretty fast. They're mainly from the RSSAC public slides, so there's nothing new here. Raise your hand if you see something.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think you can log into Adobe and where you show the regular screen, but the computer actually doing the presentation needs to be full screen, because otherwise, people can see [inaudible]. But on the regular screen you can see the – yeah.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'll e-mail the agenda and the slides to the whole RSSAC again. And there I need to make that change again. Okay. So, they'll be another version of these with this broken up into two slides. Duane, I made this one up. Are you cool with that? Okay.

WES HARDAKER: Tools really ought to be last. It ought to be the collection point.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So, I'll change it to tools as last. Okay. You can just have this slide up when you're talking.

BRAD VERD: Everybody okay with that? Looks good? Alright. We're set for tomorrow. Thank you. Back to the regularly scheduled program. The workshops. Here we go, the agenda.

Future workshops. We collected a couple of notes in the previous days. We wanted to continue the conversation about format, frequency type of thing. And then there were topics where notes were taken which could have been legacy issues around appointments of RSSAC members by the ICANN board. We were talking about that with the NomCom stuff and that whole cyclical thing. Being part of the empowered community. Then, revising 001. Then, obviously some 037 related items which was the [BPQ], further defining ethos, and other guiding principles, composition of functions, and what does bad look like. So, these were notes from the previous days' conversations.

We were getting into 001 pretty heavily and I said let's talk about this later in the week. Liman, you have a question?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. I seem to remember we also talked about possibly discussing revamping the caucus or revamping our interaction with the wider audience.

BRAD VERD: Having a workshop on that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It was suggested. I'm not saying that we should, but it was suggested.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Put it on there.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You don't have to have it up here, but scribble it somewhere, I think.

BRAD VERD: Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: So, I think as a potential topic would be the future architecture for the DNS root system including many experiments with [inaudible] firms.

BRAD VERD: Certainly. Technological evolution?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm trying not to sound like a broken record. Going forward, I'm feeling a concern to raise issues that there are broader issues than the purely technical and I'm wondering whether composition of functions rather than trying to backtrack on how we should have done things in the past. The composition of function, should they contain a more obvious financial or political element to trying to solve solutions or is that just a rathole that none of us want to go down?

BRAD VERD: To me, there are no more ratholes. If there's a place we should go, we should go. Because, back in the day, the idea of adding or removing a root server operator was a rathole. We decided not to go there for decades.

How do I say this? This one, compositional functions, I think, Wes, maybe you brought this up. We were talking about who the members of the different functions are. My comment at the time was that, to me, was kind of a little bit more political and outside of just what I was trying to address with getting the simple things ... I shouldn't say simple, but the non-economic or political piece of 037 done in advance. To me, that's one that the composition and function is something that would

happen after we find out what the board wants, what implementation looks like and we start talking with the community to see who really wants to be involved. That was how I viewed that. But we can certainly have a discussion sooner if you guys want to.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Well, we've talked about whether RSSAC [exists] after the board accepts and buys into the 037. It is kind of germane at a pretty basic level. I think discussing that before the board comes back and says, "What were you thinking about?" it would be nice to be able to say, "Well, we've had discussions," rather than, "Okay, now that you've said that, we're going to start from zero."

BRAD VERD:

Okay. Just to be clear, that's different than what was brought up. So, what was brought up was who the members of these different functions would be, right? So, what you're talking about is where does RSSAC live in the future world, which is RSSAC might be a part of that composition. The discussion here, at least what I remembered, it was like we can start reaching out to people and having discussions outside of RSSAC, and that to me was a little premature. That's all.

WES HARDAKER:

So, a bit of clarification because you're right that I phrased it that way and I'm going to state now that I badly phrased it, because I wasn't necessarily thinking we need N members from these groups and N members for these. But it was in part more, actually, how do we solve

the political issue of who are the right community members? Who are the right players that want to have a voice and how do we ensure that all these bodies in the future, that we do make sure we reach out and attract the right participants, not necessarily an N versus M down to the technical details, but what's the larger community look like? So, it does come back to a political question of what elements need to be involved in these future decisions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

And, adding to what Wes is saying, the disappearance of RSSAC should [inaudible] what the surviving organizations look like because it's not duplicating anything if this group goes away.

BRAD VERD:

Yes, yes, and yes. I agree with all of this. I will disagree with the intent of this topic and having that in there. I'm happy to put this up there. I'm happy to put it in this topic if you want to. That wasn't the intent here, though. The intent here was to identify topics that would easily plug in to whatever the future world looked like, 037 or not, which to me, fell in the technical realm. We are now very much out of the technical realm. We are very much talking about engaging outside parties to find out if you would be interested in working with us in this new governance model. We don't know what that looks like yet. We just don't know. We don't know what the board is going to come back with us, and then we engage people. That's the way I've seen it or thought about it. If we want to engage people tomorrow, we can do that. Happy to do that. Carry the flag. I will make that happen. These are very valid topics that

need to be addressed. I'm just not sure ... That's not what my intent of having this topic here in a workshop. That's all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, then when? I'm not trying to say shove it into that crap. But I'm trying to say ...

BRAD VERD: I can't answer that because [inaudible] anything back from the board. I just don't know. I don't have that answer.

WES HARDAKER: So, to try and find a neutral ground, somewhere in the middle, in the organizational review, it was stated that we should be doing more outreach and more integration with the rest of ICANN. So, regardless of 037, if we want to consider trying to address that problem, perceived or not or true or not, maybe there's thoughts to be had there. Maybe we do need to have more liaisons. Maybe we do need to figure out other ways to get our voice heard and get more people in the room. We still have small rooms, and even though we're open, not many people attend. Why not?

There is possible interaction with the rest of the ICANN community that we may want to try and solve, too, and that's unrelated to 037. It would certainly feed information into 037 if it comes to light. And you're right, we don't know. So, I agree with you on that, that we shouldn't be defining the results of 037 in the membership, but ...

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Regarding Geoff’s question, when for that conversation, 037 is a starting point, so it’s envisioned there will be some kind of a fallout process to further define that. That’s where this conversation [had happened]. I think for RSSAC to better organize itself is, during that conversation, the RSSAC continue to discuss those questions in that context and then for you to give your input to that process. That’s where the proper venue I think those questions should be surfaced. That’s my opinion.

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay. I’m not allowed to say I’m the new guy, but I don’t feel comfortable enough with this process yet to completely trust that it always works towards justice and truth. What frustrates, me, for instance is I read the comment from Ram at the board saying, “Geez, is this the perfect plan? Is there something to push back on or are they absolutely certain this is the right thing and the right dollar amount?” Head scratch, head scratch.

I looked at it and I just wanted to run down the hall and go, “No, it’s what we came up with. What do you have? Where do you want to go with it?” So, if we’re saying we’re waiting for them to come down from the mountain with images and they’re wondering, “Wow, is this their perfect implementation they just want us to bless?”

BRAD VERD: [off mic].

GEOFF HUSTON: And he asked whether it was and nobody on the board seemed to answer the question. Again, that struck me as disconcerting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's a fair point.

BRAD VERD: It strikes me as a bit political, but yes.

WES HARDAKER: So, I mean, I listened to the dialogue and –

GEOFF HUSTON: We ignore the political at our peril. I mean, who do you want to give it to?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

GEOFF HUSTON: Okay.

WES HARDAKER: I mean, I was listening to that part of the conversation, too, and that's why I wasn't helping in the tutorial, because I was actually plugged in and I heard ... I know Kaveh was there, too. That's not the

interpretation I got. I think the reading of the text and the wonderful notes that Kaveh sent – by the way, thank you for sending them because they were much better than what I was going to write that Brad asked me to write because I was only listening half the time.

But, it really was a question. It was more how fleshed out is this? Is there disagreement? It really was not a negative question. It was just a leading question of let's think more. They know it's a starting point. So, that's the way I read his voice and his words together. Go back and listen to it. It's public record, I think, at this point.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

That would be my interpretation.

BRAD VERD:

I think it's good not to trust it. It's good to ask questions. I'm not saying that. The frustration you're seeing right now is that the workshops, if I go back to where this all started – workshops. Do we want to have workshops? The answer is, "No, we don't need workshops. 037 is done." And I'm like, okay, but there's a whole bunch of work that you could pull out of 037 and do and would stand on its own. That's where it started. And we always digress into these other discussions away from where I tried to drive it. So, apologies for me even maybe not messaging that. I think we should document this. We should document this as an issue that we need to talk about. Maybe it's something that clearly needs to be addressed maybe at a later date once we know what the board is going to say. When the board comes back are they not asking this

question? If not, then maybe we should. I'm not saying dismiss it and let it go away when you say, "Well, when?" I don't know when. But, we should certainly document the issue and have it on our list of things to do and make sure are addressed. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY:

One of the things that I read from Kaveh's notes, and let me also add my thanks to what Wes just did – great news, thank you, Kaveh – is that OCTO now has some tasking with respect to 037 and whether or not it would be a workshop-related item or handle it in some other way, does it make sense for RSSAC to ask OCTO if they want to have iterations between whoever on OCTO – whatever they're working on on this and the RSSAC, whether it's to get more detailed, get more what our thinking is. I don't know that this is an appropriate thing to ask, but I wanted to toss it out because it seems like it could be beneficial because we've sometimes gotten surprising answers out of OCTO that we just didn't know were coming and a little engagement ahead of time might lessen the surprise.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. To be honest with you, I would say, yes, we should do that and now that that meeting happened and it was public, we can do that. it's the perfect setup to actually ask OCTO at our meeting if we could – we could say what you just said. We don't know if this is appropriate. I'm not sure how it's worked in the past with the closedness of the board sharing this type of data where OCTO or other people have showed up with something you don't expect. But it seems like OCTO, if you're

working on this, if you need help or if you have questions, we're here for you. We're here to help. We're here to support. We'd like to have that opportunity for a dialogue.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, first of all, back to your previous comment about maybe we should document the questions and open issues. Actually, I think it's very good. It would be very proactive from our point of view or our side if you start, maybe have a page for 037 and 038 and start to document some of this stuff, including the issues and open questions because that will help us to refer people back because these things will come up every time we bring this up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So, we can actually tell people that, hey, yeah, we know. We are just not there. But we have documented that and if there are others issues, we can keep it open.

BRAD VERD: That's exactly what I was saying.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. I think that's a very good idea. On the second issue, basically what Russ said – no, I lost my comment, so I will wait.

FRED BAKER: Would it make sense for us to invite a liaison from OCTO into the RSSAC?
Who is that liaison?

KAVEH RANJBAR: May I? Now I remember and it's related. So, this is – in general, this type of work is new, as far as I know for ICANN, this type of interaction. SSAC, NCAP is kind of similar. So, the [inaudible] working with NCAP is OCTO has actually a project manager, [Bernie], who is working with a small work party from SSAC. So, SSAC has their own work party for NCAP and there is [Bernie] from OCTO who is doing the project management work with the staff and they produce documents. So, they're in constant touch with that work party and I assume that work party talks to SSAC when needed. So, there is direct interaction all the time. I think that would be the model that OCTO would suggest. And if you're not sure or if you want to go the same direction, we can actually ask OCTO in the meeting with OCTO and tell them, "This is model [inaudible] prefers."

But, personally, I think that's a practical model. It had some issues for NCAP, but now apparently, as far as I can see at least, they are past those issues, so it's working. There is a good project plan. I really like that. They foresee all of the steps and all of – I know Steve contributed a lot to that project. That appears to be working.

RUSS MUNDY: I would say there are, yes, parallels between the examination of 037 where it's at not and the NCAP. But I think there's some important

differences. The most important one being that the NCAP work was essentially tasked to SSAC a year ago by the board as a board says, “Go do this by resolution,” where we’re still waiting to hear anything from the board on 037 and what, at least my vague understanding, OCTO has been asked to go help make some input to the board so the board can say something.

So, it’s not like, because on NCAP, my understanding is that the SSAC, as an entity, still has sort of the final okay on what’s happening on the project, but the contracting project management, the day-to-day stuff, is going on in OCTO. So, in that way, OCTO is sort of responding to guidance out of SSAC directly, and right now we’re waiting for OCTO to say something so that we can respond to whatever it is OCTO says.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I agree, but I just want to point out, the board is obviously ICANN board and OCTO is their own independent organization, but we have a lot of [inaudible]. So, if we want a resolution out of the board, there’s a very, very good chance that we can get it. If we have a plan, we can make it happen, to a very good degree. I can’t speak for the ... I can’t say the board will vote yes to everything we say, but generally, if we [give] clear direction, if we have a plan, board would be more than happy to support us.

So, if we see there is a need for resolution, for example, or something like that to advance the board faster or more efficient, I’m sure we can definitely get that through.

BRAD VERD: Kaveh, do you have any hint on a timeline that we can guess on for when they ... Do they have a goal for ...?

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, OCTO committed in that meeting, I think I mentioned ...

BRAD VERD: Yeah, but I meant more from the board's perspective.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, no, there is no commitment, but the idea was for the end of the year commitment from OCTO was the board will have a workshop end of January or first of February, something like that. So, the idea was that would translate to resolution or something, some direction for the next step from the board in that meeting. That's the idea.

WES HARDAKER: Alright. So, they do hope to put a resolution sometime Q1 next year.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Definitely. As I said, this is not yet published. Hinted by Cherine, but I worked really hard to make sure – it's the very first item on the strategic priorities for ICANN. So, it's like you open up the strategic plan, first thing that hits you is the [evolution] of root server system and the action item is to respond and follow-up RSSAC 037 and 038. So, it's actually in

the plan for the next year. It is also budgeted for the next fiscal year and there is also ... The five-year plan is most prominent thing, so yeah. The board has to deliver on that. The board has to deliver on that. It's really one of the main items they have to deliver.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But, the response would be about the process? Because, basically, we're asking them to take this document and elaborate the strategy. Would they come with – we're going to go through a cross-community something?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Exactly. That's the expectation and also give us direction if we have to do anything or what would happen if – as I said, if you really also have a [inaudible] plan, we have a very good chance we make that [inaudible] feed that into the direction that the board gives. But, if you don't, the expectation is [inaudible] comment period and there will be a proposal and we will be involved.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. The public comment, okay.

BRAD VERD: So, two things there. One is I think it's important that we kind of have a rough idea of when we think the board will let us know something and the reason being is that we don't want to take on four work parties,

have them respond that they need something for 037 and that derails all our resources type of thing.

Secondly, you mentioned it would be nice to have a plan or something like a response or something.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

What I said, if we as a group feel strongly that there is a right way of moving forward, like next step, if you have a clear path for next step, for example, we can guide the board and tell them – and we have a lot of [inaudible] making that happen. That’s what I’m saying.

BRAD VERD:

So, it’s a good question. Do we? Do we want to create that? Do we want to spend time working on that? It seems like we do. It’s a question for the room.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

We can also wait for OCTO to see what they propose, and if we don’t like that, then comment on that and course correct there.

GEOFF HUSTON:

It seems it would sure be nice if we could have cooperation in the middle of making decisions instead of “here’s a document that took three years” [inaudible] your peril. Here’s a decision that took us six months. Change it and you’re a jerk. These steps are so monolithic ...

It's kind of ... It seems cooperating in between would be anything but that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Yeah. That I think will be a good idea. Just a few suggestions. The RSSAC keep a running list, and every once in a while, we add to that running list what needs to be done. And that I think is a good checking point for RSSAC and that the RSSAC, make yourself available to whoever wants to draft an implementation and then there is some back and forth, some feedback, informal feedback, bounce of ideas. So, I think those are good thoughts.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I think that's an important thing to also tell to OCTO in our meeting, because now you're [inaudible] commented, correct? So, at least until December, we can – if we want to allow them to work on their own plan, at least [inaudible] keep us every two weeks or every month, join one of the – every month [inaudible] give an update or something. Until December, I think there are two more RSSAC meetings, so not much.

BRAD VERD:

Is it okay to say the same thing to the board, essentially what Geoff just said? We feel like we know it took us three years to get this document to you, but we feel it's important and there's a lot of good stuff to come out of this. Waiting six months for an answer, this process maybe isn't the most efficient way to do this. Maybe if you want to do some sort of back and forth, we're open to that type of thing.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think they have realized it and there is a bit of frustration, as we saw in [inaudible]. But, yes, pushing it further doesn't hurt. So, there's no [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Again, share the sentiment from Goran and some of his team is that – and I said this earlier is in a goal to be accountable and transparent, we become completely ineffective. And I think this process – and I'm not saying the process is ineffective. I'm saying that it is what it's been and if we want to suggest changes to it, let's do it.

GEOFF HUSTON: Right. At the risk of – oh, like I care. Half of the lines on the first screen are about who's going to get nine new heads, and given how [inaudible] people are, that is going to distract most people who look at this and say, "Woohoo! Nine heads!" where that is not the path of what we intended to say, and yet, it's half of what we have said.

BRAD VERD: So, back to the original question. Workshops. Does it look like we could use one? Should we plan for one in the spring, start working on it? Make sure that the resources are available, start identifying a location, blah-blah, all those things. All the stuff takes planning, takes time, so that's why I'm kind of asking we need to know. We need to have an answer to

that question before the end of the year. So, the end of the year is not that far off. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I definitely think yes. I don't think we need two per year, but I think having one is a good idea. I think we should work on finding – identifying what people want to focus on during a workshop and I think we should be prepared to make changes to that once we receive a response from the board. So we have both a plan A and a plan B because I think we have more work than we can fit into a workshop after the board response, but I don't know what the response is going to be. I don't know if it's suitable for workshop work or not. But I think we have enough on our plate to warrant a workshop in maybe that May timeframe.

BRAD VERD: I would say we've got enough to warrant two workshops. Just keep the process as it is. But, I keep getting the feeling that people don't want the workshops. That's okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You took me wrong. From my perspective, this was a financial limitation. I don't want to stress the budget.

BRAD VERD: [inaudible] budget. We still have – it's all ... I mean, nothing has changed thus far.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, because I actually like the workshops a lot. I think we get a lot done and I think it's a wonderful way to work together with you guys. I appreciate them a lot.

WES HARDAKER: So, we are budgeted for next year for two?

BRAD VERD: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Two workshops, yeah.

WES HARDAKER: Alright. So, then, let me state my piece. Liman, I actually think you're [inaudible] makes sense. It was a long haul to do so many a year and I'm already going to DC like four times a year as it is right now and that's two more trips for me, so I don't envy the time. I would do it happily if we're going to be productive and do good stuff.

What I get concerned with is doing workshops for the sake of doing workshops. So, the reality is that the first workshop started because we were going to be ineffective at solving a larger problem without it, at which point it became immensely valuable.

So, the question is do we have the reason behind it? Or can some of these problems be solved at ICANN meetings where we're together for a week, too? And remember that if we're going to involve the caucus, as we should for the workshops, then that's a different level of funding support. We talked about it the other day. There were a couple of people that made the statement, well, they should come to the workshops, too. There ought to be more of an open session.

So, I'm all for them when we need to have them. And more importantly, I think the right answer to your question of should we plan for one is probably yes, to the point that we might want to turn it down and say, "You know what? It turns out that we don't need it." It's better to do that and be able to pull back and say, "No, we don't need it, as long as you don't put too many resources into the planning," so [inaudible] definitely committing. But I don't want to have a workshop just because they worked well in the past. We don't want to sit in a room for three days and not get much done.

Now, if we have something big to talk about – and I think we do. I'm not saying that we don't – then we should have them. But don't do it just for the sake of having a workshop.

BRAD VERD:

Alright. So, again, yes. I don't know how else to respond to that. I don't believe we've had workshops just to have workshops ever. I don't believe anybody ever implied that we like workshops and produce nothing valuable out of them. I believe our workshops resulted in 037 which is valuable.

So, with all that said, it seems like it's a yes on the workshop, that we'll start planning it. I think, in the meantime, is the admin team will take this list and come up with a plan. We shouldn't be waiting for the workshop to start work on some of this stuff. We should identify a work party to go after 001 and start that effort because we've got to do it anyways. And maybe we start doing that on some of these other things. I don't know. But we'll try to come with a list. We'll come back to the group and say, "Here it is. What do you guys want to do?" And start that work. But, we don't have a lot of meeting time between now – the end of this ICANN and the end of the year. There's not a lot of formal meeting time.

Alright. So, that's what we'll do there. Is there anything else that people want to add to this list? [inaudible] grab the other issues that we're not necessarily germane to – I mean, not germane, but not specific to the workshop but issues that we still need to work on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

There is something maybe not directly related to this, so it's not a 037-related item – or maybe it is. I don't know. It's the RFC 8484, DNS [inaudible]. It might have – I don't know, but it can potentially, and I saw the tests with [Mozilla], for example, it can have a huge [inaudible] effect on [our] relevance, basically, because if it goes the way they are planning to go of most probably, the major browsers, you open it up, you will choose one of the relevant public servers and there's a good chance they don't use roots, our services. They just [inaudible] root zone and do the DNS queries and do all the business.

So, we will be there. But, if then that's the reality and most browsers go that direction or [inaudible] go that direction, we might be there only for legacy reasons. Just a [inaudible] possibility. But do we care about that? Do we want to look at that as an affect for future of [inaudible] evolution? I think anyways it's part of evolution discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's typically what I also envision with the discussion on evolutions.

BRAD VERD: Alright. We will take that back and come up with a plan forward on that. Is there anything else that we should add to this list right now or do I give some time back to you?

Alright. With that, I will adjourn this and we'll have a great day. I will see you guys all at dinner this evening, 7:30 across the street. I know myself and Duane will be late, just to let you guys know. We are coming but we'll be late. We have a conflict at that hour. We actually have a conflict at 7:00 and hopefully we're going to get out of there early enough to get there before meals are served.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I just sent a note to the list actually about the dinner.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]