BARCELONA – RSSAC Caucus Meeting
Tuesday, October 23, 2018 – 10:30 to 12:00 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

BRAD VERD: There is an attendance sheet that will be passed around, so please sign it and make sure your name is on that, please. Let's do quick introductions. Do we want mics? Try to get to know everybody as we don't get to meet all that often. Matt, if we could start down at that room, we'll do the table and then we'll take the mic around to the chairs.

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson, ICANN Org.

BRAD VERD: If you're at the table, please just introduce yourself and your affiliation.

AHMAD ALSADEH: Ahmad Alsadeh, ICANN Fellows.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Abdalmonem Galila, [inaudible] of Egypt.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

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.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Daniel Migault, IAB RSSAC liaison.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Jaap Akkerhuis, [inaudible] RSSAC Caucus.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane Wessels from Verisign as the root zone maintainer liaison.

BRAD VERD: Brad Verd, RSSAC co-chair.

MARIO ALEMAN: Mario Aleman, RSSAC support staff.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Andrew McConachie, RSSAC support staff.

CARLOS REYES: Carlos Reyes, RSSAC support staff.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Lars-Johan Liman, NetNod, member of RSSAC.

[KEN RENARD]:   [Ken Renard], RSSAC, Army Research Lab.

JEFF OSBORN: Jeff Osborn, ISC, RSSAC.

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker, USC, ISI.

BRAD VERD: Just a name and affiliation, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, sorry. [inaudible] University, Department of Computer Science.

MALLORY KNODEL: Mallory Knodel.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] or Jason from [inaudible] Telecom. Hello.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] from Taiwan.

RUVENI WAQANITOGA: Ruveni Waqanitoga, Fellowship.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] dot-RU registry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Yoran Safflind].

MARK SEGALL: Mark Segall, ICANN staff.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible], Canadian participant.

BRAD VERD: Alright. And as Mario is walking across the room here, two new people to the table.

FRED BAKER: Fred Baker, ISC.

BRAD VERD: And?

MOHAMED ABUABED: Mohamed Abuabed, Fellow. And potential participant, hopefully.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. Yes, over here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I am [inaudible] from the Consortium of University Services here in Barcelona.

[MARCO DIAZ]:   Hi, [Marco Diaz] from NIC Chile.

EDUARDO MERCADER: Hi. Eduardo Mercader from NIC Chile.

SHAILA SHARMIN: Hi, I'm Shaila Sharmin from Bangladesh, an ICANN 63 fellow.

SHINTA SATO: Shinta Sato, JPRS, RSSAC Caucus.

KAZUNORI FUJIWARA: Kazunori Fujiwara, JPRS, RSSAC Caucus.

[MATT STAFFBERG]:   [Matt Staffberg], IAS.

BRAD VERD: Great. One slipped by you, Mario. Could you introduce yourself?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] ICANN Caucus.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you, all. Welcome. Thank you for coming. I'm going to do a quick review of the agenda and we'll put some slides up because we

EN

can't do both agenda and slides in the Adobe room, so apologies for that.

So, we're going to run through some administration for the caucus, talk about when we meet, when we've agreed on that, and have a discussion around that. We'll get an update from the membership committee. I will give you guys an update on the organizational review that is ongoing with RSSAC and that we will then run through recent publications and then we'll jump into the meat of it and hopefully have some good discussions around the work parties that have happened and are happening. Then we'll cover any other business and adjourn.

So, with that said, is there any other business we want to add to the agenda right now? Does anybody have anything you'd like to add? Not seeing anybody in the room or on the Adobe Connect. We will leave that as is right now and we will … Excuse me as I try to get my bearings right with Adobe Connect here. Onboarding process, does that mean onboarding as far as caucus membership, just for clarification? Okay. We will talk about that. We'll just do that in the administration piece. Yeah. We'll cover that when we cover the membership committee and anything else. Great.

Welcome, everyone. Let's jump right into it. Go to the – who's got the clicker? Thank you. No clickage. Can somebody just advance the slides? One more. Okay.

So, really quick, we're going to run through some slides here that are in the general order of the agenda, but just a review for anybody who's

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

new, we want to go through what the caucus is made up of, who it's made up of – apologies – and talk through some of that.

Obviously, RSSAC appointed representatives from the 12 organizations running the root servers. Each of them have alternates assigned in RSSAC. Then, obviously, we have a number of liaisons, RSSAC does. We have outgoing and incoming liaisons. We have liaison to the board, liaison to RZERC, liaison – I'm drawing a blank here. I just went through this in my head. CSC. We have the root zone maintainer. Anyway, there's a number of them. They're all posted on the RSSAC webpage, if you want to check them out. Then, obviously, we have the caucus which is made up of the body of experts and all the members of RSSAC are members of the RSSAC caucus. Next slide.

If any of you guys were in the last meeting, this might be a quick repeat, but right now, we're 100-plus members in the caucus. Everybody has provided an SOI and again the big takeaway here is everybody who contributes information or writing on any document that is published by RSSAC gets full credit for it. So, it's full credit for the individual work contributed by you as a caucus member.

Purpose for the caucus? Pool of experts pulled from all over the place. We want transparency of who does the work, again, giving credit to anybody who is in the caucus and providing a contribution. Then, obviously, we've provided a framework. We do a statement of work. We'll do a call for a work party. We'll take the volunteers for the work party. We'll get them together. The work party will identify a work party leader and then we work the statement of work. There is also, from the

RSSAC, there is usually a work party shepherd assigned to each work party to make sure that we all stay on the same page as work progresses.

Then, obviously, if you're not a member of the caucus, there is the e-mail address that you can send information to and we can get that taken care of. Next slide.

Engagement. This was defined by the caucus, so when the caucus meets was chosen and selected by the caucus members. We went through a long round of discussions a while back and the decision was that we would meet at every AGM which we are here now. Again, welcome, ICANN 63. The next caucus meeting is IETF 104 in Prague. So, the caucus – because there are a lot of technical experts, i.e. a lot of the members of the caucus are in attendance at IETF and to take advantage of people's travel schedule and expenses, and just opportunity, we have a caucus meeting at the IETF and the caucus has chosen to do that at every even-numbered IETF. So, every other IETF the caucus will meet. Next slide.

So, before we get to that slide, I'm going to stick to the agenda. The membership committee. Now, there was a question that was asked to put on any other business the onboarding process. We can certainly talk about what the actual process is, but I will say I've had at each of the last three ICANN meetings I have been at, somebody has walked up to me and said, "Why was I not allowed into the caucus?" I want to state for the record that nobody has been denied access to the caucus. Nobody.

So, if anybody is experiencing that, please let us know. We want to hear it. Most cases, an e-mail is lost somewhere or any number of things have happened that might have delayed a response, but again, anybody who has applied that we are aware of has made it into the caucus. Carlos, I'll give it to you for a membership committee update and then maybe if you could just go through the process of onboarding that was asked in the chatroom.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. Hello, everyone. My name is Carlos Reyes. As part of my RSSAC support responsibilities, I with the membership committee. Currently, the membership committee is comprised of three members and an ex officio member. The chair is Matt Weinberg and we have Alejandra Costa and Dave Lawrence who are caucus members who support that. The current co-chair who is an ex officio is Brad Verd.

Together, the membership committee meets about every month to review statements of interest that are in the queue. As Brad mentioned, in the history of the caucus and the membership committee, the committee has never declined membership for anyone. There was a period of time where applicants – there was a delay when the membership committee was turning over. That was earlier this year when we changed the composition of the membership committee. But since then, we've caught up with the queue of SOIs.

Basically, the process. There's a statement of interest that is submitted to the membership committee and the membership committee then reviews the statement of interest and makes a determination on that

particular SOI. After that, there's a recommendation to the RSSAC. Once the RSSAC makes a decision, that decision is communicated to the applicant.

There was a recent exchange between a new caucus member and the membership committee about onboarding. Historically, we haven't really had much of an onboarding process other than reviewing the materials that are online and provided. So, we took this feedback as support staff and we'll be working with the membership committee and coming up with some sort of lightweight onboarding process for caucus members. The cadence of this will probably be something for future discussions because if the membership committee and RSSAC approve members every month, we may have to somehow class or group different applicants so that there's not a lot of repetition in terms of onboarding. So, we'll be working through that.

Again, the membership committee taking a look at that and just broader caucus participation and engagement in work parties. The staff has been producing some data for the membership committee to consider in that process.

Other than that, we have been receiving I think maybe two or three statements of interest during the Barcelona meeting here. So, thank you very much for those of you that are promoting the caucus and the membership committee will start to review those after the meeting. Thank you.

BRAD VERD:	Thank you, Carlos. Hopefully, that addressed the question that was raised in the chatroom. I will add that we are – we, the admin committee, the chairs, staff, and we want to have a conversation here with the caucus about engagement with the caucus. This is an ongoing conversation that we've had with the caucus every time we've met. How do we engage you guys better? How do we help you? What works for you? What doesn't work for you? What are we doing well? What are we not doing well?

These are all questions that we have and we need to hear from you, things that we've done in the past – I'm sorry, things that … Yeah, things that we've done in the past with our work parties as I described earlier. We pull a work party together. We identify a work party leader. Usually, we create a work party mailing list that is specific to that work party.

What we've done with the two current ongoing work parties that we'll cover here shortly, we decided earlier this week that we would do away … We would do an experiment. Do away with the very specific mailing list that is the work party mailing list and just have everything go to the caucus.

The reason we're doing that is we need input from the caucus. Again, we get lots of inquiries on how do we engage RSSAC? How can we help? How do we do things? How do I influence what's coming out of RSSAC? The answer is the work in the caucus. This is where all the work is done. So far, though there may be interest, there is very little output. So, we are asking what works for you guys? I will actually pause right here for a minute and see if there are any comments, questions, suggestions

from anybody here in the room, specifically caucus members, which is all of us. Or even a participant, if you want to share a thought. That would be fine, too. Anybody got anything to add on how to make things better? Things that are working, things that aren't working? Anything?

Okay. This is representative of what we've seen recently, so please, if you don't feel comfortable doing it at the mic, please come and approach myself or anybody on the caucus or work party leader afterwards. We can do one-on-one and bring those issues around. There are a few people raising hands here. We've got Ryan and then, George, we'll come to you in a second.

[ANDREW MCCONACHIE]: So, one thing I would like to address … Oh, sorry. One thing I would like to address about the caucus and to potential caucus members, and even those members in the caucus – really, to anyone. This is broadcasting. Yes, the caucus is a technical body. However, if one doesn't feel that they're technical enough, do not be scared to not be a member of the caucus because we need many different aspects in the caucus, from business to policy, to all kinds of personnel with various and diverse backgrounds within the caucus because even though a lot of the work parties and taskings are technical, we need people for wordsmithing, writing, maybe even – who knows? Maybe even graphics. We just need a very diverse group of individuals.

So, if you feel that, "Well, I'm not technical. I'm more policy. The caucus is technical," yes it is, but don't hesitate to join or participate because there may be a particular skill or something that you catch upon that

could be interesting because the topics are very interesting, that you may be able to contribute to. Just take a dive in and have fun.

BRAD VERD: Yes. I would add that everybody brings value to the content. Everybody.

GEOFF HUSTON: Geoff Huston, caucus member.

BRAD VERD: Apologies for that.

GEOFF HUSTON: That's alright. One thing I have noticed, though, in phrasing some of these work items is that they are shared in common with folk like SSAC and I actually am musing to myself as you bring forward some of these work parties whether you might wish to work in conjunction with some of these others to gather some more input and some more perspectives.

Part of the issues around the roll of the KSK was certainly shared in terms of an issue of study by both the RSSAC caucus and by SSAC. Areas around packet sizes. Unfortunately, that particular work party didn't get as far as it could have, but again, it seems that it's shared with others and I would certainly encourage the caucus leadership to go through the SO and AC chairs to see if others might well be interested

in participating or contributing to that kind of work to keep the momentum up.

On the plus side, I really do like the clear phrasing of work parties. I appreciate that. I appreciate understanding when I sign up exactly what I'm signing up for. I think that's helpful for me, certainly, and hopefully for others, to understand where their interests and where the work that's happening coincides. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Geoff, how would you suggest … Obviously, we engage SSAC. RSSAC does at the ICANN meetings. We have a liaison to SSAC that takes information over. We have a couple of SSAC members who are part of the caucus. What's the best way, in your opinion – and I don't mean to put you on the spot, but what more can we be doing and how?

GEOFF HUSTON: I suppose it is a practical question, so let me give you a relatively practical answer.

BRAD VERD: Please.

GEOFF HUSTON: I would appreciate the liaisons coming across saying, "We're doing this. If you want to sign up, please sign up. Here's the way to sign up into the

work." You don't necessarily have to join the caucus. If you're part of SSAC, it works. If you're part of RSSAC, the other way. It just works.

But, as I said, there are topics of interest, certainly in those two groups, which have some technical areas that are absolutely in common and it might well benefit by being able to sign across into that work without necessarily being an SSAC member or a caucus member formally. I put that as a suggestion.

BRAD VERD: Great idea. Okay. We'll take that back to the admin and I'll obviously talk to our RSSAC liaison about that. Fred, yes?

FRED BAKER: So, I have an operational question on Geoff's idea. If we're now saying let's not have work party mailing lists or let's not primarily use them, let's instead send mail to the RSSAC caucus, does that mean that we send it to the caucus plus a list of [inaudible] that are interested in a particular topic? How does that all work out?

BRAD VERD: I think that's something that can be solved. It is certainly addressable. This is … It's an administration piece. We could have a second mailing list. We could have an alias. If we want to have people who are not members of the caucus [but] members of ICANN, other committees want to be able to add without going through the caucus, as Geoff shared here. We could figure that out. I don't know. We need to take

that back and have a discussion. But that is a technical problem that is very solvable with a technical answer. Geoff?

GEOFF HUSTON: I might be missing the order here, Brad, but if you're talking about how to get more engagement, I'm wondering whether it isn't worth mentioning that we decided to broaden all the follow-up mail to the broader group than just the work party itself.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry. I'm not … Again, I'm still working on my coffee.

GEOFF HUSTON: Pick it up. Have a sip.

BRAD VERD: Ryan?

RYAN STEPHENSON: So, what Geoff is mentioning is what you mentioned already is that we opened the two work parties up to the caucus already, the entire caucus, versus just the members that decided to join the work parties.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Again, we're trying anything and everything to engage everyone and we don't want the work – even though people who have expressed interest and are on the work party and are being tasked with work, we

want everybody to see that dialogue going on. So, if you see something that you're passionate about or see something of interest to you or see something that you can contribute to and/or isn't quite right because of your expertise and you know that, then you can chime in and either we course correct or we add content. That's the goal here. Fully transparent. We want everybody working towards a common goal. Daniel?

DANIEL NANGKAHA: Yeah. I think, also, the expectation is that as the discussion is going to be on the caucus mailing list, if you're not being involved in the work party from the beginning, you can jump into the conversation. That's what we are expecting from all the members.

BRAD VERD: That's what we're hoping for. Yes. Alright. Any other things that are working, not working, things we're doing good, things we're not doing good for people to be engaged? No? Alright. Again, if you guys think of something or you're just not comfortable at the mic, please come and talk to us directly. We will take it back to the larger audience and get whatever is being brought up shared and addressed. There's nothing in the room, doesn't look like it. Alright, let's move on to the organizational review which is the ongoing RSSAC review.

As you know, RSSAC has published a statement which will be talked about shortly on our – some recommendations from our experience in

the review process. What I'm going to give you a quick update on is where things are in that process and what's next.

In June, the independent examiner completed its review and turned in its report to the board. We have since – we, RSSAC – have since come back with our … And this is a bit of a tongue twister, our feasibility assessment and initial implementation plan. So, that is essentially in the report from the examiner there are a list of recommendations and in this feasibility assessment and initial implementation plan, we address each of the recommendations with how we see the best way forward.

This is draft. We've shared that with the Organizational Effectiveness Committee who is responsible for these reviews. The next step will be a back and forth between us and the OEC figuring out what the board is willing to accept as far as what the action are for each of the recommendations and what the next step or the implementation of those recommendations are.

So, then with that, once all the parties agree, that's when we end up with our final report and then becomes the implementation of that final report.

So, that's where we are right now. Again, we just turned in the implementation plan, draft implementation plan, over the coming months, I believe. We will finalize that and then next year we will start the implementation. That's the current timeline. Any questions around the organizational review?

Alright. Let's jump into a quick update on recent publications. This was … I'm going to turn the mic over to my colleague, Liman, who's going to give you a quick update on recent publications.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Lars-Johan Liman from NetNod. Since the last ICANN meeting, we've issued three publications and there are six areas. One is a statement regarding the KSK rollover plan. That was issued well in advance of the actual rollover. RSSAC 040 is the result of a work party and RSSAC 041 [inaudible] reflections and recommendations that come out of the organizational review that Brad talked about. So, we're going to walk through all of these. Next slide, please.

So, RSSAC 039 is the result of the board reaching out to various communities asking for advice on the KSK rollover plan and resuming the plan that was put on hold back in 2017. So, this happened during the summer.

This document provides advice … Well, it provides two things. At least two items that ICANN board should consider addressing. One of them was whether this would lead to increased traffic to the root server system and ask technical people to investigate whether that was a likely outcome of rolling the key. The second one was to ask ICANN to review the published recoverability plan, so that we were sure that we could back out of the situation if something really, really, really bad happened.

But, as a conclusion, we said that we see no technical reasons to put our foot on the brake here. There are no technical reasons to stop the key rollover. So, I'd eventually [inaudible] proposed. As far as I know at least no noticeable interruption in service for the root server system and also no noticeable effects on the Internet as a whole. Next slide, please.

RSSAC 040 is the result of the work party where the root server operators submit – the root server operators collect incoming DNS queries. They collect incoming traffic on a regular basis every year as part of a project called DITL, Day in the Life of the Internet. So, every year for 48 hours on certain dates we collect all incoming traffic and we submit it to a long-term storage so that this information, this traffic, can be retrieved in the future by researchers who want to look at long-term trends but also possibly to look at details of traffic going to root server operators.

One problem with this is that the traffic itself contains the source IP addresses of all the incoming queries and that can be seen as integrity sensitive information for end users. So, some operators are either uncomfortable or even obligated by law to obfuscate this information before storing it in a semi-public archive.

I know we at NetNod, we have been doing this and in the broader group, we've had the thought that maybe we should try to coordinate this and ask the caucus to help us see if there are any specific obfuscation methods that are better or maybe not so good to use for this purpose and hopefully to recommend some things there.

So, RSSAC 040 provides four algorithms for anonymization and it contains discussions regarding the pros and cons for this. Next slide, please.

The outcome is basically the three recommendations. The first one is the root server operators should consider the advantages and disadvantages of harmonization and anonymization of this DITL data, and I should add that this also pertains to other times when these large collection are being made. The yearly DITL is not the only time it happens. It also happens with other major events. For instance, the KSK rollover. During the KSK rollover all the root server operators collected information for an extended period, more than – I think it was even 84 hours that time to see how the traffic changed during the rollover, which it didn't by much.

The second recommendation is that the root server operator should consider this individually, that it didn't have to be harmonized so much. It should be a local decision for each root server operator and [inaudible] that the harmonization was not all that important.

The third one was actually a bit of a surprise because that suggests that the autonomous system numbers, the numbers that identify the various ISPs, the autonomous system number for the ISP that sits closest to the resolver machine that sends the query, that autonomous system number should also be included in the data that's uploaded, but they also note in this report that depends on whether the autonomous system itself is large enough to anonymize the client, because if it's an extremely small autonomous system, it more or less identifies the client

anyhow. So, this is something that we will have to look into because this doesn't happen. At the moment, we don't submit the autonomous system numbers, which we, by the way, don't know off the top of just the traffic that we have, so that will mean that we have to go an extra step to obtain the autonomous system number. So, those are the three recommendations from RSSAC 040. Next slide, please.

RSSAC 041, this is a document from RSSAC that comes as a result of the Organizational Review. RSSAC noted a number of – or rather, was surprised by … Both by the way the procedures were carried out by the independent examiner but also surprised by some of the information that the independent examiner decided to put forward in their report, which we didn't think belonged in an investigation of that type.

So, this organizational review [inaudible] responsibilities of the ICANN Organization and it provides advice … Well, our report here provides advice on how to write the request for proposals when ICANN Org selects the independent examiner, the [inaudible] reviewer. It includes guidelines on how this organizational review should be conducted because we've found that it wasn't only an organizational review, which we thought it – which is what we expected from the outset. It provides five recommendations which are listed on the next slide, please.

So, the first three are that the ICANN Organization should define organizational review in a more clear words so that it's clear to both the organization itself, the [sub]-organization under review but also the

independent examiner exactly what's going to be reviewed and for what purpose.

Also, it should document the intent of the review and what information ICANN Org hopes to obtain and how that information is supposed to be used.

We suggest that ICANN Organization continues to use the RFP process that is used to [inaudible] the independent examiner but that it should be modified to ensure that the independent examiner is an expert in assessment frameworks and methodologies but that they're not part of the ICANN community, so that they are really, really external to the entire ICANN and can look at it with unbiased eyes. Next slide, please.

We also suggest that there are checkpoints, so that the ICANN Organization [inaudible] keep track on what's going on and that these instructions or these outlines that we described in the previous bullets are actually followed and if something is about to derail and go the wrong direction that it can be remedied quickly before it derails entirely.

Also, at the conclusion of an organizational review that the ICANN Organization reports on the process that transpired and that lessons are learned, that there's feedback from one review into the following review for other [sub]-organizations. So, that's the content of RSSAC 041. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Liman. Next, we will jump into the work party and work products that have happened and are happening. So, the first one we have is packet sizes. Next slide. Duane Wessels is going to share an update on that.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Brad. So, this work party was formed a little over a year ago and the statement of work describes how this work party would understand the issues around fragmentation and truncation of larger DNS packets. The original impetus for this was to understand this in advance of the KSK rollover.

                             During the year or so that this work party had been meeting, I think it had met, I don't know, maybe six or seven times, something like that, and seemed to … It had a hard time gaining traction and making progress.

                             So, after that time, it was decided by the work party that it had been overcome by events since the rollover had occurred and the root key had been published and packets got bigger. There wasn't really sufficient motivation by the work party members to continue this, so it was decided to shut it down.

                             There was some code that was contributed to the RSSAC caucus GitHub repository, the tools repository, so that still exists there and will be archived. And of course the messages and everything will be saved as well.

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

BRAD VERD: Any questions for Duane? This is the time. Anything from the caucus? [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] small problem with this working group [inaudible] and then dropped by accident from the mailing list and forgot about it, so it might have happened with more people.

DUANE WESSELS: That's a possibility. I wasn't aware that you were on it and then got dropped somehow. It's something we can look into. But this was kind of a smaller work party, so it was hard to get a lot of people together for the calls and the meetings in general.

BRAD VERD: Any other questions or comments? Alright, let's move on to next slide. I think it's service coverage. I'm going to hand this one over to back to Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. This is a work party that has very recently started. Its focus is to restart from a new angle to tackle the problem of service coverage. The root server operators hear from time to time that there are certain areas that receive service that is good enough and we think that we need to get a grip on this from the technical standpoint. We need to understand what this means, and at the end of it, where on the network it happens and why.

So, the first task this work party is to explore the concept of accessibility to the root server system, meaning what indicators and performance factors are there that we can look at and use to determine whether service is good or not. So, these are technical indicators that can tell us that, no, it's not functioning in the way that we think it does or it should do or whatever.

Also, factors that [inaudible] the risk of service degradation or outage, even if it's working decently well for most of the time, if there are risks for outages and these risks are higher in certain topological areas of the network. What factors influence that risk?

Once these indicators are discovered and found, the second step is to suggest procedures and provide – hopefully provide – tools that can be used to determine this so that we have something that we an actually work with to look into this which will be the next step, to actually put these tools into operation and these procedures, to identify areas with poor service. Once these areas have been identified, finally to give recommendations to the RSSAC and the root server operators in the Internet community At-Large, what steps can be taken to improve the situation, to enhance the service in these areas where it obviously isn't as good as we would like it to be.

So, these are the four steps for this work party. As I said, it has just recently started. We don't even have a work party leader yet. I've solicited input for that and work is ongoing there. We have had our first telephone conference with, let me phrase it like, moderate participation. We had five people on the call. One person besides me

was actually talking. I would have thought that this is something that was of interest to a wider group on the Internet because we hear these comments more often than just from one person, so I'm actually actively soliciting more input from a wider part of the caucus, and actually from anyone who's interested in this subject.

This experience with this low participation is one of the triggers for going from the work party mailing list concept to having a wider discussion in the wider caucus. So, by doing that, I hope to get some more input on this subject. I'm also happy to, if someone has input on this here and now, please speak up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think this would be of interest to TLD operators as well, so yes, I would be interested.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm very glad to hear that. Please join us. Any questions, comments? Dead silence.

BRAD VERD: Again, in the hallway I keep being approached by people who want to help, who want to – how do I affect change? This is how you do it, these documents right here. So, if you want to help us move the ball forward and continue to create the foundations for the root server system, please do so. This is where we need the contributions.

Thank you, Liman. There's a question that came up in the Adobe Connect room. Duane, it's directed to you for the packet size one. They're asking – I'm just going to read it. It says, "I just want to clarify. Is the work party on packet size still in existence, as it seems it has been shut down from his initial comment but seems confusing to me the way it said? Hence, the need for the clarification. Sorry for taking us back." So, can you just clarify if the work party has been shut down or not.

DUANE WESSELS: So, the work party has not been officially, formally finally shut down. At this point, the work party itself has agreed to shut down. There's still an outstanding action from myself as the shepherd and from George as the work party leader to write up the reasons for shutting it down and send it to RSSAC and then that would be the last step, I guess.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. So, we're following our process to close down a work party and that's what we're doing. But there is no more work or phone calls happening on the packet size.

DUANE WESSELS: Right. There's no future meeting schedules. The mailing list still is up, so I suppose that would give it the sense that that party is still existing, but otherwise, no. There's no calls planned or anything like that.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thanks for that clarification. I hope that addresses your question. Alright. Moving on, next slide, please. We have the resolver behavior work party. I'm going to turn this over to Fred. Fred?

FRED BAKER: Hi, there. Fred Baker, ISC and the shepherd for this particular work party. The question before the house is how do the resolvers actually work? It turns out that they are different in a variety of ways. They use different software. Even using the same software, they might be different versions, different configurations. Then, sometimes they're simply home-grown software. Which means that they interact with the root in a variety of ways. They interact with each other and with their users in a variety of ways. Basically, we'd like to understand them.

Now, you could argue that this is kind of on the edge of our scope. If our scope is the root itself, how the resolvers work and fixing the resolvers isn't necessarily our target. On the other hand, making DNS work well for the Internet absolutely is. So, that's kind of what we're targeting, what configuration guidelines might we recommend, what protocol changes might be appropriate to improve the service which of course would go to the IETF for discussion. And what advice might we give to the ICANN board as to things that we might suggest to the TLDs or to the resolver operators with respect to their services.

We have, like the other work party, have just started. We had a call on October 3rd. On October 3rd, we had nine people in the work party. Today I understand we have eleven. But, of the nine people, five were on the call, so I kind of wondered what happened to the other ones and they

all had good reasons for not being there. One of them was asleep, but whatever. So, trying to figure out how to improve the interaction with the caucus in that regard.

We plan to have a next meeting, roughly noon Bangkok time, at IETF 103. So, in two weeks. I know for sure from a Doodle poll that five people said that they would show up for that. We'll see whether others do. I would encourage others to.

Specifically in the room, we're likely to drag in people that are working on software bases that are used by the resolvers, so that would be people like Mark Andrews and Jaap and others, and get advice from them or commentary from them. And having any resolver operators themselves in the room would be interesting and useful. And TLDs are welcome, too, if you want to come. Anybody that would operate a DNS server I think is a reasonable target for this.

So, that's what we're doing and that's kind of where we're at. We're very much just starting, and as in Liman's case, one of our first questions really is caucus engagement. How do we promote it? how do we make this something that is interesting for people to work with? Brad?

BRAD VERD: Any questions for Fred? Suggestions, comments? Yes, please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello. I didn't get the Bangkok meeting. It's going to be the study group going to meet in Bangkok or the time of Bangkok, I didn't get it.

FRED BAKER: So, the IETF will be meeting the week of November 4th in Bangkok. So, on Tuesday during that week, 12:45 to 1:45, Verisign has offered the use of their room. They have a room at the meeting. A bunch of us will duck into it and have a call very much like this one. Obviously, the people that are in the room at the time will be talking as people in the room, but there will be others I'm sure that are out on the net. So, that's what we're doing. It's at the IETF meeting. It's not specifically an IETF discussion. It's an RSSAC caucus discussion, but it will be happening there.

BRAD VERD: Again, going back to … Really quick. Going back to what I stated earlier with caucus meetings being held at the IETF, there's not a caucus meeting happened at this IETF. It's, again, the caucus decided every other IETF, so that will be … So, caucus meeting just like we have here we have at the IETF, every other IETF. What Fred has described is a work party meeting. Because the technical experts are there, we're pulling them together. It's an opportunity because everybody is there in one place pulling them together. Everybody is going to go sequester themselves in a room and work on this. Again, that's not an IETF-related thing. It will not be on the IETF schedule. You will not see it anywhere. You only know about it from here, the caucus. Any other questions for Fred regarding the resolver behavior? None? Anything in the room? Oh, I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, [inaudible] fellowship. I believe the similar issues we raised in the previous DNS presentation, but it seemed like [inaudible] resolvers that were not able to resolve a few websites. We raised this up. [inaudible] similar issue [inaudible] statement. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. You mentioned this in the caucus meeting Monday, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Correct.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. So, the particular issue, I don't think this room is the right place to work that out. I think your best bet is to go to the ISC website and log a ticket and they'll ask you a whole bunch of questions and we can figure out what's going on. Right here we don't have the information to od that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

BRAD VERD: Great. Any other questions? I don't see any. So, I will … I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is it possible to participate remotely to the work party?

BRAD VERD: The work party meeting in Bangkok or just in general? Absolutely. Yes. If you join the work party, there are calls that will be scheduled and all that is set out. Yes. That is how most of the work is done is remotely. That's how all these meetings happen. There's no way that we could do this if we had to get together every time. It just so happens that at the IETF we're taking advantage of the opportunity of people being there. That's all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's an exception.

BRAD VERD: That is an exception. That's by no means how the work is normally done. It is normally done via phone, conference calls, sharing documentation back and forth and working through e-mail. Alright. Any other questions? As soon as I close the queue, someone is going to ask one. No?

Alright. That brings us to the end of the agenda. However, I do want to talk a couple things. I'm going to take this as the opportunity. Normally, at a caucus meeting, we'll do a call for work. I will, however, say that we already have a number of work items in the queue. If you are a current member of the caucus, you saw the two current work parties that we just covered. We put together a list of all work items in the queue. We sent it out to the caucus to have it prioritized. It was all done via Doodle poll where everybody chose one. They prioritized them. They just listed

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

what they saw as the highest priority and the two we're working on right now are what came out at the top.

So, that's what we're working on. At the time, it was the resources that we had to cover two work parties. So, we have a number of things in the queue.

In addition, we've been talking. Admin committee, RSSAC has been talking also about RSSAC has published obviously this proposal, new governance model in RSSAC 037 and we all believe that there is a number of technical things that can be addressed prior to any implementation of RSSAC 037 which stand on its own depending on whatever is implemented by RSSAC 037.

Some the examples that we talked about was taking RSSAC 01 which is service expectations of a root server and updating it, doing a full overhaul on it. And as we started to build those, we'd start building what should be measured, how it should be measured and those types of things.

So, we're putting together a list of items that will only add to the current queue and then we will all do this, so that the caucus sees it all and we will probably do another round of prioritization and begin some other work parties.

Just so everybody's aware, with RSSAC 037 behind us, we'll have some more cycles from staff to help support that. We're only limited by … We are limited by resources and people who contribute to get this work done, so we can't have N number of work parties going on

simultaneously. We've got to manage it appropriately and that's what we're doing.

So, with that, are there any questions about upcoming work, potentially? Or is there something that we should add to the list of upcoming work? Please remember, if you're going to add to the list, I expect that you will want to contribute to whatever that topic is that's added. Hint, hint, nudge, nudge. No?

Alright. Anything from the room? I don't see anything. So, with that, I will thank you for all your time. We can adjourn the meeting and we will see you in Prague. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018