
BARCELONA – RSSAC Meeting
Wednesday, October 24, 2018 – 15:15 to 16:45 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

BRAD VERD: Give us just one moment, we get the technical pieces worked out. All right. Welcome, everybody. Let's, is the recording going? Thank you.

All right. Welcome to the ICANN, I'm sorry, the RSSAC Formal Committee meeting at ICANN63. I hope everybody's had a good week. Let's run through the, let's do roll call, all right? Then I'm going to run through the... and we're online too, I assume, Mario? Okay.

Cogent? No Cogent.

All right, ICANN? I think Matt sent his apologies? ISC?

JEFF OSBORN: Jeff Osborn.

BRAD VERD: Fred, just get him. His mic was off.

FRED BAKER: Fred Baker.

BRAD VERD: NASA? Is NASA on the line? All right. Netnod?

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: Lars-Johan Liman is here.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. RIPE NCC?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar.

BRAD VERD: University of Maryland?

TRIPTI SINHA: Tripti Sinha.

BRAD VERD: USC?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Suzanne Woolf.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. ARL?

KEN RINARD: Ken Rinard.

HOWARD KASH: Howard Kash.

BRAD VERD: Howard is online. Thank you, Howard. DoD?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson.

BRAD VERD: Thank you.

KEVIN WRIGHT: This is Kevin Wright.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Kevin. Verisign? Brad Verd is here. It looks like jumping back to USC on attendance. Somebody just walked in the door.

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker, USC-ISI.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Wes. And lastly, The WIDE Project.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro Hotta.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Hiro. Going into liaisons, the IANA functions operator?

NAELA SARRAS: Naela Sarras.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Naela. Root Zone Maintainer?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane Wessels is here.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Duane. The IAB? It doesn't look like Danielle is present. SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Russ. Liaison to the Board, we have Kaveh. Liaison to CSC, we have Liman. Liaison to RSSAC, we have myself.

Great. There is roll call. So let's do – I'm sorry, what? Oh, I'm sorry.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Patrik Fältström, Netnod. Sorry for being late.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Patrik. All right, that concludes our roll call piece. Let's jump into the agenda. So we will do –

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excuse me, quick question.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Do we have a quorum? Yes, thank you.

BRAD VERD: For those of you online who didn't hear – I'm not sure – it was a question, do we have a quorum? The answer is yes.

And then agenda review. We've got a bunch of administration to do, the normal minutes, update on the committees and organizational review and whatnot. We'll go through that. We have our RSSAC Co-Chair election. We'll go through that. We'll cover the work items, the outstanding work items. Then we'll do our liaison reports and any other business and then we will adjourn.

Is there any other business that somebody would like to add?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I have an AOB about maybe a quick conclusion and two points about the meeting we had with the Board yesterday.

BRAD VERD: Great. Can we add that to the agenda, please? Let's call it a joint Board meeting review. Is that fair? Perfect.

Okay, that's it for the agenda. Let's jump into it and jump into the administration piece. Draft minutes from October 2nd. Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Brad. I have sent over the mailing list, the draft minutes from October 2nd, 2018 teleconference call. The only action item that we have from the previous teleconference is RSSAC to discuss RSO identification document during the next teleconference.

And given the short time, we're still working on some of the action items that have been listed in the minutes. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Is there a motion on the floor to approve the minutes?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I so motion.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I second.

BRAD VERD: Is there any discussion?

All right, no discussion. Is there any objection to approving the minutes?

All right, with no objection, they are approved. Thank you.

Moving on with the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee update.
Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: Hello, everyone. This is Carlos Reyes with an update from the Membership Committee. There was a brief teleconference yesterday but no SOIs were approved. We have a queue now after this meeting. I think there are probably three SOIs in the queue, so the Membership Committee will review those in the coming months and have a recommendation at the next teleconference.

Other activities the Membership Committee has been working on, staff, Andrew, Mario, Steve and I have been working on a data analysis of Caucus member participation and engagement in the Caucus. We're nearly done with the data scrub so we will hand that over to the Membership Committee for their analysis.

BRAD VERD: Any questions for Carlos regarding the Membership Committee? No. Okay, there is one thing I forgot to say. I apologize. I'll say it now. This meeting will represent our November meeting based upon discussions that we've had on the previous calls and the agendas. That was, essentially, our decision point for was there enough agenda for the meeting in November? We will, this will represent the November meeting and the next time we meet will be the first week in December, so apologies for not saying that when I called the meeting to order.

All right, next topic, RSSAC appointments, update back to Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. So as you know, every year there is a set of representatives from the RSSAC that are appointed by the Board. This was just part of the cycle. This year, we submitted the paperwork for appointments from ICANN Organization, ISC, Netnod, and Verisign. So those will be approved by the Board tomorrow. It's part of the consent agenda.

And then we also have appointments from NASA and UMD for changes in the midst of their current terms. So you'll see those resolutions posted after the ICANN Board annual general meeting.

BRAD VERD: Any questions? All right, moving on.

RSSAC Organizational Review, again, back to you, Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. We covered this last month when the RSSAC approved the draft feasibility assessment and initial implementation plan. That was a document that the work party produced and the RSSAC reviewed, that has since been delivered to the ICANN Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee. We're waiting for a response from them but the work party will have an opportunity to present that document to the ICANN Board OEC sometime in December. So I imagine the work party will give the RSSAC an update at that point and once the presentation happens, that's when the OEC and the RSSAC engage in a dialogue about how to move forward with implementation of the recommendations from the final report of the independent examiner.

BRAD VERD: Great. We've talked through that a couple of times. Any questions for Carlos?

No. All right, last administration item. ICANN63 action items, Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks. Hopefully you're not tired of my voice yet. So ICANN63, first off, thanks for a very productive week. We had five RSSAC work sessions and three Caucus work sessions, a variety of joint meetings and some public sessions as well, of course, tutorials. And in the meantime, staff captured some action items.

I'll quickly review them now. We'll also distribute these via the mailing list. But some action items include I'll produce the next draft of

RSSAC000, Version 4. These are the operational procedures so this draft will reflect the discussion from the first work session.

Andrew is going to go through the list of publications and identify those publications that could benefit from potential revisions in preparation for any pre-RSSAC037, 038 implementation. So Andrew will be working on that.

Together, the staff is going to propose what administrative changes need to happen with the Caucus mailing list and just scheduling in general in light of the conversations about broadening engagement, and we'll propose some sort of a transition plan for the two work parties that were just launched, so look forward to an update from staff on that.

Andrew is also going to update the queue of work items in light of the discussions this week. If you'll recall, last year, we started tracking a list of work items that the Caucus and RSSAC had both proposed, so Andrew will update that.

For the December teleconference – as Brad mentioned, that's the next time the RSSAC will convene – we'll make sure to add workshop planning to that agenda just to follow on the discussions that happened here this week. I'm going to work with the membership committee to develop some sort of lightweight onboarding for Caucus members. This is some of the feedback that we received during the Caucus meeting. It also aligns with a request from the last

teleconference, the last RSSAC teleconference, to develop some sort of onboarding for the new RSSAC members as well. So I'll make sure that those compliment each other.

And then we discussed some initial steps that the RSSAC can take for implementation of some of the recommendations in the final report of the independent examiner. So I'll develop a template for a potential RSSAC work plan for your consideration. I'm also going to write up an overview of current leadership training and succession plans that are in place, so we have an answer prepared for implementation.

And then Wes, Ken Rinard, and Liman were going to draft a question to send to the Caucus, basically about improving operations and administration.

So those are all the action items we captured from ICANN63. Is there anything that anyone thinks we may have forgotten or any modifications?

BRAD VERD:

Great. Thank you, Carlos. Moving on. RSSAC Co-Chair election. Right now, we have one nomination. The nomination is Fred Baker. Is there any discussion around Fred?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Should you ask Fred to leave the room?

BRAD VERD: No.

FRED BAKER: If folks would rather I left the room, I can do that.

BRAD VERD: Well, with no discussion, the second question is, are there any other nominations?

So with no other nominations, is there a motion to approve Fred as Co-Chair by acclimation?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Moved.

BRAD VERD: Second?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Second.

BRAD VERD: Is there anybody opposed? All right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can you say “in favor” [inaudible]?

BRAD VERD: So this topic is now closed. Yes. So Fred is our new Co-Chair. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: By acclimation.

BRAD VERD: By acclimation.

FRED BAKER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Congratulations, Fred.

BRAD VERD: The reason, historically, if you go through all of our votes, the normal way of asking is there anybody against, anybody abstaining, and then everybody else is assumed to be in favor of, so that's, otherwise you go around.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And that's very wise and that's why I still say I'm the new guy because I didn't know that.

BRAD VERD: But you're not the new guy.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He is.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you, everybody, and congratulations Fred.

CARLOS REYES: Unfortunately, I have to step out and support another meeting. Thank you for a great week. I'll be following this meeting remotely.

BRAD VERD: Thank you for all your help, Carlos.

All right, let's jump into the work items. Packet sizes work party update. Is there anything you want to share?

DUANE WESSELS: Just a little. So this work party, we've talked about shutting it down. There's an action on myself and George, the work party leader, to write something. I started drafting that today and just before the meeting, I asked the staff to provide some data on the meetings, such as how many meetings there were and how many attendees there were so I'll include that in the formal request to have it shut down.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thanks. Any questions for Duane?

Okay. Let's move on. Service coverage of the RSS Work Party update.
Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

We have discussed this fairly at depth during the conference here but for those of you who are on the phone, the current situation is that we have had our first telephone conference which was extremely sparsely attended with only one person engaging actively in the dialogue with me, myself, and staff.

And what we agreed on was to start on a Google document where we have a kitchen sink for ideas that need to go into the future document. That document does already exist and in addition to that, I received help from, who was it? Ken. No, Ryan. Who was it? My memory is just too bad. Someone help me to create an outline for the coming paper so we had the headline for that.

BRAD VERD:

That was Ken.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

That was Ken. Right. So we had headlines and labels for where we can start to put more text into that document, and in addition, the sparse participation in the telephone call was a bit of a trigger for our decision to open up the discussion to the entire Caucus mailing list so we will do that and hope for more input that way. And we will also, I believe, schedule an upcoming phone call for an SSAC phone call.

I have also solicited input for a work party leader, and I have received some input there but it's not a finished item yet. So that's the current status. Questions?

BRAD VERD: Okay, thank you, Liman. Moving on, next work item is Studying Modern Resolver Behaviors Work Party. Fred, can you give an update?

FRED BAKER: Well, so we have some people on a mailing list as with the other work party. We're probably going to move that to the RSSAC Caucus list, but as it stands, we have a separate mailing list with, I think, 12 names on it.

And we had our first meeting October 3rd, picked a work party leader which is Paul Hoffmann. We will collaborate with his lab, which he's setting up at ICANN, Jeff Houston's lab at APNIC, Jaap Akkerhuis, however he pronounces his name at NLnet Labs and anybody else that wants to collaborate. And kind of see where that goes. We plan to have a meeting at the ITF 103. We'll be using Verisign's room for that and we'll have participate.icann.com as we do here.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you, Fred. Any questions for Fred?

I see nothing in the room. Moving on, future workshops. We talked extensively about that here this week. I think we've all agreed that we should continue with planning of the next workshop sometime in the

spring as we needed to know yea or nay on workshops by the end of the year so that we can start putting resources to it, so we've come to that decision here as a group and staff will begin the logistics planning on that.

We've also started to talk through a number of different potential workshop items and we will, going back to what Carlos said with the action items, we will put the new work queue together and share it with everybody and then have a discussion about topics for the next workshop. Any questions around that?

All right. Great. Let's go into the report. So our Co-Chair report. I know my name is here, but I guess Tripti can share also. The only thing that I will share here, I've already shared with the group but I'll share it here in the formal meeting for people on the phone. The only thing that has happened since the last phone call is that we met with Cherine while here at ICANN63. He made it very clear that he wanted us to bring back an apology to RSSAC for not having a response sooner – RSSAC 37 AND 38 – and that it is a top priority and discussions this week have substantiated that. So again, he was very apologetic and wanted that to be shared.

Our discussion with Cherine went around, really went from the questions that we had proposed to the Board and how the technology side of ICANN works and maybe how to improve on that, the communication piece and nothing more, really. Was there anything else that we talked about? Kaveh was there also. Kaveh, anything else to share? All right.

TRIPTI SINHA: But he did very strongly apologize for not responding to 37 and 38. He spent a significant amount of time in that meeting apologizing.

BRAD VERD: Anything else you can think of as a Co-Chair report that we should share?

TRIPTI SINHA: No. I guess you've got the joint meeting as an AOB item. Yeah, so we'll... yeah.

BRAD VERD: All right. Great. Any questions around that? Anything for myself or Tripti?

All right, moving on, liaison to the ICANN Board, Kaveh, anything you can share?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No because there was no specific activity and then I sent the report about the last one. The only thing that will come up is a five-year strategy plan and as I mentioned before, 37/38 is actually high, item 1.1. So as soon as the draft is published for the public, I will make sure that that's [inaudible] to RSSAC and if you have any comments, because there will be time to change it, so if you have any comments

or any change that you foresee, we can implement that. But it's very high level. It just sets it as an important priority for the organization.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Kaveh. Any questions for Kaveh?

All right. Liman, any report from the CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, the CSC has had a couple of meetings this week. One of them was an informal meeting where, like this meeting, we decided to have face-to-face rather than by phone. But the first meeting was actually just like RSSAC, the CSC, undergoing periodic effectiveness review and that, it's a first for CSC, obviously, because it's only been around for two years and it's due to, I would say, having a totally different review team. It went a lot smoother, so it has nothing of the controversy that we saw with the RSSAC. It's right on track and yeah, it was a very expedient meeting with them. Things were working quite well there.

In addition, what else can I say? The CSC has worked to create something called remedial action procedures where in the case that the PTI doesn't perform according to expectations and there is a systemic and persistent problem which is we don't deal with specific cases. We deal when you have systemic failure. Then there is, now, a remedy to the action procedures that the CSC can invoke in case there is something that doesn't work well.

We've been extremely far from wanting to do that. I can tell you because everything just seems to run quite fine. But they seem involved, turning to the PTI Board first, then the ICANN CEO, and eventually, the ICANN board at the end. And these have now been completed and approved by the PTI and also by ICANN.

It has led to a bit of back and forth between various documents that are involved to know if you want a set of documents and then there are some small changes by legal or something that can influence the other documents that you have already improved, so you have kind of a circle there which is hopefully going to work at target, but right now we have one more document that needs to be modified or in details I think.

And we've had some turnover in the membership of the CSC due to terms expiring and people not being re-elected so we actually have a new vice-chair in the term, in the shape of Lisa [who], if I remember correctly. Wasn't it?

TRIPTI SINHA:

Elaine Pruis.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Sorry. Elaine Pruis, sorry. Sorry, did you say it's not from a membership? No, she's liaison. Yeah, Elaine Pruis. Thank you.

What else did I forget?

TRIPTI SINHA: And two new members, the CC community sent Brett Carr and the gTLD community sent Gaurav Vedi.

LARS-JOHAN Liman: Yeah, that's [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Liman. Any questions for Liman?

Okay, moving on. Liaison to RZERC, just myself. There's really only one topic to share here, which is OCTO had submitted a request to RZERC to review the RZM, the root Zone Maintainer Contract. This was as a result of the IANA functions – I'm sorry – the IANA transition, there was a requirement in there that after a number of years, that this needed to be reviewed. Is it running okay? Are things okay? Kind of like a sanity check. So this was submitted by OCTO to RZERC. RZERC was working on it, and it was recently pulled back from OCTO. So OCTO pulled it back from RZERC.

Basically, it was identified by OCTO that OCTO was not one of the approved or defined channels that work for RZERC, could come in from, and it's supposed to come from a community group, PTI or, I think, the board and OCTO is not one of those. So it was pulled back and we got a little bit of an update yesterday from David in our OCTO meeting about that. But that's the big change as my liaison to the RZERC role. RZERC is no longer working on that and what's left in their queue is there's some administration on how we function as a group that's going on. There's discussion happening around that.

But there is no content at the current time. So that's all I have and I would say Duane and Russ, you could add to that if you want to, if I missed something or got it wrong since they are both members of RZERC.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I'd say that's about right. The other thing we learned yesterday was that it sounds like maybe OCTO is intending to continue with that evolution study and will involve RZERC at some future time.

BRAD VERD: Correct. It was, rather than sending, asking RZERC to look at the review and whatnot, it was, I believe – and we learned this yesterday with OCTO – is that they create an RFP, maybe get a response to the RFP and that might be shared with RZERC.

So any other questions about RZERC? No, all right. Moving on. SSAC, Russ, any update?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Brad. Just a couple of quick things.

One, we had the joint meeting, RSSAC, SSAC. Thanks to all the RSSAC members that were there and contributed. I think it was a very useful meeting and appreciate the feedback we got there. The plans are, again, to schedule one for the next ICANN meeting and so thank you there.

The other item is the processing of RSSAC 37 and 38. It's still not completely clear exactly who's going to be asked to do what, when. The Board has said, "Yes, they plan on formally asking SSAC, but in our various meetings this week, I raised the question if there's going to be informal coordination ahead of time, especially with the OCTO planning of the inputs and the answer was, "Well, yeah, we'll probably be working with RSSAC," and I raised the suggestion that maybe SSAC ought to be involved in that.

It's still fuzzy enough that we don't know but I just wanted to let the RSSAC folks know that I'll be carrying the messages back and forth about what's going on in the informal coordination with RSSAC on 37 and we may raise our hand and say, "Yeah, we think we have something to say here, too." So that's it.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, Russ. Any questions for Russ?

All right, we will move on. Daniel who was not here when we did attendance, so we need to make sure he's on the attendance list. Daniel, any update from the IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT:

No, no update, but I'm contacting them to try to see if they're willing us to have new topics for the next workshop.

BRAD VERD:

Good. Thank you. Any questions for Daniel?

All right, moving on. The IANA Functions Operator, Naela.

NAELA SARRAS:

Thank you. So a few updates.

I think I pointed previously to this group that we are doing the annual customer service or that just closed for the PTI, disclosed recently. We're currently going through the results and analyzing them. Having said that, we are moving towards a more immediate customer survey where we will query the customers right after a quest closes and get a better sense of how the request went. But we will remain. We will keep the annual survey but will reduce it to a few strategic questions that we're looking for input on and the strategic customer groups that we'll be contacting.

I know nobody wants me to say this, but the KSK Rollover went good for the part that the IANA functions was involved in. We do have still some clean-up tasks that we still need to do and also as you heard yesterday, we're now OCTO and David Conrad is the executive responsible for the IANA functions, so we'll be working with their team. I think there's a final report to be that OCTO is working on.

The last update was, I think I also told this group that we are doing the FY20 budget for the PTI that's currently in public comment. By December, we will have wrapped it up. It will go to the PTI Board for approval and then it will join the ICANN FY20 budget process.

But the budget, essentially, is flat compared to last year in spending. It's not asking for anything drastically different. And that's it. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Naela. Any questions for Naela?

All right, and lastly, we have the Root Zone Maintainer, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Nothing to report. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Duane. And we are now in our “any other business” section, which was added. There was a topic added by Kaveh so I will let Kaveh cover it.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. I wanted to add one point and maybe a point for discussion about the meeting we had yesterday with the Board.

So one point because I heard a case from one of the operators and I [filled] from another one discussing afterwards in the [inaudible] that... The comment was, “Oh, so the board had, for two years, they had meetings about the strategy of Root and we didn’t know about it?” No, they didn’t have anything with the strategy of Root. All of decisions the Board had during either workshops or the meetings, about discussing anything about Root has been reported. So I have, for every single one of them, I have seen an e-mail to RSSAC.

[inaudible] has it in the slide so I've also shared the slides. It has been always educational, so the whole, and for two of them, I guess, Brad and Tripti actually presented two or one.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, I know one. Well, no. We were at two different workshops where we worked and a lot of that was just kind of bringing the Board up to speed on Root Server Operations, how things worked and whatnot. It was more informational versus a strategy or anything.

DUANE WESSELS:

Exact. So in all of the cases, at least the ones that I've been involved in have been on the agenda. This has been the routine, to educate the Board. Actually, it's part of what's called technical [deep dive], so the Board actually goes through one subject and they learn more.

In a few cases, they also discussed L-root and issues because, for example, there was a budget [inaudible] for L-root to increase the budget for L-root so they can spend more, and obviously, the L-root team presented their views on how attacks are affecting their operations and why they need more sites and where they want to put them.

But that's all the Board has discussed, so it has been all open and transparent. I just wanted to clarify that for the record so we know there was nothing discussed other than that with the Board. So it wasn't that the plan to strategize or take action on any of this stuff. That's the first part.

The second part, I still think, because we didn't get to resolve the point that I raised yesterday and I know it's a point of contention. No matter what we do, and to be honest, at least from my personal point of view, even unrelated to 37 or 38, if we don't resolve this difference of view between the Board and RSSAC, I think we will have a lot of issues in the coming years.

Let me clarify what the issue I'm referring to. It is basically, at least part of ICANN Board and ICANN Org, and this is my understanding, which was reinforced especially yesterday because we never talked about it directly but we always saw signs. See that there is [C] and the role of ICANN as part of security and stability of DNS, to strategize for the whole DNS system.

My position always has been, "No, this is not the role of ICANN." The way I read the bylaws, that's not how it's said and for that role, we have always independently, at least in the Root operations, we have always done that independently and we don't see ICANN as the body to do that. And that has been my understanding from the workshops and from all the sessions we have.

But at least parts of the discussion in the Board and in the Org, very strongly think, "No, they have that role so no matter what RSSAC or any other advisor coming to say, says they have this role to strategize and put their resources to make sure stability of the DNS on top, not only as L operations but on top, is secured.

So first of all the armor is strong on my position, representing RSSAC, not as my personal position but I wanted first to check with RSSAC. Is

this also the common understanding in the room that ICANN shouldn't do that? If it's not, then I wouldn't be so strong in that argument.

And then if it is, my suggestion is to really try and resolve it, one way or the other. Maybe we ask the Board formally or whatever, but I think without getting to an agreement on this is a role or not, we will have these issues coming up in different ways and different forms. So that was my comment and question to the room.

BRAD VERD:

Comments or questions for Kaveh on either two of the topics that he shared? Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN:

This is unfair because Kaveh and I have talked about this a lot, but also, I had this discussion with various members of this group and with the Board. I think there are a couple of root issues that we're too polite to talk about, and one of them is the members of the Board of ICANN feel like it's going to be their fault if there's a disastrous failure of the DNS system and the U.S. Senate and other scary organizations are going to put them on subpoena, put them under oath, hand them microphones and say, "Why did you let this thing fail?" And what I have said to them is, "You go, what fail? It wasn't our fault. There's this group that preceded us by years that operates it. Let me introduce you to them." But they go, "No, no, no. That's silly. Everybody knows it's our fault." To which I respond, "No, they don't. We don't. This is an error right there and this is, I think, a very fertile ground to talk about."

And then we can go from there. There's a very basic problem where they're all afraid they're going to get called for something they're responsible for that they're not responsible for and discuss.

BRAD VERD:

Kaveh, a quick response and then Liman is in the queue.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Just a quick response. Yes, I have heard of that augmentation which was also brought up yesterday, the Congress call. They have two fundamental issues with that personally.

First, I don't see ICANN Board or the [inaudible] responsible to the U.S. Government, so having this example of you, as Congress, calling them. Yeah, let them call them. I don't know. They shouldn't be. They are not accountable or responsible to only one government or to any government. So we have the multi-stakeholder bottom-up so we are not responsible to governments. We interact with them. That's first.

And now, I understand it might but this is the whole idea of the system, correct? So if it is [inaudible], we have to and it's the U.S. Government who dictates how we should behave or who we are accountable to, then that's good but let's clarify that. So that's the first thing, which is wrong from my point of view with that argument.

And the second part is yes, having, coming up with responsibility, self-responsibility. I can also come out and say, "Oh, I am responsible for

this,” and tell the Board I am responsible, but as you said, this group had existed long before the whole set-up, correct?

So someone cannot just come up and assume responsibility and then say, “Oh, I’m responsible so you have to listen to me.” That’s the way I see that and, again, that’s the part I want to reinforce from the group because I don’t think we, at least, as RSSAC or Root Operator ever agreed to give those powers or rights or whatever we have, accountabilities to the ICANN Org. Maybe we decided to do it, but then we need to document that, correct?

BRAD VERD:

Great. Any other comments or questions?

It sounds like this will be an ongoing... Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Brad. I heard yesterday as people were making comments about this, especially from the Board side, the inference, at least in my hearing was that they were saying that they felt they were responsible for the entire DNS and I think that’s something that really needs to be worked on because they certainly have some amount of responsibility for the DNS Root Zone content.

Beyond that, the amount and type of responsibility is much more difficult to define, and so, as the Board members talk about we’re responsible for the DNS, I think this is something that from an educational perspective, we, as a group from RSSAC and myself as the

SSAC Liaison, and [inaudible] in SSAC, we need to do all we can to help the Board get a solid understanding of where their responsibilities lie and where they don't. So this is, I think, a bad misconception.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Russ. Right now I have Ryan, Tripti and Fred in the queue. I skipped Liman? I'm sorry, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No, I think we should follow Kaveh's advice and look into this and kind of establish an understanding of the relationship that both sides agree to. Before we do that, we should carefully read the bylaws because there are serious [inaudible] dragons in there and I just started to do a brief search for the word "DNS" and already on page one, it's inconsistent. So this is actually a task that we should undertake with some focus and sit down, possibly in a small working group, and work through this and figure out what the underlying assumptions are in the bylaws and from that, what our opinion is.

So that the group can bring to the wider group, the fundamentals of the wider group can come to consensus about what the opinion should be. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Liman. So then we have – hold on, let me make sure I got this here – Ryan, Tripti, Fred, Wes, Daniel.

RYAN STEPHENSON: I think I 100% agree with Liman, but also, we keep using the term “If DNS fails,” If a TLD fails, is ICANN Board to blame? So that’s, I think we need to say, “Of course, I agree 100% with Liman with what we have to do. But keep it in the scope of the Root, Root Server Operators and the Root Zone, serving the Root Zone versus DNS altogether because, again, if a TLD fails, is ICANN to blame? I know that if there was an issue with the mill, the mill personnel that handled the mill department of [defense] would be the ones up in front of Congress or whatever. Anyway, that’s it.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Ryan. Tripti?

RYAN TRIPTI: So I’d just like to take everyone back in time when we first embarked on our workshops. This was exactly what we were tackling, which was we pre-date ICANN. Who are the stakeholders of the Root Server System? We spent many, many hours discussing that so this is something that we were fully aware of and we put all our thoughts into 37, so that’s what’s baffling me is why is this a problem today when we’ve produced a 50-page document that lays out a path forward to address exactly these ambiguities.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. It will come back to you. Fred?

FRED BAKER: This might be a devil’s advocate viewpoint, but so ICANN is raising, I think, or the ICANN Board is raising a legitimate question in this sense. Governments may wonder what’s going on when something happens and so let’s rephrase, not U.S. Congress but European Commission or pick your favorite government.

It seems like there is a need for hem to have somebody that is the go-to, something hiccupped, who should I talk to? And to refer them, not to go and try to say, “Well, I’m now responsible for this thing that went in the crapper.” But to redirect them to the appropriate interface.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Fred. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Thank you, Brad. I think a large part of the issue stems from the fact that they have a very difficult situation. They manage a name service for which there is a huge mix of responsibility and ability to control and regulate and the liability associated thereof. I mean, if you look at just... Forget the Root Server System, right? The ccTLDs versus the historic TLDs versus the new gTLDs, there’s a huge, tremendous difference in their ability to regulate different parts of the tree and that’s certainly got to be really frustrating.

To my knowledge, the Board has never made this statement and maybe you can correct me when I’m wrong, that they want responsibility. If somebody was going to say, “Okay, we’re going to hand you responsibility for the whole thing,” would that make them

happy? Have they ever made the sort of statement that they need that control, that this is not working for them? This is sort of a question to Kaveh.

BRAD VERD:

All right, a quick response, Kaveh and then we'll go back to the queue.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So, no. At least to my knowledge, no. But the dynamic is also a bit different because it's not as straight-forward as that, but in that sense no. Sometimes, but the statement's coming, for example, from Org even when [inaudible] letters usually [inaudible], correct? When the statements come, many times they are built on that assumption. So they are not directly reframed to that assumption, but a lot of these statements are built on the assumption and, yes, sometimes it doesn't go to clarification in-depth because they agree four TLDs, they might be really responsible for at least the new gTLDs or the ones that they have contracts or relationships.

But for how the root is operated, the assumption in many cases is very quickly also to rush this point. That's why two years ago, we really started to give them the trainings and we had the slides and all of that. So it's not like we repeated this. We have repeated this message multiple, multiple times. We tried to train them but [inaudible] that understanding still exists and it's [inaudible]. I don't think it's something we can fix by training, maybe a statement by RSSAC we're

in interaction with the Board, formal interaction so it's documented.
That's my personal understanding.

TRIPTI SINHA: Wes, you used the word "regulate". ICANN doesn't regulate. It coordinates and makes policies.

WES HARDAKER: I'm the first to admit my vocabulary is never stellar.

BRAD VERD: Okay, back to the queue. It's Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So it makes me think that if something goes wrong on the Internet, would we say, "Well, the IAB have been the architect of that so is the IAB responsible?" So we're maybe in situations that look a little bit similar and what is strange for people outside is that everyone I know always asks, "Who should I contact to the IETF?" So to then ask that, wow, there is no one here you can contact so who is the Chair? Yeah, but it's not the person you're really willing to have."

I think the deep question and maybe that's our topic we should propose to the workshop is to, in case of defining how the responsibilities should be handled by the different people and clarify that with the Board.

BRAD VERD: Yeah I think this topic, we're not going to solve here. I think this is going to be an ongoing discussion, so yeah, we're taking notes on that. Ryan, you're next.

RYAN STEPHENSON: So I guess to further add upon Daniel, we have three stakeholders. I guess we never truly defined what would happen in the event that the stakeholders have some type of disagreement where one says, "Do A," the other says, "Do not do A; Do B." Root Server Operators or their organizations or stakeholders, the ICANN Board, ICANN community is a stakeholder. Where's when that friction point of who has the boundary? I know one of our guiding principles is Root Server Organizations operators. They are independent. They have this independent spirit.

So anyways, maybe that's something to add on to Daniel's, something to be worked on for the workshop.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. Patrik?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank You. So we're talking about potentially ICANN and the end users or whoever the stakeholders are. One thing I think we should remember is that we already have legislation regarding electronic communication around the world which covers large portions of operations, of the Internet including DNS, which complicates things

because just because ICANN doesn't have the responsibilities, it's not the case that there are no responsibilities on whoever is running DNS around the world. So this is a very complicated situation and because of that, I also would like to say that this probably needs to be, definitely needs to be dealt with in a smaller group.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, no doubt. This is definitely a complicated challenge to solve here. So any other comments on this? Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: So I just want to, just for clarification because as I said, this is a position I'm taking but on behalf of RSSAC so if RSSAC really wants me to change that position or whatever, please let me know because I need direction here or if you want me to continue with that direction, please let me know. But I really need...

BRAD VERD: Can you restate that just one last time so everybody can hear?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. So my position is RSSAC doesn't believe, as a group, doesn't believe that ICANN Org has an overarching role in strategizing how DNS works.

BRAD VERD: I think I would add to that, to try to make that much more positive which is we're happy to work with them.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. Sorry, yes. That's just from my internal [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: I understand. Yeah.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes.

BRAD VERD: All right. Oh, I'm sorry. There's a hand up. I'm sorry. This is the formal meeting and this is not for participants. I'm sorry. Yes, Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA: so I have a question for this group, don't you believe we actually addressed this problem in 37. We did, right? Kaveh is shaking his head.

BRAD VERD: I think we did, yes.

TRIPTI SINHA: yeah, and once this is vetted by the community, it'll get more definition and once it's ratified as a document and implemented, hopefully this will be addressed.

BRAD VERD: I would echo that, yeah. So when I heard different things being said here, Liman, I got you, I just added you into the queue – but yeah, like Ryan when you were saying if there was a disagreement between the stakeholders, that was to be worked out when the different specifics, the different functions are worked out if 37 is implemented. Those checks and balances would be put in place to handle those disagreements and grievances, which were called out in the document.

So I believe those will happen, but it should be solved in the model as implemented. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I agree. But I think that's five years down the line, so we may have a problem until then that we may want to address some way and I still think we should come together and have a look at that in a shorter time frame as a temporary measure, until that model reaches a final [inaudible].

TRIPTI SINHA: Liman, could you clarify five years down the line. What's five years down the line?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's two and a half years down the line and something that a person who never became my father-in-law told me. Every project takes pi

times as long and costs pi times as much as you think it will. So I think if in a year and a half or two years times pi, it's five or six years.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So we can argue about the time. Even if it's a month, what I'm saying is because ICANN, anyways, is a powerful organization. They have budget so they might come up and the Board has a lot of power there, correct?

So the arguments might come up in other shapes and forms, so yes, I agree that SAPF function basically should resolve that whole thing. My question was until we have that in place because even getting that thing in place and running, we will hit this issue multiple times. So that was why I raised it.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, I think Liman, you're correct. I think Kaveh, you're correct. We, as a group, need to continue to manage this challenge because we've proposed an answer. The answer has yet to be implemented. It's going to take some time. In the meantime, we need to continue to manage it and that's, I think, Kaveh is asking for clarification on that and we will all continue in doing what we have done in managing this issue.

TRIPTI SINHA:

And if you ruin the one we were riding 37, we didn't propose how to implement it because we wanted community vetting. But we did say that once it's implemented, the Secretariat would probably go first –

that was the own hanging fruit – and that we needed to tackle the stakeholder discussion up front and architecture could probably go in parallel because they were so decoupled. But stakeholder was definitely one of the first things we wanted to do. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: All right. Good discussion. Anything else? No. Okay, with that, we have reached the end of our agenda.

Again, I want to thank Tripti, my Co-Chair, her last time here for being our Co-Chair, and again, we look forward to working with you in your new role as a Board member.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you again, and I honestly, as I said, I enjoyed working with all of you. It was fun writing 37/38. We had some very intense discussions but it was fun. So it was a good ride and I look forward to continue working with you. And Fred, congratulations. You will have fun. Trust me.

FRED BAKER: Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, so congratulations to my right, not to my left. Congratulations to Fred. You will officially be Co-Chair at the end of the AGM when Tripti steps down, and so next week, the work load will hit you.

All right, with that, we are adjourned. Thank you very much. Thank you for a wonderful ICANN63 and have safe travels home.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: If anybody wants to attend...

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]