
BRAD VERD: Hey, everybody. Brad's here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hi, Brad.

MARIO ALEMAN: Hello, Brad. Welcome.

BRAD VERD: Good morning.

STEVE SHENG: Good morning.

MARIO ALEMAN: Hello, Steve.

STEVE SHENG: Hello, Mario.

MATT: Hi, everyone.

MARIO ALEMAN: Hello, Matt. Welcome to the call.

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.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello.

MARIO ALEMAN: Hello.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Hello, everyone.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Kaveh.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

MARIO ALEMAN: Hello, Kaveh. I can hear you a little bit faint. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. Is it better now?

MARIO ALEMAN: It is, yes. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Good morning, all. It's 9:00 AM. Let's give it another minute or too, let some other people join, then we'll get started.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello. Just testing the audio. Can you hear me?

BRAD VERD: Hi, Liman. Yeah, we can hear you. We're going to start here in just a minute.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. That was not what I had hoped for to hear, because the sound goes the wrong way to my computer. I'm glad you can hear me. I can hear you too, but not in my headphone. Working on that.

BRAD VERD: Alright, 9:02, let's get started. We'll call it to order. Let's do a roll call. So from VeriSign, I had myself –

MATT WEINBERG: Matt Weinberg as well.

BRAD VERD: Matt Weinberg is here. USC, anybody on the call? Wes, Suzanne? No? Okay, moving on. Cogent? Paul or Brad? No? Moving on, University of Maryland.

KARL REUSS: Karl Reuss.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Karl.

KARL REUSS: Hey.

BRAD VERD: NASA? Anybody from NASA? Alright. ISC.

FRED BAKER: Fred and Jeff are both here.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Fred. Hey, Jeff. US DOD.

KEVIN WRIGHT: It's Kevin Wright and Ryan Stephenson.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Kevin. Hey, Ryan. ARL?

KENNETH RENARD: Ken Renard.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Ken. Netnod.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, Liman is here.

BRAD VERD: Hello, Liman. RIPE? I know Kaveh was on.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah, Kaveh is here.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Kaveh. ICANN.

MATT LARSON: Matt is here.

BRAD VERD: Matt. I know Terry's in the Adobe Connect. I didn't hear him on the phone though. And then lastly, WIDE.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro Hotta here.

BRAD VERD: Hi, Hiro.

HIRO HOTTA: Hi.

BRAD VERD: Moving on to our liaisons, IANA Functions Operator?

NAELA SARRAS: Naela's here.

BRAD VERD: Hi, Naela. Root Zone Maintainer.

DUANE WESSELS: Good morning. Duane is here.

BRAD VERD: Good morning, Duane. Liaison from the IAB? Daniel? No Daniel. Liaison from SSAC. No Russ. Liaison to the board of directors, Kaveh is here. Liaison to CSC, Liman is on the line. Liaison to RZERC, I am here. And

then for staff, we have Carlos, Steve, Andrew, and Mario. Is there anybody that's now on the call that I didn't cover or join late?

HOWARD KASH: Howard from ARL.

DANIEL KARENBERG: Brad, this is Daniel.

BRAD VERD: Alright, [inaudible] Daniel. A lot of feedback on your line, Daniel. If you can mute it. Thank you. Alright. Moving on to the agenda review, we've got our normal administration [inaudible] membership committee and some action items. We have the current work items that are underway we'll talk about, and then we'll jump into the reports and we'll close with Any Other Business. Is there anything that somebody would like to add to the agenda?

Hearing nothing and seeing nothing in Adobe Connect, I will move on to the administration piece. Minutes from the 24 October meeting. Mario.

MARIO ALEMAN: Thank you, Brad. I have sent to the mailing list the minutes from the 24th of October. If you [have reviewed,] I have made only minor changes. Basically, one suggestion from Naela about the survey, and the only action item that we have from previous teleconference is RSSAC to

discuss [RSO] identification document during the next teleconference. That, I believe, is actually – it's a work in progress.

Besides that, we have completed the rest of the action items. Thank you. Back over to you, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Any discussion on the draft minutes from October 24th. Any questions? I have a motion to approve the minutes from our meeting on the 24th.

RYAN STEPEHNSON: [inaudible] motion.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Ryan. [Is there a second?]

BRAD BELANGER: I'll second it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is Liman –

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Liman. Thank you, Brad. Are there any objections to approving the minutes from the 24th? No objections. Any abstentions? No abstentions, the minutes are approved. Thank you. Moving on to the

RSSAC caucus membership committee. I'm going to turn this over to Matt.

MATT WEINBERG:

Hello, everyone. So there were a bunch of statements of interests that came in since the last meeting. I suspect a lot of these came from after the ICANN meeting and other events that have happened recently, including IETF as well. The membership meeting did meet. We reviewed all the statements of interest. Carlos sent those out yesterday as well for everybody to review in advance.

In the end, I believe we got eight. Carlos, we recommend moving forward with six of them, and they're in Carlos' e-mail yesterday. For what it's worth, we don't rubber stamp everyone. There were a couple applications that we felt that merit consideration by RSSAC at large without further clarification or more information. So we punted on those and asked for more information from the candidates.

So, we can start with that and then we can also talk about the RSSAC mentor for the ICANN fellowship program. So let's start with the six applicants. Are there any questions? Considering we have six of them, [inaudible] really think I need to review each and every one of them, but [inaudible] the recommendation from the membership committee was to move forward with all of them.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Matt, a quick question before you go to the detail. That would be the first time that, if we don't accept, let's say, those two, that would be the

first time that membership committee is rejecting an application, correct?

MATT WEINBERG: Didn't reject. Just to be clear, we did not reject. All we did was ask for further clarification. There was one application –

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, I'm just asking [inaudible] no, I'm just asking if membership committee decides that they are not fit, that would be a first, correct?

MATT WEINBERG: Yeah. We have never, to my knowledge, rejected one outright. We didn't reject [before we asked for further] clarification for consideration.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. Thank you.

MATT WEINBERG: [We didn't feel that they are weak applications to the RSSAC.]

KAVEH RANJBAR: Fair point. Thank you.

MATT WEINBERG: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: Any discussion on the six that have been put up for approval by the membership committee and sent out to the list? [inaudible] through their names, just –

MATT WEINBERG: Yeah, it was – the names are [inaudible]. Another candidate was Abdul [inaudible]. I apologize for not pronouncing the names properly. Third was Mallory Knodel. The fourth was [Elena Rakovic.] The fifth was Petr Spacek who I think a lot of people know. And the last one was [inaudible]. So again, I apologize if I butchered those names. But if there aren't any questions, I would ask if anybody would like to make a motion to move forward [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Is there a motion on the floor to approve the six candidates as presented by the membership committee?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So moved.

RYAN STEPHENSON: I'll second.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you.

MATT WEINBERG: Thank you very much.

BRAD VERD: Alright. The six applicants are approved, and notifications will be sent out.

MATT WEINBERG: Yeah. And then finally, there was – Carlos, I might ask you for a little help on this one, but there is a position for an RSSAC mentor for the ICANN fellowship program, and that is the final application that you see in there. It's from a gentleman named Rao Naveed Bin Rais. We traded e-mails with him and he wrote what we felt to be a very good statement of interest. So the collective agreement was that he should be the person selected for that position. Carlos, can you add to that at all about the position itself?

CARLOS REYES: Sure. Thanks, Matt. Hi, everyone. So, a few months ago, the ICANN organization started a process of restructuring the ICANN fellowship program, and as part of that effort, there are two separate groups from the community that will now be advising ICANN staff with the fellowship program.

One is a selection panel, and the membership committee reviewed Sols a few months ago and selected that person already. It's another caucus

member. And this is the second group, which is a group of mentors that will advise ICANN fellows. So this appointment would fill that spot.

MATT WEINBERG: So, just to reiterate, our recommendation was to move forward with this candidate for that position. Are there any questions?

BRAD VERD: Alright. With no questions, is there a motion on the table to approve the candidate for the fellowship program as represented from the membership committee?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I so move.

BRAD VERD: Liman. Is there a second?

RYAN STEPHENSON: I'll go ahead and second, please.

BRAD VERD: Your item is approved.

MATT WEINBERG: Thank you. And that is all to report, unless I'm missing anything, Carlos. [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Alright, moving on with the agenda, we have pending action items. Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. So just to quickly review some of our action items, mostly from ICANN 63. You'll recall that we've had some discussions in Barcelona about streamlining how the caucus functions. This is something that the admin team will discuss in about ten days. We have a transition meeting here in the ICANN Washington office. Fred will be joining and Tripti will join us as well. So staff will propose something by then, and we're also working on an onboarding for RSSAC and caucus members. Mario has a draft, and we'll discuss that with the admin team as well.

I think those are the two main large pending action items. We'll probably go through some updates throughout the course of this call. I know Andrew has been working on some things related to caucus work items, and I've been working on 000. So Brad, I'll hand it over back to you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. Any questions for Carlos? Okay. Moving on, we'll jump into our work items. We have the packet size work party update from Duane, and I'll let Duane talk and then I'll add some comments

afterwards. So go ahead, Duane. Is there anything you want to share, or do we just want to jump into the request, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, so there's nothing really new to share other than – we've talked about this before, we've talked about shutting this work party down. It was presented a number of times in Barcelona. I submitted a formal request in an e-mail to the RSSAC a couple of weeks ago with the approval of George, the work party leader. So the formal request is on the table to shut down the work party.

BRAD VERD: Was there any feedback on the e-mail from you that came to you or George or anything?

DUANE WESSELS: No, there was not. Not that I saw.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thanks. This isn't something that we would normally vote on, and so the work party has met, they believe that the work party should be shut down, and all we want to do here is just kind of notify everybody and see if there's any issues or objections or things that somebody wants to say before this is shut down. The work will be archived, put on the shelf, basically, so nothing's lost. We've done this before. With that, is there any discussions or questions before we officially shut down this work party?

I hear nothing, I see no hands.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] hand from Daniel.

BRAD VERD: Oh, I'm sorry. I don't see it. I'm sorry. Go ahead, Daniel.

DANIEL KARENBERG: Okay. So I have nothing against shutting down this work party. What I'd like to hear is a little bit more. While the work party didn't seem as unachievable to me from the beginning, so would be good to understand why. I mean, it's a lack of motivation, but why those people were not motivated enough to end this work party properly, it would be good to think a little bit about that, I think. To learn from that, just to make sure.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. So I think it was a couple of things. It was a little bit due to lack of participation. You know, there was not a large number of people on the calls that we had. Another factor was that this work was originally motivated by the key rollover. There were concerned about the size of packets getting larger due to the key rollover, and since the key rollover happened sort of well before the work party completed any of its work, people felt that there was no longer that motivation, there was no longer a need to continue working on the work party post-rollover. A lot of those things had already been proven to work, for example.

And lastly, when the work party met and asked people to sort of step up and contribute things, code or writing for the document, it was just really hard to get people to commit to doing that. No one stepped up to do the actual work.

That's an overstatement. I'm sorry, it's not that no one stepped up. One or two folks did step up, but they didn't meet deadlines, they didn't make progress sort of in the way that they should have. So people did offer to do work, but it was just really hard to get them to complete it and get the work done.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Duane. Alright, with that, we will shut this down and we will look at appropriating resources. So thank you for your work, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS:

BRAD VERD: Moving on – I see no hands, no other comments, is the service coverage of root server system work party updates. Liman, anything to share?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No. With a fair bit of embarrassment, no, I have nothing to share there. It's not really as active as I would like it to be, and it's mostly my fault. So no update.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Brad, if I may, there was a hand raised actually before me, and that was Ryan. I think he had a question about the service coverage. And then I had an additional comment about the resolver behaviors.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Well, clearly, hands are not working on my Adobe Connect, so please speak up.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Okay. No problem. Just out of curiosity, I did send out an e-mail regarding the service coverage. We've had a couple e-mail issues here. Did people receive e-mail where it's kind of briefed about the service coverage, the positions? And it pretty much was a copy of Fred's e-mail in some way, but I don't know if others received that. I spoke with some outside that are outside of our e-mail system that's in the caucus, and some didn't receive it and some did receive it. So I'm not sure if people received that since we're all part of the caucus as well.

FRED BAKER: Well, I saw your repeat of the e-mail. At least one saw it. Yeah. And I found the call I was looking for at 10:00 eastern on Thursday.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. Thanks, Fred. See, Fred sent a mail a few days ago with some RSSAC documents for updating, because I had taken four documents and then Ryan added a fifth and made Google docs of them so that people comment on them. And this is about capturing feedback from

the RSSAC on what documents the RSSAC would like to work on updating for 2019, and probably update before the work on RSSAC 37 kind of kicks off again.

So if people have updates – if people have documents that they would like to add to that list – let me run down the list, documents that are currently on the list. So far, we have RSSAC 001, RSSAC 002 – well, I'll read the full title. RSSAC 001, Advisory on Service Expectation of Root Servers. RSSAC 002, Advisory on Measurements of the Root Server System, RSSAC 23, History of the Root Server System. RSSAC 24, Key Technical Elements of Potential Root Operators, and RSSAC 26, the RSSAC Lexicon.

So if people have a document that they'd like to see updated in 2019 that is not one of the ones that I just mentioned, please tell me and I'll add it to the list. And if people have updates they would like to see to those documents, please go to the link that Fred sent and add those comments into the group. Thanks. Back to you, Brad.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. Just to add on to that, these were documents that the admin committee went through and said that – kind of identified that they could use an updating after the discussion we had in Barcelona of updating existing documents. They'll be added to the existing work list, and that's going to be coming out shortly – or has come out, I don't remember – so that we can prioritize what to do next with our resources. Any questions? Liman. I see your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. It was just a minor one. I think this is all good. I am definitely interested in the RSSAC001, and I will try to comment on that one. But I saw actually yet another document in the mail which Andrew didn't mention now, which is RSSAC 28, and the title of it escapes my memory, but it was on the list. Andrew, comments?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah, you're correct. That is one that I – I think that's actually in the list, I just didn't mention it. Yeah. Okay, so RSSAC 28 is also on the list, but it is not in the document that tracks all the other documents. So I'll update that document. Thank you for catching that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Alright. And the title of it is –

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Oh, this is the title of –

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Oh. [inaudible]

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: This is the naming of the root servers document.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Oh. Yes. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Just that one had like four, five action items out of it. Alright. Anything else? I see no hands. Are there any other, Mario?

MARIO ALEMAN: No, Brad. I think you can move forward.

BRAD VERD: Alright, great. So we'll move on to RSSAC 000. Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. Hi, everyone. In Barcelona, the RSSAC had really good discussions around 000. So I have the updated version of that reflecting those discussions. I'll send it out, and it can be on the agenda for discussion next month. So hopefully if you have some time in the next few weeks to review it, it'll just reflect the discussion and tracked changes. So we'll make sure that it's on the agenda for January.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Carlos. Any questions around 000? Alright, moving on. Alright, we're on to the reports. Co-chair report, you guys get to listen to me for a bit. So there's a new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP that's going on, and they requested a liaisons from different groups.

Historically, we have stayed out of this because it's really not related to the root, with the exception of – we've stayed out of being in the policy development process with the exception of – this is where the root

scaling question continues to come up of how many TLDs can be added and how fast, such and such. So we've made comments on that.

With that said, talking to Fred, we kind of agreed to both be added as the liaison to the group, and I guess the understanding of the role of the liaison is that they are not actively engaged in the discussion, but they have somebody to call upon, should there be a question with something related to that group. So that's what is happening there. Any questions or comments around that before I move on to the next one? I see a hand. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just a quick question. Can you just spell out with a few words what gTLD subsequent procedures entails?

BRAD VERD: This is the group that is discussing the next round of TLDs to be released, and they're talking through the procedures and when and how and what the requirements are and so forth.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So it's subsequent to the previous rounds.

BRAD VERD: Correct.

MARIO ALEMAN: Sorry about the echo. Should be fixed no.

BRAD VERD: Does that answer your question, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It did. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Okay, great. Anybody else? Alright, next one, additional budget request process. So right now, we're in the budget process for ICANN, and they usually come around and ask if there's any additional moneys to be added for certain things. Right now, I've talked to Fred, we've talked through the admin committee, that we don't foresee any additional requests.

Just to give you guys an example, the workshops were an additional request that were added when we first started them, because they were not in budget. They are currently in budget, so they are no longer an additional request. But things like that are what they're looking for, things that are not in the current budget that we would foresee in the coming year. So this is really just kind of a notification, and an ask, is there anything that you guys see that we need to be spending money on that wouldn't currently be covered, knowing that stuff that is in budget is the normal travel support, and the workshops are in budget? So, is there anything that people can think of that we should be directing money at or should be asking money for? [inaudible]

DANIEL KARENBERG: This is Daniel.

BRAD VERD: Yeah?

DANIEL KARENBERG: So I don't know if it's in scope or not, but in Kobe, I think Wes is not coming, and usually, we have one more travel request. I'm just wondering if that could be [inaudible] request to increase the travel budget for an additional member.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, this is correct.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

BRAD VERD: Do you have something more, Daniel?

DANIEL KARENBERG: No. Well, it's [fine] for Kobe, but is that something we would like to be able to manage easily for the next ICANN meeting? [inaudible] it could be something we may request.

BRAD VERD: We can go back and look at the travel support and see if it is in line with everyone else, and if not, we can make a request. I don't believe we need to be asking for more, but I'm happy to go back and take a look. Do other people feel strongly about this? Alright, we'll look into that.

JEFF OSBORN: Brad, can you hear me?

BRAD VERD: Yeah.

JEFF OSBORN: I just like [inaudible] and it looks like they've more tried to find people to need it rather than having need without funding. So I will do. If you want to go look and see whether other people are funded to some higher level for similar functions, that makes sense, but I don't see we have room to complain.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I'm kind of with you, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay.

BRAD VERD: [inaudible] Kind of like what next steps are. So that was supposed to be today, it's been rescheduled for a couple weeks, so hopefully, the next meeting, I'll give you guys an update on that. Are there any questions or concerns around that? I don't see anything.

So last up, workshop planning. This is really just a notification. We are planning a spring workshop. We have not sat down and figured out what topics we're going to be working on. Some of that, and probably a majority of that, will come from the work items list that is being finalized, so it's on here to remind everybody that there is a workshop, you will be getting e-mails of it here shortly, and so let's just keep that on the counter. We don't know the exact date yet, but historically, we're usually in April, May timeframe.

Any questions [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have a question. Am I correct if I understood that there is also already a list of working items?

BRAD VERD: Yes there is a list of working items that went out. I don't remember when, but it went out in the past, and that list will be augmented with the list of documents that need to be updated.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So I'd like to have a look at this list. I will provide feedback very soon.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you. Alright, if there are no further questions around workshop planning, we'll move on. Kaveh, any update from the board?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello. Yes, so basically, yesterday we had a call from BTC, and then one of the items presented because OCTO was basically what they have been working on for basically moving forward with RSSAC 37 and 38. If you remember, in Barcelona, they made a commitment to deliver something to the board before end of December, and basically, that's on track. When it was – we didn't have time to go into details, so basically just the first page of the proposal, the feasibility study was presented. But I suggested that it maybe is good if RSSAC sees that.

This is between OCTO and board technical committee, so it's not a public report or anything like that at the moment, but I thought maybe just to make things more smooth and then maybe cut a few cycles back and forth between board and RSSAC later, ask for some time. So if you have any feedback we can provide.

I forwarded that document to the list yesterday, so if there is anything we think we can provide to smoothen the future interaction with the board, because this will go to BTC, I assume, BTC might come back to RSSAC, and later on, it will be formally presented to the board and then board will take action from that. But if you have something in-between which we think we can provide, I think that's a good opportunity. Because they want to stay on their own deadline to the board, they suggested if you have any feedback, you provide by 10th of December.

Obviously, if you really have serious feedback, they can change the deadline, but as I said, we are kind of inserting ourselves in the middle of that process, so my suggestion is we do not delay the process. But it's up to us depending on how much we want to influence or discuss this at this stage.

BRAD VERD: Any comments for Kaveh? I see Liman's hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. Kaveh, you mentioned that you had forwarded the e-mail to the list. Was that the RSSAC list? Because I don't see any mail from you on the RSSAC list for –

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, it was RSSAC list yesterday.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, so I'm just curious whether it's my mail system or – did anyone else see it?

KAVEH RANJBAR: And Fred's replied publicly, and I received one or two private replies. So I think it was sent to the list.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Then I need to check my e-mail settings, and I will pull out my fangs and get to [inaudible] subject of this year. Thank you so much.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Good luck, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'll need it.

BRAD VERD: Duane, your hand is up.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Can I ask a question about something in the e-mail that Kaveh forwarded? Is this an appropriate time to do that?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, sure.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So, Kaveh, in recommendation 1 of the document that you forwarded, it says here that ICANN Org recommends more than one solution be presented to the board for consideration. Do you know any more about that? Is that an ask of RSSAC to come up with more than one recommendation? Or who's going to come up with another recommendation, I guess?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I've just also read it like you, because as I said, in the BTC call there was not enough time to go through the detail, unfortunately. So that was postponed. But my understanding is OCTO will suggest to the board that we get more than one way of doing things for the question 1.

I really don't know how they expect – like do they expect OCTO to propose more options, or do they want to come back to RSSAC and ask? But yeah, so I saw that point. I also didn't get it first time. My reading back then was it is OCTO who is going to provide the different ways of doing things, but I'm not sure. I can ask for clarification.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, it seems a little troubling. Jeff, your hand is up.

JEFF OSBORN: Yes. Can you hear me?

BRAD VERD: Yes.

JEFF OSBORN: I read that as sort of encouraging, but it means it's a little more work, because you'll pardon me for being redundant, but they seem to be

putting half of their response on the issue of budgeting where we spent a really tiny proportion of time on dollars, and I'd argue that our request for funding was cursory at best. I don't even know if everybody on this call could recite what it is we asked for.

So I was kind of glad to see them offer us the chance to actually give it some thought this time. And I don't mean to step on the feet of anybody who feels like we did a good job of it, but I thought it was cursory at best.

BRAD VERD:

You're specifically referring to – Jeff, just so I can clarify, is how much the model would cost to you. That's the piece that you were saying that we did cursory at, correct?

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. We put together a document that asked for something like eight or ten full-time staff people at ICANN that came to millions of dollars, and everybody I talked to about it said, “Where the hell did that come from?”

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, but Jeff, sorry, if I remember correctly, we did not submit that. So basically, that was internal discussion. Finally, what we submit was that measure, and so we said this is the way to [inaudible] the model. But we didn't provide any estimates on number of staff or numbers or anything, that was just an internal discussion during the workshop.

Please correct me if someone else thinks we submitted anything further than our measures.

JEFF OSBORN: Oh, Kaveh, if I'm wrong, I really apologize then, because I read this, I went back to what I thought we had submitted, and it had that in it. If we had no detail at all in the funding request, then it's nice that they're coming back and saying they want additional things because we didn't provide it in the first place. Is that what you believe, Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think what you provide – yes, was only the BPG, and that was a costing model, so we didn't even say how much it would cost, we just provided a model to cost it.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. Well, then either we can write our fate or let other people write it, but it seems as if this would be a good opportunity if we don't want OCTO to simply write our budget for us to at least figure out a way to be involved.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. And then just to add to that, on recommendation 2, their comment basically was the cost estimates may occur sequentially. So basically, the project doesn't need to pass for the cost estimate. First of all, we can provide it sequentially, and it can also go in parallel with the rest of the process.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Okay, Kaveh, and I apologize if I'm kind of jumping in this late, and maybe there's something I'm not understanding correctly. But one of the things I think Jeff may be referring to is actually on RSSAC 037, page 29 of 50, [running cost of] the model where it actually states about the RSSAC request that the [SF] or [prior senior project manager, one] project manager, I think that's part of the numbers that Jeff is referring to. And if I'm wrong, just let me know.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. No, I'm also just trying to understand. And maybe I'm missing it now. But that was basically our request, our indication of how much work is required to basically sum it up and come up with the whole work. So that's the setup during the initiation process, basically. Correct? Sorry, I don't have the 37 open right now, but I will find it.

RYAN STEPHENSON: And Jeff, sorry if I have it way off point or what you were stating.

JEFF OSBORN: No, I don't think at all, Ryan. I should have [left that up.] Thanks for finding it.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. No, I think you're right on the spot, Ryan. That section on page 29 is where we call out fully loaded FTEs as [inaudible]

RYAN STEPHENSON: For implementation, correct? I'm just trying to figure it out.

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. The bottom of page 29 calls out a number of FTEs that –

RYAN STEPHENSON: Oh, yes.

JEFF OSBORN: – if you're familiar with math come up to many millions of dollars.

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, you're right. Jeff, you're right. This is what we discussed. I thought we took this out because we went through the [inaudible] of that. Yes,

you're right. I don't know why, because my understanding is we decided not to include this. But no, you're right. This is what we indicated.

JEFF OSBORN:

Yeah. Good catch, Ryan. This is us saying we need millions of dollars for a bunch of administrative people to do something, and the fact that we didn't even know it was there after it was put in, I would argue, augurs my case that we didn't pay a lot of attention putting it in.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yes, because idea was –

RYAN STEPHENSON:

I apologize, Kaveh, for over-speaking, but there was the one question that the board asked prior to release, prior to the spring workshop, and that was basically they were wanting to know what's the cost of running the model.

I remember the question was asked by the board and also the overall costs of – there were three particular questions the board did ask at the ICANN in Puerto Rico with the joint meeting, and one of them was the operating costs of the model. And originally, Tripti threw out some numbers, and then we kind of were like, “Well, how did you get this” and so forth at the workshop, and we went back to, “Hey, this is what the board asked, we should at least provide answers to the board.”

And then of course we then came up with the BPQ. Just to give some context to where a lot of this came in. But as far as the numbers and so

forth, that's where it's talking about where the decision was made about one or two. I think that's where I'm kind of a little fuzzy on. And I'm not sure if I'm driving your point, Jeff, or if I'm way off course now.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Okay. So I see your point, and Jeff, I also agree now that I see that, because I was really under the impression – sorry, my bad – that we didn't include this finally. Because that's what I recall, that we decided not to include this part. But it is part of the recommendation, you're right. The amount of time we spent on this part was basically – it was just a basic proposal, very short amount of discussion.

But I can make sure, I can communicate back, if you're interested to discuss this further, I can communicate back that we are going to have a session or workshop or whatever on this and maybe provide a more detailed or more exact or a more – I don't know, logically funded way of estimating this, if that's what RSSAC thinks we should do.

JEFF OSBORN:

Well, just to restate what, to me, is the obvious, I think half of their concern is financial, and some fraction of one percent of our concern was financial, and we can either fix that, or I would argue we sort of [bail on.]

FRED BAKER:

Well, so let me ask a question. Brad and I are starting to think about a workplan for the coming year, as I mentioned in e-mail, and part of that is, would it be useful to have a workshop? And if so, what would we like

to do at the workshop? Is this an appropriate topic that we should include in a workshop plan?

JEFF OSBORN:

I would strongly recommend we do that. I think we have been remiss by undervaluing it for the last several years. So I think it'd be overdue.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Okay. So my takeaway for now is at the moment, I don't see further discussion about other stuff in the feasibility study, so I expect that we might discuss this further on the list, but if there is nothing on the list by 10th, what I will communicate back is about we are planning to discuss the costing more, and I will refer to this section of the 37. And I will just inform them that this is something that we want to do next year, or we are actually planning to do next year, so they have that information.

But other than that, at the moment, I don't have any feedback. For now, we will stay loyal to the deadline of 10th, and if anyone wants any changes or any discussion, please discuss it on the list. Back to you, Brad.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, Kaveh. Ryan, your hand is still up. Do you have something more to add?

RYAN STEPHENSON:

No. I'm going to lower it. Thank you. Appreciate that, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. Naela, any update from IANA Functions Operator?

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah. Hi. A very small update. One thing we expect to release this week from the IANA is, I think I mentioned it before, we're going to start doing something called a post-interaction survey, so after the ending of each interaction that our customers have with the IANA function, we'll send a quick questionnaire of how did we do, good, bad, and then if you want to give us any comments.

So we're releasing this in a phased release, and the first group will be the domain name customers. We expect to have that released by the end of the week, and we'll send communication once that happens. And that's it from me.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Naela. Any questions for Naela? And lastly, we have RZM. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: No, nothing to report.

BRAD VERD: Right. Thank you, Duane. Any Other Business? There was nothing added at the beginning of the meeting. I see a hand up. Ryan.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yeah. So I apologize. And this was carried on from the last session at ICANN 63. After we met with the ICANN board, there was some discussion about where – and it seemed like the general consensus in the room was that the ICANN board was overstepping in regard to, hey, what if the root server system wen down and so forth?

I don't know if that's a discussion we want to – since we have a little bit of extra time, or maybe if you had something else already planned for the extra time, to discuss, because there was – again, that last session in ICANN 63 with the RSSAC session where we were discussing the board in the joint meeting with the board, it seems like there were a couple issues that were unresolved.

And I'd also felt like the ICANN board may have been overstepping its boundaries with the root server system in regards to RSOs and the way they operate or the way they manage their operations and so forth for preventing any type of attacks on the root server system. I don't know if we want to further carry on with that or if that's just something we'll discuss later or what.

BRAD VERD: Carlos, I saw your hand up, but now it's down. Anything to add?

CARLOS REYES: Not to Ryan. It's for later, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Okay, great. Anybody want to add anything to Ryan's comment? I think – Fred, go ahead.

FRED BAKER: Well, my perception of that kind of [reciprocation] with the board, the issue wasn't so much that the board asked OCTO a question. The issue was that the board didn't ask the committee that it had formed to advise it on such questions. Why did they not talk with us? For them to go to OCTO within ICANN, "Tell me about the L-root," that actually kind of made sense.

And I think the point that got made to the board, at least I walked away with the idea the point got made that we're here, you have questions like that, ask us. Thank you, Brad.

Yeah, so one of the new board members, I think she's in a liaison role, is Merike Kaeo, and I find myself at ICANN 63 sitting next to her and we talked about this briefly. Her comment was that there were several – including her – technical people that were now associated with the board, and she wouldn't let that kind of thing pass in the future. So I think we have some support in that regard on the board. And of course Kaveh.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Fred. Anything else?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Correct, and if I may add, I think [inaudible] and I think because the composition of the board has changed, this will be different probably with the new board, because we have Tripti now on the board, we have Merike, and of course, I'm also there. So I think it will be a different dynamic, but we definitely have to keep an eye on that. I agree with Ryan that that's an issue.

It's still an open issue because the message from the board has not changed. I mean there has been no interaction, so we don't know if it's changed or not, but I will keep a close eye on that, and if it continues, that's something that I would really like RSSAC's guidance on how to move forward with it.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Thank you all.

BRAD VERD: Paul, I see your hand up. Paul? If you're talking, Paul, we can't hear you. Paul?

PAUL VIXIE: Yes. Can you hear me now? [inaudible]. Sorry about that. So I just wanted to say, just as a point of order – can you hear me? Good. As a point of order, I worked with Merike Kaeo for several years at ISC and then several years at Farsight, and the R in her name is Estonian, which means you pronounce it the Russian way. If you're able to roll it, roll it. If you can't roll it, pronounce it as a D. Thank you.

TOM MIGLIN: [inaudible] today's meeting, and we'll be talking. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thanks, Tom. Alright, I still see Paul and Tom's hands up, but I think they've covered what they want to. Anything else? Alright, hearing nothing else, we will adjourn this meeting. Thank you all. We will talk to you in January.

CARLOS REYES: [Excuse me,] Brad.

BRAD VERD: Carlos. Yeah, hold on. Carlos, you had your hand up.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks. So I actually wanted to talk about the call next week. Sorry, next month. I keep saying next week. Next month, the call would be on January 2nd. That's the first Tuesday. We happen to be back at ICANN, but I'm just wondering if that makes sense for everyone or if we should run a Doodle poll.

BRAD VERD: Liman, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: From my personal view, please run a Doodle poll, because in my part of the world, Christmas runs all the way until – but it's called [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Alright. We'll run a Doodle poll. If there's any issues, we'll move it a week and we'll go from there. So that'll be coming out shortly.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If I'm the only outlier, I'll make it, but I would personally prefer to have it pushed a week. But please do a Doodle poll. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Will do. Alright, sorry, Carlos, anything else?

CARLOS REYES: And I guess as part of that Doodle poll, Brad, do we want to revisit the time zone issue we discussed last week with the admin?

BRAD VERD: Yes. Let's bring that up. Just for everybody [inaudible] the meetings are scheduled at UTC so that when the time shifts here in the States, the meeting time shifts, which can be confusing for us all. So we'll try to address that.

Alright. Anything else? I see Suzanne's typing. I don't have anything else, I don't see anything else. Okay, with that, we will adjourn, and be

looking in your e-mail for the Doodle poll on the meeting in January.
Everybody have a wonderful holiday. Thank you all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Happy holidays.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Happy holidays.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]