
ABU DHABI – RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus Work Session
Saturday, October 28, 2017 – 17:00 to 18:30 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good afternoon. October 27, RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus Work Session.

BRAD VERD: Welcome, everybody. I'm Brad Verd, I'm co-Chair of RSSAC. I'm going to be kicking this off. We've got a couple of topics to cover during this open session here. We're going to get an update from the Reviews Team, followed by we'll be meeting with the SSR2 Team, and then internally, we will be sharing overview work that we have done on our Procedures document, RSSAC000. Then we'll be closing the meeting, talking through the evolution work that RSSAC has been spending a lot of time on. So without further ado, I'm going to turn this over to Lars and his team to talk about the reviews.

LARISA GURNICK: Hello, everybody. My name is Larisa Gurnick, I am part of the ICANN organization, the MSSI team, or the Reviews Team. We seem to specialize in reviews, and we have a lot of them, so we really appreciate you making the time for us to give you update

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.

on what's happening in the land of reviews. I have my colleagues with me here today, Negar Farzinnia will talk to you about what's happening with the CCT review and the RDS review, and Lars Hoffmann will talk about what's happening with the organizational reviews, of which the review of the RSSAC is one as well as operating standards. And our lovely Jennifer will help us with the slides. Thank you very much.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Hello, everyone. I wanted to provide a brief overview of where the specific reviews are at today. We have CCT review ongoing currently. The Review Team is currently working on publishing the second draft of their report for public comment. We are expecting that the public comment will begin after ICANN60 in November, and the Review Team is working towards finalizing the report so that they can submit that to the Board officially towards the end of this year, or early next year, depending on how the work progresses.

As far as the RDS review is concerned, we have the review currently working on the work plan and terms of reference document. They are at this point nearing the completion of these documents, and targeting end of November to submit the documents to the Board for their review, reference and purview of the work plan, terms of reference and scope of work. Review

team has made really good progress, but it has just been formed in the recent past, and they are making progress towards starting their official review after the documentation is completed. Next slide please.

The SSR2 Review Team will be meeting with you after this meeting, so we will not be covering those slides as they're going to be presenting to you, and with that, regarding ATRT3, Lars, let me turn that over to you so you can provide an update to the team, please.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Yes, can you hear me? Yeah, I'm going to stand up, I've been sitting all day.

On the ATRT3, we have the two ticks here. The [inaudible] closed, extended and then finally closed in June, and currently, the selection or the nomination by the SO/ACs is in progress. I believe the RSSAC made their nomination. The GNSO did as well, but the remaining five SO/ACs are still doing their internal processes to nominate their candidates. And what follows then will be the SO/AC Chairs will come together to select the final team, and so we expect that to happen hopefully later, toward the end of this year, and then the Review Team either starts in December or early January. But as I said, it'll depend on the

timing of the other SO and ACs when they nominate, and then when the Chairs get together. Thanks.

I'm still on the slides [about the organizational] reviews. You can go to the next slide. No, actually, one back. I thought it was the overview slide.

So just a very quick brief of the organization reviews, which are basically what's happening on the RSSAC at the moment. As you know, undergoing, starting the review for the RSSAC. These are reviews that happen every five years for the different SO/ACs apart from the GAC. If you look at the Bylaws, they have a special rule and the ASO is conducting their own review also separately. If you can go to the next slide.

The At-Large review has just finished in terms of the independent examiner presented their report in May, and we have the At-Large doing the feasibility assessment, which is something the RSSAC will be doing eventually as kind a response to the final report, and then be considered by the Board. The timeline here indicates it towards end of this year, early next year.

All these dates in the upcoming slides have a little star attached to it, which basically means that they're estimates. All these reviews depend a little bit on the peace of the community and the review, and external factors. If the Board is involved,

sometimes it takes a month or two because the Board is not meeting, etc. But these are the rough timelines for them. If you can move on, next one.

So this is the NomCom review that's in process at the moment as well. I always say that everybody in the ICANN community has a secret plan on how to get on to the Board. If that applies to you as well, you really should make sure to fill in the NomCom survey that's still open. That'll be really helpful.

So the review, we expect the final report to come out in May 2018, and then again, the response by the NomCom will be the feasibility assessment, where the question here – It's the NomCom Review Working Party who does that, and that's composed of people who used to be on the NomCom. Some of them are on the current NomCom, but they're not the NomCom – because obviously the NomCom's makeup changes every year, so it's a mix of community members from different SO/ACs who are on the Review Working Party there. [Two forward the slide].

The RSSAC review, I don't have to tell you too much about it, I hope. It just started off, the selection of independent examiner has occurred last month. The Review Team is here in Abu Dhabi in the [inaudible] interviews. If you can go to the next slide, Jennifer? One more.

I wanted to remind everybody because it's most [personal] on the scope of the review, all of these are kind of organizational derived from the Bylaws section 4.4. I'm not going to read through all of that. You can look that up if you want. If you can go to the next slide? Thank you.

And so this is the scope for the RSSAC. You may recall, for those of you who were involved, this has been developed together with the RSSAC. I think we shared an initial scope with you during the Copenhagen meeting, and this is essentially what the independent examiners will be looking into. Assessment of the previous RSSAC review and implementation status, the question of whether the RSSAC has a [continuing] purpose within ICANN, and then assessment of how effectively the RSSAC fulfills its role. So it's not making a normative judgment on the work output of the RSSAC, it's looking at the procedures and the functions that the RSSAC has within ICANN, and how they may be improved through this review.

The GNSO review has been completed. The implementation is currently in place, so that's being done by the GNSO. There's a report coming out in fact towards the end of this year to kind of progress the implementation of the various recommendations that came out of that. And so then if you look, it started in May 2011 with the planning. Probably in two years' time, the GNSO will kick off the circle again there. Do we have more [in that]?

ccNSO, there was a Board deferment. I don't know if you're aware of that. So they were due to start this year, but due to a workload for the ccNSO, they requested for a deferment, and the Board granted that based on the language of the Bylaws. That is a possibility the Board has, and so this will now be slightly delayed until next year. And I think this should be the end of the organizational reviews. The SSAC review, I'm sorry. It's job security really is what it is for me, quite frankly. We're in the process of selecting the independent examiner, so we hopefully will be able to kick off that later this year.

And then the operating standards. The review of operating standards is something that came out of Work Stream 1 of the Accountability. It's basically going to be a document that does three things. It kind of brings together best practices of the specific reviews. Negar just talked about CCT and SSR, as well as the RDS review, the WHOIS review, and obviously the ATRT review. It's going to be a document that is prescribed by the Bylaws as something that we have to develop with community input. I don't want to bore you too much with what happened in the past. What's happening right now is that the document is out for public comment, it's been published a couple of weeks ago now. It's an ICANN meeting, so who knows how long ago. On the 17th of October, and it'll stay open for 90 days, so it'll be open

until mid-January next year. If you can go to the next slide?
Another slide. That's the last one.

And on Monday – with that, I'm going to finish – there's a cross-community session on the operating standards that are guiding the specific reviews at 3:45 on Monday, and it would be great if you could be there. It's really an important document that will kind of govern or at least establish the rules, how the specific rules are done, and so having the input from the community is certainly welcome. And I can only encourage you to also submit a public comment on that text to see if you have any improvements or if you think that it hits the mark, that'd also be good to hear. That's all from me. Thank you very much.

LARISA GURNICK:

So obviously there's a lot of work going on and opportunities to participate to those of you that would like to get involved in reviews in different ways, so we'll leave you with some information about participation in reviews all the way from observing what's going on for all the specific reviews which are previously the Affirmation of Commitments reviews, that's the term that we use, specific reviews.

Everybody has an opportunity to observe what's happening with those reviews. Also through the public comment process, people have the opportunity to provide input to the Review Teams, and

that of course goes for specific reviews and organizational reviews. And of course, with the upcoming accountability and transparency review, some of you will have the opportunity hopefully to participate in that review. So the level of participation and commitment certainly reflects your interest and the amount of time that you have to contribute to this important process. Next slide please.

We will leave you with some information about the different sessions that are happening at ICANN60, review-related sessions so that if you have an interest to pop in and see what the work is that's going on, of course.

And then finally what we wanted to highlight for you was so much activity happening on reviews. My team is really putting in an effort to make the information about reviews a bit more accessible and a hopefully a bit more useful to people who are interested to know more. So while we have the standard information on the ICANN.org pages on reviews, every review has a home and it contains information, high level historical information and key information about the purpose of the review and sort of the general review process, but when the actual review kicks off, the working space of the Review Team is contained on the wiki.

That's what you see here, is a quick snapshot of the wiki pages. Each review has its own wiki space, and it includes an enormous amount of information. We've been working diligently to standardize the information, bring some consistency to all the different review wiki spaces to make it easier to find information. And this being ICANN, everything is pretty transparent. We certainly do our best to overwhelm with information, but hopefully it's organized and presented in a way that you can find what you are looking for, and there is really a lot of useful information.

And of course, our team is always available, happy to answer any questions on the process, why we do things, where you can find information, and anything of that sort. So with that, I will turn it back to you for questions. Happy to take questions.

BRAD VERD:

Are there any questions? I'm happy to carry the mic to somebody if there is one. None? Okay. Well, thank you so much. Appreciate it.

So moving on, we are supposed to hear from the SSR2 Review Team, but I don't think they're here in the room, so we're going to jump ahead to our Procedures document and updates that we've made to it, of RSSAC000. Carlos from ICANN staff is going to brief us on that.

CARLOS REYES:

Hi, everyone. My name is Carlos and I work with the RSSAC and the caucus. A quick update today on the changes that the RSSAC approved recently to RSSAC000 which is the Operational Procedures for the RSSAC. And the reason we're providing this information now for the purposes of the caucus and how the caucus conducts its work, the caucus adopts the operational procedures of the RSSAC. So I'm going to quickly go over the changes and the updates that are in the latest version.

First, some organizational changes that came into effect after the IANA stewardship transition, so let's move over to those pages. As you know, the RSSAC has outgoing liaisons. The existing liaisons are the NomCom and the Board of Directors. These are liaisons that the RSSAC sends to other groups. After the IANA stewardship transition, there were other bodies that were created within ICANN. First, the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee and the Customer Standing Committee. The RSSAC was invited to appoint liaisons to those groups, and subsequently we have updated the Operational Procedures document to capture those liaison relationships.

In the document, Kevin Jones who is the representative for E-root, NASA, Kevin Jones led the work on some of these updates, and in the document we capture the terms and the

qualifications that are necessary for those two appointments. Some of them we received guidance from the RZERC or the Customer Standing Committee, but those updates are fairly noncontroversial in that sense. And then the outgoing election procedure remains. This is something that the RSSAC has adopted for how it selects its liaisons. So this process applies for both of those new liaisons.

The only other change related to liaisons actually involves the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee. You are all familiar with the Membership Committee, because that's the group that reviews the Statements of Interest for caucus applicants. And in the revisions to RSSAC000, the Membership Committee's scope of work expands just slightly to recommend appointments to the RSSAC for any new liaison roles that may be created by ICANN before the operational procedures are updated. This gives the RSSAC a mechanism to follow and a process to follow in case liaison relationships are established before the operational procedures can be updated. That's built into this new version of 000 as well.

I'll pause here, because the rest of the changes have to do with the publication process between the caucus and the RSSAC, so I'll pause here to see if there are any questions about these changes.

Okay, I'll move on to the Section 2.5. When Kevin Jones and the RSSAC started looking at this document, there were a lot of gray areas between how the RSSAC and the caucus interact as work products move through the caucus. This document tries to address some of that, bringing some clarity to that process.

The first update is in Section 2.5 about how a work item is proposed. This new section essentially clarifies who can propose a work item and how that process is tracked. I think that's something that from a staff perspective we've often tried to manage that, but this brings some more clarity so that everyone is on the same page both on the RSSAC and as caucus members.

The more substantive changes come in later in the document. We also defined the work party shepherd role. This has been something that the RSSAC adopted fairly informally when it started its work and when the caucus started as well. So this document tried to outline what the shepherd role does, and how that shepherd functions between the caucus and the RSSAC. So that's in 2.62.

And then finally, the Publication Procedures. This is what I was mentioning just a few minutes ago about the gray areas in terms of how a work product goes between the two groups. The first step in these revisions was just defining the types of work products. There are three types of work products: there are

RSSAC work products, RSSAC caucus work products, and then RSSAC work products with caucus input. So this document then goes in and spells out step by step how a document goes from a live version – meaning either the RSSAC or the caucus work party is currently working on it – to approval.

For RSSAC work products, that stays within the RSSAC, and then for caucus work products, that stays within the work party, and then ultimately, it goes to the caucus for review and then it goes to the RSSAC for consideration as well. For work products that the RSSAC initiates but have input from the caucus, it's a similar process in that the RSSAC does its work, but then it is also shared with the caucus for input and feedback before it goes back to the RSSAC for approval.

We're working on infographics for this flow, because it is very complicated. It's actually simple when you look at it, but reading through it and listening to it is probably difficult to absorb. So we'll be working on that and trying to distribute that information just to make it more clear for everyone involved about how these two groups interact and how the work moves forward. I think a lot of caucus members have approached RSSAC members about some of these concerns, and hopefully this starts to rectify some of that confusion. But those are the main changes in 000. As I mentioned, largely procedural in the second half, and the first half are just administrative matters as

a result of the IANA stewardship transition. Any questions? If you'd like to take a read of this document, it's on the publications page. I think Kevin and the RSSAC tried to make it as lively as possible, but there's only so much you can do with operational procedures. And that's it from me.

BRAD VERD: No questions? Alright, great. Moving on. We're going to keep going with the schedule, and we're going to give an overview of the evolution work.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: They're not here. So Tripti is going to come up and talk through that. We're going to project some –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The report.

BRAD VERD: The report.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Good afternoon. I'm Tripti Sinha, co-Chair of RSSAC. I'll give you a quick update on our evolution work. For those of you who have not been following our work, you're probably wondering what evolution work are we doing, what are we evolving?

What we're evolving is the DNS root service model. As hopefully most of you know, what the RSSAC does is advise on matters pertaining to the DNS root service, and we are composed of all the operators who operate the service as well as several other entities who [touch] the root zone.

This model has been in place for over three decades now, and it's about time to look at how different things are today. Let me take you back in time. In 2014 when the big IANA transition was announced, there was global engagement from the ICANN community, and we talked about a multi-stakeholder model approach to governance and so forth.

In 2015, RSSAC recognized that it was time for us to look at our old model and evolve it to bring it into the future. There were questions that we were asking ourselves and people were asking regarding accountability. Who's holding us accountable, and holding us accountable to what? What are our plans for continuity? And so forth. So we came to the realization that it's really time for us to put some energy into this work and begin what we call our evolutionary work.

So we started our work in 2015, September, and we have published five reports. We just published our fifth report. So I would encourage all of you to go to our website and read our previous work, but what I'm going to do today is walk you through what happened in October. We typically meet twice a year and we call them RSSAC workshops. The inception of our work goes back to 2015 September, and we meet in the Washington Metro area. We meet at the University of Maryland once, and the new alternate between Verisign, which is also very close in the metro area. So we go between the two, and this is an update on our most recent workshop.

It's been an iterative process, and we have continued to build upon the work that we started to develop in September of 2015. And in the most recent workshop, we took a hard look at what we called the stakeholders of the DNS root service. We've been very good stewards of the service, been doing this for the global community, but who are the actual stakeholders? And we're attempting to address that question. The multiple ways you can look at this problem are, what do we mean by stakeholders? Who are they? Are they informing us, telling us how to do our jobs and so forth?

So we've taken that approach, and some of the questions that we've attempted to answer are: who are the stakeholders, why do we the RSSAC believe they are stakeholders, what role do

they play or should they play, and what does accountability mean to these stakeholders? We spent a fair amount of time answering those questions, and we are slowly narrowing in the problem space and coming to an answer what we believe the stakeholder community is or a stakeholder entity is.

Then we spent some time on root server operations, and this is an activity that currently occurs. We gave it some more time and looked at what are these different activities, how do we meet, what are the mechanics, form and function of this group? And added more definition to it. Once again, I urge you to read that report and take a look at that.

And then we spent some time discussing the root server association, and that is coming together in some kind of entity, a secretariat function that would hold assets of the root server operators, and also assist us in organizing meetings and so forth. That's another concept that's evolving and getting better and better definition.

And we realize in the future, looking at the future, you need a group that is always strategizing, looking 5, 10, 20 years into the future. There are clearly architectural elements that play into it, and many policy events, so we call it the SAP function (the Strategic, Architectural and Policy function). We've done some good work on that, defining that this is a group that's very much

strategic in nature, looks at this cloud service, looks at the technical elements of what a good service would be, and defines that for us, and of course attaches policies where there need to be policies.

And then there's the question of designation removal function. Today, there are 12 operators. We've been in business since the very beginning of the Internet, and as time continues to move on and Internet evolves, there will likely be a change in this landscape. How do we handle that change? We don't really have any processes in place. We've been spending quite a bit of time looking at this, at how we designate and how we reduce or increase, and so forth.

And the last thing was performance monitoring and accountability function. Actually, that's not the last thing, there's one more, but the last one item here is performance monitoring and accountability. We all do a very good job of monitoring our own services and so forth, but what is a good model going forward? Once we've defined our stakeholders and we have accountability measures in place, how do we report back to these entities, and what do are measured against?

There's clearly a set of requirements that we're going to be held accountable to, and monitoring comes in two flavors. One is your daily monitoring to ensure that everything is up and

running, and then there's an audit, if you will, where you come in every two, three years and you bring an independent body, just like we got an update from the review committee just now – sorry, did you lose that? – on a set of requirements. We get audited, and then you get to come up with an outcome, a result. So as we build that framework, we would need to put those checks and balances in place.

And the last item we discussed was financial function. Thus far, the operators, we are all self-funded. We finance the functions ourselves, the operations ourselves, but really and truly, that is not a sustainable model going into the future, so we're looking at what is the right model. The Internet is a different beast today from what it was when we were all first conceived. Here it is a global platform running trillion-dollar economies, and attack vectors are getting more creative.

So we have to look at funding this appropriately. We're looking at that very deeply and we've come together. If you read our previous reports, we refer to a mind map. We're also putting it all together into a loosely coupled diagram, and when we release our future reports and advice, you will see that in time as well. So it's fairly good work that's been done thus far. It's on our website, I urge all of you to please read the report. And that actually brings me to the end of my update.

Are there any questions? Really, nothing? Okay, I guess I'm done.
Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Alright. Thank you, Tripti. We're working through some challenges with our Adobe Connect, but then as that's being worked, the SSR2 Review Team has arrived, and they're going to come up front and give us a readout of activities.

GEOFF HUSTON: Good afternoon, all. My name is Geoff Huston, I am a member of the second Security, Stability and Resiliency Review Team. To my right here is Eric, he's one of the co-Chairs, and Denise in the front of the room is the other co-Chair. We're kind of rotating some of these duties and talking, so it's my turn. We've got half an hour. I'm certainly not going to take half an hour. I'm going to take a lot less than half an hour, because we certainly want to hear from you. So if someone is driving the slides, I want the slide driven to the next page. I really do, because otherwise...
Okay, good.

I think saying this to you folk is almost redundant, because as you're well aware, these days, security, stability and resiliency is at the heart of almost everything ICANN does. It just is everywhere. You have to take it into consideration. So when you

talk about what ICANN does, whatever it does – I need to see those slides, thank you – stability and security is right at the core of what it is. So how are we doing with this? Because it's a really important issue.

Every five years, by the Bylaws of ICANN, a community-based SSR Review Team is formed from the SOs and ACs and their job, their task is to examine ICANN's activities, and the particular focus is to look at their effectiveness in addressing our concerns over security and stability. It's kind of a very broad-based review with a particular focus on one aspect, security, stability, and resiliency. This is one of four community reviews mandated by the ICANN Bylaws, so we're part of a broader process, but that is our focus. Next slide. Great.

Look, you can read. You can. It's on the slide. I don't really feel like I should recite this out, but that's our mandate. It's a rephrasing of what's in the Bylaw, so it's not invented piece of information. So we are assessing the extent to which it's implemented these efforts, the effectiveness and so on.

I'll give you a pause to reflect on this. I don't want to recite slides, because when people recite slides at me, I just go to sleep. So the exercise is to read and read quickly, or look at your screens and go and read it there.

Last and not least, by the way, I should draw out the extent to which the SSR recommendations have been implemented. Interesting question. Next slide.

This is a lot of work, because if you think about trying to look at the stability, security, and resiliency of almost everything ICANN does, then that's a massive amount of work. We are volunteers. We're not full time at this. And this is a large set of material in which to sort of get ourselves up to speed and get the current context. And literally, the very diverse skills and backgrounds in the Review Team have been helpful in trying to address all of this. It does require a very broad range of skills that none of us individually have, and so we all try and bring some little bit into this piece to make sure that we're trying to address it.

Why? This is not a form filling exercise for the Bylaws. It's not a tick box. We are doing this because we care. And because we care, we want to be thorough. We want to be thoughtful, we want to do the right thing, and we want the report to be helpful. This is not just a self-exercise, it's an all of us exercise. So necessarily, this is not quick. It is not a pro forma exercise, it is intended to be substantive, thorough and thoughtful, and that is a massive burden to take on, as I'm sure you'd appreciate, particularly for voluntary effort. So yes, we are hurling ourselves at the wheel, damn it. Next slide. I didn't realize this when I signed up for it. I wish I did.

Some of the Review Team members are here today, and I will ask them to stand up, because most of them are at the back. So Alain and Noorul are not with us, Kerry-Ann is not with us. Oh, Noorul, sorry. My apologies. Noorul from Katmandu. Ram is at the back there, Zarko, Boban, Denise at the front, Eric. Kaveh is at the Board stuff, isn't he? He's boarding. And Norm Ritchie has recently joined. Two folk have had to drop out for various reasons, Emily Taylor from the GNSO and Cathy Handley, who was actually nominated from this group, from RSSAC. Next page.

So we've kind of blocked the work into five sort of key areas. The first – and this is also part of our mandate – is to try and work through the quality of the implementation of the 28 SSR1 recommendations from way back in 2012. If you've ever read that report, you realize that is a challenge. Some of these recommendations were specific, some of them seemed like [clean air is a good thing] which makes it difficult to implement.

The second part is ICANN's key security, stability, and resiliency activities as ICANN. But the third one actually takes the domain name system and isolates and looks at that in particular, so activities that impact the security, stability, and resiliency of the domain name system within the specific purview of ICANN and where ICANN contributes to or facilitates. Necessarily, that focuses strongly on ICANN's administration of the root zone of the DNS.

Challenges to secure and resilient operation of the unique identifier system. That broadens it out into the broad ICANN mandate of unique identifiers in the Internet, and having a look at the broader challenge environment in terms of security and stability.

And last but not least, because of the major event that happened in the last five years, that's of course this transition from a relationship with the U.S. government to not a relationship of that form with the U.S. government, the impact of IANA stewardship in that transition. Those are the five key areas. Next slide.

We're kind of halfway – maybe a third of the way – through. It is a long exercise. So we've done terms of reference, we're collecting and analyzing data, we'd be embarking on formulating findings and recommendations, but certainly, this week is an interesting week in terms of the relationship of this review with the broader community and will be reformulating I think the work going forward in consultation with the broader community. But this was our intent at the start of the week when we drafted these slides. Next slide.

We're doing work, and this is work. It's full of text. If we weren't doing any work, it would be blank. If you want to look at what

work, go read the slides. I'm not going to recite that. There are too many words. Next.

This week is actually a week about communication, and it's actually time to really sort of work through with the community about understanding what's needed and what is on other people's minds. We're going to spend the week talking, like we are here, and as you're heading home, we'll still be here, sweeping the floors, cleaning up the mess you leave, and also digesting what you tell us. So next Friday, we'll still be here and we'll spend the day actually looking through what we've heard, and trying to understand that.

We are keen to continue this conversation and modulo whatever instructions we get through the week from the community. Exactly how we do that is not sure, but certainly from the point of view of the individual team members, I think we took on this job in good faith, and our good faith is to continue to carry on this conversation as might be possible. Next slide.

I've taken enough time. I think I've taken 14 minutes, so the next 16 is yours. We've told you what we're doing, but we need your help. We need what's on your mind, and the kind of question I'd like to throw at this room and this group is just one thing that is burning about what you do – and you are in the thick of it as the root servers – if there's one thing that you think we should be

looking at, we're here, we've got our keyboards out, or I will in a second. We want to hear, because it's what you think is important that helps us.

So over to the room, please. Questions, comments, whatever, but if you bear in mind that if you can give us some helpful suggestions as to where we might choose to look and help our work and your work, we'd all be grateful. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA: Geoff, thank you for that. The slides went by quickly, and I'm not a speed reader, so could you scope the review for us, please? So when you say it's security, stability, and resiliency –

GEOFF HUSTON: [inaudible] Sorry. I'm trying to find the right slide, and we'll leave these slides with you. Which slide do I want?

JENNIFER BRYCE: This one?

GEOFF HUSTON:

That one. That was our mandate. Our mandate is to examine the extent to which they've implemented the security and stability efforts in relation to how it manages the unique identifier system. That's an awfully broad mandate, because it actually encompasses names and addresses, if you think about it. And we're trying to sort of assess ICANN's efforts against ICANN's objectives. And in some ways, this becomes a more specific thing when we talk about our effectiveness. Are the people engaged in this work appropriately resourced? Are they appropriately skilled? Do they understand the objectives of what they're doing? Do they feel that they have the necessary resources available to them to do their job? Are we impairing those folk in any way? What are the blocks in terms of doing this job to the best of our ability? That is encompassed in that first and indeed the second bullets. Do we understand the job, and are we resourced and capable of doing it?

The third one is really hairy. When we try and look at the extent to which these things are fit to meet future challenges, that's a big leap into the unknown. And I think the best that any of us can do is to try and understand the extent to which not only do we react against what we know about, perfecting yesterday, but trying to understand how today changes to tomorrow, trying to understand the current and emerging threat environment, and make sure that the staff and indeed the community are

informed, capable and able, and appropriately resourced to be able to adapt and meet those challenges, without actually knowing what they might be. So again, that's part of the understanding here what we're trying to do.

And last and not least, go through those 28 recommendations from SSR1 and assess to what extent they have been implemented. Hopefully that answers your question. Thank you.

ROBERT MARTIN-LEGENE: Hi. I have a question as to the timeline of all of this. I think we were presented that with the first presentation. Oh, you have that there. Okay. Thank you.

GEOFF HUSTON: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Go ahead.

GEOFF HUSTON: We are in receipt of a letter from the Board, which at this particular point is saying, "Do what you need to do this week, but we are reevaluating the progress and efforts of the Review Team." So at this point, we're kind of nearing the end of collecting and analyzing data, but the further work is more of a

conversation between the Board, the SO and AC Chairs, and that community as to where they want this to go and why. So while these were our expectations as of yesterday, that's not necessarily what is going to happen. We're not sure.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So that's the ICANN Board?

GEOFF HUSTON: Yes, that is the ICANN Board, and the SO and AC Chairs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So how independent are you from influence of the ICANN Board?

GEOFF HUSTON: Maybe Denise might want to answer that. We have not discussed this as a Review Team, and we all have opinions on this. And I think it is appropriate that Denise shares her opinion, because she holds a very strong opinion about this. But please.

DENISE MICHEL: The Review Team just an hour ago or so received a letter from the Board telling the Review Team that they were suspending our activities. This was a follow-on to a letter from SSAC to the Board – and this is on the correspondence page – where they

express concerns about the scope and membership of the Review Team. The Review Team has not spoken with either SSAC or the Board, so we really don't have a lot of details as to what their concerns are. We're hoping that we will find out this weekend.

Speaking in a personal capacity, and to answer your questions, yes, this calls into question how independent an independent community review team is if the Board – if SSAC unilaterally decides that –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Like Catalonia.

DENISE MICHEL: Yes, like Catalonia. I don't know. So I think there are questions certainly that this raises about independent community reviews which were intended to be a lynchpin in the accountability and transparency commitments that the community called for in conjunction with the IANA transition. This is the first community review that has been launched post-IANA transition, so I think it's ultimately up to the community to decide how it wants these reviews to go forward and what the role of the Review Team, the community and the Board is. And again, I'm speaking

personally, because we just received this letter and have not had a chance to discuss it as a team. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: I'll ask a question. You mentioned a lot of work, a lot of resources, a lot of skillsets, and I guess my question given what's happened recently and whatnot is, do you have the resources? Do you have the skillsets? Do you have what you need?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: I think we as a team feel that we've actually made a lot of good progress in a lot of ways, and so I think we've been very happy with our ability to execute. That being said, we do have room on the team for more members, and I think we'd always welcome more help. Certainly, we've been putting in a lot of hours to sort of go through briefings, sort of digest the briefings and come up with documentation like terms of reference and stuff. So we're certainly not adverse to more help.

BRAD VERD: Thanks. Any other questions? No questions?

GEOFF HUSTON: I am just slightly surprised. I would have thought that this is a foremost topic in general for the activities of the root servers.

You hold a very privileged position in the DNS, and necessarily it's one of extreme responsibility and care. I was certainly expecting some slight pointers here, but that's okay. If you feel everything is fine – and I don't think that's the case – then I can certainly take that impression. But if there are things that you think deserve and merit some attention outside of the RSSAC review itself, the more generic review, this is why we're here and this is why we're trying to gather input.

So thank you. If you do have anything, the contact points are at the end of the slide pack. If you feel the urgent need to get in touch with us at some point, please say so. Now would be a good time, but if you want to cogitate further, feel free. Thank you.

ERIC OSTERWEIL:

Just to pile on to that, just back to the question on the deck, if there was one thing that you guys thought that as a Review Team, it'd be beneficial for us to spend our time looking into, one thing that you would sort of pile on to whatever else we may be focused on that you think from your perspective is important, modulo, whatever happens with intricacies of that letter, I think now is a great time for us to hear it, because we have a lot of momentum, but that doesn't mean we've come to closure on anything. So this is a great opportunity for us to ingest from you

all the perspective that you hold and try and effectuate it through the process that we're in.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you. As Chairs, we'll take that back. I'm sorry, is there a question?

ELISE GERICH: Hi. One of the items on the scope is a gap analysis it looks like from the previous – was it 2012 – review. I don't know if you've gotten to that part of your activities yet, but it seems to me since these reviews take almost two years it looks like from the timeline that you have, and the other one was in [2002], when you look at whether the recommendations are implemented or not from 2012, and whether they should have been, do you ever look at whether they're obsolete because it's so long ago that maybe they shouldn't be implemented anymore? Or do you just look at whether it's a checkbox, "Yes, it should be done because we said so in 2012?"

DENISE MICHEL: I think that's one of the things – there are some recommendations from 2012 – keeping in mind that in 2012 of course, the new gTLD round hadn't been launched yet, a number of events have overtaken the 28 recommendations that

the first security Review Team issued. So absolutely, the context is important, and we have found that events have surpassed some of the recommendations. So we're certainly mindful of that and keeping that in context as we continue to assess the recommendations, and the gap analysis consultant perspective will be another point of information that comes into the Review Team, if we get unsuspended, I guess. Thanks.

BRAD VERD:

Any further questions? Alright. We will take your comments, the Chairs will work with the RSSAC and the caucus. If we come up with the answer to your one point, we'll bring it to you. Alright? Thank you.

GEOFF HUSTON:

Thank you very much.

BRAD VERD:

Alright. That covers the content of this meeting. I do want to point out a couple of opportunities coming up in the coming days, some meetings that we're having that you are welcome to attend, and I encourage to attend. Sorry, I'm going to wait for them to leave the room so we can have it... Great.

Okay, so tomorrow, 9:00 a.m. is an RSSAC review session where the independent examiner will be going through the review of RSSAC. So if you're interested in that, that is tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. in Capital Suite 6.

Tuesday we have two meetings. We have the RSSAC caucus information session where we will go through all the work that's been going on within RSSAC, give you updates on it, and cover that. And then following that meeting is the official RSSAC caucus meeting. Both of those will take place right here in Capital Suite 5.

And then lastly, on Wednesday the 1st at 3:15, we will have our official monthly RSSAC meeting, and it will be open for observation. If you want to come and watch that, that will be in Capital Suite 6.

That is all we have to share right now. Are there any questions before we close? No? Alright, well, thank you so much. Have a wonderful day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]