
BARCELONA – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and RSSAC
Tuesday, October 23, 2018 – 18:00 to 19:00 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

KAVEH RANJBAR: Hello, everyone. In two minutes, we're going to start the RSSAC and board meeting. So please take your seats. ICANN board members and RSSAC members, please come to the table. Should I name you now? Merike, you're welcome here. Fred, Liman, Wes. I am calling them. Duane, Suzanne. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, let's start the meeting. My name is Kaveh, he's Liman, but he has my tag. So, let's start this meeting. Welcome. This is the meeting of the ICANN board and RSSAC. Thank you, sir. And, I don't think we need to go through a roll call. But just so you know, we have most of RSSAC here present, and we have members of the board --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If you could do roll call for the scribes, they would appreciate it.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay, so then let's go through the roll call. Sir?

GORAN MARBY: Goran Marby, ICANN org.

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.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy, SSAC liaison to RSSAC.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Suzanne Woolf. USC-ISI RSSAC.

LITO IBARRA: Lito Ibarra, ICANN board.

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker. USC-ISI and RSSAC.

JEFF OSBORN: Jeff Osborn. ISC and RSSAC.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson, Department of Defense. RSSAC.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Akinori Maemura, ICANN board member.

BRAD VERD: Brad Verd, co-chair, RSSAC.

TRIPTI SINHA: Tripti Sinha. University of Maryland, RSSAC co-chair.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar. RSSAC liaison to the board.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby. ICANN board.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Chris Disspain. ICANN board.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Lars-Johan Liman. Netnod and RSSAC.

DUANE WESSELS: Duana Wessels. Root zone maintainer liaison to RSSAC.

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard. Army research lab. RSSAC.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Daniel Migault. IAB liaison.

FRED BAKER: Fred Baker. ISC, RSSAC.

MERIKE KAE0: Merike Kaeo. Incoming SSAC liaison to the board.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. Do we have any RSSAC members in the audience or not? Yes, we have -- could you please introduce yourself?

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM: Patrick Fältström. Netnod, RSSAC.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you.

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson. ICANN org, RSSAC.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. So with that, as usual, the board has sent us some questions, and then we have sent some questions for the board. We'll start with the questions from the board and give it to Brad, one of RSSAC coaches, to start a discussion. Brad?

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Kaveh. So, we were presented with two questions from the board. First one was, "What were your main priorities for 2019?" We've discussed this within RSSAC and our simple list -- we've kind of

broken it down into three subjects or topics. First and foremost is RSSAC 37 and 38 pre-implementation work.

So we've been we have been discussing internally that there are a number of technical documents that could be done in addition to any response from the board regarding -- or, in support, I should say -- of RSSAC 37. A simple example of that would be the measurements function. What should be measured? How it could be measured? Those types of documents can be done while we are in this back and forth between the board and RSSAC and done before any implementation work is done. So, we're just trying to keep the ball rolling. This is all work that needs to be done regardless.

So we sat down, we had a session this week, and identified a number of topics. And we will be focusing on that, adding that to our current queue of work and then prioritizing it with the caucus. Which flies right into the second bucket, which was caucus work items. So right now we have two open work parties that are currently underway. Those work parties were determined by the caucus after we identified our queue of work. They were prioritized from the caucus and based upon available resources that we had available to us. I'm sorry, I said that twice. But based upon resources from staff and from the caucus, we have two open work parties, and now that our work with 37, which was consuming a considerable amount of time, we're going to be starting a couple other ones and that will be, as I said, worked into the priority list.

And then lastly for 2019 is us to complete our organizational review, where we are in the draft feasibility assessment has been turned into the OAC, and we will be working on the final by the end of the year and then next year we will be implementing what those recommendations are. So, I will stop there and see if there are any questions around priorities.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much, Brad. Any questions from the board?

CHERINE CHALABY:

Just the second one. Could you just -- I lost a little bit of the strand on the second part.

BRAD VERD:

The first one and the second one kind of blended together, which was the first one was identifying technical work that could be done in advance of any response from the board for RSSAC 37, like measurements and whatnot. The second one was the caucus work items, which is currently in queue. So we have a number of work items that are currently in queue, waiting to be worked on that haven't been executed because of resource constraining. You can only have so many work parties going on at a single time. So we're trying to be as effective and as efficient as possible. And that is our second priority, is completing all the work items that have been brought to us by the caucus.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. Okay. If there are no order comments, I would go to the second question. Brad?

BRAD VERD: I don't think I'll read this one. This one is a little longer. But for us, this answer is kind of just doing more of the same. Like, we are continuing to work with our caucus to figure out how to be more efficient, we are sitting down and coming up with a work plan. Much like I stated, RSSAC 37 was consuming so many resources that at one point in time, we had too many work parties going, so we had to kind of, you know, better evaluate how to be more effective with the resources that were available to us.

And, you know, we in RSSAC like to think that we're in this perpetual self-improvement mode, for good or for worse. We are a bunch of engineers that are constantly trying to make things better. So that's what we're doing. And that includes everything from the work to transparency. All of our meetings now default to open. We only close them if there is something going on that would require some confidentiality around the root. So, that's what's happened.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

To simplify the question coming from the board -- because you're right, the caucus part is evolving. But I think the gist of it that the board is asking, "Does RSSAC need more resources from ICANN?" So, that's community and org, but obviously more on the org, because that's where it has more control. And is there anything the board can do to facilitate RSSAC's engagement within the whole model? Okay, [inaudible] notes, I will leave it to Cherine to clarify.

CHERINE CHALABY:

Sorry. Let me tell you the reason why we asked that question. You know that over the last seven months since Puerto Rico, the community together with ICANN, the board and all have been working on developing the next strategic plan for ICANN for FY21 to FY25. And during those seven months, the community identified five main priorities that they believe will have an impact on ICANN's future and which should inform the strategic plan. One you're very familiar with was the security. Second one was governance. One was the unique identifiers and geopolitics and financials. The governance one is the one that is relevant for this question.

So we heard quite a lot of concerns from the community about, on the one hand, the multi-stakeholder model is really suited for our needs. It's what gives us legitimacy. It's what brings us all together. But it has matured over a period of 20 years. And is it time to start just asking questions so that we make it even more efficient for the next 20 years? So that's the question. And we heard things like -- I'll read them to you. So they were concerns that there is an increased amount

for inclusivity. I mean, they may not be relevant to RSSAC, but this is just looking at the wider picture, as you are one of the seven stakeholder groups.

So, increased demand for inclusivity, accountability and transparency across the whole spectrum of our activities. There's a need to improve our policy development process to achieve consensus in a more effective and timely manner. There are concerns that progress in certain area can ground to a halt because of polarized interest. Concerns about volunteer shortage and fatigue. Concerns about the inefficient reviews. Concerns about, in some cases, ineffective involvement of the technical community.

And then finally, concerns about our own meeting, which are sacrosanct. But nevertheless, they're getting large, expensive and in some cases cluttered with too many meetings that people are having difficulty keeping pace with what's going on. So, that culminated into this kind of concern or trend that the community believes it's going to impact ICANN. Our plan is to issue a consultation paper towards May or June next year to all of the community, including yourself, asking views in the aggregate, not just for yourself: do you believe there's things we can do to improve our model for the next 20 years? Put it this way: what can we do it? Because it's essential to our legitimacy; it's essential to the way we operate.

But we owe it to ourselves on a periodic basis, like everything, to look at things and see if we can evolve and make it better and more suitable to our needs. So that's really the origin of why the board is

asking this question and the purpose for today was to get some views for you wider, if possible, outside the RSSAC, if you guys see things that you think we ought to improve and we ought to work on. That's the background.

BRAD VERD:

All right, well thank you. That's certainly not how we interpreted the question and we certainly didn't look at it from a 20-year perspective. We looked at this as priorities, you know, for 2019, and maybe we shouldn't have conflated the two, but that's what we did. Regarding things for improvement, I mean, I could sit here and run through each one of these that I think RSSAC is doing well or doing differently than maybe the rest of the community.

But I think maybe the one thing that we would like to drive home to the board would be that normal advice from SSAC -- I'm sorry, from RSSAC -- would be turned over and, you know, we might have a back and forth once and there's action items done, and then it goes away. Obviously, with 37, this is kind of a different animal. It's different than what has come out of RSSAC in the past, and maybe the processes around advice from an advisory committee need to be amended a bit.

And what we mean by that is if you use the organizational review process as an example, or if you use the PDP process as an example, there's kind of like a work party committee that works along with, you know, the stakeholders on a piece of advice or on an implementation plan, so that people can hit the ground running when the product is

final. And I guess a simpler way to say it is, we know it took us three years to get this product to you. Based upon the timeline, you know, that we've heard, OCTO will provide their read out to the board by the end of the year.

It will be worked on by the board in the workshop, and maybe we'll see or hear something in Kobe. So, six months from now. During that six months, it would be nice to work alongside with OCTO, with the board, so that when it's delivered, there are no surprises to anybody. So really, we're just offering our services. We want to help. If we can help, we're happy to do that.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. And I think the point is taken. We have been slow in responding.

BRAD VERD: That was not the point.

CHERINE CHALABY: I know, but that is an extra point and we've discussed it. So, but the no surprises and getting involved is important. And therefore, yes, point taken. Thank you.

Anything else in terms of ICANN and the wider perspective? Maybe we should leave this because you didn't have time to think about it, and there be other opportunities to get the community's view. And

anyway, there'll be a consultation paper coming out around about the May or June timeframe. We're collecting views at this point in time, so you'll have plenty of opportunity to comment.

BRAD VERD: Apologies for the misinterpretation.

CHERINE CHALABY: No, no. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. So, any other questions from the board members to RSSAC before we go to the second part? Okay, so we've submitted four questions to the board. The first one is basically -- I'll read the question. "Was it the ICANN board's intention to signal that each single operator should similarly explore diversification and resilience model for zone distribution and resolution, post on their own, and in loose collaboration with ICANN org, other RSOs, and the community? Or was it ICANN board intention to scope these efforts to IMRS or L.ROOT, operations only?

If the intention was the former, then what community or PDP activities feeding the groups does the ICANN board envision to effectuate any outcomes of this work that may impact the root server system as a whole?" And from the board, I know that David has -- because we discussed it within the board and within the BTC. And yes, we have worked with David to provide an asset. Please? Under -- okay.

GORAN MARBY: Can I start with something on and then let David --?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Please. Yes.

GORAN MARBY: So I joined as a CEO two-and-a-half years ago. One thing I figured out, we didn't have any internal discussion about the root server we manage. No strategy. No real -- we have very good people doing it, but we've never had any discussions and made a paper and a policy about our own sort of system, which sort of came as a surprise to me. The board has never actually, to my knowledge, discussed the management of the root server. And I know I'm not supposed to call it that. It should be the ICANN managed root server. Thank you. I'm trying to stick with that, Tripti told me to call it that.

So, I started -- and eventually, you know that's it has been very important to me to make the difference between what ICANN does and your independence is root servers. And I think I've said that many times. So, we started an attempt, and we brought this also to the board's attempts where, of course, David told us that we can't do things just for ourselves. We have to have a communication with the other operators. And that sort of goes back to the root server corporation where we are one of them. If I said anything or did anything that, well, sort of -- and I'm new in this game, and you've

been around for a long time and maybe I sometimes use the wrong language.

But one of the funny facts of that was the board got quite interested in the whole thing as well. And, we sort of went through the same process and we probably used the wrong words and said things in the wrong way. The intention is never -- as always -- I think I said it earlier, we have no intention other than have a good cooperation with the other operators as one of the operation. My intention and our intention was to get our act together, and I hope that's sufficient for you. Now, I will leave it to David. So, anything that is anything wrong, it's probably my fault.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Goran. David?

GORAN MARBY: Of course, I usually blame David. But I just want to note that.

DAVID CONRAD: With a straight line like that, I mean, it's hard to resist.

BRAD VERD: I'm not sure you can say you're new with this anymore either, by the way.

GORAN MARBY: Yes, I can.

TRIPTI SINHA: You can say it, but it's not true.

GORAN MARBY: When I started this, I was newer. Can I go home now, please?

DAVID CONRAD: So in response to this question -- I feel a little awkward, you know, speaking for the board here -- But my understanding is that the intent was to signal that there was an underlying issue that needed the community to address in the development of a strategy, and that ICANN org with them implemented that strategy as agreed upon and assuming that it fit within the context of what L-Root was able to do and the feasibility of implementing it within the our internal structures.

The strategy, as discussed within RSSAC, we proposed a very high-level strongman proposal on how to move forward. But the idea would be to coordinate with RSSAC and SSAC and the RSSAC caucus and the root operators to develop a strategy that would be applicable across the root server system as a whole, and then each root server operator would then be in a position to implement as they see fit.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So, maybe I should add a bit of background, because yes, we had a session with OCTO a few hours ago because we had kind of a similar question to the OCTO, because we have engagements with OCTO on other issues as well. And so, I wanted to first to have that retreated here and then go back to the board if there's anything additional. But I know Ram is on the queue. Ram?

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you. Ram Mohan, SSAC liaison to the board. I wanted us to just bring a little bit of history here. A little bit of background. I co-chaired the board risk committee. And about a couple of years ago, one of the issues that came up in front of the risk committee was a question about the resilience of the root system as a whole, especially in light of reports that had come up about both the huge increase in the volume, the scale, the frequency of large-scale attacks that were focused on the root service system.

There was also another concern that had been raised inside of the risk committee and then eventually to the board, also questions about getting some further clarity or understanding of the other risks -- not just the technology risks -- but the other risks that exists; for example, financial stability or other things like that. So those were brought up, I believe, last year in a discussion between the board and the RSSAC, but that was the initial impetus for discussing how do we get to an overall ecosystem that is stronger and that is better.

Now, if you go back and look at the board resolution about the ICANN managed root server and the strategy for it -- and I would suggest you look at the rationale section on that resolution and not just the resolution itself -- because the rationale actually speaks to the fact that while ICANN is charged with a root server and management of the roots server, et cetera, what it's being asked to do is to come up with a strategy and to then consult; to work without the root server operators, work with the RSSAC, SSAC, et cetera, and see whether the strategies that it is coming up with are good strategies, viable, and then make it open for consideration by other root server operators. So that is the rationale, and that is kind of what lead to that board resolution just a few months ago. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Okay. Thank you very much. Yes, please, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Ram, thank you for that explanation. I'm just trying to explain why there is this disconnect within the RSSAC and the resolution you passed. It took RSSAC two-and-a-half years to work on this project. And if you've read the executive summary of 37 -- I don't expect that everyone's read -- how many pages is it? 50 pages? -- all 50 pages. But the executive summary clearly states that the reason why it's time to embark on this project is because the world has changed and there are numerous attack factors and inherently the system could potentially be very weak if we continue.

So that was the premise upon which we started, and sitting at the table was L-Root for all two and a half years. So, how do we reconcile this work that was being done by L-Root of their own accord, which ended up in a resolution, and what RSSAC is doing? That's the reason why there's this confusion. Thank you.

BRAD VERD:

Actually, Tripti, if I may, I think some of the confusion is compounded by maybe the use of the terminology in the resolution. I don't have it in front of me, so I can't give you quotes. But the question here is just asking for clarity. Because if when you read the resolution, having background as a root server operator, it's clear when you're talking about the IMRS, but then when you jump to root server system, you are no longer talking about the IMRS.

And the strategy that was referred to, I believe in the resolution, the strategy was about the root server system and not the IMRS. Sorry, I will learn that. So, that's part of the impetus of this question here. And the second question goes to a lot of what Tripti's saying.

GORAN MARBY:

I was just on the verge of correcting Tripti for using the term L-Root server, because we don't use that anymore, do we?

TRIPTI SINHA:

You know, since old habits die hard, especially yours. So to benefit you, I said L-Root.

GORAN MARBY: Thank you. We made this -- we were supposed to do this just to make a point.

BRAD VERD: Scripted?

GORAN MARBY: Yeah, scripted. If you believe us enough to say that we have no bad intent -- by the way, if we turn it around, we can't tell you what to do, can we? You know, so it would be sort of in vain if we come up with something that you didn't think was a good idea in the first place. So, I agree. We probably put in some word incident and I will take credit -- not credit. I will take the blame for that, because I'm the one who presented it to the board, and I'm very happy to retract and work to change things so it becomes obvious.

It was not my intent and would never be to be anything else. We just had to attempt to get our shit together and then train myself and the board and executive team to also make sure that in a place where we are now talking about priorities, we would go through the different functions that we have to actually have a real discussion about why we're doing this and the way we're doing it. And I can give you one example; this is an outcome of the internal discussion. One decision we had before was that we sort of used our instances as some sort of political thing. It was a part of us. We went to a country, put it there.

So now, we have made a decision that the only reasons why we put an instance is we want to see a technical benefit out of that. So, shorter time, for instance. And that means that we also want to look at that, not only from the L-Root server perspective, but also -- sorry. I give up. Not only from our work, we also want to check them that if there are other instances, they're already solving the problem, we should go somewhere else. So that is one very practical one. The other thing we did very practical out of this was that we have an escalation path. So when we place an instance somewhere in a new place, we actually, in the end, let me take the decision because sometimes there are countries that politically get affected by doing that.

So, there's this sort of practical consequence. So, I'm willing to rework any material to change anything, and I hope we can help the assumption it was no bad intact. Maybe badly done. I do mistakes all the time. And I usually let David have the blame for that. But this time I will take it.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Goran. I know Brad also has a response for that. I also have -- there's a queue. So, Maarten and then Ram.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Just as you know, I'm not a return a root server operator, although I'm involved in the IMRS. Yes. So I just want to express that the military cycle that we work and is built on trust, right? And I can see that they're some feelings like what is going on here. And, just

from my perspective, you know, I've been coming to your meetings, even though I didn't have to contribute technically. But it's because of sheer admiration for the fact of how you were organizing yourselves from a culture that was totally different into something that is better fitting for today.

In that, what I've experienced in the board where we've talked about our own priorities for the year to come, where this is a subject in the strategic plan that we've been working on for the five years to come. Time and time again, we've looked at these aspects and the import from Kaveh and Tripti and David on, like, be aware of the sensitivity.

This is to be the role that we have to play together with root server operators that used to be fully independent, each even from each other, to an echo system that can together deal with the challenges of today. So, that is at the mind of the board. And if it hasn't been perfectly expressed in the board motion, I'm happy to improve it. But this is very much the spirit in which we see our collaboration in making this work together.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. Ram?

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, this is Ram. Tripti, thank you for that clarity, that was helpful. And to me, what that exposes is that there's a communication issue, and I actually think that that's something that the board will

take seriously. We'll have to work on, because that kind of a gap shouldn't arise, especially when you have parties at the same table together. And so I would suggest that that particular question be turned into an action for the BTC to go and look into, to try and find a way to make it better.

Brad, just responding to what you were saying, I'm just looking at the resolution, and there are a few places here. There's a clause that says, "Whereas a root server system is currently deployed is seen by many within the technical community as at risk of being unable to keep pace with the growth in attack capacity, and thus is increasingly vulnerable to attract attack traffic with the launched by malicious entities or as a result of mis-configuration, misuse of bugs, whereas a successful attack against the root server system would pose a serious risk to the security and stability to the DNS and poses a potentially existential risk to ICANN org as the facilitator of the coordination of operation and evolution of the DNS root server system."

So there are five clauses. Two of them speak to the IMRS and three others speak to the root server system. My recollection in various board conversations, including at the board workshop -- at the most recently concluded one in Brussels -- was that the concerns were actually about the root server system, and concerns about understanding whether there are vulnerabilities, whether the system can get overwhelmed. And that's a conversation that's been happening for two plus years. When I look at the resolution, I see the contradiction in terms that you were pointing out, that the direction to ICANN org is to do things better with the IMRS and then consult. But

there are other clauses that do speak about the roots server system and vulnerabilities.

Having said all of that, I'll say this. My recollection is that the conversations and the concerns, what was really heightened was not just a concern about IMRS and the potential vulnerability of IMRS going down. The concern that arose in the board conversations that I remember had to do with the risk of the root itself going down and what that might mean for the internet at large. And Kaveh, you were in those conversations as well.

So again, just to provide some context and some background. So, I'm not sure that there should be a complete backing away from that resolution, because the rationale that led to it was actually about a deep-rooted set of apprehensions and concerns about is the root going to be safe and the impetus for that had to do with the mission of the security stability that is in ICANN. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much. May I first? Thank you. I think this is actually an important subject, and we have never -- within RSSAC, together the board and RSSAC -- we have never tried to address it clearly. So I think there is a gap, and it's good to have that discussion. Either way, Ram, I think we need to come to a decision and agreement that where we sit, because there's a big difference between understanding and taking action. So we did -- with RSSAC as well -- we did a lot to make sure the board understands the risks of the whole root server system.

We started from how it works, and then we went to the works deeper, going through the attacks and possibilities and how we can mitigate them. But when it comes to actions, there are two clear paths. And we also discussed it a few hours ago with OCTO. One is SS root operator, IMRS. Any root operator can bring up concerns about also the whole system, not only their operations, but they say [inaudible] CC operator, one of the roots, and we can say, “We see, actually, this system has its flaws. So we want to pursue this in IETF or any other venue because we want to address this.”

That's a given; it has been done many times. Many of the developments in DNS and how roots work actually has been done this way. So as an equal peer, obviously IMRS has every right to do so. But then there is the other view which ICANN asked the organization, basically on top of how the root works. And let me clarify that in details. But I guess we all understand what it means. Provisioning of the root zone and making policies for that has an important role in safeguarding the DNS and strategizing for DNS at a high level and how it works. That's at least -- maybe it's true, and maybe it is a role that ICANN should take -- but I can speak for a large part of the community, and I can, I think within RSSAC, we can agree, this has never been discussed, and I don't think the RSSAC agrees with that.

Maybe we do, but we haven't discussed that. “Should ICANN have this rule or shouldn't? And what is the rationale behind that?” So, my suggestion is taking this -- if the board wants to take this role, this position, that's fine. But there is a there is a gap, which is a community engagement, with not only RSSAC but also other

community parts to say, “Okay, ICANN also has this role or doesn't.” And we missed this clarification. A lot of these questions, I think, come from that.

And when you spoke, you referred to understanding. Definitely. We did a lot to make sure the board understands the risks. But now without that resolution, there is a bit more going into taking action after those understanding. So then, with that, I will give it to Brad.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, Kaveh. I’ve got two points, really. The first is a response to -- nobody believes that there was ill intent in any of the resolution. Nobody believes that. All we were asking for is clarification. Second point: I think maybe we're also looking for some consistency. And the reason I say that is if you go back to previous advice from RSSAC that was specific -- and I’ll use the example -- I believe I’m getting this right. I'll have to go double check. But I believe when RSSAC 002 was published about the measurements, the specific response from the board said, “We can only give a response on this regarding L.” Not the root server system; it was about L.

And there was some back and forth and there was a disagreement and it was pushed back to RSSAC, saying that ICANN org is only responsible for L. Therefore, we can only speak authoritatively for L. This resolution does more than that, and it talks -- as RSSAC met with OCTO earlier today, it was very clear. They stated that their

interpretation of this was they have to go create a root strategy for the root server system.

Now, it's up to the root server operators to adopt that. But, that is more than L. So, this is the consistency we're looking for. We're just trying to understand what should we expect.

DAVID CONRAD:

If I could verify. I wasn't saying that OCTO would develop a strategy for L. I said explicitly that OCTO would work with the community as specified within the resolution to develop a strategy that root server operators could implement at their discretion.

GORAN MARBY:

I'd like a point of order, here. So actually, those two things are highly consistent, because I can handle questions about what was before called L-Root server. Okay? For us to engage in something beyond that, to talking about the strategy, I need the board to say so to me to be able to engage with you on something that is beyond what is now called the -- so, those things are consistent. You know how it is in a company. You have a mandate to do something. And if you want to do something more or the board thinks it's more, they have to tell you to do that.

And the way we do that in ICANN is through resolution. So, it's actually highly consistent with how we work. So, when we got the question about -- because I answered that one. We got a question

about, “Can we answer for anything more than the L-Root?” “No, we can't, because in that specific system, it was done.” Now, when we start to engage in -- and hey, guys, you've done something quite remarkable. You put the -- and Tripti and Brad has done fantastic work -- you put the root server discussions on the top of the ICANN board because finally, they're interested. Sorry. The masses are there.

We are now trying to learn how to live with experience. So in their wisdom, they said, “Okay, OCTO --” Which is not the L-Root server operator in entering us -- “Go and talk. Have this. You have the permission to have this discussion.” Maybe that was a misunderstanding. Sorry. I had a small Tuesday event that I have to attend to, things that happens without my -- yeah, shit. The good thing is bad shit happens on Wednesdays. So, this is just a Tuesday. Bye.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So, Ram. Before -- may I make a quick comment? I agree. So I think this is mostly RSSAC with the board. So this is not about the org [inaudible]; they are following up the resolution at this point. But we want to understand that does the board feel the responsibility or the need to check that role of strategizing for the DNS with the community or engage with the community or no? They're basically assuming that for that ICANN. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN:

Thanks, Kaveh. This is Ram. I cannot speak for the board, but I can provide use some context and some of the things that happened. I'll say this, Brad, the resolution, it was not incidental. It was intentional, what was in there. And I completely take on board what you're saying that consistency is a good thing. And if there is a change in the approach and more proactiveness or engagement, than the expectations have to be set. The communications have to be done. And clearly, there are gaps there and things that have to be fixed in that area. And again, I would imagine that given that the BTC is chartered with that engagement part and getting the communications done right, that clearly becomes a high-priority item for the BTC on behalf of the board.

The other thing is that the concerns and the discussion and the board had -- if I remember right -- six or seven specific sessions, multi-hour long sessions, some educational sessions about, you know, the scale, velocity, frequency of attacks, et cetera and then other sessions about the risks that this might pose. And Kaveh, to your point, one of the questions that came up -- which I don't know that an answer actually has arisen -- but one of the questions that came up was if the root goes down, if things go dark, who is going to be -- in a fictional, hypothetical world -- who are the parties who are going to be, you know, brought up in front of Congress to provide answers to it?

And in that discussion, one of the points that came up was it's pretty likely ICANN would be one among those who would be called up, because it is visible, right? But all of that being said, I think the message I take away, anyway, is that there is a communication flow,

and there's a collaborative approach where much more has to be done than what exists today.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Ram. Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA: So, I'd like to make two points to the initial point that you're making about the gap. And I think if I understood you correctly, you're saying who are we collectively responsible to? Is that what you were saying? Basically, who would be called in front of Congress? In one case, it would be ICANN, but who owns this? Correct? Is that --? I didn't understand your gap thing. If you could just explain it to me in a few words, because I think I know what you're saying, but I want clarification on it, and I have a response to that.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you. So, basically, who sets the high-level strategy? So, for example, we say there is not enough number of root operators, or root operators are not doing a good job because there is a lot of attacks and our total capacity is lower, for example -- correct? -- to be able to handle that. Is this a role of ICANN org?

Or at least does the ICANN board see that as the role of ICANN org to monitor these things and then to act on them outside of the limit of IMRS. Because, yes, as a stakeholder partner in this game, all of us

have this role and we constantly make changes. But on a higher level, we need to distribute more geographically, or things like that.

TRIPTI SINHA:

Thank you. That is exactly how I understood it, and that is what is contained in 37. So, you know, I'm in a very awkward position, because in less than 36 hours and one second, I'm going to be part of the board. So what I'm going to say next is the board knows that, that is contained in 37. So this problem will go away if the board will give RSSAC a response on our advice, which is contained in 38. If the board wants to reject it, that's fine. And then go ahead and charge OCTO to do what -- of course, at that point I'll be part of board. So, you know, we're going to have to charge OCTO to do what they want to do.

But at least make a decision on 38, because this is causing a lot of confusion. Everything that we just went over is contained in 37. And OCTO, L-Root, IMRS --whatever you want to call yourselves -- were at the table for three years with us, hand in glove, writing this document.

So we shouldn't have this confusion. Anyway, I've said what I had to say. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much. So, Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: So, I agree with Tripti on that. I think once we respond to 37 and 38, right, that response has to clarify their questions. Otherwise, the response is meaningless, frankly, yeah? But I think there is confusion; I agree with that. And we'll have to clarify. There's no doubt. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay, that's a fair point. Any other comments? Akinori?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Akinori Maemura for the record. First of all, if our resolution in September is confusing, then we need to address that. Then the intention is already clarified by many people from the ICANN org and ICANN board. I read every single point of them. Then yes, I am now the incoming BTC chair, and I need to take care of any of the technicalities from you guys.

And I need to make progress and the proper response to them. And I really need to try my best to do that. And then, maybe, I hope that kind of effort may mitigate if you had any mixed feeling about that. Then 37 is proposing quite a dramatic change of the governance scheme. And at same time, both have been discussing the risk of the DNS system as a whole, you know, as quite a huge increase of the secretary threat.

So, ICANN is in a position to facilitate the coordination of the entity in the system and then they definitely need the cooperation with the

DNS in the server operator's community. How can ICANN be responsible for that mandate? It's difficult and a little bit different from what it was before, because of the increase of the threat. So I think that this process is quite, you know, uncharted, and we definitely need cooperation to make it quite new and viable. A scheme to ensure the security of the DNS.

So in that way, I want to have the board take its own due effort to move up the issue for the solution. So in that way, I think about this issue, for your information. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much. Any other comments on this? Brad?

BRAD VERD:

My only comment I would add is I believe we should answer the second question also, which we haven't gotten to.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yes. And we have less than ten minutes. Is it a fair -- and this is mostly for the board -- but is it a fair summary of the discussion that, for now, we're not making any solid conclusions. And we will wait for the plan for 37 and 38, which is due from the first analysts from OCTO to the board at the end of the year. And after that we can actually have a more clear understanding of that? Is it fair from the board, or does anyone think differently?

Okay, I take that as an approval. I will go to the next question, which, as Brad said, was basically about a similar concern. I mean, it had a technical aspect, which we actually, I think, RSSAC has satisfied from the technical understanding. We also disgusted with OCTO. If no one from RSSAC needs to know more about that or board has any comments, I would go to the third and fourth question. No comments?

Okay, so the third question: “Can the ICANN board explain the rationale that long-term outlook for the traditional approach appears bleak when this is the current approach?” So from the board or the org? Yes, please, David.

DAVID CONRAD:

So, the rationale for the long-term outlook for the traditional approach appearing bleak was derived out of observations associated with the ramp up of attacks and the capacity of attacks over the recent years, which appeared to be almost exponential in nature. As the current approach is to throw money at the problem, the question then becomes, “Does an individual root server operator have sufficient money to throw at the problem?” Given all of us seem to operate under limited resource constraints, would therefore suggest that the current approach would be bleak.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much. Any further clarification required for that? Brad?

BRAD VERD: It sounds like this is a money justification. The rationale is money driven versus something else, is that correct?

RAM MOHAN: This is Ram. I'm actually thinking that I'm not sure that this is going to be a productive piece. My suggestion is that this question should get to the BTC. The BTC should have a proper discussion about it and then come back to you, because I'm just concerned that we're trying to do interpretations and it might be better to have that. Or maybe it's a session that the BTC has after it goes through these questions in depth with the RSSAC. Because I'm just worried that, you know, we'll go back and forth and maybe not get to actual conclusions. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, is this a solution that works for you, Brad?

BRAD VERD: I think that's fine. I think, you know, these questions are responses to a resolution that we saw. We were not, you know, we were not asked for any advice about the resolutions, so these were clarifying questions that we were trying to figure out. Nothing more. This is not, again -- there was no, like, we believe there was ill intent. As was stated earlier, there was nothing malicious in this line of questioning. It was strictly just trying to clarify so that we could understand RSSAC's role in this going forward.

RAM MOHAN:

This is Ram. Brad, I completely understand. And I apologize if it looked like I was representing that there was any malice or any ill intent, that's actually not it. I'm actually looking for what is a consistent, effective and efficient way of having this conversation progress. And what I'm reflecting on is also that the board technical committee, in its charter, has a specific task item to liaise with the RSSAC and the SSAC and to work closely together.

So in my mind, what I'm thinking is, the next iteration for all of you to do is -- I would imagine that the RSSAC would sit down with the BTC ahead of the session with the board. Go through the questions, see if there is any clarity that comes in that part of the process, and then if there are still open questions, bring it up here. So, I'm solving for efficiency. No trouble having these questions brought up and responded here.

Just sitting where I'm sitting, it just feels to me like I don't know that the BTC has had the opportunity to review and respond substantively. And I'm looking for that substantive engagement. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you, Ram. Just because we are almost running out of time, I know Cherine has a comment.

CHERINE CHALABY: So, what I hear, actually -- and tell me if I'm wrong -- is that there is a concern or request, perhaps for the future, that any resolution that the board passes which is root related. I think the RSSAC wishes to be involved or advised in advance rather than find out about it and then try and decipher what the purpose is. Is that what the issue is?

BRAD VERD: I think to a certain extent, we were certainly not looking for veto power. It's just knowing, like, you know -- our mandate is advise the board on the root server system. We got a resolution and we were just trying to get clarity on what that is. Nothing more.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay, so I think that's the heart of the problem. I think we should -- as Ram said -- we should take this and discuss it with you and the board technical committee so that we don't have to go through the element of surprise again. Because, like you said, you're not looking for a veto, but looking to be involved given that you are advising us. That's your mission on the L-Root, or on the root server itself, right?

BRAD VERD: On the root server system.

CHERINE CHALABY: I meant the root server system. Yes. Okay, thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. So, I will quickly go to the last question. Can the ICANN board be more specific -- no?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I thought we decided to --

KAVEH RANJBAR: We decided to -- the whole thing? Okay, very good. So, I guess I can only ask the chair of BTC. We'll do some work and then some more coordination with RSSAC to follow up on this question, do clarification and I think there are things we can clarify more with the board via BTC which speaks our language. Thank you.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Akinori Maemura for the record. I feel my shoulders are very heavy right now. Let me try something. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: We will eagerly help.

KAVEH RANJBAR: And before I close, this would be the last meeting that we would have with Tripti as our co-chair. So, Brad?

BRAD VERD: So yes, again, last meeting with Tripti. She's certainly not leaving us, obviously. She'll be around, but she won't be around with her RSSAC hat on, so to speak. But we would like to thank her for her guidance and her wisdom through her many years of service with us. And we look forward to working with you in your new role.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you. Thank you. I just wanted to say I've really enjoyed being with RSSAC for five years and four years as your co-chair. And just for everyone in the room, this is a group with technical chops. They're really smart. Please engage them. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]