
MONTREAL – RSSAC Meeting
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 09:00 to 10:15 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

BRAD VERD: Alright, I guess we'll start. Good morning all, this is the official RSSAC meeting for the month of November, make sure I'm in the right month. First we will do a roll call and then we'll review the agenda. So, if we can go back to the names I was on, on the screen. Thank you. Cogent, not in the room, are they in the Zoom? Don't see anybody, okay. DISA?

KEVIN WRIGHT: Kevin Wright.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Kevin. ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Here.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Matt. ISC? Both Fred and Jeff are here. NASA?

TOM MIGLIN: Tom is here.

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.

BRAD VERD: Tom is here. Thank you, Tom. Netnod? Lars had a scheduling conflict, so he came, he was here just minutes ago, he has to chair the CSC meeting that's presenting to the ccNSO, so he will try to be here as quickly as possible, but he's not here at the moment. RIPE?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh is here.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Kaveh. University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Karl is here.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Karl. USC ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Wes. US ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard is here.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Ken. Verisign, Brad Verd is here. WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Hiro. Liaison to the Board, Kaveh is here. Liaison to the CSC, as I said, Liman has stepped out. RZERC, I'm here, liaison to SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Russ is here.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Russ. Liaison to the IAB? Daniel is here. Liaison to IANA? Naela is here in the room. Liaison to the Root Zone Maintainer?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

BRAD VERD: Duane is here. Did I miss anybody? I tend to skip over names. Okay, and then we have Staff, Andrew, Carlos, Ozan, and I guess that's it.

Alright, we do have quorum so that is good. Let's jump back to the agenda. So it's a light agenda, let's say, so we'll go through our normal administration, we'll vote on the minutes from the last meeting, we'll talk through travel support and the Vice-Chair elections coming up, we'll cover our work items that we spent some time on here, we'll get our reports from the Co-Chairs and a Liaisons.

And then Any Other Business, which we already have some stuff on here. So, right now in Any Other Business we have the RSSAC statement on the threat mitigation for the root server system. I think that goes back to the document that the root servers published. There's a public comment for the KSK stuff that we mentioned but we haven't formally talked about. And then our next teleconference would be December 3rd. Is there anything anybody wants to add to the agenda? I see nothing in the room. Anything from the Zoom Room Ozan? No, okay.

OZAN SAHIN: Just wanted to note, Ryan Stephenson has joined the Zoom Room.

BRAD VERD: Welcome, Ryan. Okay, go back to the agenda, if we could, alright. Administration, so draft minutes from our last meeting, Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Brad. This is Ozan for the record. I circulated the draft minutes two weeks ago. If you look at the Action Items they have been

completed, and if you have any further questions on the draft minutes from the last meeting, please let us know.

BRAD VERD: Are there any questions about the minutes? Alright, is there a motion to approve the minutes? Motion. Is there a second?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson, I'll second.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Ryan. Are there any objections to the minutes as they were sent out and have been posted? Any abstentions? Okay, so the minutes are approved and will be published. Thank you.

Next topic is ICANN67 Travel Support. So, Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Brad. The request for the travel support deadline is tomorrow and we asked last week RSSAC members to submit their requests by today. So if you would like to get travel support for ICANN67 in Cancun, please make sure to use the Google Document link that I circulated and it will be circulated again by today to request the travel support. As a reminder, RSSAC has six travel support slots for this meeting and two of them will be allocated to the Co-Chairs or the Chair and Vice-Chair and four for the RSSAC members.

BRAD VERD: Alright, so please get that in as soon as possible, should you be seeking travel support. Thank you.

Alright, moving on. Vice-Chair election timeline. Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, again, I circulated a note on the RSSAC list, flagging the start of the nomination period for the RSSAC Vice-Chair so it will be open for a month and then RSSAC is supposed to elect its Vice-Chair on the 3rd of December meeting. We have not received any nominations yet, but the nomination period is still open.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you, Ozan. Any questions around that right now? Alright, I see none here. I don't see anybody in the Zoom Room asking a question.

Alright, moving on. Work Items. RSS Metrics Work Party update, Duane, we've talked about this for a lot of this meeting. Any quick update you want to share for the people on the call that haven't been here?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, we spent a lot of time this week talking about the metrics stuff, I feel like we're getting really close to our state of having a final draft for the Caucus to review. Assuming, as you sort of predicted, if this

meeting goes short then we're going to use the remaining time in this session today to talk about a couple of outstanding items with recommendations.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, just to let everybody know that should this meeting end early, we talked prior to the meeting, we will use the free time after the meeting to spend some time to continue talking about the metrics. Alright, any questions for Duane? I don't see any hands up. Moving on. Modern Resolver Behavior Work Party update, Fred, anything to share?

FRED BAKER:

Well, let me turn that over to Paul. You commented yesterday in the caucus meeting, could you just repeat those comments?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

Sure, this is Paul Hoffman for the record. We are pretty much done with the main work which was to create a software platform that people could use to look at resolver behavior. That platform is pretty much done, it is done, modulo a check that the license that we put on it is acceptable to ICANN Legal, and the license we're seeking is you can do whatever you want, pretty much, as long as you give us credit if you duplicate it.

So, assuming I get that, I will write up a short document explaining the purpose of the two parts of it and we'll write that up, send it to RSSAC,

that should be done before the Caucus meeting that's in a week and a half. Thank you. Brad, would you like me to speak for a little bit longer?

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, alright, also things we talked about here in this meeting, we've talked about updating RSSAC002, 023 and 026. I'll hand this over to Andrew for a quick update.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Yeah, like you said, the RSSAC caucus is updating 002, 023 and 026. We had sessions here on those three documents. I got a lot of really good feedback from the caucus and I think next steps are for Staff, me and Danielle, to go and do a bunch of writing on those three documents. And then once we have satisfied those items we need to update, then we will schedule some calls on those documents and discuss them further. I think that's the way forward.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, Andrew. The only piece I'll add is I'll encourage the RSSAC members representing the root server organizations, should you have updates to 023 for your individual identifiers for history, please get that into Staff so that we can include it in the document. Are there any questions around that update from Andrew and the three documents that we are looking to update? Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: This is Carlos, this is actually for Paul. Will there be a document that RSSAC needs to vote on as part of the output for that work party? Just so that Andrew and Ozan can plan with the admin team for a vote.

PAUL HOFFMAN: We actually didn't discuss that in the work party. I was going to produce a short document summarizing but it'll be like a page or two. Once the caucus looks at that...

BRAD VERD: Just for the edification of everybody in the room and not in the room, we've gone back to the resolver work party, if there will be a document out of that group.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Yes, for the Resolver Behavior Work Party. So I'll do a short document basically reiterating why the software is created and how to get access to the software. The software itself has read me's and such like that. Pass that through the caucus, once caucus says yep, great, thank you, I would send that to RSSAC and I don't know if RSSAC wants to turn that into a short RSSAC document or not, that's totally up to RSSAC, but that hadn't been discussed.

FRED BAKER: So I would think that we would have a report out of that working group in the long run that will sort of detail the results. You're not

talking about the results, you're just talking about here is software we did and how it works.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

Correct. There's one short set of sample results, but since there wasn't enough interest in the work party to actually run through them, I didn't want to say here are the results. I don't want to do results that aren't going to be evaluated. So possibly to answer Carlos' question we do a small document saying what had been done and if results come later, which I would certainly love people to use the software and such like that, maybe then later we collect some and we generate more, turn that into a second more interesting technical document possibly.

FRED BAKER:

The purpose of the of the work party was to try and document, actually there was a good presentation at DNSO work about what resolver behavior in there too, so I think there's multiple things we can pull together including some of my own analysis over time, too, that my colleague has done, and if we pull all that together we'll end up with a much better report of how resolver actually behave, and I will most certainly help collect all that information.

BRAD VERD:

So I think the short answer, Carlos, is yes, there will be something, but there may be many something's, okay? Any other questions around

that? I don't see anything. Alright, moving on to reports. We have a Co-Chair report, so I guess I'm on the hook for it. A couple things to share, and I'll look for added commentary from Fred.

Since the last meeting, we did have a phone call with Göran, which is the normal phone call with all the SO/AC leadership. It was pretty uneventful, I think. We ran through obviously the questions that we were going to ask to the Board, just briefly talked about those, confirmed that he was happy with the independent documents, since he was the impetus for that, and was there anything else that we covered with him?

FRED BAKER:

Well I think there was something that came out of the BTC meeting where they want a paragraph that kind of says please go read that, and I'm not sure why they need that, but apparently they do. So, Andrew is putting that together and we can discuss and vote on that in a little bit.

BRAD VERD:

This was in reference to the threat mitigation of the root server system that was done by the RSO. So we'll touch base on that, but he basically reiterated that there was something from the BTC that would like to get done and we talked through that a bit.

FRED BAKER: And we had a conversation with Cherine and Maarten who like what we're doing, they were very positive.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, so we had the Göran call a couple weeks ago. Here at the ICANN meeting we had a sit-down face to face with Cherine and Maarten, which again is just a normally scheduled visit. We went in, kind of our goal or our topic added to the agenda was we were just looking for continuity from Shereen to Maarten that the follow through on RSSAC37 and 38 and what not, going forward, we were assured in no uncertain terms essentially that nothing was going to change, this was moving forward, and they were very pleased with it. That was most of the discussion, actually.

FRED BAKER: Well yeah, there was the question that Jeff gave us to talk about.

BRAD VERD: Oh yeah, so there was the third question that we removed from sending to the Board about SLAs, as it turns out, the question was has ICANN thought about SLAs, have they thought about what they would like, and the short answer is no. They haven't really spent a lot of time thinking about it, and would like to understand kind of what our view is on that, and our answer to that was well we're working through the metrics work which is kind of a starting point, but there would be, it

was unclear whether or not there would be kind of like, how do I say this, one contract or many contracts, should SLAs come to fruition.

And since they hadn't thought about it, they weren't prepared with an answer, but they are thinking about it now. And I think the conversation has started as to, let them think about it, let them digest it, hopefully they'll come back to us with something more.

FRED BAKER:

Yeah, I'd really like to understand their side of the discussion. We also had lunch with Dave Conrad, and his comments, and we asked him the same question, his comments were essentially not an SLA with an RSO but an SLA with the RSS.

BRAD VERD:

That's where you started, and then we started to go through that, like who is responsible for the RSS, where would that lie, he quickly kind of came back to where we came back to, which is, you kind of need to define what you want for your availability of the RSS and then figure out how many RSOs you need in order to achieve that availability. That was that conversation.

FRED BAKER:

Yeah, that conversation ranged kind of all over the map. Do we need more RSOs, do we need less RSOs, that kind of thing.

BRAD VERD: So I think those were our three meetings that we've had since the last meeting.

FRED BAKER: And I have been told that the Chairs will have a meeting with ICANN in January and that will be discussing kind of all the topics that are discussed here at this meeting and trying to figure out a way forward that is coherent and makes sense.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, so obviously I won't be in that meeting but there is a meeting tentatively scheduled on the west coast in January which I feel, based on what I've heard from people, would be All the SO/AC leadership getting together and kind of talking through prioritization for the community, I think is that a fair assessment?

FRED BAKER: Yeah, and discussing the agenda for that, at the moment there's a large amount of hand waving...

BRAD VERD: Well, actually tied right into that is we also met, I'm sorry I forgot this one, we met with Brian Cute, who has been tasked with the starting of one of these organizational goals of evolving the multistakeholder model, and he's been doing a bunch of interviewing people over the last year, trying to figure out where the topics are that need to be

addressed and he is presenting tomorrow. So, I won't steal his thunder and share what it is, but I don't think there were any surprises that will come out of it, but his presentation is tomorrow. And there's really nothing of substance to share back here, this was more...

FRED BAKER: No, we had the conversation, and I think that's what's of substance.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, right. Any questions for Fred or myself? Alright, moving on. Kaveh, anything from the ICANN Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Basically there was nothing new. The BTC SI had a meeting and basically the DWG, the resolution to form the DWG asking work to form the DWG will be approved in the Board meeting tomorrow. So that's the only news. Today we have the meeting with the Board, there are three questions as we went through them yesterday for the threat mitigation. We will show the statements. We are not going to, I mean it's not yet voted on, so we will discuss and say this is what we are going to vote on and we assume it will pass. Is that enough for you now? Just to make sure all the loops are covered, all the holes are covered.

Then there is the DWG progress which I will work with Carlos to make sure we have some updates, but nothing out of ordinary, there is just the process moving forward. There is the question from the Board

which asked RSSAC, basically every constituency, what do they think about the three plans for the future of ICANN for the upcoming years, 2021 to 2025.

And as we discussed yesterday, our answer is we don't have any specific comment, individual members might want to comment, but just so you know, I already brought that back to the Board and Cherine, Maarten and Tripti, and basically they are the leadership of the Board, because Tripti is going to be the Chair of the Board Governance Committee, and Maarten is going to be the ICANN Board Chair, and Cherine is the current Chair. They all actually said they really expect RSSAC to also participate in this discussion, I'm just echoing that back.

So about the future of getting involved not only into the technical root related stuff but governance of the whole organization, budgeting, future plans, and their argument is the multistakeholder model works basically on each stakeholder participating in the whole game, not only focusing on their part. Because if we go like that, basically things like budget or policy related stuff will be controlled only by likes of GNSO, the GNSO singlehandedly would run the organization.

So dating is good that all stakeholders use their power and provide input. I think that discussion today will go in that direction and still we always have the right to say no, we want to focus on our work, but they really expect the constituencies to be more involved. Just so you know, that will be a bit of the discussion, I guess that will come up today.

BRAD VERD: Can I add a bit commentary, or my personal view? I feel that if we as a group RSSAC want to move to the empowered community, which I believe we do, we've talked about this, then I would echo exactly what they said. We need to be more involved and kind of, I'll just say more involved.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, so Cherine might, I don't know if she will or not, or Cherine or Tripti might actually show the slides they have on that, as well, because in the other constituencies where I sat, like for example today, they actually went through all the plans, high level, but it's still like what are the budget priorities, what are the organization strategic priorities, things like that, and they will discuss and get informal feedback. They might want to do that. So basically I guess if we dive into that item these things might come up. Just so you know.

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

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, really quickly, this is Wes. So it sounds like there's almost a list being formed of the ways in which we should be more involved right, or the concrete list of ways that we can participate better as RSSAC.

KAVEH RANJBAR: The thing is there is no shoot, there is no force, but there is some expectation at least from the Board leadership which is not written, it's not the rule of law, but it's basically what they expect. And I agree with Brad, if you really want to be more vocal, like be part of the community and maybe become SOs or something like that, we really need to show that we are participating. So it will be up to us, we can still say no, we don't want to, or this is not within our scope. I don't think anybody can push us to provide comments, but they really expect us to do that. And I think they will reemphasize that.

BRAD VERD: Well, and by the way, that's not entirely new, that came up in our review, as well. So the fact that folks would like us to emerge from our room, okay, I understand that. The thing that I would respond to it with, and I think the RSSAC would respond to it, maybe you can tell me that they wouldn't, is we do have a certain remit and whatever we say, whatever we do, is going to be related to that remit. And if the community in question, if they're talking about other topics, we may not have an opinion.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Fair enough. I just want to point out for example some of the groups very much are engaged into setting strategic points for ICANN, for ICANN Org and the Board. They're very active in providing those or prioritization or budgeting. I will just use GNSO as one of them, which are very active on that.

But for us, we can save your focus let's say on RSSAC's remit, but still if you have input on prioritization which might not be specifically only routes, it might be other stuff, but if we need those things in place before we can, or in order to have a proper root, or for financing, for budgeting, it might not be directly related to budgeting for RSS or for the governance, but it might be budgeting like making sure that the funds already draw enough reserve so we can do so. This is not clear cut into the remit but that's exactly I think what they want to say, that we shouldn't focus on exactly what's there, because part of this multistakeholder means each stakeholder actually plays the whole game, not only their own part of the game.

BRAD VERD:

I'm kind of echoing what you're saying, if there's a conversation about prioritization and we're not in there, then we get deprioritized. It's real simple. So just things to think about. Any further questions for Kaveh?

FRED BAKER:

One other thing that maybe should have been in the Co-Chair's report, I mentioned this the other day, but I met Xavier Calvez, the CFO at ICANN, he walked up and shook my hand and said I need your help, and by that, he means he needs your help. He's thinking about money for projects related to RSSAC37 and so on and so on, and I guess is going to have some meetings in Marina del Rey related to that, and he will want input from the RSSAC on those projects.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Fred. Any questions there? No, okay, moving on. RZERC report. The thing to report is that we have a meeting later today which is our annual meeting so the bylaws of RZERC say we have to meet once a year so this meeting is to cover that, and I will report next month what happens. SSAC, Russ, anything?

RUSS MUNDY: We had I think a quite successful joint meeting yesterday some followup actions that are still ongoing, but I don't think anything more to add than what we discussed yesterday, unless someone has questions or wants to raise any specific points. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I a conflict so I wasn't in that meeting, but my question is did we show the threat scan document?

RUSS MUNDY: We talked about the fact that SSAC is doing work on it and that there is a target to try to get somewhat closer alignment to the Board threat scan, and in fact there was a joint SSAC BTC meeting earlier in the week where that was discussed at length. So we did have a short discussion about it yesterday.

BRAD VERD: Were you looking for something in particular?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I just wanted to bring that up because I have seen that document from SSAC, I have lot of issues with the content, but content aside, I think that's actually a very good idea. It's basically a mind map of what they see and some of the result of your scope and they acknowledge that, it's basically this is in this environment, interesting for us. And I think it's good to have such a document also to align with the Board but also internally. So when I saw this I thought that can be very useful for RSSAC.

BRAD VERD: Well, I will say we didn't see the document, it was not shared and we have not yet seen it. My only feedback to them was that if you're looking at threads and whatnot, well it's a much narrower focus, but RSO had published a document about threats and mitigations for the root server system. But yeah, we haven't seen anything yet.

FRED BAKER: And I see we have an AOB, more is going to be discussed today about the RSSAC RSO.

BRAD VERD: Maybe whenever that document is able to be shared, you can share that with RSSAC.

FRED BAKER: Absolutely. There's a great deal of concern and hesitation on the part of SSAC with sharing it at this point, because it is what I would consider a very raw threat analysis without a whole lot of proper qualifications of things that are in it. But I think it's a very useful document and continue to work on it with the objective of making it available for the broader community.

BRAD VERD: Well, maybe if you could just take back to SSAC that we would like to take a look at it, that would be great.

FRED BAKER: Thanks Kaveh. Any other comments, questions? Okay, thanks.

BRAD VERD: Alright, next, IAB, Daniel, anything to share?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I don't have much, except that the IAB is considering to have to present for GWG, so things are being processed.

BRAD VERD: Great, alright, next is the IANA functions. Naela, anything to share?

NAELA SARRAS: I have no updates, Brad, thank you.

BRAD VERD: Any questions for Naela? No, okay, moving on. We have Root Zone Maintainer, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Nothing to report at this time.

BRAD VERD: Any questions for Duane? No, okay. Moving on, we have ATRT3 update. Is there a representative here? Ramet? No? Okay, moving on. Liaison to SSR2, Eric is not here. Okay, we will move on.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: This is Naveed, I just want to say that I'll be happy to answer any questions regarding SSR2, because I'm also on the...

BRAD VERD: Is there any update you could share?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I can share a quick update.

BRAD VERD: Sure, that would be great.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually we are in the phase of drafting the final recommendations so just this Sunday afternoon we presented to the community initial draft set of recommendations that cover four areas which are mandated by ICANN to the team. One of them is review of the SSR1, the second is ICANN SSR, the third is DNS SSR, and then an optional one which covers the future challenges related to the security stability and resilience.

So there are a few set of recommendations that are related to RSOs operations and RZM basically, so I can explain or read out these if you want, now or at some later stage. But we are still in the drafting stage and we hope to actually finalize and put the final recommendations for public comment early next year. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. Any questions? No, okay. Moving on, IANA Naming Function Review, I don't think Suzanne is here. Moving on to the next one. Liaison to the NomCom, Amir, please.

AMIR QAYYUM: Hi this is Amir, Ozan, can you display? This year's NomCom 2020 has been constituted and our initial meeting started on Saturday, so Saturday and Sunday were the full days where the operating procedures and the timeline for the nominating committee has been explained to everyone.

The new incoming NomCom members, there are seven positions this year to Board positions, one PTA Board position two ALAC regional positions from North America and Europe, one GNSO Council member, and one ccNSO council member. So these are the seven positions which will be filled by the NomCom this year.

An important thing which has been changed from previous years that usually the applicant has to apply till middle of March, but this year they are changing, in fact they have changed, and the application deadline will be mid February 2020, because they would like to utilize the Cancun meeting for the initial assessment of applications. Otherwise, it started after the March meeting. So this is the major thing.

Another thing is that RSSAC liaison to NomCom is a nonvoting position, like the SSAC liaison to NomCom. So, yesterday the three technical persons in the NomCom which was the RSSAC liaison, SSAC liaison and the IAB from IETF. So, Chris Roosenraad called the meeting, me and Peter Koch, we attended, because we can only advise, so we formulated a strategy to effectively give a technical opinion on certain aspects for the selection of NomCom members, particularly to the PTA Board, which is highly technical.

So, me and Chris Roosenraad are also part of the Interview Questionnaire Subcommittee, which will be formulating the questions so that the face-to-face interviews, the candidates can be evaluated in the face-to-face interviews in the meetings. So, we are trying to formulate a strategy so that an effective advice and technical insight

can be provided to the other nominating voting members so that while they're selecting the candidates, they can take the benefit of this advice.

BRAD VERD: Great update. Carlos, question?

CARLOS REYES: Amir, are there regional restrictions on the Board seats based on the bylaw requirements?

AMIR QAYYUM: Last year there was a requirement to select at least one member from Africa for the ICANN Board, but this year it is not, but the day before yesterday they told us that it is very much recommended to select at least one member from Europe, because the seats which will be the outgoing members of ICANN will make an imbalance for Europe this year.

It is not required because the requirement is that minimum one member from each region and maximum five members from each region on the Board. Last year there was a requirement to select one from Africa, but this year it is just highly recommended to us by the BGC, Board Governance Committee that one member from Europe, if possible, can be selected.

BRAD VERD: So, not a requirement, just a strong recommendation.

AMIR QAYYUM: Not a requirement. Because it also depends that other constituencies when they send their representative to the Board, that can also play a role.

BRAD VERD: Great, any questions, comments? It's my one comment, I hope that maybe they prioritize technical acumen over some of the geographic diversity, that's just my piece. Alright, moving on. The Fellowship liaison, Amir, also?

AMIR QAYYUM: Since 2018 I was also working for the Fellowship Selection Committee member and in the last two months with the other five selection committee members, we selected the candidates for ICANN67 in Cancun.

One of the things that I came to know was that there was an outreach and engagement working group in 2017 which formulated some of the recommendations for the fellowship selections and only ALAC has provided some fellowship selection targets and these are these eight diversity criteria, none of the other constituencies have provided any.

So if RSSAC would like to provide any targets, they can provide on these eight criteria. However, during the selection process I have seen

nowhere to prioritize based on these provided selection targets. So it is there, this document was there in 2018, only ALAC provided some input because they would like to have the regional diversity and the language diversity, and gender balance, younger ages, et cetera. So, they provided some of the targets. But I have not seen anywhere during the selection process that this input has been utilized effectively.

BRAD VERD:

Alright, any other questions for Amir on this? No? Okay, thank you Amir. Alright, Fellowship Mentoring Committee?

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah this is Naveed, this is the second meeting on this mentoring process with the changes in the fellowship program. So the process works as follows. There are five mentors from five different SOs and ACs, I am one of them. Each of them are assigned between six to eight mentees as fellows and the process starts two months before the meeting starts.

So it involves a lot of material sharing, initial share of information, like exchange of information, there's target setting objectives, and weekly online meetings connecting through different media, whatever is feasible between the mentor and the mentees and some onsite mentoring and guidance about which sessions to attend depending on the interest of individuals. So yesterday for RSSAC Caucus meeting I

invited a few of them and they were here to get an experience about how the RSSAC caucus actually works.

So there were quite a few of them available. At this time the unfortunate part was that I was assigned initially eight mentees, six of them got rejected as their visas to enter Canada, then I was given three more, and those three were also rejected. So actually onsite in my mentees out of 11, I could only get two of them.

But for others, most of them got actually diverted towards Cancun and because I will be their mentor again, hopefully, so I did not exclude them from role as mentor and I'm still guiding them with our weekly online meetings, but they are not here unfortunately. So that's all I have.

WES HARDAKER: One quick followup question to that, was it that they were actually denied visas or they did not complete in time? Do you have any idea?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: No, actually some of them got denied twice. So actually they were quite quick in responding, most of them got their replies of rejection in 10 days and one reason was almost common between all of them, though they were from different countries, that the Counselor does not think that they would leave the country after completing their experience of the meeting, so that was one of the reasons that is common between them. So, that was very unfortunate. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I had exactly the same experience, I was told visa was being refused for the ITF in Montreal.

BRAD VERD: Okay, any other questions? Alright. That concludes our reports from our liaisons and Co-Chairs. Did I miss anybody? Alright, let's move on to Any Other Business. So, RSSAC's statement on the threat mitigation of the root server system. We've been asked by the BTC, looking at Kaveh, we've been asked by the BTC and it was kind of echoed from Göran for us to identify and kind of endorse the document that has been published by the route server operators.

Fred and I have both kind of ask the question why this is needed. It seems like a formality and I go back and forth on whether or not we should do this, but it is not for me to judge, it is for you guys to figure out what we want to do. So, Andrew has provided a draft paper or draft document that we could send around for edits go through our normal process, vote on, and this would become an RSSAC zero-something and it would essentially endorse the document that has been published by the roots server operators. So, I will open it up for discussion. Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN: Quick question, I'm not clear, this would pretty much be the entirety of RSSAC00x? You're not going to include the document itself?

BRAD VERD: It's not our document, so yes.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Okay, and would there be a URL to the document? Or you're just going to call it the document? Okay, sorry, I didn't see that. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Matt?

MATT LARSON: I think publishing this makes sense, since the Board did ask RSSAC and RSSAC asked Root Ops, and then Root Ops did this, it seems to complete the circle for RSSAC to publish this and it seems mostly harmless, as they say.

BRAD VERD: Mostly, mostly dead.

FRED BAKER: You have a footnote on the threat mitigation, is that the link? Yeah, that's the link, so responding to you, Paul, the link is there.

DUANE WESSELS: So just a bit more on this, the second footnote is the actual document, the first footnote is a link to the transcript from ICANN61 with the RSSAC meeting with the ICANN Board, because I couldn't find like a specific ask from the Board where this was a bit more formal, so that's literally just a link to the transcript.

BRAD VERD: Got it. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: I agree that formality is sort of annoying but the reality is that we've talked many times in RSSAC about wanting the ICANN Board to be accountable and not make decisions just willy nilly and so this goes in with their transparency of doing everything above board with the information that was directly handed to them and not taking stuff that they didn't get from the community. So, we have to do this.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Wes. Anybody else? Anybody in the room? Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Just a quick comment. Some of the things I heard in feedback from the SSAC folks about the document coming from Root Ops, it would be I think viewed very positively by SSAC if there were something like this

from RSSAC that says we endorse this and it does sort of pull it into the ICANN community, since Root Ops is not formally part of ICANN.

BRAD VERD: Okay, great, thank you. Any other comments?

DAVE LAWRENCE: Dave Lawrence. So, Matt said mostly harmless, I think it was just a joke, but I'm curious, I'm not hearing any negative. What would the negative reason be to not do this?

MATT LARSON: For the record, it was a hilarious joke, and the room laughed.

BRAD VERD: Alright, so what I'm getting from the room is that this is a good thing, we should go forward with this, it completes the circle, and everybody's okay with that, yes? Alright, so this will go into our normal process, we'll send this out to RSSAC for review and edits, we'll look for a clean copy for seven days and we will probably vote on this in the December meeting, unless there's a bunch of dialogue and changes. Does that make sense? Alright, great, thank you very much. Back to the agenda please.

Alright, second bullet in Any Other Business is IANA. IANA has the Proposal for Future Root KSK Rollover document, I think it's about an

11 page document, and we as RSSAC need to make a decision on whether or not we want to comment on this or not.

Now, I will say that in the discussion with SSAC yesterday, we thought that it would be a good idea if maybe we could do a joint statement just a one-pager type of thing. So I guess I'm looking to the room here. Is there consensus that we should comment on this and endorse this, or are there challenges that we need to work out first? I guess I will interpret silence as no challenges.

FRED BAKER:

Just a suggestion, I know I haven't actually read this guy, you might give people an opportunity to do so, comment to the RSSAC list, and we can pull that together into whatever response we want to make.

BRAD VERD:

For those of you who were not in the room with SSAC yesterday, there is a timeline on this, it was going to be somewhere in December but now it's moved to the end of January, the comment deadline, so we just don't want to wait on this for too long, the clock is running. So if you could go back read the document, look at it, Staff can we take an Action Item to send a message to RSSAC asking for thoughts. Go ahead Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

I was just thinking, shouldn't we include caucus as well? Not a work party but also ask the caucus, give them a chance if they have any

comments which they want to be incorporated as part of RSSAC. I don't know, I'm just asking because we said we would like to do the administrative work in RSSAC and involve caucus, which are all members, for more meat of the work.

BRAD VERD: Should we ask the caucus? Objection? Yes. Okay, so we'll take that as an Action Item. Hands up, Naela.

NAELA SARRAS: Thank you. Kim is going to be discussing this proposal tomorrow at the DNS workshop. I think it's 1:30 to 3:00.

RUSS MUNDY: This afternoon, Naela. This afternoon, it's today, not tomorrow.

NAELA SARRAS: Oh, yes, today is Wednesday, I'm sorry. So yes, if you haven't read it please at least go, Kim will be going through the proposal this afternoon.

BRAD VERD: Great, the only commentary I'll add is that again yesterday in the SSAC reading there were a bunch of topics brought up about kind of what was missing, algorithm roles and whatnot, and I think the comment made in the SSAC meeting was this is not trying to boil the ocean, this

is the next step for operational experience, create a role type of thing. So, if there are comments that we want to start getting into that type of discussion, we'll have to make a judgment call on what goes in and what doesn't in our comment. Alright, so please go review the document. Any other comments or questions? Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So, just for my understanding, it's not yet clear if the RSSAC will be responding to this? But you would just like to see comments from the list, essentially.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, so let's put together, I mean, we can sit down and maybe in our admin meeting come up with what to ask, but essentially it's please review the document, if you have comments, if there are things that you think RSSAC should comment on, please share that, and we can aggregate that and try to come up with what our statement would be. I think the first statement would be, maybe we ask this in a question, is RSSAC in support of this, and should we put that in a one-pager, and then list whatever else is brought up on the mailing list as things that that should be covered.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay, thanks.

FRED BAKER: And Kim's presentation is this afternoon?

NAELA SARRAS: Yes.

BRAD VERD: In the DNSSEC workshop. Alright, if no other questions on that, is there any other business that we should cover that's not on the agenda? Alright, hearing none, our next teleconference is Tuesday, December 3rd. We will see you all there, or hear you all there on the phone. And with that, we are adjourned. Thank you. You can stop the recording.

[Part II]

DUANE WESSELS: Ozan, if you can maybe scroll down to like, I guess it's Section 7 now. So, Section 7 and 8 have been, we've been making some changes here in the last couple days. These are sort of around the recommendations. Previously this table of the summary of the thresholds, previously this was under the Recommendations section, so it appeared as a recommendation to the Board.

At this point we have taken it out of the Recommendations section and just listed it as a summary, so it no longer carries the weight of a recommendation, if you will, and even previously, it wasn't really

written as a recommendation. So that's been separated out. That's one thing to sort of point out and discuss, if necessary.

The other thing that I think we really need to talk about, if you can down to Recommendation 1 in Section 8. So, I feel like we don't have really consensus around this point yet, which is the extent to which the RSSAC recommends to the Board commissioning an implementation of the measurement system. So, you can see the current wording here, we're calling it a proof of concept. There are proposals to strike that and just call an implementation, or the implementation, so just go straight from, not have a proof of concept phase, and just go straight into implementation.

I feel like others, based on the some of the discussions we've had, I feel like others maybe even think that going to an implementation provided by ICANN is maybe premature at this point. So that's kind of the discussion I wanted to have today, if possible. Open it up if anyone wants to make a comment.

WES HARDAKER:

This is Wes, USC. I guess the way I would word it is that we believe that this should be set up soon, because it will help the measurement, blah, blah, blah, but to do it in a way that we believe will be able to be taken over by the performance monitoring function of 37 when that's instantiated. So I'm not sure I would use "preliminary" or something like that, but more like this is going to be useful immediately, but it should transform as a base piece for the future work.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, that's a good point, and I think I've heard that from other people, as well, so I like that. So, Russ? Oh, I'm sorry, Ken?

KEN RENARD: This is Ken. What do people think about the full public disclosure of this data before it goes to full implementation or not?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, that's kind of one of the, I think, the important questions that we need to think about. To me, a good reason to make this kind of recommendation now, is that we get this experience. We gain the experience of not only operating the infrastructure, but seeing what the results look like. And so the question is, if we do that, should these results have the same visibility as they will in sort of the final version, or is this something maybe we just sort of try to keep internally and use to advise the next version, I guess.

KEN RENARD: If this stays as a proof of concept, would be publish metrics that in theory could look bad, that aren't necessarily refined as the whole system, if it's just a proof of concept system versus a production system.

TOM DALE: Hi, this is Dale. I unfortunately have to run right now, but I did want to get in my opinion on I agree with Paul's suggestion. I don't actually know whether he was supporting it himself, but I would drop the proof of concept phrase. I think it implies a throw away-ness that is not really necessary here. I don't see, okay, maybe the first implementation will evolve from there, but it's still a pretty solid implementation base that we're starting with. It's not like a scientific experiment, or something. So, I would be in favor of removing proof of concept.

DUANE WESSELS: Alright, thanks.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I might have been the one that started this conversation, so I think we should remove proof of concept. I guess my question to you, Ken, is this is not new, this is not science, this is all stuff that's really well known, really well executed elsewhere on the internet. So if we're collecting systems and the data is just wrong, then we need to fix it, and that goes back to getting operational experience, we need to figure that out now, versus later. So, the data is out there, elsewhere. So I'm trying to understand the concern for having public data.

KEN RENARD: It's not a concern, it's just something I wanted to feel the room see what people thought about it.

BRAD VERD:

Okay, I think this should be a system that should be instantiated as soon as possible, so that we can start collecting data and possibly refine or evolve our measurements, once we know it, once we know what things look like. I stole a sentence from Jeff and I added it in Recommend 3, Bullet 4, it's keeping with the provisions of 37 and 38.

Maybe we move that up to the top. Maybe we just start the recommendation with that, because I think anything that comes out of this, any of the recommendations that come out here in the metrics party should not usurp 37 and 38, the work that will be done. That's never been the intent, and should just plug right in to 37 and 38, should it be implemented and finalized. Jeff?

JEFF OSBORN:

I agree with that. Something I'm wondering about here, this is sort of passive in Recommendation 1, where we're saying the Board should commission an implementation. This is a small industry. Somebody is going to put out an RFP or something, somebody is going to go ask somebody, I mean, somebody we know is going to do this. Should we be a little more directed and say a qualified so and so of type so and so should do this for some amount in some time period?

RUSS MUNDY:

I would suggest that maybe we have some discussions, Jeff, about what happened with SSAC and the NCAP project, because that more

closely resembles what I'm hearing you describe, and after trying to undertake such a thing, SSAC said, uh, no, it really shouldn't be detailed specification project managed by the advisory committee, that needs to be a Staff function. So I would suggest, not.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

This is Naveed. I wonder if we remove this, I agree removing the proof of concept, but I wonder if we remove the word, "proof of concept," then the essence of the whole Recommendation 1 would be lightened. Because it later says in the second part of the phrase, "to gather initial operational data and experience," so the idea of the proof of concept is exactly that, to gather the initial data and experience of the system. So I think if we remove that, then that should also be modified in a sense that it should be like a perspective kind of measurement system.

BRAD VERD:

You took that off of my list, thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

So, just so I understand, the proposal is to -- clearly there is no support for proof of concept, so we can take that out, but you're also suggesting to remove the last sentence, or keep that?

BRAD VERD: If I may, the "gather initial operational data and experience," I would say "gather operational data and experience," rather than just initial. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Yes, so the point with both the proof of concept and whether we release the data publicly, I think the thing that we're struggling around is that we don't expect the output to be perfect the first time. Half the point of it is to gather data for a while, so that we can see it, as we state in the document, we want to reduce stuff at some point in the future.

And I think the right way to do that is to label the output as beta, or some mechanism that says if somebody comes along and says we're going to make a decision on this and your data proves it, then we can say, look, this is still listed as beta until we come along with that. It's really the output that we care about more than the implementation, in terms of it being a prototype.

BRAD VERD: So, we'll look for some language from you on how to do that. My other comment going to what Jeff said about being directive, there is one directive piece that I thought that maybe we should put in there, and that is that the implementation should try to avoid cloud providers that current host root server operators to deploy the probes, because there's lots out there, there's lots out there, so it seems like that would just be, yeah, and we have Karl, and then Matt.

KARL REUSS: I was going to agree with Brad. I don't know if I would say cloud provider, but I think the location of vantage points is very important. I was playing with some RIPE ATLAS probes, or anchors, and used my anchor, and my numbers started looking really good, took mine out and used another North American one, it balanced out a little more fairly.

BRAD VERD: Matt?

MATT LARSON: I could see doing that if the intent were to choose a single cloud provider, but if we're going to have a diversity, I think it's all going to come out in the wash. This is going to be hard enough to do to get the geographic placement. If we start eliminating cloud providers, I think it's going to be harder.

WES HARDAKER: Let alone things are going to change over time, and cloud provider that may not be in use today could be used very, very soon after that.

BRAD VERD: If I could play devil's advocate for just a second, which is, if somebody were to ask me to go implement, let's just say I'm ICANN, and it says as soon as possible, please go deploy this in 20 locations geographically

diverse, blah, blah, blah, there's probably one or two providers I could very quickly choose that also serve root server operators that would, as soon as possible it would be deployed and I would be collecting data. Whereas if you had just a little bit of specification on there, then that could easily change, also.

DUANE WESSELS:

I still object to that, to constraining the cloud providers, because I think to get good geographic coverage, it would be a naïve implementation to go and try to do this with just one or two, I think we're going to need multiple cloud providers and we would want to do that, to spread it around. So, I object to limiting it to not include ones that have root servers. Because as Wes said, that could change tomorrow, which cloud providers do and don't host.

So, Brad, we do have some text in the document that might satisfy your requirement already. In Section 3.3, it says that vantage points within the same geographic region, so continent, or city, I think, no, continent -- vantage points within the same geographic region should use different connectivity providers if at all possible. So if VP Vantage Point #1 uses ISP #2 and Vantage Point #2 uses ISP #2, and so on.

BRAD VERD:

I guess all I'm asking is can that same sentence if all possible be applied to cloud. That's kind of what I suggested. But it sounds like no, absolutely not. Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

This is Paul Hoffman. Two things here. First if your concern is if we use a particular cloud provider that was already root server operator, you would get very short responses. What we found in the initial data that published in the earlier version of this draft, is even not using a cloud provider but being in the data center that seems to be close, got ridiculously low TTLs for some people. And that was specifically not using the cloud provider, but just being in the same data center. We got 1 and 2 millisecond round trips anyways. So I think that gets lost in the noise.

The other thing I would like to say though is if RSSAC recommends to the Board to commission implementation, that's the beginning of a hopefully short conversation, so that the implementation gets going, but I would assume, I'm trying to say this really carefully, but I would assume if the Board said yes and ICANN started to do this, ICANN wouldn't, the next step wouldn't be here's your implementation. The next step would be maybe this is a reasonable design of your implementation, does anyone object, we're moving forwards, and certainly position of those 20 would be part of that conversation.

BRAD VERD:

Well, that's not specifically called the recommendation, but yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: So, do we want to specifically call the recommendation that the design should go through some public review period? Is that what I'm hearing? I mean, that's usually the way it happens, right?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Two things. The first one regarding cloud, why is cloud an issue? Cloud to me is a business model, its not a technical implementation. Data center servers, yes, but cloud is when you build it into a business platform. So I don't really make a technical distinction between something that's implemented in the cloud or in a separate server somewhere. I do support Matt in his statement that we shouldn't limit this to a specific way of implementing it. We should specify the diversity that we need to see from it, and I think we have, already. What was that last thing, I had a comment about that...

DUANE WESSELS: About the public comment of the design?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Ah, yeah. I think the design should be open for comment. It should be published before hand, whether it goes through the ICANN version of a public comment or if it's open to comment some other way is not really essential to me. If it turns out that we run into extremely complicated processes for this, I'm open to have it some other way. But it seems that the public comment is not such a heavy thing, and then, why not?

MATT LARSON:

So, if we play this forward, what would happen is if the Board adopts this recommendation, it's going to turn around and ask the Org, which means asking OCTO, which means asking OCTO Research, which means asking me, and so that means that we will either have an RFP to find somebody to do it, or have Paul do it. And in either case, we can certainly work with RSSAC. Russ brought up the NCAP example.

In that case we definitely using a contractor, and Org worked closely with SSAC, we shared RFP documents ahead of time, worked on the statement of work, so there was a lot of collaboration, because in the case of NCAP, it doesn't make our life easier if we end up hiring a contractor to do something that's different than what SSAC wanted in the first place, so I see a lot of parallels between that.

So the point is it's not like this will be launched into the ether and what will come back will be the finished monitoring system, but there will absolutely have to be a dialogue to make sure that what ultimately ends up getting built and/or contracted is the right thing.

BRAD VERD:

And just for clarification, nowhere in there did I hear public comment between you and SSAC on design, SOW, and what not.

MATT LARSON:

Well, aspects of it were, but there's even a precedent for that. The definition of name collision went out for public comment. We opted

not to put the project overview document, I'm sure we can work that out, is the short answer. I don't fundamentally object to a public comment on the design. I think that's reasonable.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

This is Paul. Public comment adds a minimum of say 50 or 60 days, and I, boy, I hope this is not a career limiting statement, I don't see a purpose for that. I think having RSSAC look at it would be required, more than valuable. I don't see a value of that being out in a public comment because this is an implementation, this isn't the implementation, at least according to the wording we have here, this is an implementation for the benefit of RSSAC and the current RSOs to evaluate whether everything in this document is good, whether anything is need, and such like that.

If we aren't going to take this document out for public comment, which I don't believe we are, and I don't believe we should, I'm not sure that an implementation that is supporting this document would need to go out. But it certainly does need to be discussed with RSSAC, however it goes.

BRAD VERD:

Liman? And I think we're running out of time.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Liman here. That actually fits with my previous statement, public comment or some other way, because I would see RSSAC and

especially the extension of caucus as if not public, at least something where a wider audience has a chance to look at it. So that works well for me.

MATT LARSON:

So, after hearing Paul, I'm changing my tune, because I had neglected to think of how long the public comment would take. So if the desire is to get something up and running, a public comment just increases the time. But I'm not hearing any desire from anybody in here to say no, let's limit access to the design and limit feedback on the design. I just think an actual ICANN public comment is probably too cumbersome for this.

BRAD VERD:

Great. Really quickly, Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

This is Naveed. I wonder if we can just include in this recommendation with the involvement of RSSAC or in consultation with RSSAC, and implementation of such and such, that would clarify things. But on the public comment, I think from the transparency point of view, because on implementation the commission would require some resources, so there might be a requirement from ICANN to make it an open thing, and ask for involvement or other communities to comment on that. So that we should keep in mind.

BRAD VERD: Great, okay. One last comment from myself, just to clarify, because I feel like I was misinterpreted, but it was probably my fault. I was not suggesting limiting cloud providers in an attempt to exclude some, I was simply trying to apply the same philosophy we apply to network providers and whatnot that we've called out in the document to that. So, with that, Duane, it sounds like you've got direction to move forward.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, we do, thank you very much for the time. We're going to have an editing session tomorrow morning and we'll get these changes made.

BRAD VERD: Great. Alright, so this meeting is adjourned. We will see everyone at 2:30 in 517D with the joint meeting with the Board. Alright? Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]