
ABU DHABI – RSSAC Meeting
Wednesday, November 1, 2017 – 15:15 to 16:45 GST
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

BRAD VERD: Start with a roll call. So, from VeriSign is myself. USC?

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker and Suzanne Woolf.

BRAD VERD: Cogent? Anyone from Cogent online? All right. University of Maryland.

TRIPTI SINHA: Yes. Tripti Sinha here.

BRAD VERD: NASA? Do we have audio to the room? Kevin, are you there? We see you in the room, but we can't hear you if you're talking. All right, we will move on right now. ISC? Can you use a mic, please?

FRED BAKER: Fred Baker and Jeff Osbourne from ISC.

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: Thank you. USTOD.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Ryan Stevenson and Kevin Wright.

BRAD VERD: USARL? Is anybody online for them? Doesn't look like it. Moving on. NetNode.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Lars-Johan Liman.

BRAD VERD: RIPE NCC? Again, I see Daniel online but we're not hearing any audio yet. For those of you in the Adobe Connect room, you need to dial into the bridge for audio. That's what I'm being told here. Moving on. ICANN.

TERRY MANDERSON: Terry Manderson.

BRAD VERD: Wide. Hiro doesn't look like he is present. Moving on to our liaisons. IANA Functions Operator?

NAELA SARRAS: Naela Sarras.

BRAD VERD: Welcome. Root Zone Maintainer?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane Wessels present.

BRAD VERD: IAB? Not here. SSAC?

WES HARDAKER: There's a public SSAC meeting going on right now so Russ Mundy is not available.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, there's lots of conflicts. From the board, I don't see Kaveh here. He's probably on his way or in another meeting. And then the last two liaisons, CSC is Liman who has already stated he is here and then RZERC, which is myself. Great. So we have our

role call. Sounds like we just got some audio. Did somebody join the phone? [AUDIO BREAK]

Hello, Kevin. All right. So, the agenda. We will do some administration. We'll cover the last month's minutes. We'll talk through the Membership Committee. We'll move on to discussions, DNS Root Sources statement that we will discuss and vote on. We'll talk about Root Scaling request that has come in and we'll cover the SSR2 update. Then, we'll talk about travel support guidelines.

We will move into the concept papers that have been underway. We'll do some work updates on our ongoing work parties. We'll get liaison updates. We'll do any other business and then we will adjourn. So at this time, I'll ask is there any other business that we need to add to the agenda?

All right, not hearing anything or seeing anything in the room, let's get started with our administration. Kaveh, who has just joined the room, welcome.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

That's what I wanted to mention cover the arrangement, Kaveh Ranjbar RIPE NCC just joined.

BRAD VERD: Great, so let's do the last month's minutes. Doesn't look like Andrew will be doing that. Carlos, are you taking the lead? So, Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. Draft minutes from October 3rd were circulated two weeks ago and then again last week, but just quickly to review them here. All the action items were complete, obviously published the September 5 minutes. Those were also shared with the caucus. We informed the new caucus member, we announced him on the new caucus list, we published the triple zero version three. Ryan and Tripti finalized the DNS Root Sources statement, and there was an action item on Steve to capture the discussion on new gTLD subsequent procedures letter that we received from the GNSO and Steve summarized the history of RSSAC feedback on that. So, all the action items are complete.

BRAD VERD: Great. Is there any discussion on the minutes? Do I have a motion to approve?

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker moves.

BRAD VERD: Is there a second? Great, so Wes, motioned. Fred and Tripti both seconded it. Those were approved. We'll put down in the record and published. Moving on. Membership Committee update. Matt Weinberg is the Membership Committee chair. He is unable to attend this meeting but giving an update I think is, again, Carlos. So back to you.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. So, last month there was a new applicant for the Caucus. There are no applicants currently. As those of you here in Abu Dhabi know, yesterday I gave an update on the annual membership survey. So, at this point, the membership committee will consider all the feedback and responses from the survey and make recommendations to the RSSAC for next steps.

There were a variety of points that the Caucus members raised about the frequency of meetings, location of meetings, and just general input on the work flow between the Caucus and the RSSAC. So, the membership committee will meet, discuss that feedback, and make recommendations to this group.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you, Carlos. Any questions or comments that we should take back to the committee?

All right. Hearing none, let's move on. Looks like Daniel made a comment there. Looks like we have audio in the Adobe room now. All right. So, moving on. Discussions. At the top of our list is the DNS Root Sources statement which we've spent some time on, and I'm going to turn this over to Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Brad. Carlos, could you display that on the screen? So, just to remind everyone, this was a topic that we discussed at Workshop number four, I believe. Yes. The essence of what came out of this discussion was that there are three locations where the identities of Root Server Operators reside, and that would be the Root Hence File, the Root Zone, and the RootServersdotNetZone, and that this essentially identifies a Root Server Operator and conversely the inclusion of such information is a reverse lookup on who the RSOs are.

There was a request at the last meeting to no longer specifically refer to PTIs, so we made that adjustment, Naela, per your request. This was presented to you two weeks as a stable document. So this is now in front of you for approval. Any discussion? All right. So this is being presented to the

community as a statement of fact, so I'm putting a motion on the table to get this approved.

RYAN STEVENSON: I'll second.

TRIPTI SINHA: Thank you, Ryan. You want to run the motion?

BRAD VERD: Sure. Any opposition to the approval of this document and publishing it as an RSSAC paper? No. Hearing not any abstentions.

WES HARDAKER: We do have quorum, right?

BRAD VERD: Yes. Daniel raised your hand. Daniel, can you hear us? We're asking for audio to get turned up, Daniel. We can barely hear you. Just a second. Can you try it again, Daniel? I think I'm hearing him on somebody's laptop. [AUDIO BREAK]

If you're not dialed into the bridge, we don't have audio in the room for you other than you in the Adobe Connect. So, do you

want to share your opinion with Kaveh, and Kaveh can share your thoughts with us here in the room? Daniel?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. He's typing in. He says what I said in email. Give me a minute, please. [AUDIO BREAK]

Yes. So, Daniel's point is basically there is no explanation of the motivation or the purpose of this document, and because of that he thinks the proper vote is no vote.

BRAD VERD: So that's a no vote for Daniel, correct?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Except if there's an accompanying motivation or [inaudible] which is going to be open to all of us.

BRAD VERD: Just for clarification, we have...

KAVEH RANJBAR: For this piece of text, [inaudible] modification or adding motivation, then the vote is no.

BRAD VERD: Okay, so we have a no from K?

KAVEH RANJBAR: From RIPE NCC.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry, from RIPE NCC. Old habits die hard. But thank you for correcting me. Any other objections? No, hearing any abstentions. No. Okay. So, we have a quorum and we have enough votes, that has passed. Great. Thank you all very much. Let me pull the agenda back up now.

Moving on. The RSSAC has received a -- can somebody mute their computer? Great. So we received a request from the GNSO regarding the number of changes to the Root Zone that happened as a result, or was the result of the Root Scaling Study back in 2010. We are drafting up a statement that we will be sharing with the RSSAC here in the very near future. I will also add, that as most of you are present, we will be working closely with the SSAC to make sure that both their statements and our statements are in alignment, but there is much discussion to be had on this, and the due date is not until January, I believe, so we have some time, but that is happening. Is there any

questions or anything further we want to talk about on that right now? All right, nothing from the room. I can't monitor both.

Moving on. The SSR2 review, that has been happening. So, the bylaws as far as the reviews go state that each of the SOs and ACs are given three slots to appoint people into. Those people represent themselves and not necessarily the group that they're appointed from. We have appointed two people to the SSR2 team and one of those persons resigned, maybe almost two months ago, a little over a month ago maybe, so we just want to state for the record that we want to thank Kathy for her service and appreciate her value add. So, that leaves us with two slots that have not been filled. We will be going back and reviewing our process to see if there will be any appointments going forward. Any discussions? Kaveh, anything you wanted to add?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Formally, I'm the board delegate to SSR2, but I can just report back. Generally, just for the record, the board had sent multiple letters to the SSR2, one late June and one which we might have been interested to read is 3rd of October. We can find it on the ICANN correspondence page, the letter from 3rd of October from the board to the SSR2 team. Basically, the board was worried about the scope of the team.

Earlier this week, Friday, Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board met with SO and AC chairs, and informed them that the board is intending to pause the review and asked the committee to see if they need adjustments to the team because of scope issues and because of composition and possible competency issues. None of the chairs objected, so the board issued a letter to pause the review. The review right now is paused. The letter also instructs the team to conduct their engagements throughout the week because they had many engagements with basically all SOs and ACs, which they also did one with RSSAC and used the Friday session which they had planned to go through the engagements and summarize them, but do not take any other action until there is results from SO and AC collective to see if any adjustments are needed or not.

Right now, this is happening. I know there is a meeting planned for SO and AC chairs for tomorrow with the SSR2 team and the board to see how they want to move forward. Basically, ensure the ball is in the court of the community. If they want to continue with the team as is, they can and board will resume the review. If not, some adjustments will be made.

So, the board considers their scope and also the commitment and time. Many of the team members are putting a lot of effort in that, but there are multiple causes that only one or two

people are joining so maybe there is a resource issue. This is one of the points we have asked the committee to look into, and depending on the outcome of tomorrow's meeting, either the work will be resumed or after some adjustments, it will be resumed. So, this is the current status.

Personally, I think if the work is going to continue, it's good to have, if we can, make use of our three opportunities to make appointments and appoint three people so the team has enough energy to move on because these organizational reviews are important for ICANN and for the board, for the whole community to make sure ICANN is actually doing the right thing in security and stability and resiliency right now.

BRAD VERD:

Any questions for Kaveh? I'll add to it. Yes, there is a meeting tomorrow with the SO/AC leadership, the board, and I guess the SSR2 team now. There is also, for the benefit of the former RSSAC committee, there is discussion between the SO leaderships of making a statement to the board. Drafting of that statement is underway, so I would ask you following this meeting and over the next 24 hours to watch your email as there might be an emergency vote on approval of that statement. So, please just keep that in mind and be available. So, with that

stated, is there any more comments or questions? [AUDIO BREAK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Dumb question. So this group would be asked to have a vote?

BRAD VERD: It's a unique situation. So, we as chairs, we don't want to misrepresent the RSSAC, but the bylaws put the -- and I'm going to quote this wrong so I don't want to quote it, but the board has asked the SO/AC leadership to step in and figure out what needs to be done to unpause the SSR2, and so there's a statement being put together, a very generic statement, of accepting that task -- is that fair to state -- with some other commentary that I would share with you guys.

So, I guess, for discussion, my question is, is that something that the RSSAC will put in the hands of the chairs, or is it something that you would much rather like to see and vote on? That's up for discussion. I did not want to assume the responsibility, so I am asking.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'll go first and say I think you guys had the organization, you certainly have our faith and backing as one random vote.

BRAD VERD: So with that it sounds like maybe, is there any objection to us working on -- again, this is going to be from all seven SOs and ACs. It's not just from RSSAC, so you can imagine it's not going to be very specific to the different constituencies. It's going to be very generic in that sense, but very specific towards SSR2 and what the board has asked. So, if there aren't any objections, then Tripti and I will work on that. We'll certainly share it with you, but it doesn't sound like we need a vote on that.

FRED BAKER: That's my view.

BRAD VERD: Any objection? Great. Thank you. Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Just as a quick background. The reason the board has come back to the SO/AC chairs, the bylaws specifically assign the appointment and composition of the teams to the SO/AC chairs, so that's where that issue stands.

BRAD VERD: Great. Moving on. Community Travel Support Guidelines. Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: Thanks, Brad. So, in another hat within the organization, I'm working with the executive team on revisions to the guidelines that the ICANN organization uses for community travel support. This is a fairly new topic for RSSAC. Only in the past three years or so has RSSAC opted to receive funding. As you know, in the last fiscal year, we went from five supported travelers to six. That number seems to be working for this group, but for the purposes of this process, the guidelines that determine how these travel resources are allocated have not been updated since 2013.

This is something that actually used to happen annually but it was paused because of the IANA Stewardship transition. So now that we've made it over that transition, the guidelines are up for revision again. So, the process moving forward, there's a questionnaire. I'll work with the co-chairs on sharing it with the group here at the RSSAC. For any of you that have received funding in the past or currently receive funding, or if you think you may receive funding in the future, I definitely encourage you to take a look at it. We're trying to gather as much feedback about the guidelines and what works and what doesn't work in

travel support, so any experiences you may have would be helpful.

We'll take all of that feedback, compile it and then send it back so that I can then go back through all the feedback from the groups to get a sense of what's working for the guidelines and what's not working with the guidelines. So, I just wanted to raise that here for those of you that have participated in that past. Definitely open to individual feedback. Feel free to approach me about that, and if not, the group will probably review the questionnaire in December and from then on, I'll take it into the broader process.

BRAD VERD:

Great. Any questions around the travel support? All right. Moving on. Number six. Concept Work Papers. We just want to do a quick update of the on-going work that's going on within RSSAC. And we're going to start with the Stakeholders paper. Fred, I believe you're giving us an update on that.

FRED BAKER:

Sure, so this is actually discussed, of course, in RSSAC29, but the question is who can hire us, who can fire us, who are interested parties that have a vested interest in the operation of the Root Zone. We wound up deciding that from a governance

perspective, the IAB/IETF and the ICANN community and the other RSOs are those stakeholders.

BRAD VERD:

Great. Thank you for sharing that. I would like to echo what Fred said. This is follow on work to the recent RSSAC29 document which is the workshop report that's been posted, so if anybody needs more feedback or more background, they can go check that out there. Moving on. What's listed here is the Root Server Association. Ryan, do you want to talk about that?

RYAN STEPHENSON:

So, the Root Server Association concept paper is still in development, and the Root Server Association itself will be a secretary/administration function to the Root Server Operators. So, this is one thing that we need to capture within the paper, and explain verbiage for. That's about it.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, Ryan. Moving on we have a section on these papers called Root Server Operators, which Wes, you're heading up?

WES HARDAKER: Correct. The text that is in 29 is actually quite good in terms of filling out that group. There's some clean up that we discussed about adding pulling text from other documents to define what a Root Server Operator really is and putting that as an introductory text because right now, it kind of skips the actual definition so that's really all we have to do.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you, Wes. The Strategic Architecture and Policy function was headed up by Matt Weinberg. He is not here, as I stated earlier, so I believe Steve Sheng, ICANN staff is going to give us a quick update there because he's been supporting that group.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you Brad. Strategic Architecture and Policy function, or the SAP Function, is to offer guidance on those matters concerning the DNS Root Service. We have prior to ICANN60, we circulated a paper to the RSSAC and we had an extensive discussion in one of the work sessions, so we have the action item to take that feedback and also to integrate it into a paper.

At a very high level, the feedback received regarding further work on this strategic versus architectural stream, and also some additional text on the composition and manifestation of

the function. So those are kind of the high level feedback we received, but we will go through the recording and integrate the comments from the discussion to the paper. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Steve. Moving on. The performance metrics and accountability function. Lars, are you going to speak to this one?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, a little. We have this performance monitoring and accountability function. The things we've been fiddling with are the exact role and also the relationship with the other functions that we are trying to outline in this entire concept, and there is more wordsmithing to do here, but in general, I think we're in pretty good shape here. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Lars. Terry, you're going to talk about the Designation and Removal function that is being worked on.

TERRY MANDERSON: Yeah. The Designation and Removal Function paper is seeing good progression, and based on discussions this week, further

updates need to occur in three directions: the composition of the committee, trigger points and interactions for the functions with other functions, and then the inputs and outputs of the function. A version that incorporates these should be available in about a month.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Terry. Finally, a finance function is being developed. Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA: So, in our discussions this afternoon, or today rather, we all agreed that we will continue with the decoupling of how the service is architected and offered versus the funding and recognizing that a funding model would be put in place. Some would partake of it, some would not, and appropriate agreements would come with those, with the funding. The paper will be updated with that content. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Tripti. All right. Any further discussion on those updates? Any questions? Not seeing any in the room or on the Adobe Connect room. We'll move on to work party updates. So, these are just quick updates of what's going on within the work

parties run by our leaders as listed here. The first one is the Distribution of Anycast Instances Work Party. Kaveh, do you have a quick update?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No progress since the last update. I think there is still -- Steve correct me, is waiting for staff to finalize the document and then publish it and wrap up that work party, go back to the caucus.

STEVE SHENG: Yes, my apologies. That is still action on staff. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you. An ongoing work party right now is the Harmonization and Anonymizing Procedures Work Party. Lars, do you have a quick update you can share?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, there is a first version. It's not submitted as a draft version to this entire group, but there is a first cut of the document and it's been shared on the work party list. It has received some useful and some substantial comments from John Heidemann at USC, and those will be incorporated into the document. The next steps are to try to get more input from more people.

There will also be a test bed constructed in order to try out various types of anonymization algorithms to see what possible effects they have; good, bad, useful, what have you. And then from that, construct the next generation of the paper.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Lars. Moving on. Packet size work party. Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, so as the work party shepherd for this, I can tell you that there's been no progress since the last update other than the work party is going to try to meet in person in Singapore during the IATF meeting. We're looking for a spot to have a meeting in one of those days. That's it.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you. And then lastly but not least, tools. Wes.

WES HARDAKER: Thank you, Brad. I've already recapped the tools that are in the repository twice this week in other meetings, so I won't reiterate that here. We have three in total though. I heard from at least one person that based on our presentations earlier this week

that we might get another one or two coming in the door so that would be a wonderful thing, but that's about it.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you very much. Any questions or concerns around the work updates? Fred.

FRED BAKER: A quick comment to you, Duane. There were, at this IATF meeting, a couple of rooms that you can walk up and reserve. So you should be able to get one of those.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I think it's too short notice at this meeting, and not all the work party members are here, but yeah, thank you.

BRAD VERD: All right, moving on with the agenda, we'll do the liaison updates. Kaveh, do you want to go first? Any updates from the board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, very quickly, there is nothing much. There are many resolutions coming up but the only one which might be related,

and I gave a hint at the SSAC meeting as well, RSSAC/SSAC meeting, is a resolution that the board might pass. It might present in the formal board meeting tomorrow, I think, 6:00 to 8:00 or 6:30 to 8:00, and the resolution is about home court mail and also other possible collision names, so this, just so you know, there is a request from community to delegate these names but because there are security concerns which have been raised before, we've received a sizeable amount of traffic already, there have been some concerns.

So, the board is proposing in that possible resolution to ask SSAC to liaise with all related technical parties and it names ITF and other technical bodies, to look into the issue and come back with a report to the board, plus a timeline and how they are going to move forward so the board can make a final decision on that. The resolution doesn't mention RSSAC, and I didn't ask for it to mention RSSAC, because, at least to my understanding, it's not directly an RSSAC issue, but we can make sure that SSAC talks to us and gets feedback from us. I think that is already what they have mentioned.

But if you really think we need to give direct feedback on that to the board, first of all, we can always do that but if you want us to be part of that resolution, I can make that happen. Personally, I don't see the need, and again, another benefit of having SSAC,

because they are technical, but if we can actually talk to them in our language, they will send a consolidated report back to the board. But if anyone in RSSAC feels we need to be named directly in that resolution and be directly in touch with the board about that specific issue, please let me know and I can make sure that ends up in the resolution.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, Kaveh. Any questions for Kaveh? All right, moving on. Our CSC liaison, Lars, any update from the customer standing committee?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

No. Not really. Not much is going on there which is as it should. We do receive the periodic reports from the PTI and they have been increasing standards, starting up very high, and are now excellent.

The thing the CSC works on right now is to find a way to feedback into the community that there is need for certain changes in the service level expectations because some of them are not quite well designed as they are, which we kind of learned from experience as we go, so the work is on constructing a feedback loop there so that SLEs can be changed without having

to go through the full motion of modifying the contract, so that's the work.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, Lars. I will give an update real quick on the RZERC, the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee. The procedures document is done and published and right now the committee is spending time running through scenarios to help the committee and potentially anybody looking at the committee show what the scope of work would be, so they're running through scenarios on what would be in scope and what would be out of scope.

There's a list of hypothetical scenarios and we're discussing through them and making progress, and they had their first public meeting today. So, if you want to look at that, there was a slide deck that you can pull up and look at also. Moving on, IANA Functions operator. Naela.

NAELA SARRAS:

Yeah, thank you, Brad. A quick update from the IANA Functions operator. As of October 2017, literally before we headed to this meeting, we've added new DNSSEC algorithm support to the Root Zone Management system. This is the system that our customers interface with to provide change requests.

So, this has been a request from the community to include support for new algorithms, particularly associated with elliptic curve cryptography, so we added three new algorithms and two new digest types that the customers can use. So, what that means is that TLD operators, as of right now, can submit change requests to include these new algorithms in their delegation for their TLD and the Root Zone. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Great, thank you, Naela. Any questions? Alright. Root Zone Maintainer. Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Nothing new to report.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you, and our IAB and SSAC members are not here, so Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Just, can I go back to the possible resolution that the board might pass? I can read a bit of the text from that just so you know.

BRAD VERD: Please.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah, so it says, "The board would request SSAC to conduct these two studies," and I will tell what are these two, "in a true and inclusive manner that includes technical expert groups, such as members of ITF working groups, technical members of GNSO and other technologists to present data analysis on points of view and that this study be conducted in a timely fashion," and then the rest is the work. The two studies, one basically is the home court mail and the other one is more generic to set a baseline for making these decisions.

There are nine questions specific. If you need, I can go through them, but they are like, "Define what is collision," and so the harm that existing users may occur if collision strings were to be delegated, possible courses of action that might mitigate harm, factors that affect potential courses of actions to mitigate the harm, potential residual risk of delegating collisions, collision strings, suggestive criteria for determining whether an undelegated string should be considered suggestive criteria for determining whether a collision string should not be delegated and measurements to protect against intentional or unintentional creation of these situations.

So, this is where RSSAC is not named by name, but I think it's very clearly implied that SSAC will talk to us. Engage with us.

BRAD VERD:

Okay, any questions for Kaveh? All right. That brings item number seven to a close. We'll move to number eight, which is any other business. Is there any other business that we need to discuss? Terry?

TERRY MANDERSON:

ICANN as a Root Server Operator is keenly aware of GDPR, so with noting that we have a work part on harmonization of anonymization of data, is it possible for the work party to send the root server operator team in ICANN a copy of the work to date so that we may commence efforts toward compliance of GDPR?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I'll take that as an action item and see what can be done. The answer is probably yes.

TERRY MANDERSON:

Thank you and please let me know.

BRAD VERD: The harmonization of anonymizing procedures work party does not define compliance for GDPR. I just want to make sure that's clear.

TERRY MANDERSON: It's very clear, but I have data, I've published sets of data, and I have a wonderful, enthusiastic legal team that would like to see compliance met.

BRAD VERD: Great. Wes.

WES HARDAKER: So likewise, Terry, if you're able to export any of that analysis by the legal team for the rest of us to review and pass to our own staff to decrease our own analysis time, that would always be a wonderful thing.

TERRY MANDERSON: I'll see what I can pull out of legal, but at this present time, it's really about data that is published into the public domain, meaning collection data for DITL and so on and so forth. It goes to DNS [inaudible], data that stays within the organization within its boundaries is generally okay, from what I can

understand, please don't quote me. I'm not a lawyer, and I don't pretend to play one, but any data that goes out, and to date, we have not -- when we've participated in DITL, we have not anonymized any data. So, if we do publish data in the future, we expect it to be anonymized to find ourselves in compliance with GDPR.

BRAD VERD: Lars.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Lars Liman here. It just struck me, for the actual DNS data in the Root Zone, it's published by the Root Server Operators, but the Root Server Operators don't see themselves as responsible for the content.

Now, in a strict GDPR sense, I'm not sure that all the responsibility can be removed from the Root Server Operators which means that now my question, so we need to create a legal back channel from the Root Server Operators towards the source of the information so that we can send the responsibility back to where it will belongs? I hate myself for asking this questions, but I didn't invent the GDPR.

BRAD VERD: Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: But as a European, you sent people to parliament who made that. I'm joking. So, having had to sit through many work sessions about GDPR listening to lawyers, what I can say for sure, this is really not something for us to decide because there are very specific definitions of data control and things like that, and you really need legal experts and they don't need anything other than that.

So, I think the best thing is for each individual operator to decide and get their own legal advice because anything, even friendly advice can be a liability even I hear. So, seriously, my strong suggestion is to get legal advice, and this is what I suggest my organization to do.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I hear you and that's good advice. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: I think I will add just for the record again two things. One is that harmonizing and anonymizing procedures work party is not defining compliance, so by doing what they've recommended,

you are not in compliance. Compliance is for each individual operator to figure out.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That is completely clear. I'm not suggesting it is compliance. I'm using the processes for anonymization from that as a part of the steps towards me being compliant, what might be compliant, because I don't think anyone really understands what compliance is just yet.

BRAD VERD: The second part of that statement I was going to say that if you're developing tools to anonymize your data, it would be great to share it back and put it into the repository.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Everything we develop goes into the public domain.

BRAD VERD: Great. Thank you. Any other discussion on that? Any other business we need to bring up before we adjourn? Seeing none, I hear none and I see none in the Adobe Connect room. With that, I will adjourn this meeting and thank you for your time, have a wonderful afternoon.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you and there is a TEG meeting and cocktail. I think all of RSSAC is invited. Technical Experts Group. Hall 4 in an hour from now.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, all.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think 6:30 and after that, there are shuttles to take us to the cocktail.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]