
PANAMA – RSSAC Work Session (2 of 5)
Wednesday, June 27, 2018 – 09:00 to 10:15 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

BRAD VERD: Alright, good morning. We are here today to talk about the anonymization process for source IP output that came out of the working group and have any discussion around that. And then I believe that somewhere around 10:00 AM -- is that -- NomCom is going to come in here and give their brief rundown, their briefing of what's going on. I don't know what's on their agenda, if anything. Yeah, they just update us on what's going on. So that's what's going on now and I think Liman do you want --

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sure. So, for the people online, this is Lars Liman, I am the shepherd for this work party, this work. So, in March last year we gave the caucus -- we asked the caucus to look at whether anonymization of IP address data in collected data -- not statistics, collected, primarily collected queries was a good idea and the statement of work actually contains three parts in the scope and that's to consider whether harmonization is something to recommend to the Root Server Community and if so, whether they recommend a preferred way to specify algorithm and procedure to that one, and finally to consider

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.

whether or not to recommend that anonymization be undertaken by all who submit data.

And the reasons here because anonymization is seen as necessary by some providers of data and this was a question to the -- a wider community whether it is important that this done in the same way so that researchers and such can compare data between various data sets provided by different providers of data. So, the working party working on this, it's been a very small looking group. It's been mainly two-three people who have contributed the major part of it; John Heidemann, Paul Hoffman was the document editor -- John Heidemann has contributed a lot and there are a few others who have contributed as well.

You've all had access to this document for a while, I would, my personal comment is that it seems to contain a fairly detailed analysis of various methods to accommodate, to accomplish this anonymization, so that's a good thing. That said, it doesn't really answer the questions that we asked -- it has provided a lot of input, but it hasn't answered the questions we asked that are the three statements I read before. So, the general question on the table is how do we move further with this document? I think I personally lean towards publishing this document as it is because this is the work of the caucus, this is what they want to

present to our outer world and in line with what we've said before that we shouldn't interfere with this unless it's really important.

So, I think I would prefer publishing it as it is because it still contains a lot of good information and there are recommendations in there that are useful and if we are still not happy with this, maybe go for another round or back up ourselves and have a discussion about what -- if we as a group want to provide recommendation to the other operators and other providers of collected data. Brad.

BRAD VERD:

I'm just going to ask kind of the obvious question, is -- do we know why they were unable to answer the questions or were they the wrong questions?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

To be honest I don't know. I kind of have a feeling that they're relation to us is the same as what we have with the board. When the board asks for comments on rolling the root key, we are not quite happy to get a go. We want to provide the information for

someone else to take the decision and I have a feeling that this is the same type of relation we have here.

BRAD VERD:

So, Paul Hoffman, and I don't think we have Mike yet, but Paul Hoffman in chat said that we discussed that they were the wrong questions? Paul, do we know what questions should have been asked? And the reason I kind of ask that is because it feels like if we're going to publish it, we should state that going through this we figured out that it was the wrong questions asked, really good information here, good data, we want to publish this and share this, but we've also identified that these were the right questions to ask, sort of thing.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Absolutely, yes. So Paul, do you have a back channel to us except for chat?

BRAD VERD:

He started typing.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Oh, okay.

BRAD VERD:

While he's waiting -- you know we've had other discussions surrounding this topic and I think one of the conclusions we came to is that it was difficult to come to a recommendation because it was sort of one of those triangular problems where you have to pick between three options and there's no perfect solution.

And the goal was to get the options published and then possibly pass it to researchers that care and give it to -- and try to get external feedback outside the caucus from academic or other researchers that might you know pass it to DNSR or pass to other people and say, you know, 'we need more input to actually weigh the options here against each other'.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

My take is that from the outside, that our hope would occur inside the caucus, but we obviously don't -- we haven't been able to reach out to researchers and they are not part of the caucus to the extent that we hoped. And so, the next question is, how do we reach out to these researchers in this case? I'm still looking forward to it, I'm positive to it, I'm just looking for next steps.

BRAD VERD:

So, again, I think -- Paul is still typing here but the -- if the group wants to publish the document, I'm fine with that I just want to frame the document that if it's being published -- because we give advice to the board so the board didn't ask us this question, we think it's a valuable question so we were trying to not -- we were trying to be good stewards and address this before the question got asked.

So, we need to kind of put that in context when we publish the paper, you know, saying, we as RSSAC believe that ultimately there will be a question of how we should share data in the future, here is the different ways of anonymizing it. We don't know the best way because, as you just said Wes, there's three things and they all have to align and it really -- it's a situational thing, you know? So, we gotta word that, you know, we put the reader in context I think.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I agree.

WES HARDAKER:

I'm sorry. Paul responded. You know Paul, you can call my cell phone and I could put you on speakerphone on the microphone if that's a fallback? We cannot -- he said, 'we cannot decide the data for the data providers what their security priorities are'.

And that's a very valid point, right? I think he's spot on there, I mean how can somebody else make a decision if each one of those weighted three parts of a triangle bring different security properties? And that does make it hard to recommend.

So, I think if we include text -- you know interestingly enough, I've actually shifted my position. When I initially read this I was disappointed because a recommendation couldn't be made and I'm like, but we need one, you know? That was the whole point. But after thinking about it over time, I get it, I understand why they couldn't come up with that recommendation. So, I think that we have to do just what you said, Brad, and include texts in the front that says -- we've already done this once right?

The Root Name Server's signing you know rootservers.net, was sort of a similar thing. A significant amount of really good work come out that was completed that didn't come to a conclusion -- they narrowed it down and we probably need to revisit that one too. This is another example of that, you know, the problem's harder than we thought we gave them. That's not their fault.

BRAD VERD:

Just thinking through the actual process of submitting advice to the board -- if this got submitted, obviously this goes into the advice tool and then obviously there would be no action for the

board here. So that's why I think we need to put that context in there.

WES HARDAKER:

Quoting Paul again because he's typed again. He said, 'I heard offline from three different RSSAC's that they would not share their secret with others and that's one of the critical triangle points.'

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

And just to give it a bit of context -- one of the methods includes having a shared secret key when you anonymize the data. So, I guess that is what Paul is talking about here. Paul chimed in again. Back to what you said Brad, I don't see this document as advice to the board -- not every document we do is for the board.

So, it would potentially have contained advice to the root server operators but in its current form it has a number of recommendations but none of them is a solid instruction or request to the root server operators but there are definite recommendations that are very good for the root server community and other contributors to have a look at. A comment from Paul here in the chat that 'all methods have that

key'. Then that changes his mind, sorry I'm wrong. The new bullet three to four doesn't have a key.

BRAD VERD: So, who has the pen on the document? I mean, is there any modifications that need to give the context or is it fine as it sits?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: The document has been submitted to us, the committee. So, I interpret that as Paul considers he's done, and Paul you're quite welcome to contradict that, but that's the impression I have. And I think the document is good to go. I do hear you about setting a bit of consistent framework around that, so that could possibly be a section at the end: comments from RSSAC during publication or something like that. And in that case, I suppose I am the one with the pen and that could probably contain the comments you had about you know not asking the right questions and that part. So, if you want I can undertake two suggestions there.

BRAD VERD: That was a suggestion from me, it's what the group wants.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well I think you are quite right, that we need to create that container for the document. And I would suggest that adding that context in a very specific way, you know, the box at the end saying these are the thoughts from RSSAC we published. But would you be okay with that, Paul Hoffman?

PAUL HOFFMAN: So, can you folks hear me now?

BRAD VERD: Welcome, Paul.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Hello. Can you folks hear me? Was that a yes or a no?

BRAD VERD: That was a yes.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Okay, very good. Sure, I would be okay with -- I mean look it's your document, so you get to do what you want. I would be okay with that and I would also be okay if you kicked it back to us to in fact wind those concerns into the front of the document. Say, 'we started with these questions, we came to the

conclusion we couldn't answer them for this and this reason' and then have the rest of the current document if that's what RSSAC likes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is Liman here. I think that's an even better idea. I didn't dare suggest that to you to undertake more work on this document but if you offer to do that, thank you and I think that's an even better idea, thank you.

WES HARDEKAR: And specifically, this is Wes, Paul -- it's not RSSAC's document, it's the caucus' document, you guys did the work, so if you're willing to take on that and continuing editing it to take on the shape where we just publish it, that's exactly how it should be done. It's a caucus output and it's fantastic.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Sure, since I'm the main editor, I'm fine. And Wes, not to disagree with you across time zones, but if you look at your Adobe Connect screen you will see that in fact this document will come out saying RSSAC OXX -- there's nothing about caucus there so everyone will view this as an RSSAC document, and I

would expect that we should bang it into shape so that it looks like an RSSAC document.

WES HARDEKAR: That's a valid point and that's actually something we should consider tomorrow during the operational procedures because credit needs to be given where it's due and I know the final section says who worked on it and it's the RSSAC caucus but you're right that the top-level labeling does not adequately reflect that. Good point.

BRAD VERD: Alright, so Paul, you will take this back to add some context in the front for the readers and kind of how we got here and share it again, because I think this is on the agenda for the July vote which is the 10th. So that's not far away, we need to probably take care of this rather quickly if possible.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Do you want me to initiate the words about what RSSAC wanted or does one you want to start those, and I'll wind them in?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is Liman. I was just about to ask you, do you feel that you have enough guidance on doing that because if you do I would be happy if you did, if you don't feel that you have enough guidance, we should probably chat some more.

PAUL HOFFMAN: I'll have enough guidance once I look at the recording. Unfortunately, as Brad was describing what he wanted, we were juggling with the phones, so I don't feel comfortable. But, I think once I listen to the recording again I'll be able to do that. And I'll let you folks know almost immediately if that's not avail -- if I need more from you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That sounds perfect to me. Thank you. And I should note also, a warm thank you to you and John Heidemann and all the others in the working group for this tremendous work you've done. I was too focused on other things to remember to thank you properly. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I'll double that. Thank you very much for the work on this Paul. Anything further on the harmonization?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Not from me.

BRAD VERD: Anyone else? It's kind of quiet in the room. No? Alright, we have this and NomCom on the agenda this morning and now we have to --

MARIO ALEMAN: I just asked if they could come earlier. I'll keep you posted.

BRAD VERD: So, you're locked in the room until NomCom comes.

WES HARDAKER: Let me follow up with one question. If we were to circulate this with other people to get more feedback, do we have any plans for making that happen because I don't know how we'll manage to pull that off? We might have to present it at DNS OARC, yet well -- no I mean after it gets published. So, you know we should publish it, then circulate it and say, 'help'. The question is where to reach out to that would be sufficient?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here. I guess the OARC is the obvious place because that's where the data is stored so that's where the research will have to turn to access to the data. And as far I know they're not allowed to access the data without having an agreement with OARC about how to treat the data. So that means that OARC should have a fair understanding of who's involved and who's using this data. So that's at least a group of people to reach out to and the presenting at the OARC meeting is a brilliant idea, I think.

WES HARDAKER: They'll even hold it as a discussion at OARC, so it's not a presentation but a mike-line request please and maybe DNS-OP or something like that too.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, kind of stay a little bit of hybrid, right? Present what you -- the work that's been done and what we found and why we weren't able to answer the questions, so we need help answer these types of questions.

PAUL HOFFMAN: It's Paul. Not sure if the hand raising thing is working. The other thing that I certainly could do is take it to CFRG mailing list in

the IRTF. Since they're some of the people who, when we had one proposal for one of the correct the graphic algorithms, they jumped all over us and said no don't do that. So, I think them seeing what -- a full, you know, a full example of what our cases are and what we came up with would be reasonable.

WES HARDAKAR: That's a very good point, Paul. You know the FRG still has open timeslots too and that would be another body of measurement that would be interested in this.

BRAD VERD: I'm trying to think who should take lead on that. How should -- can staff track that? Like who would submit to get on the agenda for OARC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would suggest that Paul does that, if you are comfortable and willing to do that Paul? Because you've done most of the work, so you should be up there in the spotlight.

PAUL HOFFMAN: However, the timing of the next OARC meeting is just after the key role and I'm going to be in Los Angeles. I don't mind

someone else taking -- who's at the OARC meeting taking this up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here and the OARC meeting is just before the RIKE meeting right? So, the likelihood that I will be there is very high. Like something like 90 percent.

PAUL HOFFMAN: There's no Adobe Connect way of me handing you the ball, but imagine I just did.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So, I'll undertake to talk with the OARC people about presenting this at OARC. And it strikes me, maybe do a rerun during the DNS working group at RIKE as well? I don't know how intertwined OARC and the DNS working group are, but it could be worth actually mentioning it there. Because that would reach out, now most of them are at OARC -- I'll talk to the DNS working group chairs as well, just to see what they think.

BRAD VERD: And then what about the group that Paul mentioned?

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, so there's two IRTI groups, Paul offered to talk or at least write to the FRG group and you might see if there's a time slot Paul, to see if they'll take a 15-minute presentation in Montreal and I don't know, what do you think about Map-RG?

PAUL HOFFMAN: I think Map-RG is another good idea. And Liman, going back to your question about the RIKE working group -- one of the things that came clear to us in the caucus was the fact that you folks wanted this anonymization procedure, not just for root server operators, but for anyone who want to anonymize and certainly there are authoritative TLDs who might want some of their data published and as we are coming into other things, there are large recursive operators who might want to contribute some of their data, say to the NCAP project for SSAC who will want their data anonymized, so I think going out beyond just the normal root server community, would be valuable.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you, you just lit another candle in my head which has center staff on it. It kind of is a two-stage thing isn't it? We first need to talk to the researchers to understand what they can and cannot work with and would like to see and once we have a clear

understanding of that, then talk further with other providers of data. Or, do we want all these groups to talk to together maybe?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

I believe that we want them all talking together. This was absolutely one of the big problems we had during the work party. John Heidemann, and to some extent Wes, were sort of representing the researchers and -- but the pushback was some of the things that the researchers want are too -- just to use a brief word -- liberal for what the data providers want. That is that the researchers want better exposure and the data providers, or at least two data providers, said I don't care what you want, I'm not going to give that to you. So, I'll pick this other algorithm instead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Alright, so the confusion I draw from what you just said is that we shouldn't hold back, we should -- can we introduce this in as many places as we can to get a really wide discussion going around this topic, right?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

Yes, that sounds right.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, Liman just in case you don't know, the DNS-OARC meeting is going to be a joint program with CENTR in Amsterdam, so that'll be an opportunity to get both of those. Also, I think it's worth mentioning that with the KSK role coming up later this year, we're expecting there's going to be a data collection around that and I think that ICANN-OCTO should maybe think about what the implications of having anonymized source addresses in that data that's provided to them in analysis of how the rollover goes -- if that would be desirable or not desirable for that analysis.

MATT LARSON: Well, all things being equal, non-anonymized would be better.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Oh good, I get to disagree with my boss.

MATT LARSON: Go ahead, let's hear it, I'm used to it.

PAUL HOFFMAN: The data that would be most useful during the key role would be the IP address -- would be the accounts and IP addresses of the resolvers that are still only running -- only using KSK 2010. If we don't anonymize that it will quickly turn into a name and shame.

We already have that issue now with the addresses that we're releasing from the RSC-8145 data. We've gone ahead with that as a way of getting them prepared for the key role, but I think if we start saying, 'here's a bunch of addresses of people who are too dumb to have noticed that the key role' -- I'm not so sure I'd want to do that.

MATT LARSON: Now isn't this fun to disagree in public? But we don't have to make it available, we could use it as a resource ourselves to contact people or within a smaller, say, root-ops community.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Certainly, if we're using it that way then there's no reason to anonymize.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is Liman. My government might disagree.

BRAD VERD: There might be other governments who would disagree. Alright, so, it sounds like you're going to take the lead on OARC and the center meeting and possibly RIKE?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I'll do that, yes. So, what about the IRTF? Does anyone have connections there? I'm willing to take it on but if someone is actively involved in those groups --

WES HARDEKAR: I think Paul is going to do CFRG, and Paul it's up to you if you want to do Map-RG, I have one presentation I'm already going to give at Map-RG about 8145, but I could do another if they have the time or you can, it's up to you.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Tell you what, Wes, you and I could talk about it offline but yeah, I could do it as well.

WES HARDEKAR: Okay. I think you're the better candidate, but I'd be happy to do it if you're tired of talking.

BRAD VERD: And again, I think, just to make sure we're on the same page, this is to have the conversation with the researchers to try to come up with that recommendation. And maybe, and I don't know, if that can somehow make it into the verbiage of the document, Paul, and what you're adding, that we're going to try to have this

discussion with the community to figure out, you know, answers to the original questions.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Yup, no problem.

MARIO ALEMAN: So, this means the July 10th vote is not happening?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think you are misunderstood. I misheard you first, but then I realized what you were saying. To put into the document that we going to have these discussions, so that means that we can then vote on the document.

BRAD VERD: It's my intention that we have the vote as scheduled on July 10th, unless somebody objects or thinks that's a challenge? Okay, great. Unless there's something else that's it for the anonymization, harmonization topic. Alright, is there anything else we'd like to cover in the meantime? Was there something on the parking lot that --

MARIO ALEMAN: Well, just an update, they're aiming for 9:45.

BRAD VERD: Alright. So, we've got 10/15 minutes. Anything else?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well, this document kind of begged the question which ties into probably a later discussion, but we could plant the seed, whether we should have separate document streams for things created by the whole caucus and things created by the formal committee. Or signal that in the document title or something.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Actually, Liman, you brought up a really good point and as we're relying on the caucus more for work and input, that would probably be a really great idea to give them the credit and so forth that they provide.

BRAD VERD: I think this is a valuable conversation and I think we should it maybe when we do a triple zero discussion, you know, I might argue that we currently give credit to people work on the document and we don't specify between the caucus and the RSSAC and if we did so that might create another tiering or

second-class citizen which I think we've all argued we don't want to do, so we need to be very careful with the way we think, and possible overthink some of these things.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You are right, and that warning created another warning which is that it will possibly create further confusion regarding who's our operators, RSSAC -- no RSSAC caucus -- yeah, you know what was described yesterday in the review presentation. So, I guess I withdraw my proposal.

TERRY MANDERSON: Different topic if you're done with that one? Okay so, completely different topic, and I just want to get your general thoughts on it -- is a while ago we made an informal decision to stop talking about letters and to stop within RSSAC the L dash, or letter dash root terms, the moniker that we've applied. It was an informal decision, we applied it to all documentation going forward from about mid-2017, or perhaps even earlier. What are your thoughts on minting that as a real decision in our next formal meeting?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here. Just asking what would the purpose be to do the formal decision about it? I'm not disagreeing, I'm just wondering what the underlying thoughts are.

TERRY MANDERSON: Two thoughts. One is appropriate process, because we actually did make the decision to do that and we've got to back ourselves. The second is, it's useful for me in actions within my organization.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Plus, it would harmonization as well.

TERRY MANDERSON: Right.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Oh, I have no objections, I'm happy to do it if it helps others and I have started a process to try to remove the 'I' letter from whatever we have in the documentation and presentations and so on. And I, personally try to state net-note rather than I-note

in all contexts. It's a bit of an uphill battle, but on the net-note side and on the receiving side because people really try to tag those letters on to it, but I try and if a formal decision helps others, it could probably help me as well, so --

TERRY MANDERSON: Right, we've had 20 years of education in doing exactly, or saying exactly, that. It's changing, I guess, a muscle memory effect so it's going to be hard.

BRAD VERD: Alright, well maybe we add that to the agenda for the July meeting and it would certainly get minted there. Alright.

TERRY MANDERSON: Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Anything else? Alright without it, we'll -- we can take a five or 10-minute break, come back at 45 after when NomCom's supposed to be here and go from there. Alright, thank you. Please don't go far. [AUDIO BREAK]

Yeah, hold on, we gave everybody a couple minutes to break so they'll be back in just -- let me run the hallway real quick.
[AUDIO BREAK]

Alright, let's get started again. We have the NomCom representatives here, so I will turn it over to them.

ZAHID JAMIL: Well good morning. How much time do you have slated for us? I just want to be respectful and not eating into other stuff.

BRAD VERD: The time is yours right now.

ZAHID JAMIL: Oh, that's very kind, but we'll try to be 15 minutes and we'll be done hopefully by then. So why I am here? I said that before, when I was at the last meeting. We're trying to make sure there's transparency and connectivity between the community and NomCom. So traditionally in recent years you've never had, at least at this meeting, never or generally in some meetings people going from NomCom into the community and we decided to change that because we heard all sort of, you know, complaints.

And so, there are no presentations, it was a bit of an awkward presentation, so you can download it from last time if you were there. But I think what we did get across was that there are a lot of challenges, we've dealt with them. You should know, this is your taxpayer dollars at work basically to know that the NomCom has found a new mechanism -- slightly varied mechanism of making sure that the decisions they make are going to be face-to-face. I think we mentioned that and we were able to get the money.

And the good news is we got the money from our own resources, there was nowhere that we shunk funding from ICANN or anybody else. Although for them to approve us for using that money for different purposes took a while. Let me just start by saying that for the purpose of the RSSAC, we have had incredibly helpful, probably some of the best contribution to the NomCom, from the RSSAC delegate that you have sent, Alejandro.

And I was going to keep it right at the end, but I wanted to say it right at the beginning, if you could bring him back next year -- I won't be chair next year, my friend here, Damon will be chair next year, but if you could send him back next year, that would be of great service to the NomCom, so we'd appreciate that. He's done a fantastic job. Go ahead.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Yeah, I just want to pile onto that. I mean, it's not really appropriate to say Alejandro's done a good job, he's done a fantastic job. He's been, he thinks about things, he's been a real positive person who's contributed a great deal to us, and so my understanding from talking with him was that he was not planning on coming back. Whoever you send next year if you could have that person meet with him and get a good download from him, that would be fantastic. And again, thank you very much, he's a real blessing in your community.

ZAHID JAMIL: Thank you, and as a result, the reason I wanted to set this up is that I've said this publicly at the last meeting and I continue to sort of voice this opinion, and there are others in the NomCom who also believe this, that it's time to change the bylaws that the RSSAC and the SSSAC have full voting membership, which they don't currently. They're basically just liaisons and they're not term-limited and I think that needs to happen so that just proves to us that they're contributions are very, very important. Couple of things just to -- yeah, I'm so sorry, yeah?

BRAD VERD: Oh, Alejandro just walked in to join us. Hello, Alejandro. Just a quick comment on that, I appreciate the feedback, it's always

great to hear, you know, when people are exceeding expectations. Unfortunately, Alejandro is term-limited so that goes to your other comment that we have term-limits, while there might not be term-limits -- you keep repeating that there's no term limits for SSSAC and RSSAC, we have term-limits for the chair for that representative. So, you need to be careful in that messaging.

ZAHID JAMIL: First of all, my apologies to the entire RSSAC, we weren't aware of that and we just treated them both alike and that was wrong, so apologies. And thank you, we understand. That brings me back, if you could give a nice briefing to whoever's coming next, that would be extremely helpful.

BRAD VERD: That's great feedback and we will certainly do that, thank you.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: How long are your term limits for your representative?

MARIO ALEMAN: So, the operational procedure was revamped maybe three years ago, and previously there were no term limits on the liaison

roles. The terms are one year to align with each NomCom, so each NomCom is different. And there are a max of three-year terms, so basically three years. Eligibility resets after being off for a year. So, Alejandro could run again a year from today, or a year from now.

DAMON ASHCRAFT:

Okay. I mean thank you for that point of clarification and I think that's all the more reason why your representatives should have a vote and I think that we should work together for the change to get your representative into the vote, because the only reason that the representative doesn't have a vote on the NomCom is that absent your own internal bylaws, there's -- that he or she is non-term-limited, so if you're telling me that you have term-limits in place that are almost identical --

BRAD VERD:

And that's been in place for over three years now.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Lars Liman here from RSSAC. I have a comment, which I've made in numerous contexts when this comes up. It's kind of backwards to have an RSSAC member vote to appoint the board who then appoints RSSAC. It turns into a circular definition that

is not very good. So that's the main reason for the fact that we don't have voting positions on the NomCom and the -- what's it called? -- the Empowered Community, because we are appointed by the board.

ZAHID JAMIL: Thank you for your clarification. Again, this is just our sense of how things are going, we just like to make it possible for people who are contributing well to be able to legally do that, that's all.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That said, we've just undergone a review and there could be other changes to the bylaws that came out from that review that kind of -- it's possible that how RSSAC is appointed will be changed in the future and that will change the relationship that NomCom also -- possibly. So, things aren't cast in stone right now but for the moment that's how it looks.

ZAHID JAMIL: Good to know, please let us know if that changes. If there's anything we can do to help, you know our views, so thank you, we'll take it. Thank you, and we'll leave it to you because this is your internal process and you need to decide how you guys,

basically sort that out. Just to go back into what the NomCom has done this year -- I'm so sorry, yes?

WES HARDAKER:

That's okay I just wanted to express my thanks to Alejandro who walked in late and missed the gushing testimony you gave about what a good job he did. So, from RSSAC, thank you very much for apparently an outstanding job.

ZAHID JAMIL:

Thank you. So, what has likely changed this year was that the intersessional and the face-to-face meeting showed everybody that the SurveyMonkey approach, or the just having calls with the people you can't see approach, was working. And the beauty of it was, when it worked, when we did it the first time it was a great success. We were able to get it done in three-days' done enormous work that would have taken us four weeks or five weeks to do.

And in the second round of the cycle when we went through it, we had to because of financial constraints, do it over phone calls, and everybody could tell the massive difference in quality, etcetera that took place. The good news is, that when we did it in the second cycle, we'd already met, we'd discussed the candidates and so that had a positive effect, but it just goes to

show that the experiment worked -- to change this actually was demonstratable a success and the right way to go.

You should also know that we had extensive work done within the NomCom with deep dive teams. We didn't just reach out and interview every candidate, but we actually -- sorry not every candidate but the ones who made it through the first sorting. We also restarted an interview with some references as well. One of the things that I think that is important to also elaborate on our process is that previously there used to be sort of an arbitrary cut off, a number, so when we used to rate folks, there used to be a number that would say if you pick five then you eligible for the discussion, otherwise we'll just, there's just too many people, we'll just cut you off.

And so, everybody would fall out, you know of the poll. And this year we said, no we're going to spend the three days we have in DC. We're going to go through every single application and all of that is efficient and of course that's great. We found that a lot of people that we otherwise would have thrown off the poll or wouldn't have been in the poll, were actually rising up because we gave them the chance to be discussed and then we went through the deep dive teams and then got some interesting results as a result of that.

This meeting is our final selection meeting. You should know that we have unlike before been in communication with every candidate. Candidate's would never find out what's going on until the end of the process and this time what we've done is every stage whether you made it or didn't make it, you got to know. So, everybody had communication. And at this meeting when we make our final selections, previously the pre-deliberations, the interview itself, and the post-deliberations were about 130 minutes per candidate. We've taken it up to anywhere between 200 and 215 minutes.

So that's a lot of deliberation about candidates, well thought through, giving everybody time to think about it. And those are sort of the changes that we've seen. That's all I have from us. I wanted to ask whether you had anything you wanted to ask or wanted to sort of convey to us? Just to say, finally, that we have some -- we've actually done a good job of making our life miserable because we have such good quality candidates this time, that it's going to be interesting to see how the next couple of days go, but back to you.

BRAD VERD: Any questions? No, great.

ZAHID JAMIL: I had a question. May I?

BRAD VERD: Please.

ZAHID JAMIL: We are collecting information that maybe germane or somewhat relevant to how we do decision making. And one of the questions I had for the RSSAC was -- and we do this with everybody, as I said, so it's not specific to RSSAC -- to what extent do you feel that RSSAC 37/38 work that is about to happen in the next few years is going to be pretty extensive and it's pretty important, what impact does it have on the skills we should be looking for board members? Should we be looking for board members who understand this, who will have an opportunity to contribute to it? That's our question.

BRAD VERD: Fred.

FRED BAKER: I don't know that every board member needs to be an expert in these things, but it would be nice if there was one. We're going to have a liaison there, you can certainly educate the board and I

don't think the board is stupid, but you know, having some people there to help out might be useful.

BRAD VERD: You mean, just to be clear Fred, just to tease that out a little bit -- someone who understands governance? Or? Yeah, yeah. Cause that's essentially what RSSAC 37 is. We're introducing a governance model. So, I just want to make sure that –

FRED BAKER: So yeah, the issue isn't really the technical thing being governed, it's how to govern a thing that exists.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Again, can I tease that out just a little more? The folks who are in this room, to that extent, they do feel that they have had ample - - not experience but necessary experience coming to, arriving to this decision that they seem to understand the governed spot a little more or --

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry, can you –

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm sorry I wasn't very articulate about that I apologize. Do you feel the folks in the RSSAC, in this room for instance, are people that have the good understanding of the governance aspect, not just the technical, and will be, you know –

BRAD VERD: I think that -- I won't speak for everybody else, but I will say we spend two and a half years discussing this governance model and I believe we've all come to the conclusion that we don't have all the answers, and this is why this is going to a larger community, so that, you know, we can tease out these different pieces and get to the right answer. This was to provide a framework for the discussion.

ZAHID JAMIL: Very helpful, thank you.

FRED BAKER: So now that said, we have among us several blues manage groups and we have some management expertise, I personally was the chair of the internet society board when the IETF went through its last IASA process, and so I'm familiar with that side and familiar with the IETF administrative director and kind of that functionality in the IETF, which is not the same but

analogous. And, you know, I don't know what everybody's expertise is, but I think we have a clue.

ZAHID JAMIL:

That's extremely helpful, thank you. That would be the only question I had, and I got my answer, thank you. I guess, unless there are more questions, we're done. We just sort of would like to close by saying, keep the NomCom on your radar, please send us good people like you've already been doing, and support them. We do appreciate it.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, we're currently going through a nomination period for new candidates, so we'll have somebody for you soon. Yeah, so we're back -- that concludes this, we're back at 10:30, to -- what is the topic, I'm sorry? Yes, 10:30 we're going through future work items.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]