
KOBE – RSSAC Work Session (3 of 8)
Saturday, March 09, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry. Service coverage is the topic here. Our leader for that session is not back yet, so we will get to that as soon as he steps in. In light of his absence, we have a topic from our liaison to the Board, who would like to talk about his discussion with the Board. So I'm going to defer the mic to him, and then, once Liman comes back, we'll get back to the agenda.

So Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Brad. This is just a quick check with the rest of RSSAC. At 2:30, I will go to the Board room. There is a preparation day for the constituency meeting. So basically at that time they're going to prepare for the meeting that they will have with RSSAC.

They sent us two questions. I don't know if you can ... Okay. Very generic questions, as usual. If I remember correctly, that was actually brought up in the admin call. At least the Admin Committee's position was we don't see any value in trying to answer them because it doesn't relate to any of our issues.

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.

So my suggestion? I'm going to suggest to the Board that we don't go follow the questions but basically focus on the outcome of the concept paper discussion on RSSAC037 with the BTC, with the full Board.

So, basically, we will show the timeline slide, which Carlos had. We will have that on the screen and then start discussions around that, depending on the outcome that we would have from the BTC. We meet with the BTC on Monday and the full Board on Wednesday. So ...

BRAD VERD: Any thoughts, comments, questions for Kaveh?

Is everybody okay with that plan?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No questions?

Yes, so it's ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]. I'll read them.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE Oops.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. So the first one is, what will be your main priorities in 2019? Second, how should ICANN’s multi-stakeholder model of governance and policy development process evolve to balance the increasing need for inclusivity, accountability, and transparency with the imperative of getting out work done and our policies developed in a more effective and timely manner and with efficient utilization of ICANN’s resources. That’s a mouthful.

The first one I assume is RSSAC037and—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry. Actually, this is the Barcelona questions. But they build on this. Let me find the actual ... sorry.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Ah, okay. But the priority thing I’m sure is there. Our priority. And I assume our answer is clear as RRSSAC037 and basically [with] the concept paper. So moving forward in that line.

BRAD VERD: Just to recap, a call for questions to the Board was sent out. There were none received from anybody here at RSSAC. So obviously we got two questions from the Board, which Carlos is going to get up on the screen here momentarily. What Kaveh is suggesting is that we essentially tell the Board that we think it's a more valuable use of time to focus on the results of the meeting between RSSAC and BTC and the concept paper than it is to answer these two questions.

Is that a fair recap, Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes.

BRAD VERD: What we'll use as the stimulus for the conversation will be the timeline slide that Carlos shared with us earlier.

Are people okay with that?

All right. Here's Carlos on the questions.

KARVEH RANJBAR: So the first is just some explanation. It was shared with RSSAC. But the questions are basically [inaudible] successful implementation of the strategy plan, the plan that I shared and discussed in two of the RSSAC calls earlier this year.

The second one is about alliances.

If you want to develop an answer, definitely we can. Based on what Brad said, there was no feedback on the list. So read that as RSSAC is not much interested in discussing these two.

Okay. Thank you.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you, Kaveh. All right. Back on schedule. Service Work Party coverage update and work that we need to talk about. Liman, I want to turn it over to you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

This will be embarrassing and very short. The Geographic Coverage Work Party has not been formed, so there is not work output from that group to report at this meeting.

There are two reasons for that. One is my own inability to actually push forward on this work. The second one is that I at least sense a very low level of interest from the Caucus, despite the fact that this was brought up as one of the items in the survey.

So I suggest two things that we might want to discuss here. The first one is to have a change of shepherd because it's obvious that I haven't met the expectations for this. So I would like for someone else to step in and see if you can bring things forward.

The other one is to look for a path forward. If there are any specific ideas around this that you would like to discuss here, I would be happy to do so and use that as [seed] information for the working group.

So these are the two things that we can make forward. Or a third one is to [disband] on the entire project, which I think would be kind of unfortunate, at least without having a dialogue with the Caucus first.

Any comments?

BRAD VERD:

Has the Caucus just been silent [and] nobody's interested. So what's the – I'm sorry, I haven't been on the call – behavior pattern? I feel like this is – how do I say it? – “Here we go again.”

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yeah, it kind of is. I'm looking with Andy to – we made a call for volunteers for a work party leader, but my recollection is that we didn't receive much response on that.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Oh. Yes, that is correct. There was a call for that and there was no response.

BRAD VERD: So just to recap, this was listed as a priority by the Caucus. We put together a statement of work for the Caucus. There were volunteers to join the work party, correct?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Only very few, if it remember correctly. Like in the singles.

BRAD VERD: I thought there were like ten, wasn't there, Andrew?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Was there?

BRAD VERD: Was there more than ten?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: [No.]

BRAD VERD: No, no, no. How many volunteered for the work party?

So a handful of people, let's just say, and nobody want to grab the bull by the horns and go after it. Is that what you're saying?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: The only individual person who has actually asked about progress on this is, again, Paul Hoffman, who has been stepping up to do work in the Caucus before and helped us bring things to closure. But that speaks more of Paul’s energy than of the general interest in the group, I think.

[JUN MURAI]: If I may, we have thirteen people, including [inaudible]. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So either I make a renewed attempt, which is unlikely to succeed, or someone else takes over as shepherd, or we abandon this. So three ways forward that I see in this.

WES HARDAKER: Well, it sounds to me like there’s two independent problems. This is Wes Hardaker from ISI. One, that you don’t have the time and energy. I certainly feel that. I wish I could offer to take it offer but I can’t either at the moment. I’m a little overboard, too. And then the second one is, how do you get a leader out of a group that doesn’t seem to want to nominate a leader? It’s always possible that [someone] taking it over as a shepherd for you could also be the leaders. That sort of solves that problem if there is energy of the participants to actually do the work. I guess that’s unclear, too.

To me, I would make another call asking for a leader, independent of the shepherd issue and say, if we don't get one, unfortunately that means that we'll have to close it. So you'll at least give them the communication that you were asking for.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That definitely works for me.

BRAD VERD: I would add I don't this is a problem with the shepherd. I don't think a new shepherd is going to change the results. Just being honest with you. I feel this is a challenge that we have with the Caucus. This is a reoccurring system challenge of engagement and – what?

WES HARDAKER: No, no, no. You're right. I don't disagree. I'm wondering, how many active projects do we have right now? Two or three?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

WES HARDAKER: That might be – if this was the only thing on the table, would we get more energy? I don't know.

BRAD VERD: But we only just started the third. We only just had the first call a week call of the third, so, while I understand that theory, I don't know if it really applies here.

WES HARDAKER: Well, I think that that third one – the third one you're referring to is the 001 update – might be considered higher priority for a lot of people. So it may be that the activity level for that one is dropping because the other one is coming up. But [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Maybe. I'm certainly willing to give them the benefit of the doubt, I feel that this is – we've done this a couple of times, where we've had work parties and done some work and then end up shelving it. Paul Hoffman unfortunately is a contributor to most of these and, while good work comes out, we don't reach a conclusion. And I don't have an answer for this, but this is a systemic problem – challenge, I should say.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I have it on record that I don't think that Paul Hoffman is part of the problem here?

BRAD VERD: Oh, absolutely. No, I'm complimenting Paul and I'm thanking Paul's contributions. It's just unfortunate that the contributions never reach the light of day. We end us shelving a couple of these projects.

So I would go back to the work party. I'd make a call for a leader, or we'll have to shut it down. Does anybody have another option or thought on this?

FRED BAKER: Question. And this is truly a question. The basis for this work party came in part from what RSSAC is supposed to do, which is to figure out how well the service is running and so on and so on. I wonder whether service coverage is part of the metrics by which the RSS might be measured and therefore possibly belongs in the Metrics Working Party.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm certainly willing to view it that way, absolutely, if we can find a way to measure that. But I see shaking heads here. Fair enough.

BRAD VERD: I have a challenge of trying to boil the ocean in the Metrics Work Party. That's all.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that’s a great idea, Fred. The other thing, too, is I would probably maybe propose that, after we send out the e-mail asking, “Hey, is anybody willing to be a shepherd or a work party leader,” and we don’t get a reply back, maybe wait until – this work party will be shut down – after the Caucus meeting in Prague, where maybe this could be brought up at the Caucus, to say, “Hey, listen. We have this work party. We’re looking for this,” because it’ll be a little bit more face-to-face and we all know work gets done a little bit more when you’re face-to-face over e-mails. Just human tendency.

Maybe wait until after the RSSAC Caucus meeting at Prague to determine the fate of this work party.

BRAD VERD: I don’t see any objection to that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So I’ll try to send out that second request for a work party leader this week. That will give a week-and-a-half for people to respond, and we can use the outcome of that response as input to the discussion during the Caucus meeting in Prague.

BRAD VERD: And I would let them know our intentions as far as we expect to have a discussion about this at the Caucus meeting. So we need to add it to the agenda and hopefully get some movement. Otherwise ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It is on the agenda for the Caucus meeting in Prague. Just a current work party update. So we can discuss it then.

FRED BAKER: Should we revert to the previous food fight?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Certainly.

FRED BAKER: Okay. [Ryan], we were discussing SLEs. At least in part, this comes down to the question of independence, though I wonder whether how much of the conversation that you're having should be done – what is it? – two, three days from now in the context of the independence of the RSOs.

How closely tied in your mind?

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: I think the [independence] document is going to be – and, again, I appreciated Goran for brining that up because I think that’s a great idea for the RSSAC. I would say, depending upon the outcome of the [independence] document, we could take that discussion up again through this concept paper.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Let me ... I don’t know if this rephrasing the question. It’s another facet of the question, Jeff’s question this morning about money. Money comes in response to service of some kind. Yeah, there are two parts of that exchange.

It seems like at least part of your organization’s concern about independence ties to [that] they wouldn’t necessarily accept money.

Can we divide those into two parts and say and RSO that accepts money is going to have to give some evidence of how it uses the money in this that and the other? An RSO that doesn’t accept money is going to have different – something is going to be different there. Can we make definitions in that context that would make sense?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I follow what you’re saying, and yes. I’m completely on board with you on that.

Also, I do think, in 037, it talks about SLEs for those who receive financial assistance.

FRED BAKER: Mm-hmm.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Actually, there's wording in 037 already about this and a financial, so, yeah. So I think, if we use that, that would be good.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Can I task you to work with these guys and get the right words in place on that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. Okay. Do we have another topic that we need to discuss in the context of the concept paper?

[Ryan]?

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Sure. So Wes brought up a really good point earlier this morning that maybe we need to compile a list of – and I don't know when

our comments are due for this concept, but we need to probably come up with a list of items that may have been left out in 037. I guess [it] was just working on it during the workshop. But I was wondering if maybe it would be beneficial if we got that done a little bit sooner. I mean, the workshop is only about maybe a month-and-a-half away. So that's one point.

The other point was – or I'll just stop there before I raise my hand again.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So for the timeline – and Carlos can correct me – Carlos and David Olive's team are working basically on finalizing the concept paper, what's being sent to the BTC. But I can tell that the BTC doesn't have a meeting until – the April meeting was just cancelled because we had two meetings in March. Very early in May – I think the first or second of May, something like that – the BTC has a meeting. I think the assumption is that that's where the document would be formally forwarded to RSSAC if everything is in order.

But I assume [org] will also need some time to be able to incorporate the comments that they are going to propose to the BTC, and the BTC would need some time to discuss it on the list before the call.

So my assumption would be that at least mid-April is the latest, but ...

[BRAIN REID]: I think it's fine. I think the question here is, at what point does RSSAC envision giving that type of feedback and to whom? I don't think the BTC would do anything with it, frankly. So it's probably best for the GWG. So that gives the RSSAC more time to finalize a list of issues that can also be presented to the working group that ultimately finalized everything.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry, yes. I was talking about changes to the concept paper. But yes.

BRAD VERD: I guess the question now is raised with that comment on whether or not the issues are included in the concept paper or given as feedback to the public comment to the paper that would get published for public comment. I just said that too many times, but I think you followed me on that.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Right. I think it would be odd for RSSAC concerns to come out in a Board paper.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Right.

BRAD VERD: I think it's fair to make comments on it and provide a [bag] so the BTC is aware and the Board is aware. Then it seems that we should say that these things should be addressed or resolved, let's say. Jeff?

JEFF OSBORN: Kaveh, you're not talking about cancelling the BTC meeting that we're having with them on Monday, right?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, sorry. I was talking about the BTC's own meeting.

JEFF OSBORN: Got it. Okay. Is that really premature then? Because I mean, literally, we're meeting with them in, like, 48 hours. Is that a reasonable time to bring up an "Here's some issues. They're not formalized or anything else, but here they are"?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. The whole idea is that they hear us. It's not like – so I have no issue with that.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I think this is part of the iterative process that we asked for. We didn't want them to go off in a box and come up with a resolution and it comes back and we're like, "Whoa. This is not what we expected." So it's a back-and-forth dialogue.

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. I always like providing stuff early like that because you have the deniability of "Oh, shoot. We just came up with it," if you don't get it right. But I think the sooner they get a hold of it, the better to know where we're coming from.

BRAD VERD: I think it would be nice, if we have a list, to start putting a list together so that we can present that in a manner that they're receptive to, if that makes sense, because I'll be honest. I don't want – let me change that word. I hope we don't walk into the meeting with the BTC and start sharing our grievances because I don't want to undermine the work that we have done in 037 and/or what we have done here as a group. So I just want to make sure that we're not contradicting ourselves when we go in there.

So if we have challenges, the things that were left out of 037, let's do it in an articulate manner to say, "Hey, look. These are issues

that were raised that we know we didn't address in 037 but we believe need to be addressed in the final implementation of X."

JEFF OSBORN: I think it only makes sense. It's further explaining what it is we said. And if any of that was pointed at me, I promise to be good.

BRAD VERD: There's no pointing at anything.

WES HARDAKER: I don't think we could come up with a complete list and finalize it within 36 hours or whatever, so I think what may be the best thing to do is tell them that we're working on that, that we are trying to work toward a list of other things that we know that we're missing and to expect that in a future update and document.

BRAD VERD: Sorry, Fred. Just one second. Absolutely, but in the sense of sharing stuff early and often. We don't need to wait for the final list to give it to them. If we have a list of things right now, we can say, "Hey, look. This is the list we've started. We're continuing to work on it and finalize it for you, but we want you to be aware.

Fred?

FRED BAKER:

Well, now I'm thinking about a conversation that Suzanne and I and Ryan had just before this meeting. The Internet is not a stable place. It's a dynamically stable place. The operation of any particular part of it is, as a result, dynamically stable. An expectation that we're going to come up with a "This is the way it works, and that is static," probably is not going to work. It's going to need some kind of amendment process, some kind of an ability to change it.

So in the longest term, I think the key comment that would go back to the BTC or whoever is, "Let's make sure that we include an ability for it to evolve."

On the other hand, the first rule of deadlines is that nothing is done until the night before. I tend to think that, if we have issues and we know we have issues, getting them on the table in whatever incomplete form they might be is better than not getting them on the table.

So, coming back to a comment that was made a minute ago, early and often is probably the best approach.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]:

Adding upon what Fred said, in the executive summary I did add a comment – thanks for the wording, Fred and Suzanne, on this.

I'll tell you which paragraph I added it into: the sixth paragraph, if you go down to ... hopefully it's green. Right there. Well, it's in purple. "The Internet is dynamically stable, so governance ..." So, if it needs to be moved, that's fine. This is where I just felt it probably would be best situated.

FRED BAKER:

And I'll repeat an earlier comment that I made. Having that in the executive summary is great. The executive summary summarizes something. We probably need a few more words somewhere else in the document that this summarizes.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]:

Acknowledged.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Before going through the document, I think that's a good idea. So for me to have an idea, the format of the meeting with BTC would be basically we start with this and we go through our comments, or ... How do we want to run that session? That's basically my question.

FRED BAKER:

The conversation with the BTC on Monday is your meeting. How do you want to run that? As far as what we've got going on here,

your suggestion – and I agree with it – is we should just start going through, paragraph by paragraph, what’s wrong with this. Do we need to mess with stuff?

I’ll leave the BTC meeting to you on how you want to run that.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Okay. [Fair enough]. I think that’s good. Carlos and David Olive I assume will be there. So you can explain also where they come from and [inaudible]. So we go paragraph by paragraph. After our comments, we explain to the BTC and discuss.

BRAD VERD:

I can tell you what I want. Going to what Jeff said, we have 48 hours. If we can spend the rest of the 48 hours working on feedback here, I think it’d be valuable to then give to the BTC so that, again, as we continue down this trajectory, we’re on the same trajectory and not going on different courses. So if we could clear the schedule and work on this, I’d be all about that. I don’t know if that’s possible, but I’d like to spend time on this and start working through this, however painful that is.

Is there any objections?

All right.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Running through the document, I'm going to start with the words "executive summary" and the paragraph immediately following – I'm sorry, Wes. Go.

WES HARDAKER: Somebody [with the mic thinks]. So we do have another couple of outstanding, already-recognized issues. Do we want to start from the top or do we want to hit the issues that were already in the list that's on Carlos' slides first?

BRAD VERD: What are those issues? Sorry.

WES HARDAKER: I was hoping Carlos ...

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: The composition of the GWG was one, right?

FRED BAKER: Okay. Sure. Fine.

BRAD VERD: But what [inaudible]. No, no. [inaudible] I'm happy to do however anybody wants. Really. I just want to make sure – we can talk about it now. I'm perfectly fine.

WES HARDAKER: So my motivation for possibly doing that would be, one, people have already thought about those, and they had already been as identified as long. And we may never get to, possibly, some of those issues. So it'd be the composition of the GWG.

So a little bit of background because I started, I think, this one, too ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 2.1?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .1.

WES HARDAKER: It talks about a couple things. One, that the GWG would have three RSOs representing – well, it doesn't representing – on the GWG group. It specifically says that RSSAC would not be involved. It took me a while to realize why that last statement bothered me. I actually think it's good for the independence. It's good for

another set of people to think about this problem, but there's two issues.

One is how are those three RSOs going to be picked and are they representational if the rest of us are not? That begins kind of odd because that's never been done before and it's sort of explicitly against it – hold on one second.

And then the second piece of that is, if RSSAC won't be involved, I think we're missing a critical feedback loop problem. So if they come up with a great plan to not come back and say, "Does this meet the vision that you spent two years on?" or, "Do you see any holes with it?" it sounds problematic. Technically, it's going to public comment, I'm sure, so there is an avenue there. But it sure seems like we should be able to provide feedback of, "You know what? You're missing these things that we thought of and maybe didn't document."

BRAD VERD:

So, yes. Agreed. Now, if I may, [with] the first, I believe, in the timeline that you've laid out, Carlos, there was a feedback loop to RSSAC. Right?

WES HARDAKER:

That was for this document, not the result of the work that the GWG will produce.

BRAD VERD: Result of the ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The final plan.

WES HARDAKER: There is no loop from the final plan. That will come out of this work body. It's never asked to be given back to us. Or for us to review and say if we think it meets our architectural needs.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So I don't know if it's not or what would be because the details of Phase 2 we haven't yet laid out, correct? So it might be or we might say it should be. But on that thing – because, for example, if we also had two people from IETF/IAB, correct? – two representatives – [I] think that the important issue is not the representation. It's the decision-making process because none of those people, including IETF/IAB, will be at the table being able to say, "Oh, that's the IETF's position," or, "That's the IAB's position." Or the RSSAC. I don't expect any one of us, even if it's twelve of us at that table, to be able to say, "This is all of the root operators' position." Correct? So the [there are] representatives

linking those groups, and they have to go back and forth. So I think maybe “liaisons” is a better word.

We have to define how the root operators basically make decisions. I’m not worried about the messenger that much, so I think three messengers are more than enough in my opinion. But how we make that decision? I think that’s important.

So, for, me, we have to – and that’s internal to us, because never in this document do they mandate us on how we make our decisions. So I think maybe we need to make it more clear that these are just liaisons. They are not decision-makers at the table. And they have to clear everything with the mother ship. But then how we decide on the mother ship? That’s up to us.

WES HARDAKER:

As a response, one way to think about it in your own mind is, if you are not one of the people that are going to be actively involved in this project, would you be concerned? Would you be okay with it? And if we’re all okay with it, then there’s not a problem.

But, again, like I brought up the previous problem, I want to make sure that we think about this. I don’t know that it’s necessarily wrong.

KAVEH RANJBAR: [Fair enough]. I just want to say yes. What you're saying is we might come up with a no-objection decision-making model. Correct? So everything comes back and there's a week and if nobody objects it goes back, correct?

So there are different ways of coming to a decision and, yes, I think you're right. We have it clarified internally, but I don't see the need to clarify it here. Here I think it's important maybe to make it even more clear that they are messengers, that these are not decision-makers. So these representatives are just liaisons. And maybe define it.

FRED BAKER: Well, I think that needs to be said. The mental model I'm going through right now is let's imagine it wasn't RSSAC – it was the GAC – and we've got some different problem and we just said, "Well, does any mind if the U.S. represents all the governments of the world?" There might be opinions.

The RSOs are in a variety of ways. That why we talk about independence and so on and so forth. I think there has to be room left for them to talk to each other.

So – [inaudible], I see your hand. Just a minute. So I support Wes' comment about a feedback loop. I think, when you talk about the

three RSO representatives being liaisons, that is a feedback loop, and you may as well say so.

Okay. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I have the gut feeling that this is not a group such as I imagined it. I imagined something substantially larger. I don't really feel that the group – what is it? Two plus two plus three plus two; that's nine people – can mirror and convey enough angles and information.

When we transitioned the IANA, the group was how big? To me, this is a similar undertaking.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. My vision was a larger group, but I'm not going to force that upon the rest of you. But we may well want to be careful with what we task this group to do, and we want to be careful to say that they will have to interact very carefully and openly with other bodies conducting meetings in various venues and so on to gather information and opinions about this.

So if this is to be a Secretariat for this, then I can live with it. But in my mind, I saw a wider representation of the group.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So just some context. When I was discussing this particular piece of the concept paper with the executives, we wanted it slightly smaller because the transition was so complicated. So these numbers are completely made up. I think maybe we take it in steps if we agree that those are the right table at the table. Then we can talk about numbers.

I think, if this group wants to have a discussion about how RSOs are represented, that's fine. The ccNSO would have a similar discussion, etc. So maybe we approach it that way.

FRED BAKER: So, [no], the paragraph at the bottom of the screen really kind of mitigates or argues against your concept of these guys being liaisons, the reason being that there are specified liaisons in the three RSOs and so on that are due to their subject matter expertise. So they're not seen as going back to the entire group. They're seen as representatives of the group. I think that's a problem.

BRAD VERD: So how do we resolve it? [inaudible]

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah. If you look, the next paragraph points out that there is supposed to be other mechanisms involved for community participation. So I think one thing that can be done is to strengthen the broader consultation language so that, for instance, it specifies that there will be observers, that there will be other ways of providing input into the group and so on and so forth. That might help. That might get us across.

But the other thing is, if it's not clear that the groups that will be sending the representation are the right groups, who's missing from there? Who should be there in addition to the ccNSO and the registry. I guess there's one other there that I don't see at the moment.

So we have two different problems there. Who is in the core group and who else should be proactively consulted. Maybe solving those separately will bring us closer to where we ought to be.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: It is too obvious or too silly if we scroll back a bit here and replace the "three" in the bracket after [RSO] with 12 or 13?

Was that clear? I got no response. I was surprised.

BRAD VERD: That was clear. I don't know how productive it will be with their twelve. That's all. I was being honest.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: We can't do a subset. I'm just proposing the obvious solution is to do the whole set.

FRED BAKER: Well, the push back, as I understand Wes' comment, is actually on the sentence, "RSSAC is not involved." I would kind of like to see that sentence disappear. "RSSAC needs to be involved." We can argue about how RSSAC is involved, but RSSAC is involved, I think.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. If nothing else, I would like there to be a check that what is being produced meets our original vision. Or maybe it'll be better. That'll be great. But to not check to make sure that it matches everything that we put [into] 037 seems strangely one-directional without feedback.

The other thing that I think is worth – I don't think anywhere in here it talks about transparency of process, that it should be done entirely in the open or not. I would sort of lean toward we should actually suggest that that be a mandate, that it not be a closed

group. It must be all done in the open with visibility from the community at large.

BRAD VERD: Carlos, can take note and add that somewhere?

CARLOS REYES: Yes. I'll add it to the bulleted list later. I think it's actually something that came up in RSSAC [inaudible] about how the work would proceed in the future.

One thing that I think a few of you are anticipating that you may be familiar with is the cross-community working group model. Now I think we're trying to avoid that specific term here, but, essentially, when a CCWG is chartered, the chartering organizations have to sign off on the output. So I think that's mostly what, Wes, you're trying to get at in terms of the feedback loop. So I think it's fine if we replicate that. We're just trying to avoid a CCWG process.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

CARLOS REYES: Right.

WES HARDAKER: [And the next]—

BRAD VERD: Can you make that change so that we can see it and understand how that would happen?

I would also like to confirm that his GWG is temporary. This goes away. At the end of the implementation, this is gone and doesn't exist anymore. I just want to make sure everybody agrees and understands that.

Now, regarding the RSOs, this is an interesting topic here because we wear different hats. This is really a question for Root-Ops: how do you want to be represented. Here, as RSSAC, you're giving the Root-Ops' answer. Or at least that's how I am interpreting it. Maybe that's wrong.

This goes to your point, that the Root-Ops have never been represented before. Maybe they should. Maybe we can ask them a "Is this possible? How would you want to do this?" type of thing. Or, "How could you do this [in a way] that was acceptable to the root operators group?" I don't know.

To me, this is kind of look – I don't know. The easiest example I could give you is the current situation with the SOs and ACs. As

chairs, we have – I don't know what the word is; I'm looking at Carlos – but when the security and stability stuff got put on pause, there was responsibility put on us as chairs to come up and get it moving again. So you had your chairs representing the group. We came back. We were conveying messages, sharing what was going on. "What do you think? What's your opinion? Let's get it involved to get it going forward."

That to me is what this would be. This would be – I can't speak for the RSOs, but the way I envision this would be however many representatives for the RSOs would be the ones building consensus for the group and sharing that with the GWG.

Is that acceptable? I have no idea. But that's a question for Root-Ops. And if the answer from Root-Ops is all twelve, then it's all twelve. I think that would be unfortunate but maybe true.

WES HARDAKER:

I only brought up the problem. I don't have an answer either. I thank you guys for your service because I can't imagine trying to not represent us [and instead] being in all those conversations you end up in. That's a non-trivial task and I do respect you for that.

It's possible – one thing – that instead of saying twelve, we could also say "RSSAC to determine the number of ..." So we can table

that to some extent and say we need to think about the answer and come up with how we want to deal with that representational number.

BRAD VERD: Yes. We certainly can. I think what I would convey here is we're not being asked right now. We're being asked to provide feedback to this document – what do we think? – and if that's an issue, we should raise that as an issue that needs to be talked about with the RSOs to come back with what's acceptable there.

FRED BAKER: I think that's an issue that we're going to have to [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: So can we start an issues list or whatnot and add that to an issues list? If I could speak candidly, I feel that – I'm trying to think how to word this – there's been a lot of, throughout this process, going through 037 and whatnot, fear and speculation about different things. We want to make sure we're representing correctly.

I'll just speak for RSSAC. For me in my chair role as RSSAC, I don't feel that, since the redo of our RSSAC – I'll only say that since 2013; I could probably go long before that – I don't think there's been

any misrepresentation from the leaders of RSSAC or things that have not been the voice of this group.

I only bring that up because it makes me pause when we say, “Well, we could never have just three representatives representing the voice of all twelve.” I don’t know. I think we could. Would it be different? Yes. I’m just saying that it would be something that we should talk to the RSOs about.

WES HARDAKER: Another way to put it, using your own words from earlier, the result of this process will be defining an accountability mechanism and to not have a voice in that –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You do.

WES HARDAKER: You do, yes, but to not have direct design into how that accountability.

BRAD VERD: I say you do, but you’re saying you don’t. So that’s where maybe we’re not in alignment. That’s all.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I might have dropped a stitch here, but I think where you guys are disagreeing is I think you're saying that this mechanism has no way to commit that the RSOs that participate are in any way representative or in any way involved with the views of the rest of the RSOs. Is that correct? Am I understanding your position here?

Because, as I read this, there is nothing to prevent – and maybe this is what you're saying – this group from getting together in a bar and deciding which three RSOs will be involved or anything of that sort.

I think, in the interest of transparency, though, the mechanisms need to be clear. Does that make sense? I think I see where you guys are disconnecting.

BRAD VERD: I will never be exposed to transparency, so yeah.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. It's just that ensuring that it's able to happen is different than – I mean, you're right. I agree. I can go tap people on the shoulder until they listen to me, but I want to make sure that there is a mechanism and the words used are perfect to make sure that the voices of everybody that will be affected by the results, which is everybody is this room, has the ability to voice their opinion. If we are independent with twelve different perspectives in

something, it's hard to translate each of those perspectives when they're fundamentally quite different in cases.

BRAD VERD: So—

FRED BAKER: I wonder whether we still are arguing about that sentence that says RSSAC will not be involved. If RSSAC is not involved, then we couldn't meet in a bar and discuss with the three representatives. That would be a violation of that.

However, we've removed the sentence, and if the sentence is not there, then you have the ability for those guys, those people, to go talk to various RSOs.

BRAD VERD: This is where I disagree because RSSAC is not involved. It would be the RSOs involved. What you were just referring to was the RSOs getting together. This is where we've got to be able to switch hats and do that.

So let me phrase the question a little different. And, again, I didn't write this document. I'm just trying to drive to a consensus. So is it hard for twelve independent opinions to be represented by one

voice? Yes. You're now describing RSSAC. So it can be done. It's not easy. It's very difficult.

So is it possible that maybe here you have three co-chairs that represent the RSOs? I don't know, but this is what I'm trying to ... I personally feel like it's – what's the right word? I hope the root server operators are mature enough that they don't need to send twelve.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

So I'll repeat what I said but maybe with more detail. I really don't think the problem is representation. The problem we need to discuss is how we make decisions.

What I heard from you is conflating three different issues in one sentence because you said "the voices to be heard." Voices to heard for what? Because, if it's a voting thing, then the question is, do we just want to be able to say something, or do we want to have always the majority? So it's all about the composition of power.

One of the is, in that group, do we want to always have the upper hand – basically, the veto right – or not, which you can do either by majority or veto, for example?

Within the root operators group, how do we want to make decisions? Should it always be unanimous or no objection or whatever?

So until we clarify that, discussing about these numbers or composition doesn't mean much because you really don't know what would be the outcome.

If you're thinking about the outcome of a decision or to be able to steer this group or, no, to just have a say or, as you put it, to be heard, then they're very different things. So think we have to start from how we want to make decisions and how much power we want to have in that group. Then representation will become an easy thing to decide.

WES HARDAKER:

I think that's an excellent point, Kaveh, and thank you for that because, if the decision-making process was better spelled out, then there'd probably be far less concern.

Back to one thing that Fred said, so now, if that sentence is deleted, are we okay? But just the fact that "RSSAC won't be involved" is gone doesn't mean that we will be. So I think we might want to specify somehow how we will be consulted as time goes on because I think that would alleviate the concern, too. If

you knew you were going to be shown this document at points in time, a lot of that concern goes away as well.

BRAD VERD: The transition – there was like a—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Charter [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: Yes.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: So, first off, when we drafted this, it was literally a period of, like, three days that I had to turn something around. So I –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: No, no, no. I appreciate that you’re pointing out some of these holes because I’m observing the conversation and this is important. We really wrestled with the GWG in particular.

I'm wondering if, if we included RSSAC at the end, where RSSAC has to consider the proposal and make some sort of vote before it goes to the Board ...

SUZANNE WOOLF: I'm a little bit baffled at this point as to why not just say that RSSAC is the equivalent of a chartering organization that sends a limited number of representatives and needs to sign off on the result. I'm not sure how what you're saying ends up being different to that.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Agreed.

SUZANNE WOOLF: And saying that would get us past the sentence about RSSAC not being involved.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Yeah, agreed. The thing is – this is a point that Goran would make – how would IETF/IAB be a chartering organization within the ICANN context?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah. We had to solve that, too, in the ICANN context. But I'm not saying it has to be a CCWG, but we can give RSSAC equivalent status within the group to what is being proposed for ccNSO and RISG.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Okay.

WES HARDAKER: Going back to mechanisms, you can't have multiple chartering organizations. You can still require buy-off from multiple organizations so that the IAB and IETF and RSSAC and FUBAR all having to sign off before this to the Board makes sense.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: So stakeholder sign-off.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, but how do you deal with the ICANN stakeholder? [Is that] the Board?

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Well, the ICANN community is being defined as ccNSO and the registries.

KAVEH RANJBAR: When you say “sign off,” do you mean there is a kind of memorandum or agreement or vote?

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Typically it’s a vote.

BRAD VERD: So are you able to capture this? Can you put that in a document so that we could see it today/tomorrow? That type of thing? Sorry to put more pressure on you.

Okay. Wes, are you okay with that discussion?

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. I think, overall, I’m definitely liking the direction where it goes. The exact wording remains to be read, but I think we’re all in agreement in terms of the best way forward.

BRAD VERD: Great. Is there other outstanding issues that we need to cover before we start at the top of the document?

So everybody agrees or there are other issues? Oh, I’m sorry. Go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I have to leave for preparation of the decision with the Board.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Kaveh. Good luck. Keep us posted.

All right. So is there anything else that we need to cover before we start at the beginning of the document?

Jeff?

JEFF OSBORN: I'm not sure this is the place to throw it in, but I've just been really thinking a whole lot about the idea of the three representatives out of the group of twelve.

Twelve is so unworkable but, again, three is great as long as I'm one of the three. But I was looking around, thinking, "Well, okay. We probably should be ISC because Fred is more equal than others by being Co-Chair, and maybe Verisign isn't because you're more equal than others, and maybe, because of ICANN, I would be self-dealing." So you have nine to pick from.

So if you pick three out of that group and then said something like each of them has a constituency of themselves and three others, then, instead of it being like, "What do I think?" I have to think, "Duane has got to think what do three others ..." It's like little teams.

The idea is that's not as awkward as a whole group of twelve and "What do we think?" But if you, as your little Caucus group, are in touch, then we'd effectively all be represented. That's a dumb idea. Whatever. But it just occurred to me.

BRAD VERD:

I don't think it's a dumb idea. I think it's a complicated idea. Again, we've got two representatives right here that represent all twelve when we are in ICANN.

Sure, we could engineer anything we wanted to, which is what we're good at, but I try to keep it as simple as possible. We've even gone from two and we're going to go down to one.

So maybe it's just a comfort level, right? It took 2013 until now – so six years – for people to be comfortable with a single co-chair. I don't know.

WES HARDAKER:

So I reject the fact that we're good at it: engineering solutions. I'm just kidding.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[Oh.]

WES HARDAKER: [Fred], if the process goes forward, where RSSAC has to sign off on the results, as does possibly IAB or IETF, do you still—

FRED BAKER: [inaudible]

WES HARDAKER: Okay. He said yes for the record.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Yes.

BRAD VERD: Anything else to cover before we start at the top of the document?
All right. Let's go to the top.

FRED BAKER: So starting literally from the top, I had a comment on the first sentence. Let me throw [out that] the statement, "There is no precedent for establishing a cooperation in governance model for the RSS," to me is false on the face of it because we have Root-Ops. They are a precedent. We can decide we don't like it, but they're there.

So we can say that ICANN has not been involved in cooperation in governance of the root [servers] or something like that. Brad?

BRAD VERD:

I actually never thought about it until now, so this is 30 seconds of thought process. But I would argue that Root-Ops is not a governance body of the root server system. It is an operational body, and the body has stated itself that they're only responsible for their own root. And they only speak for their own root. On very rare occasions, there are public statements that have come out, and that's only of recent time.

So I'm not sure. I could say that Root-Ops is a governance body of the root server system, as I heard you imply. If that's an incorrect statement, please forgive me.

FRED BAKER:

No. I made the statement [inaudible] to say [inaudible]. No precedent seemed really, really strange to me.

WES HARDAKER:

So I think your point is valid, Fred. Thank you for catching it. I think there's two different things there. There is previously a cooperation mechanism. We definitely have that. So that's incorrect, but there's not necessarily a governance model. We

have things that sort of solidify around it, like RSSAC itself. So maybe just at least removing “cooperation” because we do have that.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: What if we just cut the sentence?

WES HARDAKER: [I got -]. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

WES HARDAKER: We have a cooperation mechanism within ICANN. It’s called RSSAC. It’s right here.

FRED BAKER: March around the room carrying flags.

WES HARDAKER: “Onto Sentence Two!”

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry. Can I just clarify? Are we actually editing this document or just recording comments against this document?

BRAD VERD: Both– I’m sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: Both in the sense that we are adding comments, and our edits are being taken in redline – I’m sorry. Our feedback is being taken in redline fashion by the BTC. It doesn’t mean that this is what they’re going to end up with, but that’s our feedback, if that makes sense. Are you okay with that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I can live with that.

[FRED BAKER]: Okay.

BRAD VERD: If you have a better solution, please.

FRED BAKER: Well the second edit is the outcome of the discussion we had this morning. So let me ask, is everybody happy with what they see on the screen in front of them?

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: In my defense, I had like ten seconds to plan that sentence. So it's the intention I meant, but different wording is very, very welcome.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Let's advance. Can you advance a page?

HIRO HATTA: On the second point, yes. "Keep up the rights and [responsibilities]." Do we think that we have the right to operate the root servers?

So I don't think it's a good word. So I think we can remove "the rights and." [Keep] only the responsibilities. How about that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Supported.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Putting on my naïve observer hat, I'm just a little curious what the rights and responsibilities designated there are.

[JEFF OSBORN]: Could you repeat that?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMLE: I may be forgetting something important, but I’m not sure where those rights and responsibilities are delineated. So the reference just sort of creates a question that demands to be asked from the naïve observer.

[JEFF OSBORN]: That’s why I said I’d love to get the words better. My point was there’s a thing we’ve got and to the degree it’s taken away, we should be compensated. I’m not happy with how I put it. I think Hiro made a very good point about removing “rights.”

UNIDENTIFIED FEMLE: If I may just respond to that, I suspect that there is appropriate language somewhere in 037 in which we’re defining what – or in the glossary. I’m willing to go caving for it.

[JEFF OSBORN]: If we can leave as asterisk on this and go back and do it, I’d love to have better words, Suzanne.

BRAD VERD: Suzanne, you’ve got this one? You’re going to work on that?

FRED BAKER: [inaudible]. “Establishing three groups and setting up a community-driven process for various purposes.” That’s just going over really the sections of the rest of the paper.

So let’s continue. This next comment is again probably me being picky. I’m not going to die on any hill over that.

Going on, “The Internet is dynamically stable.” That is the conversation that Ryan and Suzanne and I had.

WES HARDAKER: Actually, Fred, I’d like to go back to your complaint about that sentence because I agree because the reality is is that the RSS is changing constantly.

[FRED BAKER]: So remove it?

WES HARDAKER: How about, instead of “was last expanded to,” “when initially designed”?

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry?

WES HARDAKER: "When initially designed."

BRAD VERD: Well, it wasn't initially designed [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

WES HARDAKER: [I didn't mean when] it was 13. When there was four, when the initial rollout went, the Internet was nowhere near envisioned like it is now. So you just reference at that point in time, rather than trying to continually over time.

BRAD VERD: I'm not hung up on it, so whatever.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: He wants to modify it.

FRED BAKER: He wants to change “Was last—

WES HARDAKER: “Change was last expanded” to “When initially designed.” Or “architected” if you like longer words.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: I think it’s a good idea.

FRED BAKER: Anything that has longer words is a good idea?

BRAD VERD: So I have thoughts on this last sentence that was added here. So I making assumptions with this thought, so I’ll just put that out there. So it reads, “The Internet is dynamically stable so governance of the Internet infrastructure cannot be static and must by dynamically stable.”

Are you implying that whatever gets – I’m looking at you, Ryan, because you wrote this, I think, right? – implemented from 037 and the concept paper and whatnot needs to constantly evolve because the Internet constantly evolves? Is that fair or is that a wrong interpretation?

RYAN STEPHENSON: That is a correct interpretation.

BRAD VERD: Okay. So with that – thank you – I feel – again, this is my assumption – that anything that’s implemented from in ICANN space would follow under the review process., and, as the review process happens, you evolve. RSSAC has evolved as a result of the review process, not necessarily a result of the growing Internet, though it was spurred our work. Does that make sense?

So I don’t know what we’re trying to accomplish here. If we want to call out the “whatever gets implemented needs to be constantly reviewed and refined to make better,” then great. Let’s say that. I’m not sure that’s what would be interpreted from this statement. That’s all.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah. Sort of the antecedent of this, the conversation we had was that part of what sometimes happens with processes like this is the people sort of drift into this mindset of, “Where here to solve a problem, and once it’s solved, it’s solved and it will stayed solved.”

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

SUZANNE WOOLF: Right. Done and dusted. What we talked about was how to make it clear that, whatever mechanisms are built under this process or this project or however you want to put it have to be flexible and there have to be mechanisms for changing them as the needs evolved.

“Dynamically stable” struck of as kind of a cool expression for it, but if it’s not working for other people, there’s got to be another way to say it.

FRED BAKER: Let me give you a case in point in that. In 037, we have this thing we call the PMMF, which is basically a place that does measurement somehow. They get [somewhere] so that someone can look at it.

If I look at the concept paper, it says that there’s a standing committee. There’s no mention of measurement. [It’s like], “Wow, those are different concepts.” That was a change.

Now either one of them might possibly be correct. I’m not saying one is correct and one is wrong.

BRAD VERD: To the mic.

FRED BAKER: But just in the course of these two papers, that concept has evolved.

BRAD VERD: My reply to that statement – again, maybe I am naïve, and I’m okay if you want to label me that – again, I compared the Standing Committee to the Customer Standing Committee, which has lots of measurements, lots of reports, lots of a whole bunch of things that are put out there. So to me it was in line with what our intention was with the PMMF. I did not interpret it as, “Oh, we’re losing this thing that we specified in the PMMF. I at no time thought that until this very second when you stated that.

And I still don’t. I believe that the – I forgot what they called – Root Something Standing Committee would implement what was put together in 037 in the PMMF – all the measurements – and I still believe that’s what they would do.

FRED BAKER: And you may be correct. I didn’t have the particular bit of the bit that connected that to the Customer Standing Committee. Just scanning through and looking for the word “standing” – so what

text is around it – you don't see anything that talks about those things.

So I'd be careful with that.

NAELA SARRAS:

Thanks, Brad. Maybe, instead of this sentence, which is a little vague – you keep bringing up the transition, so the Customer Standing Committee just went through an effectiveness review. The IANA naming function is about to go through a review. So maybe you can plant the seed here that, in a final product that comes out, there needs to be the review mechanisms built in so that the system is [visited] and evaluated or changed, etc. I think these reviews have been – the IANA naming one happens every five years but the first one kicks in two years after. I don't know. There's some formula of how often they have been.

But it would be good to plant the seed here, which I think is what that sentence is trying to do, but maybe it could be a little bit more specific.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, I agree. I believe that's what the goal is, and that's what I was trying to reference, that there is a process within ICANN that does this. Do we want to reinvent or do we just want to trigger it,

if that makes sense? If we just want to trigger it, then we just need to the sentence that kind of says that.

NAELA SARRAS: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: Carlos—

NAELA SARRAS: I'm really not trying to invent words here, but, Carlos, you could say something like, "As with every oversight mechanism created through the ICANN ecosystem, there should be the right mechanisms involved for reviewing it." I don't know. I'm making things up, but something like that.

[CARLOS REYES]: Yeah, I think that that makes a lot of sense. Suzanne, it seems like you're trying to say something?

Okay.

BRAD VERD: Can you capture that, Carlos, in the sentence or something?

Thank you. All right. Next one.

FRED BAKER: We've got as far as the introduction, I believe.

BRAD VERD: Keep on going. We're making progress. What're you laughing at?

FRED BAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: Okay.

FRED BAKER: Do we have comments on that?

Seeing none, there are several comments in part of Section 1 and Section 1.1 from Jeff and from Ryan. A question for you – Jeff, you're coming up with some text; Ryan, you're working with some people on some text – do you think we've gotten to a place where we've addressed your comments enough for the moment?

JEFF OSBORN: Yes.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

BRAD VERD: You're still coming back with that text that's going to replace something like ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay. "Root server system governance Board." We're changing "Board" to "cabal," right?

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry. Hold on. Let's – I'm sorry to do this, but go back to right here. So the thing that's highlighted here is, "In addition to these groups, ICANN would manage financial and Secretariat function." This is – Jeff, I just heard you say, yes, you're okay with that, and I don't think you are. So—

JEF OSBORN: No, no, no. I [inaudible] about this addressing [inaudible] comments throughout this where addressed and they were, while multitasking and reading that sentence and going, “Hey, didn’t we change that?” So didn’t we change that?

BRAD VERD: I think we changed it somewhere else. And I feel like it’s in there twice. So this is the piece where we said that the checks and balances need to be in place for potentially an independent party like PTI. We could even reference PTI. That type of thing. It was somewhere else in here. I just don’t know where.

JEFF OSBORN: So I haven’t seen any language about PTI yet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JEFF OSBORN: Right.

BRAD VERD: You didn’t. There was language that I thought came up from Wes or somebody about the ...

[JEFF OSBORN]: Conflict of interest.

BRAD VERD: Yes.

[JEFF OSBOR]: Right.

BRAD VERD: Where is that?

[JEFF OSBORN]: It's in the work of the GWG, so 2.1.

WES HARDAKER: How about just changing ICANN org to “a group” or “groups would manage those functions”? So we defer later until ... This is an introduction that's saying what's going to happen down below, and down below we say this may happens. So we shouldn't say that it does happen up above.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

FRED BAKER: I'll bite the mic.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay. So I'm not sure I have a problem with the ICANN Board, the ICANN org, being an example, which is the word here. Well, okay. It's a word two paragraphs down. So I'll back off on that.

BRAD VERD: Can we use the word "could" here? "In addition to these groups, ICANN org could manage the financial function." Or—

WES HARDAKER: "May" or "Org or other group."

BRAD VERD: Yeah.

WES HARDAKER: Just make it generic. The point being it shouldn't be fact because it's not a fact.

BRAD VERD: Right.

FRED BAKER: Well, it might be a fact in this concept.

WES HARDAKER: But it's not, because later on we say "maybe."

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, we might need to reference RFC2119.

BRAD VERD: [inaudible].

SUZANNE WOOLF: Hey, engineering precision and protocol design [inaudible].

BRAD VERD: I feel like there's something more that needs to be here with regard to an example. Reference the example of PTI as an independent something. I don't know where the words need to go or whatnot, but I feel they need to go there.

So we can make as asterisk and let somebody think about it or whatnot.

[JEFF OSBORN]: I'll come back to this.

BRAD VERD: You got "kwould." Okay. Moving on.

So I have a question with this one. This is, "The RGB would also establish, modify, or evoke service level expectations." I'm going to look at you, Carlos, with the term "revoke SLEs." What was the train of thought here, just so I have context?

CARLOS REYES: Basically, this is really focusing on the policy stream. So, if there's a policy that comes out and, for some reason, over time it's deemed that it's been overcome by events or that it's no longer relevant, then that's the group that could also revoke a policy.

BRAD VERD: So, just to clarify the sentence then, it could read, "RGB would also establish, modify, or revoke policies that may affect SLEs." Is that better for people?

[JEFF OSBORN]: So I like what you have, what you said, Brad. The only thing I would have is, "May affect possible SLEs," meaning that, if there is an SLE that is established, this is a group that would then handle that.

Possibly “established SLEs.”

BRAD VERD: [I guess I’m] go back to SLEs with this discussion that happened earlier. If there was RFC that stated service level expectations with specific numbers, would that be something that would be embraced by the DoD? So then you’ve got something to point to your management and say, “Guys, we got to do that.” Or is that just something that’s like not a—

[JEFF OSBORN]: Actually, with the G-root mission, yes, we would have to follow the RFCs. It’s just kind of standard within the DoD.

FRED BAKER: So we publish it as an RFC.

BRAD VERD: The reason I ask that is because RSSAC001 is tied to an RFC. It’s tied, and the argument earlier was it’s advice so we don’t need to listen to it, that it’s really a suggestion. So I’m just trying to understand where the line is to figure out where this needs to fall.

[JEFF OSBORN]: Exactly. Thank you, Brad. I appreciate that. So, basically, how we kind of review it is RSSAC001 is the companion document to RFC 7720. With RFC 7720 being kind of how root server operators should serve the root zone, then, yes, that’s the reason why we follow that document and also that RSSAC publication.

FRED BAKER: I wonder if we can dodge this question. “The RGB will establish, modify, or revoke policies that affect service measurement,” or, “RSO service measurement.” When you—

BRAD VERD: The RGB is the ...

FRED BAKER: Red, green, blue. It’s what happens on a TV screen.

BRAD VERD: So it’s the SAPF.

FRED BAKER: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: So—

FRED BAKER: But at any rate, what we're getting wrapped around is the fact that we used a legal term. I think what we're really talking about is the measurement, not the outcome of [what] the measurement implies. Ryan?

RYAN STEPHENSON: In the comments there – and, yes, Fred, I 100% agree with you. I have in there, “that possible future agreements with RSOs,” instead of using SLEs.

FRED BAKER: If that works for you, it works for me.

BRAD VERD: So, no. I have a problem with that. My challenge with that is – hold on. So that basically says the only accountability is going to be in an agreement or a contract. What I gave as my interpretation of things earlier was some people might agree to sign a contract and some people might not. And the ones who don't still need to be held accountable. You just removed that.

RYAN STEPHENSON: So I wrote that over lunch. So actually I could incorporate what you were suggesting, Brad, into this.

BRAD VERD: Okay.

RYAN STEPHENSON: And that was something that Fred brought up earlier. “Hey, if you’re receiving financial funding, you have an SLE. If you’re not, you’re still expected to meet, but you’re just not tied to an SLE.” That’s just loose terms, but ...

NAELA SARRAS: Okay. So, again, from the CSC experience, for some reason, the IANA naming function contract built the SLEs into the contract. Then, soon after we started operating under the newest SLEs, we discovered that some of the numbers weren’t built based on a large enough data set.

So now we’ve gone through a year, where we just worked on a process to amend the contracts so then we can amend the SLEs.

So if you though the SLEs in a contract with each RSO, then every change that you have to do is a contract amendment and a negotiation. So you might want to agree on having the SLEs [sit] somewhere, that contractually we point to it so that anyone’s contract has to live up to those same SLEs, assuming everyone agrees, but then changes that you make there don’t constitute a

change in the contract. I don't know if I'm explaining that correctly.

BRAD VERD:

Yes, you are. I think I'll just expand on it. So, if service level expectations were defined in, say, an RSSAC document, then the contracts could reference it. Then, if there were new measurements or new things that had to be added to it, you would change the document and not necessarily change the twelve different contracts that you've already negotiated. So that's the way I interpret that.

So, again, that goes back to the metrics work that's underway. To me, that's the technical accountability of a root server. If we defined what good looks like, then that would be what that document is.

WES HARDAKER:

How about something – I'm trying to go back to generic, Brad, like you wanted – like, "That affects expected service requirements of RSOs"? So you take out the SLE and the legal aspect of it and you just have service expectations as generic and [it] encompasses the SLEs.

RYAN STEPHENSON: I'm good with that.

BRAD VERD: For the record, I'm going to state that, when this goes to public comment, SLAs and SLEs will come up. So you just removed it. It will come up again.

You find it interesting that everybody's all of a sudden smiling because SLEs are removed. I get it, I see it, but it's going to come back.

[RYAN STEPHENSON]: Just step by step.

[JEFF OSBORN]: Am I the only one unsure on this? I never heard the concept of "SLE" until this group. And SLA is contractual obligation which, if you fail, costs you money and whatever. "E" is an expectation, so it's worth the paper it's written on? What is ...

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I am now guessing wildly, but I guess that roughly the same dialogue happened in the IANA context.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BRAD VERD: I'd almost guarantee it did.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. So they invented a new name for the same thing so it wouldn't seem as contentious. Then, eventually, now with the CSC and the IANA and the continuing discussions, we've changed it back to SLAs because no one understands SLEs.

[JEFF OSBORN]: So if we had SLRs, we could just call it service level requests?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, indeed. And that will be changed to SLAs eventually down the line because that's the only thing everyone understands.
[inaudible]

[JEFF OSBORN]: [inaudible] Why don't we just take it out then? Or are you going to give me a look if I say that because I wasn't paying attention?

BRAD VERD: That's why I just pointed this all out. That was the irony of me pointing it all out. So you just validated the irony. Thank you.

All right. Time check here. We are at the end of this session, right, Carlos? We're at the end of this session now?

So the schedule has us ... Saturday. So this is the end of – is that right? Is it really 3:00? I'm having too much fun.

So, yeah, that's the close of today. We have How It Works later in the Ohwada Room? And that is at 3:15. So I encourage you all to be there to answer questions afterwards. We will pick this up as time allows tomorrow.

Hopefully, as we work through some of the other sessions, gain some time and we can continue this discussion.

I would encourage everybody in their free time to go back and read the document – the concept paper. If you have challenges with what's in there, write a suggestion that resolves your challenge, and then we can talk about it here, rather than trying to come up with a challenge tomorrow. That'll help with time and

being more efficient. So, please, go back through the document and read that.

Anything else to cover, Carlos? Fred?

FRED BAKER: I think we're good.

BRAD VERD: All right. 3:15. How It Works. See you there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And the Ohwada Room is directly above is, so go back to the escalators, go upstairs, and then come back down this way.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]