

---

KOBE – RSSAC Work Session (5 of 8)  
Sunday, March 10, 2019 – 10:30 to 12:00 JST  
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

FRED BAKER: Okay, shall we? It's now 10:34. Hello? It is now 10:34, so let's come to order. Daniel? So, I think what we would like to do, if we can achieve it, is to finish our commentary on the concept paper. If we need to, we'll take another slot to continue the discussion. This isn't drop dead, but it would be really nice if we can actually come to closure on the things that we've been discussing.

Now, Carlos spent most of last night, 3:00 in the morning, editing, or addressing comments in the paper, red lining, and should go over, or can go over the changes to the document that he thinks where we are at.

BRAD VERD: Based on discussions yesterday.

FRED BAKER: Sorry?

BRAD VERD: Based on discussions yesterday.

---

**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.**

---

FRED BAKER: Based on the discussion yesterday, capturing that discussion, and then we'll continue from there, going through the comments that remain in the document. So, Carlos, can I turn this over to you?

BRAD VERD: So, this is really the only time to bring it up. So, there was a request sent out weeks ago, a month ago, about questions for OCTO. We have a meeting scheduled with OCTO later this week, Tuesday. So far, there's been really no questions between the two organizations and the topic has come up as should we forgo that meeting and spend more time on this, and what does the group feel about that? So, that's to be put on the table, right now.

WES HARDAKER: So, I think you said we have no questions for them, and they have no questions for us, is that correct?

BRAD VERD: Nothing that's been shared with the chairs for us to share.

WES HARDAKER: I think in the past we've had a typical sense that there were many things to discuss. It sounds like we're pretty much all caught up, and there are certainly people in the room that could speak for

---

OCTO, as well, just to make sure that there is nothing in the back of your guys' heads. Sorry, Matt, but I had to throw you under the bus.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, and not to put Matt on the spot, this was really, should this group not have anything to share with OCTO, we would go back to OCTO, not to put Matt on the spot, and say we don't have anything, do you want to cancel this meeting, or do you want to continue it? That type of thing. So, again, Matt, you're not going to be held to whatever your answer is here. This will go back to OCTO.

MATT LARSON:

Sure, thanks. We don't have any questions. We don't. So, we've canvased internally, and nobody has come up with any burning questions, and because the RSSAC 3738 implementation has been handed off to the policy side, to David Olive's team, there's really nothing to say about that anymore. So, we're always happy to meet with RSSAC, but it sounds like this time maybe there's not a whole lot to talk about.

[JEFF OSBORN]:

Just before we blow it off completely, I'm a little disconcerted that, just because the playdate doesn't have a schedule, that

---

doesn't mean it wouldn't be an interactively interesting period. It's that OCTO is a group that has so many commonalities and the things we're interested in that we do that I'm wondering whether the absence of being able to come up with a question isn't each of us showing, well, I know that, so I don't have to ask that, but the discussion of that in a formal setting might be interesting. And, if I'm full of it, blow me off, we won't do it, but you know what I'm saying, it's that I always find it interesting and learn something I didn't know.

BRAD VERD:

I'll speak for myself. I serve at the pleasure of this group, so you tell me what you want to do, and I'll convey the message.

FRED BAKER:

Well, and I similarly speak for myself here, but if we can finish with the concept paper discussion in this session, this morning, then we don't need to bump the OCTO session. If we don't get done with the concept paper this morning, that's kind of the obvious slot to continue that discussion in.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

May I add a different suggestion? So, I think it's good if we quickly spent five or ten minutes to iterate the issues that we have discussed about the work of OCTO and then see if there is interest

to have that session, maybe without a prepared agenda, but at least to have that two-day discussion because I know that there were at least one or two issues that we formally or informally touched, one of them in Root Ops, one of them, and so it's maybe good to iterate through the subjects and then the room I think has more information to decide.

I can start. One of the feedback I heard, and I think it was shared in root ops, but anyways it's public. It's the presentation of ... And we know that L-root is promoting hyper local access as a way and means of basically adding [inaudible] which is fine. Of course, any root operator has their choice, and some others do the same, but we have seen in public presentations from OCTO that they basically mentioned the whole root service system is vulnerable to attacks to DDoS attacks, and then there are some numbers shown and some arguments.

I've heard, from a few operators at least, that they don't agree with that. So, especially coming from OCTO, again, that's different coming from L-root because, as independent operators, every single one of us are entitled to our opinion, but we expect OCTO to at least consider RSSAC's input, or I think that's the expectation from the RSSAC. That's what I heard, and I think that's one of the issues that we can possibly address in the session with OCTO. Or not, but it is on the table.

BRAD VERD: This is how I fear the discussion with OCTO would go.

JEFF OSBORN: Oh, that's funny, I was just thinking this is how I hoped the discussion with OCTO would go. There's a little ... I'll be blunt. I kind of resent the implications that come out once in a while of since these bozos can't do it, we'll to it our way, and it's never that blunt, but that's what I hear when I read it at 3:00 in the morning. So, to Kaveh's point, this is not helpful with ICANN being the steward of all of our things and hand them over here, everything will be fine, when one of their components is telling us that we're part of a failing and failed system, that they're here to save humanity from the 11 other of us.

MATT LARSON: I do think that's the glass half-full interpretation of the reasons for promoting hyper local. Certainly, that's not the intent. The intent is to not cast aspersions on the root operators and the root server system, but to say, "Here is a way to improve what we already have, even further."

---

JEFF OSBORN: Every time I've heard it, it is prefaced with given the impending failure of the other people in the system then, and so I have a hard time with that, unless we're hearing different sources, Matt.

MATT LARSON: Well, isn't it a fact that the capacity of attackers only increases and that if somebody wanted to have the root server system have a bad day, they could make that happen? I'm not saying take down the entire root server system. I'm just saying that's a fact.

BRAD VERD: So, this sounds like the OCTO discussion. So, let's not cancel the meeting right now, and we will continue this discussion in our public session with OCTO. Fair?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Just to come up with this end item, there are two other things that came up. One of them, coming from OCTO, this is something that was actually addressed at the board. I'm the shepherd, but it's not yet at the board level, so I'm just appointed, but I think, Terri, I think on behalf of OCTO, send it to the Root Ops. That's what crisis communication plan for root operators. It's not yet discussed with Root Ops, so we haven't yet got it. I think it's scheduled for Prague, but just so you know, that's one of the ongoing interactions between root server operators, not RSSAC,

---

and OCTO, just so you know. I don't know if you want to discuss it in that session or not, but to bring it up.

And other subjects, again, because it hasn't yet been discussed with the Root Ops it might be premature, and that might be another reason to actually not have that session. I don't know. Another discussion I had, I brought up on the list, generally ... And this has been discussed. We had it in the public meeting in Barcelona, and in the public meeting before, but there has always been, and I asked RSSAC, again, I think in Barcelona about our position, and I think there's a difference in interpretation of the bylaws by at least the root operators and RSSAC.

Again, personally, I have a side on that, but to be honest, I think what we need now is clarity, and that's in most cases when OCTO wants to basically define a work item. They always refer to the part of bylaws which says ICANN is in charge of security and the stability of DNS and then they continue, and then they say, because of that, we need that.

My understanding was – and I really need clarity on that, as your liaison – that root operators do not necessarily agree with that assessment. Maybe I'm wrong, but I think clarity on that will help a lot. So, do operators see ICANN as in charge of DNS, the security and stability, or not? Because this comes up. Almost every argument starts with that assessment.



---

BRAD VERD:                    Okay, so three topics, if everybody is okay, we'll capture those three, and we'll share them with OCTO and that's what we'll discuss then. Any quick objections or something to add? We want to get back to the document, so Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:        I just want to caution against mixing in specific Root Ops topics with the official meeting between RSSAC and OCTO.

BRAD VERD:                    Agree.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:        So, just make sure that this is the official meeting with the RSSAC and the OCTO and not the root zone operators.

BRAD VERD:                    yes, agreed.

KAVEH RANJBAR:            And, Brad, if I may. Actually, because I mentioned all these three, but I suggest if ... I personally don't see any urgency to any of these three. These are ongoing and maybe high-level discussions. I really see value if we discuss them first in Root Ops, and also

---

prepare within ourselves because if tomorrow, or Tuesday, we go to session with OCTO, we haven't yet even internally discussed. Maybe, actually, we agree, and we concur with OCTO's understanding of the bylaws. So, my suggestion is if no one sees the urgency, actually, personally I prefer not to have the session before we discuss it first with Root Ops and, second, internally with RSSAC.

BRAD VERD:

Alright, so now we have conflicting topics here, so are our opinions. So, again, as your messenger, would you like to continue the meeting with OCTO, or as Kaveh described, would you like to get more prepared, more discussion and then come back? And, please remember, we need to focus on the concept paper and not a lot of time on this. This was meant to be a 60-second discussion, okay? So, Ryan, and then Liman.

RYAN STEPHENSON:

Can we get to the concept paper and then follow to see where we are in the concept paper, then answer that question? Or, is it no? Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Let's not punt on this. I have a solid proposal, which is cancel the meeting because this is supposed to be an official meeting and if

---

we don't officially have any questions then we should cancel the meeting. If we want to chat around the various topics, then let's do so in the hallways.

BRAD VERD:

Alright, hearing no other objections, we'll cancel. Great. Alright, back to the document. So, Carlos is going to share with us the changes that he's gone through, based upon our conversation the other day, and then we will continue the point-by-point discussion to go through it, so Carlos?

CARLOS REYES:

Thank you Brad. So, I went back into the concept paper, generally internalizing the discussions yesterday, and going through the document to make sure we're capturing the feedback in the form of edits. Most of my edits related to the discussion point yesterday about making sure that RSSAC has a role in phase three. So, if we can focus on that, I want to make sure that we get that right because I think the other issues will then flow from there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

[off mic].

CARLOS REYES:

Yeah, that's, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, I can do it here.

CARLOS REYES: Okay, let's go to Section 2.4.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, you need to Google?

CARLOS REYES: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that's right.

CARLOS REYES: Is everyone in the Google doc?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

CARLOS REYES: So, let's, yeah, let's just go to 2.4.1. So, throughout this section I have added whenever the board is considering something RSSAC is also considering it as well. So, you'll see that, specifically, step

---

2 of 2.4.1. So, it says RSSAC and ICANN board consider the GWG presents all the final material that it produces to RSSAC for their consideration. There's a step 5 for RSSAC consideration and a vote, and again in step 10 and step 11.

BRAD VERD: It seems to address the topic that was brought up the other day, yes? I see heads nodding. Okay, great. Yes?

JEFF OSBORN: Does this turn into a really unwieldy timeframe, sort of by definition? I mean, if each of these things is a certain, how bad is it, do you think?

CARLOS REYES: I don't think that should be driving the process. It's good to be thorough. That's the purpose of the multi-stakeholder model, to make sure that it's deliberative and thorough. So, it's going to take as long as it needs to take.

Okay, so I think that addresses the issues of ensuring RSSAC is involved in that step. I'll move up to the issue of SLEs and that specific term. If we look at 1.4, Section 1.4, this is the financial function. So, this section, the orange bullet points, those bullet points are taken directly from 37, RSSAC 37 SLEs is already

---

captured as a term, and if you look at that first bullet point, this is a discussion that obviously the RSSAC had about a year ago, which is that service-level expectations should exist between the stakeholders that provide funding and RSOs that receive that funding. So, references through SLEs in the remaining sections of the document go back to this original point.

So, does that address some of the concerns about referencing SLEs in the document? Because, what the concept paper does is simply quote 37 and then extend that process of what it would look like to finalize the model.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Carlos, thank you very much for explaining that, and yes it does.

CARLOS REYES: So, Ken, does that address the comment you had earlier in the document as well?

KEN RENARD: Yeah, I think so, because that was before. My comment was before was before that relationship was mentioned, only the non-ICANN funded RSOs.

---

CARLOS REYES: Right, so thanks. Yeah. So, basically, because the concept paper is quoting 37 and 37 outlines that division, or that distinction and differentiation, then everything subsequently follows from there.

BRAD VERD: So, yes, I will, I will just add one comment, commentary, and that is the metrics work party that we just finished talking about would define, in theory, a set of metrics. Let's not call it SLEs. Technical accountability that would be applied to all RSOs receiving funding or not. So, I don't know how you want to interpret that in here, but these would go hand in hand, right? So, I just want to make sure that people see that relationship. Don't call it SLEs. Call it whatever you want, but the technical accountability would come from the Metrics Work Party and the SLEs, if that's what you call it, are what people who are receiving funding have to meet, and the technical accountability as defined by the metrics work party would be what everyone is expected to meet, funding or not.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just to make clear to that point, because you and I have discussed it, lo' these many years, this is exactly what makes us responsible for meeting those things. This is the matching bookend of we are responsible for hitting a series of goals because, financially, we have been compensated for that. The

---

SLE is tied directly to the dollars paid as well. If you want nine nines, this is going to get real expensive, fast.

CARLOS REYES: Brad, thank you for bringing that up and I 100% agree, and what I was wondering is, maybe if I could just throw in a sentence, up in the RGB area, that would say basically exactly what you just said, one sentence, one line that regardless if an RSO is receiving funding, or not, service expectations must be met.

BRAD VERD: Please draft it and add it.

FRED BAKER: An approach to that might be to distinguish between the metrics and the agreements that use the metrics, that we all report on the metrics. Those that are receiving money, there's an analysis that's pursuant to an SLE.

BRAD VERD: Please propose verbiage for that.

CARLOS REYES: Okay, so those were the, I think, two sort of fundamental issues that I took back from yesterday.



---

BRAD VERD: So, Jeff, can we resolve your question here, or is it not resolved?

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah, for the state were at now, the thing I was debating whether opening my mouth on is probably due later which is was this to be a separate rather than ICANN Corporation. That would be interesting, but I think that's too much to throw in the mix right now.

BRAD VERD: How do I say this? I think, so a bunch of us have talked about that, and I think that comes at a later time. This is the board's response, so this would be the wrong place for it, but this would come out of the governance group that would be created to drive this forward, and then that would be potentially a result from there. Does that make sense?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Absolutely.

BRAD VERD: Okay, great.

---

CARLOS REYES: Okay, so I'm slowly going in and resolving some of these comments. Jeff, your paragraph from yesterday, I added it at the end of Section 1.4.

JEFF OSBORN: I think my intentions were better than my wording. So, if somebody has an edit to this, I've got no sense of ownership.

CARLOS REYES: I made a few wordsmithing edits. I think it's fine as it stands. I'll defer to the group.

BRAD VERD: This is in line with what the CEO has told us, so directly in line.

CARLOS REYES: Yeah, so I think we're done in terms of issues from yesterday. So, if we want to go through the remaining comments, I think we'll have a better sense of where the feedback stands.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So, I just have a small clarification. So at the end we keep the SLE because I think at some point, we thought of removing SLE and having only SLA.

---

BRAD VERD: Again, let's not spend all day on this again. SLE, the term, is already in 37, so SLE is there. It's not going anywhere, okay, and SLEs in 37 is tied to funding. If an RSO receives funding there is a set of SLEs that they must live up to, okay?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

BRAD VERD: Alright, are we good?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: Great.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Brad.

FRED BAKER: So, going through issues. I'm sorry?

---

CARLOS REYES: You can ignore me in the comments. We'll just address everyone else's feedback.

FRED BAKER: Okay, that sounds good. Skipping to the next comment. Okay. So, the first comment that isn't from Carlos that's still in the document is in Section 1.1. Ryan, you make a comment that RSOs need funding and all that kind of stuff. I believe we've addressed that. Do you agree we've addressed that?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yes. In fact, if you take a look, I added the sentence RSOs that receive funding and RSOs that wish to forgo funding must still meet the same service requirements and report on them using the same metrics. So, if people would like to wordsmith that, but that's kind of what I believe Brad was alluding to. The other one I added was ... I was just thinking about RSSAC documents. In the event that RSSAC was to dissipate with the new model and/or if it still exists, just the RGB would use the existing RSSAC documents as a foundation for its service expectations and that could be left in there or removed. It was just an idea.

FRED BAKER: Well, and here I'm speaking for myself. We've developed a number of documents. They inform this process that we've gone

---

through. They include things like a lexicon. What words do we use and what do we mean when we use them? To me, there's an awful lot of value in the RSSAC documents, whether the RSSAC itself, as it's named that way, continues to exist. I think there might be something. We might even call it RSSAC. It might be the same as this, but that's another discussion. So, referencing the existing RSSAC documents, to me, makes sense. So, Wes?

WES HARDAKER:

I think the idea is good. I think, so the thing to do, I would change "use" to "start with" because the reality is that the RGB is going to be the thing that extends for a long period of time, and they should start with where we started, but we can't hold them to that forever. We might want to add IEFT RFCs, as well, since there's already at least one RFC that we're supposed to subscribe to.

FRED BAKER:

Are we happy with that? Okay, moving on.

CARLOS REYES:

The next one's from Jeff.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay, so the next comment is in Section 1.1 in the last paragraph. Jeff, you basically addressed legitimacy. Where do we stand with your comment?

JEFF OSBORN: The paragraphs have been edited, and so I was trying to listen to everybody and read it at the same time.

CARLOS REYES: I'll read the clean version because this is also feedback that the BTC gave. So, basically, the new paragraph would read, "Some of the work to be conducted by the RBG is currently preformed by RSSAC and RSSAC caucus. Therefore, the existing RSSAC and RSSAC caucus may evolve in the cooperation and governance model. The exact functions of the RBG and its structure would be determined by the community-driven process." So, I've taken out the explicit references to changes, etc.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you. That addresses my concern.

FRED BAKER: Someday, I'll figure this mic out. So, okay, the comment in the final paragraph of 1.1, this cart is much too far in front of the

---

horse, what funds? And, Liman, you seconded that. Where are we at in resolving that comment?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think we're in the last bullet, actually, quoting from the RSSAC 37, which makes this something that I don't want to modify in this document because I want to retain the exact quote from the document, but the way it's formulated here is that the funds that they receive from, which kind of postulates that we do receive funds.

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah, my concern on this was addressed when I got a sentence and a paragraph that say we are not giving anything up without money changing hands. So, I don't know what Lars thinks, but my concern goes away.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so we're in a position to mark this resolved?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.





---

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah, but I report to the board and you're on the board.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think you guys ought to fire each other and get it over with.

FRED BAKER: But, coming back to your actual question, I think that authority derives from the creation of ICANN and specifically the people that were involved in doing it.

JEFF OSBORN: All I'm saying is this is an important point to make and if ISE's is going to be that that authority exists, that's a big switch, and I'm willing to throw it, if you say to throw it.

FRED BAKER: And we have to get Rick to say that.

RUSS MUNDY: So, this question, in terms of the authority to create RSOs is one that has very, very poor documentation with it. I'm in the midst of doing some work to document the history, and this is one of the questions that came up very specifically, and we looked very hard and have not been able to find any written documentation that

---

says such a thing exists. The absolute certain inferred is just the type of thing that you described, Fred, and there are a lot of people that hold various views that aren't exactly the same. So, I think we need to—in terms of what we write in our documentation here—do the best we can in terms of sticking to a written record. So, if there is a written record, then fine, let's use it. If not, let's not try to make it up.

FRED BAKER:

And I'm coming to you in just a second. I think one thing you might want to read, and it's actually on the ICANN website, but ICANN didn't write it so don't read too much into the fact. But it's an article written about Jon going to Congress and asking for money to create ICANN. It might be very interesting to go read the testimony that he gave to Congress. So, [Naela]?

[NAELA SARRAS]:

I'd love to argue about all of the details, all day, because I was there for a different subset of them than anybody else in the room, but I actually think that the goal here should be to say that this is an operational matter rather than historical, legal and all the other aspects of it. The reason why it's inadequately documented is that it was considered an operational matter, and I think the important thing is that this mechanism that exists is being created with the support and consensus of the

---

stakeholders because it needs to be, and not try to answer the question, which I love the question that Jeff posed. It's an important question. It's also not one that we've been able to come to a whole lot of useful consensus on, over many years of trying.

So, I actually support side-stepping that question in the most constructive way possible because I don't think that it's the important question. I think the important question is legitimacy now, which comes from the stakeholders.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hear, hear!

FRED BAKER: Okay, well, with that, let's move on to the next concern. And, Jeff, so what I'm looking at now is the bullet handling removal cases, so we would no longer operate through a service subject to ICANN board oversight, and you've got a fairly extensive comment there. How do you want to handle that?

JEFF OSBORN: This was addressed by the inclusion of a sentence and a paragraph that covers it.

---

FRED BAKER: So, this is something we can resolve?

JEFF OSBORN: That is correct.

FRED BAKER: On Section 1.4, the first bullet, was it envisioned that this, which is the RGB and SLEs, has RSO involvement, do you want to go into that? Is there more to discuss?

JEFF OSBORN: Didn't we? I think we resolved this somewhere else, the idea that ICANN solely having the financial secretary at another function was deemed to be a little too much. So, I believe that this was changed elsewhere and that we simply, at 3:00 in the morning, Carlos didn't find the connection. Is that reasonable?

CARLOS REYES: Yeah, we did add, there was a step where the GWG basically assesses COI concerns between ICANN org as the secretary at financial functions and it's RSO role. Is that what we're referring to?

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah, to the degree that that's referenced here, I'm resolved.

---

WES HARDAKER: Can I suggest that we actually just strike that sentence since it is dealt with somewhere else and I don't think we need it. I don't think that sentence is needed to start this section.

FRED BAKER: The sentence you're referring to being the first bullet?

WES HARDAKER: As envisioned in this concept paper, ICANN org would assume the financial function proposed in 37 because, later on, I think we state that there's possible conflicts, and we say possibly other things too.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I support that.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, the last paragraph in Section 1, it's easy to imagine a bureaucracy. What do you want me to do with that?

JEFF OSBORN: I think we've addressed this. I was trying to put something into represent Rick's fear which really is looking unrealistic now, that this would be turned into a dues-paying organization with several

---

tall office towers full of staff, and we'd all be bled dry paying for it. So, appropriate level of support and resourcing. A reasonable level is terrific, but he at one point wanted me to put in words saying there could not be staff, real estate or human resources required as part of supporting this thing.

FRED BAKER: Well, and I was there when you said that. Can we resolve this?

JEFF OSBORN: I think at this point, yes.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you.

CARLOS REYES: So, I don't think that we need to capture this in the document in any way, but there are models of independent secretariats within ICANN and the whole community, frankly. So, I think that those concerns can easily be addressed later.

FRED BAKER: Okay, the next comment is actually from me, and I was trying to capture comments that were going around and propose a constructive way forward. So, this is in Section 2.1. I suggest that

---

the GWG propose prototype policies that handle the issues that we've been discussing. I believe that we've added several things in the paper or made several notes in the paper that address this thing. I'm willing to see it resolved if everybody else agrees that that's the case.

BRAD VERD:

The only piece that's really missing here, and it's literally just like a word you could add, is it's 37, the concept paper, and the feedback from the community. So, it's those three things. That statement only captures two of the three.

WES HARDAKER:

Do you want to say community or stakeholders?

CARLOS REYES:

I said public comment process because it could come from elsewhere.

FRED BAKER:

Well, the difference between community and stakeholders is the IAB.

---

WES HARDAKER: It's a question, it indicates we are trying to actively involve the stakeholders which includes the IAB.

FRED BAKER: Got it. Zooming forward, the next non-Carlos comment I see in here. Jeff, if you can imagine this, Section 242, you discuss budget processes. Where do we stand with that?

JEFF OSBORN: The fact that I've had so many comments in here we're basically a series of belts and suspenders, so I'm making the same point, and I believe this is addressed.

FRED BAKER: So, we can resolve this?

JEFF OSBORN: Correct.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and the bottom line on my screen, right now reads [I bid]. Are there any other comments on the paper that we need to capture, Carlos?



---

CARLOS REYES: So, yesterday, there was a small section in the introduction. We had talked about potentially Suzanne providing more text that would explain. If we go to the introduction, we'll see it. Or, sorry, the executive summary. so, I think that's the only outstanding point, and then Ryan's edits, just now. Maybe we just go in and accept them, then that's it.

[SUZANNE WOOLF]: Yeah, I'll admit the dog ate my homework because I started trying to read the full red line and got very lost.

FRED BAKER: We can do that now. The one question I would ask is we have been creating a whole lot of comments on your paper. It's still your paper. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, actually, I tried to clarify this multiple times, but I know this question also came up yesterday again, just to make sure that everybody is aligned. So, yes, this is a BTC document. Basically, BTC asked Org to prepare it, the policy staff, basically, to prepare a draft for them. We have had disagreements. For efficiency, we would provide our input, but at the end, it will be BTC's decision. They might adopt all of these red line changes. They might adopt none, or some. We should use our session with BTC on Monday to

---

basically explain why we have these comments and proposed these changes, but that's why – and maybe BTC will have a formal meeting. Hopefully they will approve one form of this document, again, hopefully with all of our proposed changes, and then RSSAC will have its own formal time.

So, basically, that's why every time, I repeat, this is the informal part, but there will be the formal process. So, after BTC makes a decision on what they want to send to RSSAC, RSSAC will be formally informed, and then we will have ... We can decide to maybe vote on it, or whatever, but that's where we get our chance to basically formally say, “Okay, we are happy with this, move forward, have resolution, public comment and all of that.”

So, this is just working closely with the staff and BTC for efficiency, but they are not obliged to accept all these or any of these. We know, in general, they want to be helpful. We want to be productive. So, this is just a way of efficiency.

FRED BAKER: Liman and then Wes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just two quick comments. Yeah, can we hope for the red line version just before that meeting, at least, so that we have it in front of us?

---

CARLOS REYES: I can probably produce a clean version today, assuming I can connect with Suzanne.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: The thing is, I don't want the clean one. I want the version that outlines exactly the differences from the original document. That's the important thing.

CARLOS REYES: Yes. Yeah, so I'll do that. So, I'll produce a red line version and I'll produce a clean version. And I'll circulate those via email because it's hard to do that on Google docs.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right, thank you. My second comment is that, at some point in time – and I'm not saying now – we probably need to run this by the IAB because we probably need them to buy into this. They're one of the stakeholders. They're expected to show up in this process. So, they should probably know about this.

BRAD VERD: Well, this is not our document. So, it's not our responsibility to do that. This would be the BTC getting input from the IAB.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Fair enough. It should be shown too. Remove the we.

BRAD VERD: I think you can talk to our liaison and he could mention it to somebody in the BTC. I don't know, do you know somebody in the BTC?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: He could, for example, mention it to his fellow BTC member, the IETF liaison to the board.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, just one clarification. I haven't shared the document because it has been shared within SSAC. So, that's ...

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: [inaudible] not at this point, but at some point in the process.

WES HARDAKER: Thanks. So, I think that the one thing that we started to talk about yesterday and I think that we were going to go back and look at the sentence, was in the second paragraph of the executive summary, the last sentence. So, it's the one highlighted in yellow. Carlos just found it, that says each RSO does not intend to give up

---

the rights and responsibilities. We talked about removing the word rights, and I don't know if there is agreement upon doing that. And then, as well, the word each bothers me in that sentence, and I was trying to figure out how to fix it, because the reality is if we don't have knowledge of every RSO's opinion—and not all of them are here, for example—and so I think I'd prefer to change that to something like RSOs may not, or I'm trying to think of something stronger than may not, but RSOs might not be willing to give up their responsibilities. Jeff?

JEFF OSBORN:

Not might. This sentence is the reason I gave up on all of my complaints, and so I just ... I really strongly want to ensure that this doesn't become mealy-mouthed.

WES HARDAKER:

So, that's I was saying that I think that I didn't want to use the word may, right, but the reality is that, as it is written now, it sounds like there is a consensus among all 13, and I disagree that there's that consensus because I don't know that-

JEFF OSBORN:

So, you say each RSO may not intend to give up?

---

**WES HARDAKER:** I was thinking about some, too, but I don't know because it may be unanimous, but because we don't know, I was trying to figure out a way to phrase it saying this is a concern, it's a valid concern, it's an important one, and I don't want to diminish the concept that you were trying to put in it, but as written it sounds like all 13, and I don't know if we can say that when all 13 aren't in the room – 12, excuse me.

**KAVEH RANJBAR:** To frame your concern properly because I agree. I think it's a valid concern, but I just want to remind the whole room. This will come from BTC to us, formally, so this is not us saying all RSOs are doing that, or not, correct? So, this is a BTC document, it will be submitted to us, and when it's submitted to us, then we can say, actually ... So, it doesn't need to show consensus for all RSOs, at least at this stage.

**WES HARDAKER:** Sure, but I do find it humorous that the BTC is writing a sentence about us, to us.

**UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:** This is where I'm struggling because that's a very important point. I'm really uneasy with a paper that comes from the BTC, to us, expressing any such sentiment as this.

---

JEFF OSBORN: We've been doing this as schizophrenics the whole time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, we have. We have, and so what I started to think about, and then failed to get the specific language on, for just the reason that we're struggling now, again. I think the idea ... I understand why you want the idea in there, and I think it's the pin on which you're hanging a whole bunch of other things.

JEFF OSBORN: Similarly, the term consideration does not necessarily mean cash.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I assume the term consideration was carefully chosen. I had no plans to get rid of that. Nothing in this document presumes that any RSO intends. Does that work for you?

JEFF OSBORN That's real pretty.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, but does it work?

---

JEFF OSBORN: Yes. Yes, it does.

FRED BAKER: [Each], which is what I was going to complain about.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, and it allows the BTC to step back from attempting to characterize a consensus of the RSOs.

CARLOS REYES: I think, to Jeff's point, though, to think – and then to Kaveh's point – that could also be something that comes from the RSSAC in the formal feedback.

JEFF OSBORN: Correct, Hiro requested that and I thought we agreed.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

WES HARDAKER: Thank you.



---

**KAVEH RANJBAR:** To Liman's earlier point about having the [diff] version, my suggestion for the session on Monday with the BTC would be basically that we have that [diff] version because they have seen, of course, the document. They have seen the presentation. So, we go through that [diff] version and explain every single one of the changes we are proposing, and I will again remind everyone in that session that this is the BTC's decision at this point. So, we are just proposing.

**BRAD VERD:** I hope, I assume the BTC will read it ahead of time so that, like, every change, we can. I mean, because there's more like kind of concepts, big chunks of things, that will be addressed, that type of thing, yeah.

**FRED BAKER:** The responsibilities of serve the root, the responsibilities of root service, I think. Do we have any other things that we need to talk about with respect to this?

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE:** Claim victory.

**FRED BAKER:** Okay, I'm instructed to claim victory. I hereby ... Okay, Ryan?

---

RYAN STEPHENSON: Sorry, and this is just a quick recap, just for my general knowledge. Section 2.1, root server system governance working group, second paragraph, where it talks about RSOs in 3, was that ever raised, or was that ever decided upon? I apologize.

BRAD VERD: I believe, but I could be mistaken. I believe this was essentially resolved or – how do I say it? People were okay with that, given that RSSAC was added as the final ... RSSAC and the board are now final reviewers of the whole thing.

RYAN STEPHENSON: I understand, thank you.

FRED BAKER: Seeing no other hands flailing in the air, considering victory.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Now that we do have victory, and maybe we don't need that other session – it's still open – would the OCTO, would we still want to maybe meet with the OCTO then? Yay? Nay?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I maintain my previous stance.

BRAD VERD: It doesn't change. Yeah, nothing changes.

FRED BAKER: Okay, I'm declaring it lunchtime.

BRAD VERD: Thank you all.

JEFF OSBORN: When and where do we next meet? Okay, is this is a reasonable place to leave secure things like your own bag? I screwed that up. Okay, thank you very much.

CARLOS REYES: So, there is another session here at—

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**