KOBE – RSSAC Work Session (6 of 8)
Sunday, March 10, 2019 – 13:30 to 15:00 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

FRED BAKER: Okay, well, just for fun, let me call the meeting to order. It just seems like one of those things that ought to happen sooner or later. So, Wes wants to translate the document to French.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's already in a foreign language.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah … Anyhow. Okay, do we want to have this conversation?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What's on the agenda?

FRED BAKER: Well, what we have on the agenda, it depends on which agenda you look at the … If I look at the one in the lower right-hand corner of this Adobe Connect thing, it says that were talking about the concept paper. I had this really strange idea that we were walking in to do a prep session for the rest of the week, and so I guess my first question is the agenda.

BRAD VERD: The agenda is supposed to be a prep session for the rest of the week.

FRED BAKER: It's supposed to be a prep session for the rest of the week.

BRAD VERD: Where we go through the slides that we do with the public presentation, the slides we do and—

WES HARDAKER: So, it sounds like we should … So Brad's been saying, off mic, that we had a prep session to decide what the slides should be and stuff like that, and that's probably the first priority. That would be my guess, although we've done that so many times.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We need to prepare for tomorrow as well, where it's BTC and—

FRED BAKER: So, go ahead and have the prep session. We have some slides. Who is running the slides? Is that you? Okay.

CARLOS REYES:	The first item for prepping is the meeting with the BTC.

FRED BAKER:	Okay.

BRAD VERD:	Alright. Fine. So, if the BTC is the first thing, then you agreed you're going to come up with red line and clean version, and we agreed that sitting down with the BTC, we will go through issue by issue, or red line by redline, which there will probably be some large concepts that will cover a lot of the red lines type of thing, and do you think the BTC will be fine with that, right, that they'll be receptive?

KAVEH RANJBAR:	Yes, and I've already informed Akinori, the BTC chair, and he actually really liked the idea. He welcomed the idea.

FRED BAKER:	And the dumb question of the month is your issue … It is one of the red lines, it's one of the things we're going to discuss. Is it appropriate to defer to them?

WES HARDAKER:	It's up to you guys, when and how you want to handle it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

WES HARDAKER: So, yeah, if we don't resolve it in X. What is X? You said 15. That was generous.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

WES HARDAKER: It was. Okay, pulling up the document for those. It comes in 2.4.1. So, in a discussion over lunch, it was sort of brought up that the way that we envisioned RSSAC37 is that there are three stakeholders, and the three stakeholders that we identified are the ICANN community, through the ICANN board representation, the root server operators which are also involved in RSSAC, and the IETF and IAB.

In the beginning of the document we actually talk about all three and we referenced 37, talking about those three stakeholders. In the bullets 4 and 10, specifically, and most importantly that would be 10 in my mind, the ICANN Org presents the final SLEs and charters to RSSAC and the ICANN board for approval.

So, fundamentally, the way I read that is that we're getting approval from two out of three stakeholders, and I think that I'd prefer that all three stakeholders have the opportunity to approve the final results that it meets their criteria through the IETF and the IAB do the design work of the Internet that the RSSAC has functionally, and the Root Ops are going to do the operations, and then the ICANN board overseas. Go ahead, Brad.

BRAD VERD: I just want to voice for everybody the conversation that we had just two seconds ago, which is I'm not disagreeing; I'm just covering what we covered earlier, which was RSSAC was added here, this section was added because there was a line in there that said RSSAC was not included, so everybody felt more comfortable adding RSSAC as a gate here and that resolved a bunch of the questions that came up earlier. So, based upon your sentence that you just said, you wanted all three stakeholders. RSSAC is not a stakeholder, right? The RSOs were identified as a stakeholder, so if we're equating RSSAC to the RSOs here, then okay, but that's not officially what a stakeholder was. So, I just want to point that out.

WES HARDAKER: No and thank you for reminding me of that. I think that's very fair, and I think that the wording that I started to come up with a bit

ago with the root server operators through RSSAC, so that sort of ties in both bodies, and to be in full disclosure, I'm coming up on a term for the IAB in two weeks. So, I will be on the IAB in two weeks.

KAVEH RANJBAR: If I may add … So, I think there is merit in that comment, but yes there is more caveat, which is it mentions RSSAC and not root server operators which is, if you want to be – and we know that there is no predefined decision-making for that group. So, RSSAC in place of, it might work, but again we have to make sure that they really consent to that. But the problem I have with adding IETF or IAB, or any combination of that, is we—or in this case the BTC—I don't think can define the work for other bodies, right? I mean, we have to have their agreement. So, even if you add language to support that, it should be that they should have the opportunity or something like that, because they might not want to, and we cannot mandate others to do work, correct?

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, so let me phrase it, let me go at it this way. I think we could wordsmith immediately, but until we agree on that this would be a change that people want, or it's a good idea to make sure that all three stakeholders are represented, let's not wordsmith. Let's just think about that concept, first off.

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

BRAD VERD: If I may add, if you are going to change that, does it still protect the other concerns that adding RSSAC here mitigated? So, I just wanted to make sure that you don't lose sight of it.

WES HARDAKER: That's fair, and it was my concern originally, too, and I still believe that it does mitigate it. Anybody else have opinions? Liman, don't glare at me like that. We're only a day-and-a-half in. That's the best part.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's mostly from jet lag. I'm balancing in my mind, whether to … I support that the IETF/IAB should be one party that kind of buys into this. Two, I'm balancing whether the root server operators or RSSAC is the appropriate phrase. I tend to lead toward the root server operators because RSSAC is their [eyes], but you could phrase it as we would advise to go forward with his model.

WES HARDAKER: Right, you're wordsmithing again. So, you like the concept if I heard the beginning of your statement, yes? Okay, anybody think that that's a bad decision to add all three bodies, explicitly? Alright. So, then we can wordsmith, and I don't know if we want

to do that as a group. We don't need to. I guess I still have time left on my 15 minutes. Anybody with a proposal? Otherwise, I'll try to do one on the fly. Great.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, you have had more time to work on this than anybody else in the room.

WES HARDAKER: I have. I have, okay, so doing 10 … 4 and 10 are somewhat similar, but as I said 10 is the one I think that is more critical in mind. ICANN Org presents final SLEs and charters to … I actually want to lead with the ICANN board.

CALOS REYES: Could we just say to the stakeholders?

WES HARDAKER: So, yeah, I thought about that, and actually Suzanna and I were talking about that too, and so what I told Suzanna, actually earlier today, and I'm sorry I'm dragging you into this.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's okay. I'm here you.

WES HARDAKER: It was that I didn't want to do just stakeholders because we needed to make an explicit tie, that it really needed to be clear, but then I actually read, as I was opening this document, it *is* talked about up a head. So, I'm going to revert what I said earlier, and I'll give you the chance to defend my previous position.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Switch sides.

WES HARDAKER: So, I think the three stakeholders is fine, in my mind.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I had actually suggested all the stakeholders, so I'm find with that.

WES HARDAKER: I was the one that complained. So, because it's spelled out up ahead, I'm fine with saying the three stakeholders, as identified in RSSAC37.

BRAD VERD: Just for clarification, we're only changing 10 then, which would leave RSSAC as a gate in another portions' process, is that correct? I'm not suggesting that, I'm asking for clarification.

WES HARDAKER: : Well, so no, that's a very good point because I think in most cases, it's actually there are multiple bullets up above. I mean, I would put all three in all cases because why wouldn't you do that?

BRAD VERD: How do I say this? To get work done. You asked.

WES HARDAKER: No. No, that's perfectly fair.

FRED BAKER: Well, Wes, it sounds like you're saying in all the relevant cases. It seems like you want to have one place that says the whatevers, and I think the word is stakeholders [inaudible], and then in each of the various cases you simply refer to the stakeholders.

WES HARDAKER: Correct. Part of this whole issue is that I was thinking about the changes that we made, that if this work is being done on behalf of those three stakeholders, that it is incredibly important that all three of those stakeholders have equal footing and equal voice into the process that they are all affected by. So, I don't think adding the IAB and the IETF will significantly slow down that process. I wait to be proven wrong, and I'm certainly not at 100%,

but the IAB is typically a fairly efficient body in terms of getting work through it.

BRAD VERD: Again, I wasn't … How do I say this? I wasn't saying that the IAB, or whoever the stakeholder was, is not efficient at doing work. What I was trying to imply was we need to be careful to make sure that we don't require all three stakeholders to work throughout the whole thing because maybe some don't want to, or need to, but it sounds like—and I'm just inferring from what you said—it sounds like what's most important is that the three review the final product. That's my interpretation of what you said. That's all.

WES HARDAKER: No, and you're right, a late voice … So, somebody said earlier the word opportunity, and I forget who it was – Kaveh – and I thought that was a perfect word to throw in. So, that gives then the option to not, but the ability to catch things early, especially if the IAB is really responsible for thinking long-distant future of what the Internet architecture is going to look like, an earlier voice into that won't work for us, and for some reason means saving time and not spending time. Now, that doesn't always work that way, but—

CARLOS REYES: So, at some point in the document we cite RSS stakeholders in reference to the stakeholders that RSSAC identifies in 37, so I think that the distinction here that we can do is we're really only talking about implementation because the stakeholders are already part of the Governance Working Group. So, that doesn't change, but we're talking about the final sign-off approval, etc. So, what I can do is, on the implementation steps, which are 2.41, any time there is a reference to RSSAC or the ICANN board, we just refer to the RSS stakeholders which are defined earlier.

WES HARDAKER: I absolutely trust your wording and I'm sure you trust me to yell at you if I get it wrong. So, yeah, that's fine. So, I think we're all in agreement, and if anybody says otherwise, speak now.

BRAD VERD: I go back to the original question, and I need to look at the people who were concerned earlier because I was not one of them, which is the gate for which we added RSSAC in there because RSSAC was called out as not being part of the process earlier. We didn't lose that by having the stakeholders because, now, RSSAC is not a stakeholder. It's the RSOs, and so I just … There is a distinction there.

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

WES HARDAKER: So, I mean, I was the one that led that complaint earlier. I recognize what you're saying, and I agree with it. I'm fine, and so I – never mind.

FRED BAKER: May I point out that step 11 says that the RSSAC considers and votes?

JEFF OSBORN: Wait a minute, did we just drop the RSSAC into this process and then remove it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, that's what –

JEFF OSBORN: Right, why? I mean, I understanding the adding the IAB, but did the RSSAC baby get thrown out with the bathwater?

WES HARDAKER: So, because we get back to that blurry line that we refuse to define clearly and evenly, although we did write a document about it recently, which is why … Yeah, we've been inconsistent about it. So, because, by involving all the root server operators, we have functionally involved RSSAC. Now, we have not involved

RSSAC as the body that we are sitting in this room, but all of the voices are still present. Now, that's also why I suggested the wording earlier that the three stakeholders could be worded in such a way to say the root operators through RSSAC, right? I said something … I don't think I have the exact words.

JEFF OSBORN: How the hell does this serve?

WES HARDAKER: It makes sure that all the stakeholders have a voice.

JEFF OSBORN: But once you say stakeholders, we're no longer at – I mean, that's what I'm missing. If RSSAC can never be a stakeholder, then what good does it do to have all three stakeholders, except RSSAC is not a stakeholder, repeat until nauseous?

WES HARDAKER: The individual members of RSSAC are stakeholders. I recognize the absolute [inaudible].

JEFF OSBORN: Then call them out by name.

WES HARDAKER: We did, that would be the stakeholders.

JEFF OSBORN: If I'm the only one whose head is exploding, I'll defer, but that makes no sense to me.

CARLOS REYES: Let's see if I can try to remedy this in some way, taking Wes and Jeff's – and I know that it's going to be awkward, but maybe it should be the RSSAC and the stakeholders, and the reason being is that—even though we have RSOs in the room—there are other people such as the SSAC liaison, the IANA liaison, RZM and so forth that are not necessarily RSOs, but are members of RSSAC. So, maybe if we have RSSAC along with the stakeholders – and there is some duplicate overlay there, but it's doable.

WES HARDAKER: I'm fine with that wording, I think that's a good compromise.

BRAD VERD: I just have one comment and that is I'm going to remind every body of the conversations we had doing 37, which happened over a long period of time, and this conversation that I'm about to repeat was a very hot topic and everybody was adamant about it, which was we should not be the ones defining who are in these

groups because it was self-serving. It would look self-serving, but yet we're doing it right here. So, I just want to point that out, okay?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This is … now my head is exploding because we actually just talked ourselves fully around the maypole that we defined earlier today where what we're doing in this document is putting words in somebody else's mouth, so it's not actually the RSOs.

BRAD VERD: We've been asked to, so just …

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We've been asked to, what? Now, I'm really confused.

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, let's not make things. First of all, Ryan, to your comment, although RSSAC consists of more than RSOs, but they don't have any decision-making power. So, it wouldn't make any difference in that sense.

WES HARDAKER: They can contribute to the thought process though.

| KAVEH RANJBAR: | Definitely, but this is the decision point. So, and by triple zero, basically, it would end up with a vote, so of course they will – |

| UNIDENTIFIED MALE: | [off mic]. |

| KAVEH RANJBAR: | Yes, and I know, I'm just, I just want to say that, for formal reasons, that won't have any real difference. Anyways, that put aside, as I said, this is just a collaboration between us and BTC. This will go to the BTC, formally come to us, and then will go to public comment. The only reason we are really – and then people from the rest of the world might say, hey, ITU should be on the table, I really don't know, but there will be a public comment and we are not – not we, the group, we'll be mandated to look into those and address every single comment, correct? The point here that we are trying to be inclusive in any form I think I see, honestly two points. |

One we are at least satisfied, so it meets our minimum requirements. So, if we think that IETF, for example, should be there and the RSOs and the RSSACs should be there, that's our minimum requirements because that can be added, but we can always defend this is our minimum requirement. The other reason is trying to be complete is to make sure that we will have

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

the maximum buy-in when this goes out for the public comment because what we really don't want is we come up with the governance model, but half of the board says, "ah, but these people, they sat in a room and came up with something." So, inclusiveness in that form, that brings us buy-in.

So, considering these two, I think we should agree on what is our acceptable minimum by us, but we have to keep in mind that, first of all, this will go for public comment, so it might completely change. Or BTC, as I said, they still have full power to submit whatever form of this document to us, formally, correct? So, please consider this too.

WES HARDAKER: Alright, so I've overrun my time then, I'm quite sure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I also never got to finish my comment.

WES HARDAKER: Well, the real question is does everybody think that Ryan's suggestion of RSSAC and the three stakeholders was okay? Or, if there are objections, that we should stop and then go over the time then. Thank you, Ryan, I think we're good. Carlos, is that doable? Thank you. Let me know if you need help.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and what we theoretically came to the room to do is figure out what we're doing the rest of the week. Kaveh, tell me about the BTC and what do we need to do for them?

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, from the BTC side, there is nothing else on the agenda. Basically, the RSAC37 and the concept paper, and the concept paper has been, from the time it was published, which is I guess earlier this year. February. it was in the BTC, it has been discussed in two meetings, it has been presented. And also, the presentation that we saw, which was made by Carlos, that was also presented to the BTC earlier this week, the one which went through the steps where we are in all of that. So, the BTC has seen all of that. My assumption is that they're fully up to date with the idea and then what's happening, the stream of the work. So, I think it's good to spend as much time as we can in that session to basically explain why were proposing these red lines and these changes, see their reactions, get their reactions and see how it goes.

I don't have any other additional … and from the BTC there is no other item open related to RSSAC, so the only thing being discussed about RSSAC is this.

BAD VERD: The BTC meeting, you're going to drive and you're going to take the redline version that he's got and you're going to drive the conversation.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes.

BRAD VERD: And will we assume that we're just going to be there ready to answer questions from the BTC? Or, do they want us to explain each and every change, or do we just be like, "if you have a question, just let us know, and we'll talk about it?"

KAVEH RANJBAR: I think that we have 90 minutes, correct? So, the way I envisioned it, and I'm open to suggestion, it's basically to open up the meeting, start, and do a short introduction. I can also do a short introduction from the BTC side and then we start basically from top-to-down, what we did this morning, but we will just explain. And I don't know who wants to explain each item, BUT we can either assign or we can go as it goes.

BRAD VERD: Well, I guess, I mean, I don't want to spend time explaining something that everybody agrees with, right? So, I mean, that's why are we just literally going to explain every red line, or are we going to sit there and be like, okay, the first question that the BTC has is here in paragraph 2, line 6, that type of thing?

KAVEH RANJBAR: The BTC haven't defined the questions, and they haven't seen the red line.

BRAD VERD: Well, I understand that.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I get your point. So, I think it can only be useful to explain that why we have suggested these changes and see what their reaction is. They might say fine, or they might have questions. Yeah?

FRED BAKER: So, a suggestion. It seems like we have had two major issues here and then a collection of finer points. The major issues had to do with money and accountability, and it seems like—as an overview thing—that the introduction to that, it would probably be useful for us to say we got wrapped around the axel with these two

issues, let me talk about them, and just you'll find various things in various places and this is what it's addressing, and then allow the BTC to go, okay, this is that one, this is the – what's that?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay, so basically start with the high-level category. So, the way I propose to do that, I will do a quick introduction, I will mention the two issues, then I will pass it to you to explain the issue and I hope Carlos and the rest of the staff could support us, pointing to the changes we made regarding that issue. We'll start with accountability and then we continue with the money as the two high-level ones, and then if there is anything remaining, and we have time, we can also go to those more fine-detailed ones, fair? Does that work for you, Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yes, it works for me. It sounds like we're driving the meeting. That's what I was trying to get at. It sounds like we are going through the document.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Fair. I can, we can design it and turn it around, as well, if you want, but in that case, I assume that we have to circulate the red line version as soon as possible so they at least have some idea. I don't know if the room has any preference. Yes?

JEFF OSBORN: I think it's a great idea, addressing this at a really high level, and also Brad's concern though of who the hell is supposed to be driving this is important and I'm thinking in terms of what the expectations are from their organization. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I suspect we are such a room of detailed-oriented geeks that we're worried about paragraph 7/line 3/ellipsis number 12, and this group people has so much else going on, they're kind of rolling in going, "Is this the thing where we stop being in trouble about the DDoS attacks" And so, if we address this at a really deep level, we're going to miss our opportunity.

So, two things. One, I'm advocating that here are the high-level things that we thought were different from this. Secondly, though, I'm asking you what sort of expectations or mindsets are they coming into the room with? Almost every one of us around the table could write this document ourselves because we're that deeply involved in it, and this is going to be like a little bit of a throw-away to somebody who is looking at 20 different things this week. Are they coming in with, "I hope to God these people stop being so independent, I hope this doesn't cost us $50 million, I hope I never get into a star chamber because the DNS system went down?" I mean, what are they coming with?

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

KAVEH RANJBAR: Well, I can say, as a group, they only look for one thing. That's RSSAC, or root server operators, basically back this plan because they are the ones who are going to propose this to the board. So, for this to move forward, all they want to know—at least I can say from as a group—individually, maybe each board member, each BTC member has a different reason, but as a group, the only thing that they really want is the confidence that this is something that is really backed by all of us, so when they propose it to the board they know that this is not causing trouble because it then stops this process towards getting the governance model for the root server system. That's it.

FRED BAKER: Well, I think it's fair to say that the RSSAC backs RSSAC37.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah.

FRED BAKER: This is not an RSSAC document.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Fair. Again, whenever I say that, I keep that with the caveat that, yes, this is the document, not that we wrote it, but basically the idea that the process will follow. So, when they submit it to us, it's

they are not going to be surprised that we say, "Oh, what is this," and we never expected such a thing, and because they want that confidence to be able to continue the process with the board. So, the only concern I've heard is they want to make sure the RSOs are behind this idea, this path forward. Let's put it that way, the path forward.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, this is describing the plan forward and they're just, they don't want us saying this is the wrong plan. That's why they came to us to talk to us. And we're providing feedback and if they come up with something that's completely different than our feedback, then we'll say that. But we're not there yet. Is that fair?

JEFF OSBORN: Sure. It almost sounds like preparing for this we should be preparing more to look united than to have all the answers.

BRAD VERD: I said that yesterday, right? I said I didn't want to go in there and undermine the work that we've done in 37, right? So, and I hope we don't.

CARLOS REYES: I'm done updating Section 2.4.1, if you'd like to take a look.

WES HARDAKER: You're very fast, Carlos.

CARLOS REYES: There are some areas, and there's an ICANN board action that's very specific to ICANN, meaning approving public comment. So, obviously, I didn't make those changes there, but I think it flows.

WES HARDAKER: Am I misreading bullet 5? It seems an incomplete sentence. I think bullet 5 is supposed to be joined with bullet 4 and you accidently added them together.

CARLOS REYES: Yeah, that's probably and extra return.

WES HARDAKER: Eleven is the same way. Other than that, thank you very much, Carlos.

FRED BAKER: Is it appropriate to once again declare victory?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's always appropriate to declare victory.

WES HARDAKER: For realsies, this time, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

FRED BAKER: Okay, now with that, coming back to the Adobe Connect room, I believe we have a slide deck, and which one of us was going to present that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's what we go through [off mic].

FRED BAKER: Okay, so fine, so let's go through them, and this is a presentation that we're making to the BTC?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is open to the public.

FRED BAKER: This is very public, okay. So, okay, so who are we? We are a bunch of nerds. So, we're narrowly scoped. Next slide.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I'm sorry, before … Just for consideration, so just before, sorry to interrupt, another thing that BTC is generally, right now, they are busy basically with two things, RSSAC37 and SSAC's end cap proposal, which [Russ] has mentioned a few times. I don't know if we are interested or not, but just since we have time with the BTC, I just wanted to bring that up. That's about the name collisions study. If anyone is interested, we can bring it up with the BTC. Just so you know, these are the main two focus areas of the BTC at the moment, just point of information. Sorry to interrupt.

FRED BAKER: And who is actually presenting this slide deck?

BRAD VERD: You are.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Me?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

BRAD VED: Unless there is another volunteer, unless there is another volunteer.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so that's slide 5, then?

BRAD VERD: I have one change. Can we go back to that slide? Sorry, I just really don't like the fact how we list exact numbers of people in the caucus. Can we just say over a hundred? And so, going forward, it's like over 50, over 60, over 70, not …

FRED BAKER: And that's to deal with the question why not 107? Somebody got excluded.

BRAD VERD: It's a detail that's not necessary.

FRED BAKER: Really, okay, cool. So, we're going to meet in two weeks.

WES HARDAKER: But do we still want to talk about the proposed governance model?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic].

WES HARDAKER: Okay.

BRAD VERD: It's still consuming a lot of our time, right?

WES HARDAKER: That's a fair point. It is consuming a lot of our time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It really is what we're working—

WES HARDAKER: It feels like it's supposed to be out of our hands at this point, but.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, okay, so this is what it does. I'm not sure I disagree with it. Next slide. So, here we're going into the tutorial. And by the way, I was asked about this model just last Thursday in the leadership training program, and the question was, well, of course, it's fair, a

sign that does everything, right? So, I think we need to have the tutorial. I think the next slide starts the tutorial.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, that's fine.

FRED BAKER: Okay, I've seen that picture before.

BRAD VERD: Do we want the leaders to get up and talk during this piece? That's my question. I'm not hearing any feedback or eagerness to get up and talk, so I guess is this something that you guys just want us to keep right on going through?

WES HARDAKER: I think for flow I wouldn't have each leader get up. I mean, if you want to do major sections where you have people switch, that's fine.

BRAD VERD: I would agree with you. So, I mean, this was sent out a week or a week ago, something like that, so this is not new to anybody. This meeting always goes quicker than we think.

WES HARDAKER: He's asking—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I see a link up there for ICANN63.

CARLOS REYES: That's because the link for 64 isn't updated yet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Not updated yet, okay.   Right.

WES HARDAKER: Pause for a sec. So, the collaborative reports of major events, can I suggest that we just link to the news section of the URL and not call out a specific one? The third one down. So, it's right now events of 2016, O625. I would just delete the specific one and link to the index.

FRED BAKER: At the end of this, we take a vote, and they vote us off the island?

BRAD VERD: You're not that lucky, no.

FRED BAKER: So, Andrew has kindly drafted some slides for that, and I have to say that I haven't had a chance to poke on the URL and look at them, but they basically track the agenda that I sent out earlier that everybody was nodding their heads. There's a 90-minute session and nine major topics. That gives us about 10 minutes each, and I don't think, and in fact my specific request is that we not do any special slides for it, and I think what Andrew did is that he just took the agenda and put it into slides.

BRAD VERD: And just to share, we were … Fred and I, in the leadership meeting on Friday, we were asked about SSAC, specifically Rod, said that maybe there's some talk in the past about SSAC being engaged in the 37 stuff, and I haven't heard anything, and I wanted to know what was going on, and so I hinted that they were going to get briefed at what's going on with 37. So, I don't know if that's it. I assume that that's in the agenda, but I'm just …

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, 37 is in the agenda, and at least at one point I had the sub-pieces underneath the 37 processing. I don't remember if that was in the final email, or not.

BRAD VERD: I think it's too early for SSAC to be engaged right now, but then that will be kind of the update, right? We will certainly want them engaged in this public comment, and whatnot, having those discussions.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, and as part of my role for the liaison I have encouraged SSAC membership that this is a public document, read it, at least read the first 20 pages. Preferably the whole thing, but go read it and study it, and the other documents that I think they want to hear more about this time will be what's going on, how did the board react to it, and what did the board do with it? And they gave it to OCTO, and then they gave it to … That set of things, I think.

BRAD VERD::   That's fine and I think somebody has that agenda. I don't have it in front of me, but is the metrics piece on the agenda with them? Because I feel that that's a piece that we definitely want them, some sort of comment or engaged, or working with us as the Metrics Work Party continues and kind of comes up with some sort of product, I hope that either they're there with us, or have had input to it.

RUSS MUNDY: So, with respect to the individual work parties, they are not listed, but what the first agenda item is, I believe, it's the work plan that lists the set of things that are being worked on, and then there's, I think, an agenda item specifically to describe the active work parties. So, now, the one question that I have that I didn't really get a whole lot of feedback, well, okay, I didn't get any feedback on it. We have a draft work plan for RSSAC, and the URL has been sent out to the RSSAC list, and I didn't honestly remember, nor could I dig out, how public that work plan is. Or, is it still very drafty, and we don't want to be passing it around?

RUSS MUNDY: We're planning to have a vote on it later in the week, and later in the week I see not reason for it to not be public, if we approve it, but where it stands right now is, we're deeply thinking about it and plan to vote.

FRED BAKER: Okay, because that, the title, RSSAC Work Plan, is on the agenda. So, it can probably be covered in a 30-second to a 2-minute update.

KAVEH RANJBAR: For RSSAC37 may I suggest, because the slides that Carlos has prepared, the 10 or 11 slides, you didn't see them because they

were presented, I think, on Friday or Saturday, but I think they capture the whole status and it takes definitely less than 10 minutes to present. I think that's best if we go with that and that also brings alignment because we have BTC seen and so that's basically our communication vehicle. It has a few slides on the cornerstones of 37 and then basically a timeline. I think that's very good grounds for discussion. So, I suggest we ask Carlos to present that and then continue discussion on that.

RUSS MUNDY: I think that probably would be an excellent way to cover this. Now, one of the things that I was just relooking at here, a couple of minutes ago, when is RSSAC meeting with BTC? Is it before or after?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Before.

RUSS MUNDY: It's before, okay, it is tomorrow. Okay, good. So, we'll have at least knowledge in our heads as to what transpired then. Great.

FRED BAKER: Now, the next meeting is a meeting we're not going to have with OCTO, correct, that we came up with this morning?

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

BRAD VERD: You mean after the SSAC meeting?

FRED BAKER: Yeah, after the SSAC meeting.

BRAD VERD: Correct.

FRED BAKER: So, okay, and then after that we're going to discuss RSO independence, and we're all going to independently sit in different corners of the room and discuss it, okay?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We'll need more corners.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: More dimensions.

FRED BAKER: Okay, now, then Wednesday we start out with the meeting with the ICANN board. Other than what we've discussed then with BTC, are there other questions that the board is going to want to cover?

ICANN 64
COMMUNITY FORUM
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

KAVEH RANJBAR: No, so as we covered it, I think it was yesterday, I also informed the board that we didn't have any specific feedback on the questions, so they're fine with that, they're informed and they're not expecting us to comment on those. Basically, the main focus of the board, also at the moment with RSSAC is 37 and the path forward. So, I think they would really like to know what happened with the BTC, where we are. And, again, the question that everybody asks me is like how RSSAC feels. They just want to make sure that they are meeting our expectations and the process is moving in a direction that we want. So, if you have any concerns, we should bring it up, but on the other hand, if you are happy, or if you think it's working, I think that's also important to let the board know because, as I said, this is what they're really concerned about. They want to make sure they are facilitating, let's say. Yeah.

FRED BAKER: Okay, following that, then we're going to do some workshop planning and we have the RSSAC meeting, the monthly meeting.

BRAD VERD: Formal meeting.

FRED BAKER: Our formal meeting.

BRAD VERD: I assume we have an agenda for that?

FRED BAKER: And then the big thing on Thursday is going to the party in the evening, right? And then we leave. Oh, the public forum, oh, yes. What is our part in the public forum?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: None.

BRAD VERD: Going to the formal meeting on Wednesday, so we're voting on 000. Is that correct, what we just completed? Okay. Minutes, triple zero and the work plan, the draft work plan.

FRED BAKER: So, I believe we've covered the week. What did I miss?

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, may I ask for the session that we cancelled with OCTO, are we going to replace it with something, or? Because we didn't discuss it here.

CARLOS REYES: We're keeping the room, so I think –

BRAD VERD: Talking through [off mic]

CARLOS REYES: Those issues, correct.

BRAD VERD: Okay, right, so what came up. So, obviously, we've cancelled the meeting with OCTO, so we're not doing the face-to-face public meeting, and one of the reasons for doing that is that we needed to talk more internally about some of the things that Kaveh shared. So, the question to the group here is do we want to take that time, which is here, and discuss that, discuss the three topics that Kaveh covered so that we're here, we take advantage of the time, understand it better so that we … Do we want to do that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Why not?

WES HARDAKER: It can't hurt.

BRAD VERD: I mean, I think we should, but I serve at the pleasure.

WES HARDAKER: I take that back. It can hurt, but we should do it anyway.

BRAD VERD: Alright. So, let's use that time. We will go through the issues and see what the output is. There is nothing more this evening with us, right? There's not like a reception or anything? That's, yeah, okay. Alright, well, with that we'll end this and then we will adjourn. Thank you all.

RUSS MUNDY: And let me just offer that we have players in the DNSSEC for Everybody program for this group as well as SSAC, so if anybody wants some lighthearted fun, come join the DNSSEC for Everybody session which I think is them main hall they're having it in. Anyway, 3:15.

WES HARDAKER: Well, remember, Russ, that the root server tutorial is running at the same time.

RUSS MUNDY: Oh, it is. Oh, I forgot.

BRAD VERD: Oh, yeah, there is the root server tutorial, and everybody is encouraged to be there to answer questions, even though I noticed yesterday that no one else came up to the table, so thank you for that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm not falling for that trick again.

WES HARDAKER: So, in the past we've never done that, and it's been more town-hall, and I suggest that we could tell Andrew that we'd prefer not to do a table presentation.

BRAD VERD: Again, I agree. I think what you had was you had the people running the meeting feeling weird because the table was … The setup of the room is such that you've got this massive empty table up front, so they asked us to come forward and I wasn't about to say no, so …

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019