
ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions – RSSAC Work Session 2
Thursday, October 15, 2020 – 16:00 to 17:00 CEST

OZAN SAHIN: Hello and welcome to the RSSAC work session on the Local Perspective Tool Work Party. My name is Ozan Sahin and I am the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form, as I have noted in the chat.

I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand.

When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly, at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

With that, I will hand the floor over to the work party leader, Abdulkarim Oloyede. Abdulkarim? Abdulkarim, we cannot hear you if you are speaking.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much, Ozan.

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.

OZAN SAHIN: Is it only me who cannot hear Abdulkarim or everyone else can?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It's not just you.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, it's not just you, Ozan. I'm hearing him broken up a little bit.

OZAN SAHIN: Abdulkarim, we couldn't hear what you said so far. Would you like to try once again? Probably let's try this. Abdulkarim may try rejoining the session, and in the meanwhile, Andrew or Ken, if you can take the lead to get this call started.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure, Ozan. Can you promote me to cohost?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. I believe our tech support can do that.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay because what I can do is I can go through ... Myself and Abdulkarim and Ken had a meeting last week, Monday, where we discussed some of the user narratives and made some changes to them. And while we're waiting for Abdulkarim to join, I can go through some of those changes and if we can talk about some of those, great. So I'll just share my screen then. I'm going to kick you out, Ozan.

So, as I mentioned, we had a meeting earlier last week and I just wanted to mention the two big things that came out of that. We're merging narrative five with narrative seven. So, down here. And then punting on narrative six over to the Rogue RSO Work Party. I wanted to give people an opportunity to comment on this in case they had any issues with this or if they thought it was a bad idea or if they like the idea. It does reduce our number narratives from seven to five.

Duane, I see you're unmuted.

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, that was just because I was saying I couldn't hear Abdulkarim.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: No worries. Seeing no objections to that or comments to that, I'm just going to go ahead and merge those changes. And then it looks like Abdulkarim is back, so we can kick back over to him and he can give the update.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much and apologies. I lost connectivity briefly there. I think the first thing I want to especially welcome everybody to this meeting, especially given the fact that this meeting is happening during the ICANN69 meeting. And thank you to everybody that is attending today.

I just want to give a brief summary of what we've done so far in this work party. We have so far had [inaudible] [monthly meeting] since

the inaugural meeting of the working party in April 2020. The aim of the working party is to develop tools and metrics needed in measuring the local perspective in order to help improve Internet services in general and the root server system in particular.

The tool would help in measuring and identifying inadequate infrastructure and identify location for new root servers, root RSS instance. This will also help give the end user a measurement of their perspective on the RSS.

During our earlier meetings, we had different presentations from ongoing and previous similar work and presentations about tools that are potentially be adopted for this working party. We had a presentation from Wes and Andrew who told us about the [inaudible] and improved roots. The working party had a discussion and a desire for a tool to measure direct perspective of the root server system, versus measuring perspective via the configured recursive root server.

We desire to look for tools that may be run on a wide variety of platforms such as mobile device, desktop, data centers, servers, enterprise recursive server etc. Direct measurement to the root server system would be interesting for potential placement of new root server system instances.

The location of the measurement, such as mobile end points, need to be considered. Measurement via the configured recursive resolver would be useful for anyone to get a perspective of the enterprise ISP configuration.

So far, the working party has been able to identify several narratives which we'll have now reduced to five and we'll be discussing these five, potentially reduced to five. We will be discussing them during today's meeting. The narrative would help us in identifying the possible scenarios, thereby identifying the relevant metrics or measurements that is needed in each of the identified scenarios.

This would also allow us to identify the tool that we need to use in measuring the metrics, that we have earlier identified. And data collected would be useful, too.

We also hope to determine here the repository that we hope to create will either be a central one or it's going to be stored locally. These are the things that we still need to discuss later, as this work party progresses.

So far, the identified scenarios the five which we'll be discussing today are evaluating the proposed location for the new root server instance, then identifying current underserved areas.

Number three is the recursive resolver operators wanting to better understand the root server system. And the RSS data in support of research.

The last one, which is the fifth one that we think we're presenting to you today is improving general Internet connectivity access.

The work party is grateful to all those that contributed to the work and we also encourage more participation, especially from other [inaudible] members and those that are attending the ICANN69

meeting today. We are getting to a stage now that few individuals actively contributing are getting overwhelmed.

The work party will progress to [active] writing of our output report after discussing it during our meeting today. This is a crucial stage in the lifespan of this working party. We shall also be seeking volunteers today. We please encourage you to please volunteer. We also have some open questions that we're going to discuss as we go on in this working party.

This is a brief summary of what we have done and I just want to encourage us to participate as much as we can. Thank you very much. I don't know if you have any question or observation before we move to the next item which was started earlier while I lost connection.

I can't see any hands up. Okay, thank you. So we'll move to the next item on the agenda. I'll hand over back to Andrew to continue from where he stopped earlier.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Okay. Thanks, Abdulkarim. So we've narrowed down the number of narratives to five now. We had some good introduction on one and I'll shortly go to Ray to talk about some of his additions there.

There was also an outstanding item for Wes to send some text on the research narrative, which unfortunately we don't have. But that's actually okay because we have an outline as well we can talk about, which I'd like to get some feedback on.

So, basically, my plan here is to kind of go through the narratives—not all of them, just the new stuff. Really, just one I guess. And then skip over to the outline and start banging on that. I'd love to hear people's opinions on that. I'm sorry I didn't get that out earlier. The goal is usually to get material out for the work party like a week ahead of time but I didn't have time this time.

And then after we bang on the outline for a while, I'm going to request that some people do some writing into the outline. So start plugging in text into the outline for next time. So that's the plan. I believe, after that, if anybody has any AOB items, we can discuss those at the end.

So, onto narrative one. Ray, thanks for adding some text to this. Can I call on you to talk about your text a little bit?

RAY BELLIS:

I'll see what I can say. I come from a position of ISC as the operator of F root. This is kind of why I took this on, because we do often rely on people coming to us to ask for locations more so than us going to look for new locations. That is really our primary model.

I added some text around the measurements that we expect, which is basically we actually supply a small shell script to proposed locations which we only expect them to run once. It gives us a snapshot of latency and the identity of each root server instance that they can see from where they are.

We don't look at the availability measure. I think that would be too onerous generally for a proposed site to say go and run a series of

measurements over the course of the whole week and then aggregate them. We don't currently take that sort of measurement into account.

If the connectivity is bad, it will get better by putting a new one in there. But having bad connectivity or unreliable connectivity is less of a problem for us than simply having latent or highly latent connectivity.

I had to shuffle some of the text around a little bit. Text currently shown in red where [inaudible] different criteria. That maybe doesn't belong quite where it is, given the end of the paragraph above. Sorry, obviously, these are different colors to you guys on the screen. You just accepted the text. Is that right Andrew? Yeah.

So, the text where it currently says the RSL tells a requestor to run [inaudible] tool, that maybe belongs below the paragraph that's currently immediately below it. But we can sort that out. It doesn't really matter that much. I didn't manage to come up with anything useful in terms of availability for the reasons I stated above. We simply don't use that as a measure.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. I commented on your comment on availability and I can't imagine how a tool that's meant to be run on the edge somewhere once or maybe a couple of times could ever measure availability. I don't know how you can measure availability is my comment on here. I don't think it's possible to measure availability without continuous

monitoring and that's just something that this tool just can't do. So I think that's just out of scope or not possible.

RAY BELLIS: Sure. And I think it's worth saying here, if not in the document, that [inaudible] tool for this particular test is not going to be the same as [inaudible] tool for doing centralized measurement. It's probably going to be very different. At least that's my [inaudible].

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: The centralized measurement, the stuff in RSSAC 47, the metrics document.

RAY BELLIS: Well, we've referred to [inaudible] tool in a couple of places in this document, and I think we need to be clear that [inaudible] tool does not always refer to the same [inaudible] tool.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. That's a good point. Wale Bakare, I see your hand. Please go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Hello, sorry, can you hear me?

WALE BAKARE: Yes, I can.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay. I think we have a hand up from Wale Bakare.

WALE BAKARE: Okay. Thank you so much. I'm calling from UK, I'm part of EURALO. This is my very first meeting regarding this RSS [arc] work party, although I haven't gone through this documentation yet and maybe just ... So I don't know whether the team members are working towards the question I'd like to raise or maybe a question [inaudible] suggestion anyway.

The thing that I'm looking at, because we are talking about infrastructure here which is a very critical component of the Internet survivability and development as well, in that sense, if you're looking at a location, I think what I'm looking at, this draft should be focused on a kind of—what I would call an impact assessment. So this impact assessment will cover a lot of security aspects to be looked at, to be evaluated. And also, it will form part of the audit policy process that will be integrated as part of the core element in determining a location where the root server or instance is going to be situated.

Just my comment anyway. I don't know whether that's the impact assessment documentation or is part of the key element, the team members are looking into or they're working. Thank you so much.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay. Thank you so much, Wale. I'm not sure, do we have any other observation or comment from anybody?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: You're breaking up a little bit, Abdulkarim. But I'll try to answer what I think was a question. Thank you, Wale, for your comment. And thanks for joining this work party even if this is during a virtual ICANN meeting, so the meetings are open to anyone who's at the ICANN meeting. So this work party is chartered to really develop some requirements for a tool that will take measurements from a local perspective, so many different perspectives around the Internet. It's not necessarily chartered to kind of take all of those measurements or think about things in a very kind of broad sense, we do have some of these user narratives document. For instance, number two here which is identify currently underserved areas, but it's always from a very specific perspective, which is from the edge perspective of the Internet and kind of limits us in the way we can make statements about the overall system. But I see Ken's hand is raised, and he's probably going to answer the question better than I did. So go ahead, Ken.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. I'll give it a shot, Andrew. It seemed like Wale—and again, thanks for your comments—was talking more about a formal process for evaluating proposed location for a root server instance. So in that perspective, each root server operator has their own independent way of doing that, and we're taking a sort of different approach, kind approaching it from what would a tool like—what measurements

would you want? The work party is really focused on the tool and evaluating proposed locations is just one use case of the tool so that it could be used by an RSO, root server operator looking for a new location. So it's not the formal process that an RSO uses, just a tool. Thank you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Okay. Thank you, Ken. Andrew, can you please continue from here? Because I'm losing connecting today. I had half of what Ken said, the other half, I was reconnecting.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: No problem, Abdulkarim. I think we were kind of wrapping up. Wale, please go ahead.

WALE BAKARE: Thank you so much. Yeah, I understand just in response to the last comment. Sorry, I forgot the name of ... So yeah, okay, just to give you a bit of background of who I am, I'm a tech lead with DXC Technology, which is former HP Enterprise in the UK. So I'm one of the core, probably, infrastructure team [inaudible] at the moment. So just to give you a background of what I do on a daily basis.

So yeah, I understand this is just a work party, this was based on the kind of recommendation to the [inaudible] ICANN board. I don't know what the process is going to be. But what I'm looking at, it is a critical system, a critical part of the Internet ecosystem that we're talking

about. So that stems from my comment earlier on. So I understand it is not a formal process, but at the same time, in order to avoid an oversight from the group and maybe other members that are participating as well, it's just a way of trying to look at the key elements that are very pertinent to this draft. Thank you so much.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Okay. Thanks for your comment. With regards to process, I don't expect that this document will produce any recommendations to the ICANN board. That's something the work party has discussed. This document really is just a set of requirements—well, the document we're looking at right now is just a bunch of narratives, but the eventual document that the work party produces will be primarily a set of requirements for a tool, or as Ray mentioned, tools which can measure the root server system and individual instances from a local perspective. But thank you for your comment.

Ray, please go ahead. And then I see Brad.

RAY BELLIS:

Yeah, I just wanted to follow up the comment you just made, Andrew. In terms of recommendations to the board of ICANN, I think we should be clear that although on a longer term, we're looking at the SLA expectation, as far as I know, there's no expectation whatsoever that the ICANN board would have any say whatsoever in an RSO's choice of locations for a root instance.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Oh, I wasn't even going near that. I was just saying that the eventual document that the work party produces—at least the way we've been talking so far, it's not going to have any recommendations to the [ICANN.]

RAY BELLIS: No. I appreciate you know that. I'm not sure necessarily some of the other attendees on the call do.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Thanks. And I see Kaveh's hand as well.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, so very close to what Ray said, and I want to add to Wale's comment. It's critical system, and of course, current operators are also very much aware of that, and that's why this work will be—we as operators, and I'm running one of the instances for RIPE NCC, basically that's why we also have interest in this. But I also want to add a bit of history perspective, that for more than 30 years, this service has basically worked without any issue. Just again, on the premise of what Ray said before. Maybe not everybody on the call is aware of that as well. Cooperatively, these 12 organizations have been able to keep the system up and running without any downtime for more than 30 years.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Brad, go ahead.

BRAD VERD:

I'll kind of echo what people said here. As one of the root server operators and members of RSSAC, I think the root server operators and the organizations that run them take this role very seriously, and the intent of this work party, I think, was when the root server operators or when RSSAC or when things were [set,] like, underserved areas, it would be nice if there was a tool that somebody who claimed that they were underserved, that we could use empirical data to kind of show, oh, yeah, they are underserved, let's fix that. But right now, I know of at least five of the operators that are deploying servers all over the world. So this isn't—nobody is waiting for this tool, I should say, to go and deploy, to expand the root server system. They do that at their own cost, at their own expense, and again, I feel this document has become kind of a catchall for a bunch of things that maybe were not the original intent. And I hate to be the one who tries to reel it back in all the time, but the idea here was if somebody claimed to be underserved, that we could provide a tool and gather empirical data to kind of show that, and then we could start to build a data set to make recommendations on. And those recommendations would not be for the ICANN board, they would be to the root server operators to go and deploy more instances. Thanks.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Thanks for your comment, Brad. Do you feel—in that the document has become too expansive, do you feel that we need to do significant

work to reel it back in? For instance, some of these narratives maybe are too broad or are outside of the scope of the original idea.

BRAD VERD: Yes.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Which ones?

BRAD VERD: I do think so. I'm sorry, I don't have the document in front of me right now and I'm not in a situation where I could have it, but I feel like while I think some of these narratives are important and interesting, I'm not sure that they're part of the original scope. And if the group or if the RSSAC caucus feels that they're important, maybe we take them on in a different document or another document or another work party. But I feel like the breadth of this document is—well, trying not to sound like a broken record, but I feel like we're trying to boil the ocean a bit here, and this is going to become very time consuming. And I'm not sure we would be able to reach the end of it. I think if we break it up into little pieces, then it becomes more manageable and more achievable as a group.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thank you for that. And please do feel free to sound like a broken record if you feel as though you need to be. So that's fine. I think in the meeting we had, myself and Abdulkarim and Ken last week, we shared

a bit of that feeling as well, which is why we essentially killed two of the narratives. We went from seven to five. If we need to kill a couple more narratives, or if we need to rephrase narratives to make them more within scope, we can definitely do that.

So, if you don't mind—I know you're not in a position now to kind of review the document and it's tough to do it on call, but if you could, before the next call, just review some of the narratives and point out which ones you think are outside of the scope of the SOW, and then we can discuss that on the next call. That would be really good, because we could go down to just two or three narratives. There's nothing saying we can't just have one.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I'll certainly do that. I apologize I'm not in a position to do it this exact moment.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: No problem. I understand. Moving on, popping the conversation stack, I believe we were talking about one. I don't remember if we actually finished it. I think we mainly did. Ray, please correct me if I'm wrong there, but I think you were mostly done talking about one.

RAY BELLIS: Yes, I think so.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Given that—so I'm hoping to kind of use this narrative document as kind of like a source document for the eventual publication that this work party produces, so I'm not too worried about cleaning up the text in this document. It was in many ways like a brainstorming exercise or kind of a constructive brainstorming exercise. And now we have a bunch of good text here that we can then paste and edit further into the actual document.

So I'm going to go over to the outline I've made now, and I think—can people see a different document now? Can people see what looks like the top of an RSSAC document?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Sometimes it lets me do that when I'm sharing and sometimes it doesn't. So, this is basically the RSSAC template for a document, and I've plugged in some section headers, and written a little bit of text under each section header describing what that section is. This is my attempt at a title. It's terrible. Someone please do a different one. I'm going to scroll down now to the actual meat of this.

So, this is kind of what I'd like to talk about, and there's a few things offscreen, like acknowledgements and all that basic stuff. We can have an appendix maybe with some example output. But this right here, what's on screen now is really the meat of the outline. I'll just quickly walk through it.

Obviously, we start with an introduction. And then I thought something on the goals and the purpose of this tool, and this is a subject heading I stole from that document that Ken had started initially. It was a first document we were working with where we had a couple of headings in there on goals and purpose. And then discuss scope, which seems like an important thing that we've discussed a bunch, and this probably goes directly to Brad's comment: what precisely is the scope of this document and the requirements for this tool? And then on to the use cases, which is going to be largely just—we could start off by copying and pasting from the narratives doc and then editing that down.

And then with section four going into the requirements, starting off with the measurements—and this is probably going to be right here, section 4.1 is probably going to be the longest section of the document where we go through each individual measurement and describe what it is they're measuring and whatnot.

We'll probably break that down as well into maybe IP type measurements and DNS type measurements, something like that. And then platform requirements, what kind of requirements are there going to be for this tool to run on? That could be very broad or very specific. And then the output format, whether this group would like to see some kind of standardized output. I'm kind of assuming that that's going to be something that's useful, whether that ends up being YAML or JSON or XML. But there's probably going to be some kind of output that needs to be specified.

One of the things we discussed recently as well is the idea that we wouldn't specify what should be done with the output so that we shouldn't necessarily say, "Well, there's one central repository that's managed by some entity which collects all this output and performs statistical analysis on it or makes pretty graphs or something." That's outside the scope of this document.

And then finally, other requirements, because you always need to have an "other" category." An then I thought it would be useful to have a section discussing existing tools because we've talked a lot about that on this work party as well. These are the ones that I could come up with. There's probably some that I'm forgetting. And then conclusions, and yeah, it could be that under existing tools, we're able to map the measurements that we would like the tool to make, we could map all those measurements already to existing tools, or it might be that we can't. So either way, that would be an interesting exercise, to see what existing tools can do with regards to the easements we can come up with.

So with this kind of outline, I feel like we have a lot of text floating around in our other two documents where we can start plugging in things and start actually writing this document. But before I ask for volunteers, I'd like to get some feedback on this outline specifically if we're missing anything. Is this how people perceived the document would look like, something like this in the end?

One of the things I kind of modeled this on was RSSAC 002, which was the one RSSAC document I could think of where I thought this is the

closest thing to what we're trying to do here even though it's not a fair analogy, but it's the closest one I could come up with. Ken, please go ahead.

KEN RENARD:

Thanks. The one thing about the outline that I would comment on is maybe section four, platform requirements output and things like that, in order to limit scope of this work party and to not boil the ocean, we may just have to say let's define what the measurements are or what the metrics are for these purposes, what would the tool look like, specifying more details about the tool, like what platforms they'll run on or output formats. It would be nice to do, but let's try to concentrate on defining measurements and what they would look like. That's my perspective.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Thanks for this. And that seems like an easy way to limit the scope. [inaudible] suggest that right here. Any other comments on the outline? Is there anything we're missing? And this will certainly not be the last time people can comment on this, because [inaudible] call. Abdulkarim, please go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE:

I think we're missing point number three. We have one, two, four.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. I'll renumber. Hopefully someone will come up with something that can go into three's spot so we can solve that problem in a more interesting way than just having a renumber. But I can renumber before we have our next call.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: And also, secondly, I was thinking the use case and the measurement, because I'm thinking for the use case, depending on what we agree eventually, the number of use cases we're going to have, I was thinking the measurement—okay, I think we can separate them or put them together depending on the way we look at it.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. I'm thinking that when we have the actual measurements defined in each individual section, we can map those back, so each one should eventually map back to at least one use case.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yes.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Otherwise, what's the point of having a measurement?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yeah, I think you can continue. That's all from me.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Any other comments on the outline? Okay. Seeing none, is anyone interested in doing some writing on this? I can certainly help. I plan on doing some of the writing myself. But I'm not an RSSAC caucus member, so it's always a little bit tricky when staff members do a significant amount of writing. Ken, please go ahead.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. I currently have the writeup for narrative number two, identifying currently underserved areas. I will volunteer to rewire that and pull that over into the use case section.

But one thing I did want to bring up based on some of the comments on this section is that Horacio had made the comment about how can we measure the impact for an underserved area, and I guess this really comes down to the difference between what is an underserved area, is it based on population, need, whatever?

It's certainly not within the scope of this work party to define that. My intention here was to define metrics that might be eventually used to determine underserved, where the metrics are technical measurements, the underserved is more of a subjective interpretation of that.

So I would probably rephrase this. Maybe the use case would still reference underserved areas but the metrics are really more a test of— a really bad term here, but goodness, how good does the root server system look from this perspective? That goodness factor could then be used in an underserved determination. But let's stick to the metrics,

what's measurable, and then we can use that metric for other purposes. And I'd like to hear any comments of what people think about that. Thank you.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thanks for that comment. Wale, please go ahead.

WALE BAKARE: Thanks very much. I tend to agree with Ken on the point of looking at if that part is—you have to look at use case. So use case in context of underserved area, it's going to be totally different. So [we have to say] you want to put the measurement, so yeah, I think that could be based on a number of factors or components to look at, to say, okay, what are we actually going to measure, to what degree? Are we going to say we are measuring certain something or what are we measuring against with? And do we really have something to look into to really measure against other places?

Let's say, okay, look at underserved areas, so areas that have got this. So [before the root server is looked at it that particular place.] So, what are the things we know to identify? Let's see as it is, and to be. So we want to replicate something [to different place,] let's say, okay, this is FMO, future management operation, and the current management operation. So, what are the factors we identify in the current management operation and the future management operation? So we need to also identify all these key elements. I'll go with Ken to say, okay, should we just go with underserved? It depends on the caption

we're going to give the particular section, but yes, measurement, we can use that in terms of a future management operation area and the current management operation area to use that against to measure it against what we [inaudible] to have under that. Thank you.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thank you for your comment. In the interest of time, I'm just going to—because we have about ten minutes left. And thanks, Ken, as well, for your suggestion to do some work on use case two, or I guess narrative two. Are there any volunteers for some writing? Or I guess initially copying and pasting.

Okay. Well, I'll start off, and Ken, we can start off a little bit together and I will—

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I would also join as much as I can.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thank you, Abdulkarim.

WALE BAKARE: You can put me as [support team,] [inaudible] trying to join you guys also. [inaudible].

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Are you an RSSAC caucus member?

WALE BAKARE: [I don't know yet.] I have to check my—

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: We'll see about that offline.

WALE BAKARE: Okay. No problem.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. Thank you for offering. Okay, so I guess the next steps are for some writing to happen, for some cutting and pasting. The only other action item I think came out of this call was for Brad to look at the narratives and potentially do some cutting.

BRAD VERD: I will also contribute some writing while I do that.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thank you very much, Brad. And then there's an outstanding action item for Wes to contribute something to one of the narratives as well.

BRAD VERD: And just to be clear, I'm not going to be cutting anything off. I might maybe create a parking lot suggestion area where we would suggest moving pieces to a parking lot for further investigation.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. That would be great. With that, I think we're good. Ozan, do you want to talk about the next time we can meet?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Thank you, Andrew. The scheduled next meeting is the 23rd of November. Initially, we had thought about the previous week, which is the week of 16th of November, but this week, it overlaps with the IETF week. So the next meeting will take place on Monday on the 23rd of November at 16:00 UTC. Thank you. And if there are no other comments, I'll pause here.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Sorry, before we conclude, I just want to please encourage us to try and see how we can contribute to this document as much as we can and not just leave it to few people, because I'm sure all of us can contribute to one thing or the other. It's still a learning curve for me myself, so we shouldn't be probably discouraged. And I think I'm learning a lot. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Abdulkarim. With that, the call is adjourned. Thank you all for attending the session. [inaudible] can you please stop the recording?

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]