

**RSSAC Executive Committee Meeting
25 March 2014 | 11:00 SGT
ICANN 49 | Singapore**

Roll Call

Present A/J—Brad Verd
 B—Bill Manning
 D—Tripti Sinha
 F—Suzanne Woolf
 G—Jim Cassell
 I—Lars-Johan Liman
 K—Kaveh Ranjbar
 L—John Crain
 M—Hiro Hotta

Apologies: C, E, H
Observers: IANA Functions Operator—Elise Gerich
 Root Zone Maintainer—Duane Wessels
 IAB Liaison—Marc Blanchett

Staff: Barbara Roseman, Carlos Reyes

Agenda Review

John Crain asked to move the IAB item up on the agenda.

RSSAC Public Session at ICANN 49

Lars-Johan Liman requested reactions about the RSSAC public session on 24 March.

Elise Gerich thanked the presenters and emphasized that if RSSAC consensus does not exist on an issue, presenters should clarify that they are speaking in a personal capacity.

John Crain added that ‘RSSAC’ and ‘root server operators’ were used without proper clarity.

Suzanne Woolf stated that advance work and more practice should address these concerns in the future. She also noted that there were some questions, indicating good engagement. This is the right direction.

Lars-John Liman added that there is growing pressure for accountability.

Brad Verd expressed some frustrated at receiving the presentation so late before the public session because of disagreements with some of the content.

Lars-Johan Liman assumed responsibility for the late presentation.

Suzanne Woolf stated that the group needs to be more proactive and prepared to better engage with other groups during meetings. The RSSAC needs to take input and avoid the perception of making decisions solely as root server operators.

John Crain suggested a one-week deadline for presentations ahead of the upcoming London meeting.

Brad Verd asked if the group was learning anything from the ICANN meeting that would lead them to change anything. Duane Wessles responded that perhaps the RSSAC Executive Committee should be held before the public session. Lars-Johan Liman and Elise Gerich agreed.

Brad Verd expressed concern at the messaging of addressing accountability if the RSSAC only meets at one ICANN meeting per year.

Suzanne Woolf suggested a report of impressions and action items from ICANN 49 be drafted. Lars-Johan Liman agreed. Tripti Sinha volunteered to help Suzanne Woolf.

IAB MOU

Marc Blanchett stated that the IAB likes to have MOUs with SDOs. RSSAC is not an SDO, but it helps to avoid gray areas. The IAB and RSSAC leadership discussed this and agreed it was worth pursuing.

Barb Roseman indicated that there may be a problem in using the terminology of “MOU”, but the idea of having a document that spells out a mutual understanding between the two groups is good.

Marc Blanchett agreed that it would be helpful to have an understanding on both sides that makes it clear not just a documented understanding in the RSSAC procedures.

John Crain asked if the IAB liaison role is expected to be different than other liaison roles. Brad Verd concurred.

Suzanne Woolf stated that it was a good proposal for the IAB to make and does not see anything wrong with developing a document of this kind.

Elise Gerich expressed concern at how the RSSAC could establish an MOU with another organization if it is established by the Board of Directors within the ICANN. She added that she hesitates to add more documents to the queue until the operational procedures document is complete.

Marc Blanchett indicated that it does not matter where the understanding is written as long as the IAB and RSSAC are on the same page about their interactions.

John Crain suggested capturing the intent of the understanding between IAB and RSSAC in the operational procedures document.

Lars-Johan Liman asked Barbara Roseman to investigate what flexibility exists for RSSAC to enter into MOUs with other groups.

Lars-Johan Liman agreed to circulate the draft MOU to the mailing list for feedback and possible incorporation into the operational procedures document.

RSSAC Work Plan

Lars-Johan Liman stated that the operational procedures document is the top priority for an RSSAC Work Plan. A document defining the Caucus should also be drafted to provide potential RSSAC members more context about the role of the Caucus and their participation in it. Once the Caucus is formed, RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002 can move forward in the publication process.

John Crain emphasized the need for a timeline with the operational procedures document that establishes expectations. The next priority is forming work parties and setting priorities for their activities.

The RSSAC Executive Committee discussed the timeframe of a work plan. Barbara Roseman advised that ICANN's fiscal year runs from 1 July to 30 June. Lars-Johan Liman stated that he preferred a calendar year sequence. Tripti Sinha suggested a final decision be made; Elise Gerich recommended the work plan go through December 2014. Lars-Johan Liman recommended including a provision for revisions and evaluations in the work plan.

Kaveh Ranjbar asked if the Membership Committee was still functional. Lars-Johan Liman indicated that the Membership Committee had not been given proper instructions, but it should still be constituted.

Barbara Roseman advised that the Membership Committee was tasked with defining criteria for RSSAC members and extending invitations to potential Caucus members, but gaps exist in process and procedures around those two assignments.

Kaveh Ranjbar explained that invitations have been drafted and deadlines have been set, but the Membership Committee is waiting on the operational procedures document.

Tripti Sinha volunteered to fulfill Jason Castonguay's role after reviewing any existing materials. Lars-Johan Liman asked if there were any objections to this; there were no objections.

Elise Gerich raised the issue of rotating membership by July 2014 for those members that were only appointed to one-year terms. Suzanne Woolf indicated that this is mostly a formality for the Board of Directors—the sooner this is set the better, though. The Board of Directors expects to ratify whatever recommendations it receives from the RSSAC.

Tripti Sinha asked if the RSOs have final authority in appointing their representative to RSSAC. Lars-Johan Liman suggested adding this item to Any Other Business. Elise Gerich agreed. Bill Manning added that when Tim Shortall, Lars-Johan Liman and he worked on the initial operational procedures document, they determined that the RSSAC was in no position to tell the RSOs how to select their representative to RSSAC.

Elise Gerich suggested a prioritization of tasks for the work plan. Barbara Roseman recommended:

- Finish operational procedures document
- Provide guidance to Membership Committee
- Extend invitations to Caucus members
- Convene the Caucus
- Establish work parties

Barbara Roseman agreed to provide a timeline for this process.

The operational procedures document should include provisions on how to elect the co-chairs, how to rotate RSO appointees, how to review the Caucus, and how to approve liaisons.

The constituted Caucus would then review and proceed with publication of RSSAC 001 and RSSAC 002. Suzanne Woolf indicated that the Caucus should also review the 2870bis draft.

Brad Verd stressed the need for accountability in the work plan. John Crain added that finishing the operational procedures document was paramount because not completing it before ICANN 50 in London would lead to negative perceptions of RSSAC.

Operational Procedures Document and Approval Process

Lars-Johan Liman proposed a six-week timeframe for completing the operational procedures document. Barbara Roseman suggested a possibly tighter timeframe to aim for the upcoming RIPE NCC meeting. Bill Manning expressed concern that convening the Caucus at RIPE 68 would be perceived as favoring the European region.

Elise Gerich suggested completing a draft by the end of ICANN 49 and then circulating it on the mailing list for feedback. Bill Manning agreed, suggesting a conference call at the end of April to accept the operational procedures document. Then the Membership Committee will have instructions for its work seeking Caucus members. The Caucus would then convene when and where appropriate. Brad Verd agreed with this sequence.

Kaveh Ranjbar indicated that the work of the Membership Committee could proceed in parallel. The Membership Committee is read to move forward with its work. John Crain suggested giving the Membership Committee a final date by when to submit names for approval by the RSSAC Executive Committee.

Kaveh Ranjbar stated that the invitations for membership are ready to be distributed once the operational procedures document is complete. The Membership Committee can begin preparing a list of potential RSSAC members to invite, however.

John Crain suggested that this process be included in the operational procedures document if it is going to be a regular procedure.

Kaveh Ranjbar asked for this timeline could be announced on the mailing lists. Brad Verd suggested sharing the operational procedures document at RIPE 68 to get interested parties involved. John Crain recommended creating slides to assist with publicizing.

Lars-Johan Liman proposed 1 June as the deadline for the Membership Committee to submit names for consideration to the RSSAC Executive Committee. The RSSAC Executive Committee would then consider the recommendations. This would allow for the Caucus to convene at ICANN 50 in London.

Lars-Johan Liman asked Barbara Roseman to make appropriate arrangements for an RSSAC meeting at ICANN 50 in London.

Further editing of the operational procedures document is necessary. Suzanne Woolf indicated that some issues are editorial changes, while other issues are substantive issues that need review by the RSSAC Executive Committee.

Barbara Roseman added that clarification is needed on references to RSSAC, RSSAC Executive Committee, and RSSAC Caucus as well as the membership process. SSAC details need to be removed as well. Brad Verd suggested that points of contention be identified and sent to the mailing list for review.

Published Minutes

Lars-Johan Liman raised the issue of how, when, and where meeting minutes, specifically from the second half of 2013, are published. Barbara Roseman indicated that minutes are currently published on the internal wiki workspace.

Carlos Reyes will publish these meetings on the RSSAC webpage by the end of the week.

Suzanne Woolf added that minutes need to be published for accountability and transparency purposes. Barbara Roseman asked if the RSSAC Executive Committee would like to establish a process for publishing minutes. The ASO, for example, publishes draft minutes shortly after their meetings and then removes “draft” after they are approved. Lars-Johan Liman indicated that this should be included in the operational procedures document.

Next Meetings of the RSSAC Executive Committee

Lars-Johan Liman outlined the schedule of upcoming meetings: Barbara Roseman will arrange a call in two weeks’ time to review the latest operational procedures draft and a call at the end of April to accept the document.

Lars-Johan Liman suggested the next face-to-face meeting take place this summer either at ICANN 50 in London this June or IETF 90 in Toronto this July. John Crain added that he prefers meetings to be separated from Root Server Operator meetings.

Lars-Johan Liman will send a note to the RSSAC Executive Committee mailing list asking where and when the next in-person meeting will take place.

Tripti Sinha asked if a regular meeting schedule exists. Lars-Johan Liman responded that at this point a regular meeting schedule does not exist, but it is necessary moving forward.

John Crain added that agendas should be published a week in advance. Moreover, he would prefer to have a set day and time each month rather than trying to arrange meetings around individual schedules. This creates an expectation, and it is the responsibility of each member to attend.

Any Other Business

Tripti Sinha asked a question about quorum. Lars-Johan Liman indicated that only a majority of members are needed to take actions. Bill Manning added that the original operational procedures document stated that quorum is not required to conduct a meeting, but it is required to conduct a vote. Barbara Roseman incorporated some of that in the current draft.

The GAC has asked to send a liaison to the RSSAC. Lars-Johan Liman stated that he thinks it is a good idea to have that bridge between the two groups since some misconceptions have emerged. The GAC has proposed the representative from Finland.

Lars-Johan Liman will send more details about the GAC liaison to the mailing list.

The RSSAC Executive Committee meeting adjourned with no objections.