SAN JUAN – RSSAC Work Items
Tuesday, March 13, 2018 – 10:30 to 12:00 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

BRAD VERD: Brad Verd, Verisign.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane Wessels, Verisign.

FRED BAKER: Fred Baker, ISC.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson, DOD.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy, SSAC liaison to the RSSAC.

ALEJANDRO ACOSTA: Alejandro Acosta, liaison for the NomCom, also RSSAC Caucus. I
                             work for LACNIC.

WES HARDAKER: Wes Hardaker, University of Southern California, ISI.

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.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Lars-Johan Liman, Netnod.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Hans Petter Holen, associate chair. That means I was last chair in NomCom, and just gave it to Wes this year.

ZAHID JAMIL: I'm Zahid Jamil, chair this year of the NomCom.

DAMON ASHCRAFT: Damon Ashcraft, chair elect of the NomCom.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Daniel Migault, IAB liaison to RSSAC.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Andrew McConachie, ICANN staff supporting the RSSAC.

MARIO ALEMAN: Mario Aleman, ICANN staff.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar, RIPE NCC.

KATHY SCHNITT: Also, we've got a few RSSAC members online. I'd just like to introduce them to you. There's Kevin Jones, who's online, as well as -- I don't think Howard is dialed in. He was dialed in earlier. And this is an open meeting, so we have other attendees as well online and in the back of the room. There are empty seats, so please feel free to move up to the tables if you'd like. With that said, I'd like to turn it over to you.

ZAHID JAMIL: Thank you very much. We're gonna make it really snappy and short, because I think there may be stuff we want to discuss that's more substantive with the RSSAC as well. You've been hearing stuff in the community, so let me just do a quick presentation. Basically, you know what the NomCom is. We're not going to waste your time. Just know there are three board positions open. Anybody can apply. We would encourage you to suggest people to us, so we can reach out to them, or just have them apply straight to the NomCom.

The three board positions open this year are for three-year terms. That means there's a lot of spaces we need to fill this year on the board. The GNSO, one seat is open. It doesn't mean you have to be affiliated, representing, recommended by the GNSO,

because there's this misunderstanding in the public. Anybody could be appointed by the NomCom to the GNSO for that one seat for a two-year term. It's a non-voting position.

Then you have the ALAC. There are geographic restrictions in this one; this is the only one which has geographic limitations this year. There is one seat for Europe, one seat for North America, so that means you either need to be a European or a North American to qualify for one of those seats. Again, you don't have to belong to the ALAC, you don't have to have any affiliation with the ALAC, no one has to approve you -- just apply and it'll be up to us to decide to fill those two seats. The last is the ccNSO. Again, it's important that you are not a ccTLD manager here.

I think this is something we've learned from last year's experience. The ccNSO does not want us to appoint anybody to that seat who is involved in, affiliated with, or related to a ccTLD management role. So it has to be somebody else. They're looking for diversity and that's what they want. They don't want that to be a second seat for people to use as a back door.

So that's the four different areas we're trying to cover. As you can see, we have three, which is a lot as far as board seats are concerned. If you know folks in the RSSAC community or otherwise who could be great to apply, we would encourage you

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

to either send their names or get them to apply directly. It's really important that we see a lot more qualified women applicants, and for folks from the Latin American community. At the moment, we're seeing a low turnout of applications. It has risen because of the great work that Alejandro has done over the last two days, by the way.

Specifically, he's an excellent NomCom member, I must say. You're very well-represented in the NomCom because of Alejandro. And if it hadn't been for him, the uptick in applicants wouldn't have taken place. So as you can see, we had last year 36 percent women as opposed to the previous year of 19, and 50 percent of the candidates selected were women last year, as opposed to 29 percent the previous year. We're trying to do better.

To give you an example, there were two board seats last year, and both board seats were women. That doesn't mean that we're just trying to appoint people just because they're women, or they have a diversity criterion. No, they were qualified. That's what made a difference. So seeing more qualified applications who are either women or are from developing countries would be really good. I wanted to quickly give you where to apply.

We now have for the first time -- I call us nomads, we were nomads, we never had a fixed website, it was always NomCom

2017, 2018, so the SEO searches on Google were just really bad -- we now have http://nomcom.icann.org, and if you go to that website, you will find the Expression of Interest that you need to fill that out by the 19th of March, which gives you very limited time right now. And then you have until the 26th of March to be able to complete your application.

I'm sorry, that's a typo, I apologize; we'll have to fix that, Charla. It says 2017. I didn't spot that earlier. Now if you could travel back in time, that would be great. So, basically, 26th of March is the -- but you've got to get your Expression of Interest and your access to the application by the 19th. We're encouraging you to do that. There is some talk about extending the deadline by a few days. We're not there yet. We haven't made that decision yet. But treat the 19th of March as your deadline, suggesting people to come into the system. Thank you.

Let me go ahead and talk about improvements that have taken place this year, and Alejandro will maybe give you more insight when you do the full RSSAC meeting. We said we had great responsibility, but no power, in the NomCom, with our own operations. Our destiny was predetermined before our birth. I'll explain what that means. We had a *Groundhog Day* situation where every year we had the same problem again and again, doesn't matter how much you try to fix it, it couldn't get fixed. By

the time we were seated, we were told that, 11 months in advance, our budget had been hard-coded by the staff.

We had nothing to do with it. And they say our operations and everything, we needed to do that. We were already sort of predetermined. We were in this situation where we couldn't make decisions. This year, we fought hard and changed it. Our recruitment firm, our budget, our assessment firm, schedule, meetings, operation planning, used to be predetermined.

This year, what we've done is taken decisions right on the first day. We did a lot of pre-planning. On the first day that we came into existence, we started making decisions, and we had this decision go to staff. It took a long time to get it through, but we forced a partial budget review. We didn't know what a budget was. And in that budget, we found space to make many of the decisions we've taken this year. I'll go through them in a second.

So we now have a second recruitment firm; we don't just use one recruitment firm as we have done in past years. We have a second one, thanks to staff and their understanding of why that was required. In coming years, moving on, we will have a pool of recruitment firms from which Damon, of course, as chair elect, will be able to choose. We've changed our assessment firm this year. They were also something that used to be five years, we've had the same ones.

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

And this is important: we've actually decided that instead of having SurveyMonkey to be used to select board candidates, we're going to actually meet face-to-face, discuss every single candidates, and decide whether that's a good candidate or not. Previously the process used to be that people had a polling online. You'd just sit at home and click numbers and say, oh, this person's 4, this person's 5, this person's 1. And that was put together and, based on that, there was a cutoff, and people who didn't get high numbers really didn't make it through the process.

We think that in order to improve this, we need to make sure that we meet face-to-face and consider every applicant, regardless of how they may have been rated. That's why the face-to-face intersessional is happening Just so you know, that is not new money; that is not additional money. We've had to make serious sacrifices within our existing budget. That's why we needed the budget numbers, to then use that for our face-to-face intersessional. We have, for the first time, a job description. We asked the experts, which are the board members themselves, and said, look, this is what we are describing you ask. Is this right? They looked at it, they vetted it, and said, yes, that's right. This is the amount of time commitment it's going to take. So that's a first.

We are going to have criteria this time set in before we get the applications. So we're not going to look at people and say, I like this person. There are criteria. We don't have a matrix yet, but we have criteria against which we're going to match folks. We've worked really hard on that over the last few months. We have a quality and skills document, and there's guidance we've received from the board about what they're looking for. That's not binding, but the board basically tells us what they're looking for. We do pay heed to what they are asking for. SurveyMonkey vs. deliberations, I explained this, so we're going to take time to know each and every single candidate. Everybody who applies is going to be considered by this NomCom. We're not just going to cut you off because your numbers weren't good enough.

As you can see, we're doubling the recruitment capacity. We have two firms. In the long term, there are RFPs this year being put out for a pool of recruitment and assessment firms. We're going to be broadening our network, which has been one of the biggest criticisms we've received, that we use the same network and we get the same people. We don't really get the diversity.

And this is one thing we've heard a lot in the community, that NomCom is a black box; once you apply, nobody knows what's going on. You don't come back and tell the candidates where they are, what stage they're at. We're changing that this year in a

big way. At every single stage, when somebody doesn't make through, they're going to get a communication from the NomCom, telling them which stage they were able to get through or not, and ask them to re-apply.

I've made a personal commitment this year that folks who didn't get to an advanced stage will get a personal call from the chair to explain to them what happened, to the extent that we can reveal it, and encourage them to apply again. Because if you got to an advanced stage, that means you were a really good candidate, and you should apply in the next cycle, given the fact that you were well-perceived by folks in the process.

That's something we're going to do, try to be better to, in effect, our customers. We want to get to know our customers and what they need, so people we're going to appoint, we want to get to understand what they are. I'll give you a simple example: Someone in the ccNSO may not have a very good understanding of what the GNSO is like and what the political situation is like, and vice-versa, the GNSO may not understand the political issues related to the ccNSO. But they're appointing people in these positions, so they need to get to know one another.

We have training, thanks to Damon here, who did a lot of this confidentiality training and training on ACs and SOs, and I did some on board governance. We had some more on interview

training done -- actually, yesterday, to teach us how to do interviews. We're not experts at taking interviews.

We had a process where once we made our final decisions, we then used to send that final decision list to ICANN for due diligence. We would sometimes have a situation happen last year where suddenly the due diligence guys said, we've got a problem. Someone you selected didn't make it through. And then we didn't have time, space, money. People just weren't interested in meeting to actually change that decision.

So that was a problem. We're fixing it this year. We're going to do due diligence of those people who come to Panama for the final interviews, prior to them being interviewed and being selected. In Panama, once we've made a decision, it's done. We don't have to send them to due diligence. We're trying to improve that process.

As you know, we were going to get a permanent website, and we actually ask every single ASCO that we appoint, could you please tell us what you need from us? What are you looking for? The board does it every year; they send us a letter. But we've asked the GNSO, we've asked the ALAC, we've asked others, the ccNSO, please send us a letter. And they have. We're still waiting for the GNS letter, though, to tell us exactly what they're looking for. Again, this is not binding on us, but it helps us understand

our customers and how we're going to be appointing folks to them.

The last thing we changed, and this is important for you, is that we're trying to be law-abiding in the bylaws. Non-voting liaisons are non-voting liaisons. They're also term-unlimited. They can come as many times as they want to the NomCom. I'll describe the process in a second. In the preparation, the participation, deliberation, suggestion, recommendations, and one other thing: even in the straw polls, non-voting liaisons will be participating. In the rating that we will do early on, they'll be participating. They'll be rating numbers. They will also be part of the straw polling.

But when it comes to a final vote, to take a person from stage 1 to stage 2, or stage 2 to stage 3, that voting will be done by the voting members, which is typical of what happens also on the board. So that's what's happened. And I want to emphasize this, because there's a lot of conversation going on about whether or not the NomCom this year is changing its rules and trying to disenfranchise, maybe, liaisons or not. If you haven't heard it, I'm glad that you're hearing it from me, at least. That's not the case.

Yesterday I stirred up at the public forum, and I made a statement on behalf of the NomCom as chair, saying that we

actually are recommending, and we did recommend, to the board, that they change the bylaws and make sure that RSSAC and SSAC liaisons are not term-unlimited non-voting, but term-limited voting members moving, forward. We'd like that bylaw changed so we can implement that, so that folks like Alejandro, who's doing an excellent job, can actually vote through the entire process. You may have questions, so I'm going to stop now and open it up. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. Brad Verd, co-chair, RSSAC. Very interesting. It is in alignment with what Alejandro has shared with us. However, based upon your comment yesterday on the public forum, which I appreciate, I've heard lots of hallway conversation around this. This is not the first time I've heard this, so I have my interpretation of what used to be and what is today, and what I hear from other people has been wildly different. So I guess I'm kind of curious if you could just give me a scenario of what used to be and what is today, so to make sure I'm in alignment with the understanding.

ZAHID JAMIL: So there has been a substantive change, let's be clear on that. What used to happen was that everything through the process,

from the beginning to the end of the NomCom, used to be considered a fictional straw poll. Everything was a straw poll, which meant that when we went from 100 to 40, from 40 to 20, from 20 to five, from five to one, elimination and selection of candidates, effectively, so we're rejecting and selecting, that used to be done by what people used to describe as a straw poll. We looked really closely at that, because we'd had a bit of a problem last year with people getting really annoyed at the situation, saying that's not a straw poll. And actually non-voting can actually determine the outcome.

So what are we doing? Are we violating the bylaws or not? There was a lot of discussion about this last year. This year, not me, but others, raised that as an issue, some newcomers as well. They read the bylaws, and I'll let also others who had a different view and how their view has changed speak also to this. When you look at the bylaws, it says that you can participate, but you can't vote, and the definition of "vote," if you look at it in the bylaws, is basically determination.

So we are following exactly the same process as the board, where liaisons to the board don't get to vote in a decision-making vote. We also had the advantage of asking, apart from the fact there were a lot of lawyers in our NomCom who had the same advice, but also ask counsel, and the issue was if it's a

straw poll that you're taking, perfectly fine. Absolutely can, it's not outcome determinative.

So absolutely non-voting liaisons can participate, and they're going to be doing that this year. But when it comes to eliminating someone, where they go from stage A to stage B and they're gone then, they will not be part of moving forward, that's a decision you're making regarding that candidate. That's basically a decision of the NomCom. And so that's the interpretation we've taken.

Now what that means in the difference between last year and this year is that previously we used to consider just the final, formal action of the final vote that we called a vote. And everybody realized that was a fiction. It didn't make any sense, because we are making decisions and we're eliminating people on the basis of these straw polls. The interpretation and the advice we've received is basically, when you make a decision on a straw poll, you are actually voting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Let me just sort of give you a brief example of that. For example, let's say you and the two gentlemen on either side of you are running for a board seat. The way it used to be done is that if we had two slots available, we would have a poll to elect two of the

top candidates out of three, you and the two gentlemen on either side of you. The poll would select two people, eliminating one of you. That was deemed to be a poll. We called it a poll, but one person has been eliminated. It's really, effectively, a vote.

Then what would happen is at the end of that polling process, we would have a slate of candidates for the board. That slate would be voted upon, and then the non-voting liaisons, who participated in the poll, would not participate in the vote. We didn't think, since that was essentially eliminating a candidate, that that was in line with the bylaws.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: So I've been on NomCom for five years, and when we discuss this, we need to be very careful, not saying that previous NomComs have done something terribly wrong, while we think there is a need for change. So there has been other changes as well. My first year, the theory through the whole process was that NomCom can at any time go back and pick out candidates that they have previously eliminated. When I was chair last year, that kind of non-determination in the process didn't make sense to me, because it wasn't necessarily driving us forward to right discussions we've had in the past.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

So over the years, it's become more and more that you actually start with the 100, you reduce it to 40, you reduce it to 10, 20, and then you end up with one or two candidates, and you actually make decisions moving forward. That's why we're here. So it's been a change in the rhetoric. When this came up at the end of last year, I actually went back and talked to Ram, who is on the board, to get two perspectives from him. How does the ICANN board do this?

And he is a non-voting member of the board, so he said, well, at some points, we do straw polls, and then when you sense the temperature of the room, there is a formal vote only with the voting members. But there is never a sort of vote issue where the non-voting members take part. There is a straw poll first, and then a vote. There is a clear distinction between straw polls and votes. And the practice in the NomCom had been to only have straw polls to make decisions. So that's a big change. And he also said that it was quite clear when he participated in the NomCom, he was not taking part in any of these votes.

So there has been a significant change of practice in the way the NomCom have been working over the years, letting go of this detail and part of it that I will actually defend that previous NomCom's work, okay to do this, was since they allowed to pick up candidates again at any point in the process, which to me

doesn't really make sense if you want to have a streamlined process and reach a goal. You need to focus on the candidates that move you forward, right?

So that's part of this as well, that makes it much more complicated than just looking at if those non-voting members participates in straw polls or not. The big distinction is making clear what's a vote, writing that in the operating procedures or the voting procedures that we're now making, that this decision is okay to participating, this is not okay, and making that very clear, so nobody -- and this is the important thing -- nobody should come in the last day of the NomCom and say that, oh, but I don't agree with this because the only reason that candidate ends up here is because of the non-voting members.

That's the worst case that we want to avoid. And I think that Alejandro has really seen this, that, okay, it's not important for him to vote, it's very important for him to be able to voice his opinion, and if everybody knows that he's not voting, maybe they will actually listen more to him. I mean, that's my interpretation of that.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much for that detail. I just wanted to ask Zahid, because I know some other people were not in the public forum

yesterday, and you made a comment which personally I think was a very sane and valid comment in the public section. If possible, could you please repeat for the room so we are all on the same page?

ZAHID JAMIL: Thank you. The comment I made in the public forum is that we would recommend, as chair of the NomCom, not just a personal thing, that we have a lot of challenges because of this distinction that exists in the bylaws. We would recommend that the SSAC and RSSAC -- and I didn't say non-voting liaisons, because that means the GAC also gets included, the GAC also ends up having a vote -- imagine them being there and imagine that how politically affects everybody -- so it's very specific, the SSAC and the RSSAC should have term limits, which they currently don't, and should have full voting rights like everybody else. That's my recommendation to the board. And we're going to be making that recommendation to the review team as well.

KATHY SCHNITT: Alejandro, and then Liman.

ALEJANDRO ACOSTA: Thank you. Well, I'm going to rephrase what HP said regarding -- I don't mind to vote or not to vote. But I just want to mention that when I entered NomCom, almost three years ago, I was not expecting to vote or to poll. So for me, it was a surprise that in that moment, they allowed me to poll, not actually to vote.

But one more time, if you read the bylaws, it explicitly and very clearly says that an SSAC representative is a non-voting member. So somehow there are two lawyers there, Damon, Zahid. So I fully understand that they want to say what the bylaws mention.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Lars Liman for the record. I understand where you're coming from with this proposal. But it gets us into the same conundrum that we have with the entire community, since this advisory committee is formally appointed by the board. Having to vote on incoming board members creates a circle which is kind of complicated, at least. So please bear that in mind.

ZAHID JAMIL: Well, as we had a private discussion on that, I would then suggest that you also propose to have a fully bottom-up appointment of the RSSAC. I mean, RSSAC, they are root server operators, and you should be fully capable of bottom-up

appointing this counsel. So you don't need the board involved in that, and then you don't have a circle. That may be different for SSAC, but let's fix that as well. I think that's my engineering approach to this. We don't want to make changes to your thing here, but that would be the logical solution then.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, sorry. I've been collecting my questions. So a couple of things: One, the example you used, you're more like the board now, and you used Ram's example of straw polls happen on the board, but then when it comes down to voting, there is a vote and the non-voting seats don't vote. Correct, that that's what you just said to me? You also said "outcome-determinative" means the non-voting seats would not be involved in anything that was outcome-determinative.

So I'm going somewhere with this, which is based upon the hallway conversations that I've been in. Can you define to me "outcome-determinative?" And the reason I ask, before you jump on it, is one of the conversations I was involved in, and I was really kind of dumbfounded by it, was stating that any conversation that our liaison was involved in, where he was sharing his opinion, trying to influence the outcome of a candidate, which is what I believe his role is, is outcome-determinative.

So therefore, he could be involved, and I literally was speechless. So I really would like to understand, when you say "outcome-determinative," what does that mean?

ZAHID JAMIL: Okay. I'm sorry, I'm going to be very frank. I know this is open, it's probably transcribed, and there's a point at which you really just have to say things. We're having a serious problem with some folks getting out there and disseminating -- and I'm saying it right now, on record -- disinformation. It is unfair, it is incorrect, I'm even going to go as far as to say it's deceptive. Sorry, I apologize, because we've been hearing this, not just from you, from others.

BRAD VERD: This is why I'm asking. [CROSSTALK]

BRAD VERD: My answer to the people that I was having this conversation with was -- I'm meeting with them tomorrow, I'm going to point-blank ask the question, so they understand that, because I didn't -- I disagreed with them point-blank, to say that didn't make sense.

ZAHID JAMIL: This is malicious --

BRAD VERD: So that's why I'm asking.

ZAHID JAMIL: This is malicious, deceptive rumor-mongering, and I say that with full response not just because I'm upset -- because I am upset as well. [CROSSTALK]

ZAHID JAMIL: So let me describe the process to you, because I had to do the same thing with the SSAC also, and when they understood what the process looked like, they understood most of what was being discussed in the NomCom. We have the following process, and I'm sorry, we're going to go a little bit over time, but give me these two minutes, because I think it's important.

The first thing that happens is, the applications close. Every one of us gets our application, so we look at them and we have maintained the process where people online, all of us NomCom members online, will rate those applications. So everybody gets a 1, 2, 4, or 5 --

BRAD VERD: Including the liaisons?

ZAHID JAMIL: Everybody, except the leadership team. We totally exclude from this process. So Alejandro, as an example, or Mark Seiden, who's with the SSAC, for example, will actually rate them 1 to 5. Those numbers will come up. Everybody will see those numbers. Everybody will know who voted and how -- not vote, but basically rate them. We call it rating. Then what happens is, there's a call, and we go through every single applicant and we ask if there is a proposer and a seconder for every single applicant.

In that process, because proposing and seconding can be outcome-determinative, we have allowed the non-voting liaisons to suggest somebody. They can say, hey, hold on, I suggest this person we looked at. They need to find one proposer and one seconder to take that person through the process. That's a very low bar. The liaisons get to suggest. There's a proposer, there's a seconder, there's no vote, per se, but there is a proposer and seconder, effectively this outcome-determinative action where that person either goes forward or doesn't go forward. That will give us a large number.

A very small number of people will be excluded from that process, because with such a low bar, we're not going to exclude a lot of people. And that's deliberate, because you want the maximum number of reasonable applications to get to the intersessional face-to-face meeting, because what we're changing this year is saying, we're not for our own efficiency going to start excluding people. We want to consider as many people as we can, practically, and give consideration to every single application as much as possible.

So at the intersessional, here's what happens: We have a discussion regarding candidates. Everybody participates, and I say everybody, including the non-voting liaisons. And then we have a straw poll. In that straw poll, guess who participates? Non-voting liaisons. Everybody gets to see what's happening with every single candidate. And we go through the entire process, and once closed, then we do it again.

And when we do it again, this time, again, non-voting liaisons get to discuss. And then when the vote happens, to take one candidate to the next stage, to eliminate them or not, that's when the non-voting liaisons don't vote. But up until that entire process, they're fully participating in everything. And by the way, that cycle is repeated, of course, because we have to keep reducing the numbers. That's what it all looks like. For the sake

of time, I'm not going to go into how many times we do this. But that's what we do.

Also, when the interviews take place, how the deep-dive teams are set up, we have asked that they be part of the deep-dive teams. We've asked that they provide reports to the NomCom. So they are members of the deep-dive teams, providing recommendations. So they're fully participating in every other process. Only one thing that they don't do. When it comes to a vote on a candidate, elimination or not, that's when -- first there'll be a straw poll, they'll participate, but when it comes to the vote of making a final decision, the fate of that candidate is in question, that's when they don't. That's it.

BRAD VERD: Thank you. Thank you for that clarification. That was my original interpretation and what I walked in the meeting with. One last comment, this is my personal comment: I do find it interesting that the procedures are reset every year for NomCom. I do echo the SSAC comment on that outsider looking in, I don't understand it. Maybe there's a reason for it. But it is confusing.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Well, if I'm going to be a bit blunt, I would say that's not true. The bylaw says that the NomCom gets to set their own

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

procedures, that every year, in the five years I've been there, the NomCom has started with existing procedures, gone through them and seen where we need to make improvements.

So effectively, the NomCom has to approve its own procedures for the year, so they have the ability to change them. In practice, the changes have not been that big. There is a substantial change this year because of this clarification. But the procedures -- if you go to the website and go back and see, you will see that 80 percent of the text is probably the same every year.

BRAD VERD: And, again, I'm not trying to do a point-counterpoint on what was changed or what hasn't changed. I'm just sharing the confusion, and I think that though little changes happen over time, they lead to a big change, like you just happened right now.

ZAHID JAMIL: Can I just share my thoughts on that? My initial reaction, having been on the NomCom a few years and knowing that we set our own procedures, was, no, no, no, I think we should set our own procedures. It was an instinctive reaction. And then I certainly -- this is a conversation I had with some folks in the SSAC -- I said, no, actually, you know what? That's good. If the community tells

us what the rules are, we don't have to waste time trying to set our procedures, and we're done. It's okay.

They've decided, and that's what we need to comply with, which is the same thing with the bylaws. The bylaws are written the way they're written. We have to just comply with them. We can't monkey around with them -- for instance, just like we would say, well, let the non-voting liaisons vote -- we can tell the ALAC, for instance, which is a voting member, you're not voting this year. We can't do the opposite.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: I would just add to that, that yes, I can agree in principle with that. But please don't make it so that it takes two-and-a-half years to change something that's obviously wrong in the procedure, which is what we get. We tend to get into, in ICANN.

ZAHID JAMIL: I'm so sorry. Because this was important, we've gone seven minutes over. Somebody else on the ALAC is waiting for us to make a presentation, probably with the same questions in mind. But if you excuse us, and if there's anybody who wants to reach out for further questions, please feel free to do so. We want to be able to answer these questions.

KATHY SCHNITT: So thank you very much for coming. This is very informative. I'm very impressed with the level of thoughtfulness that's going into your work and the integrity associated with it. You're asking some tough questions to ensure that you're living by the right rules. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Yes, thank you very much.

KATHY SCHNITT: So now we go into our open work session. Brad will run that session. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Andrew, can we get the work list up, please? There's room at the table for anybody who wants to come up. You get power and a mike to talk to. Yes. All right. So these are the existing work items that are currently being -- what's the term, that have been identified at different caucus meetings and at different ICANN meetings, or I should just say caucus meetings, because it was caucus meetings at the ICANN meeting versus caucus meetings at the IATF -- that were identified, so the process for these would be to collect these wordsmiths and to give a little bit of

background where they're coming from, and then send them to the caucus to look for volunteers to create a statement of work is the wrong -- a statement of work, kind of a problem statement, that this is what we're going to go solve, and then there's a call for a work party to be created and to work on it.

So I'll just quickly run through them, see if there are any comments. These are not wordsmithed -- these are the raw suggestions. These will be wordsmithed, and what I mean by "wordsmithed" is not to change the intent or the content, but to give background for the caucus when they get them. So the first one came up -- there was a question on how to research how resolvers choose which root server they're talking to. This came up at the last caucus meeting, I forget where it was, and it was brought up by, I believe, one of the current root operators. But it seems like a question -- Duane, you want to add something?

DUANE WESSELS: Well, I would say that as far as I know, resolvers choosing servers, there's nothing special about the root. This is probably more general -- how does a resolver choose the server for any zone? And I would assume it's the same for roots. If it's not, that would be interesting to know.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Andrew, can you make a note of that? Just when we can expand that question a bit, to make sure that it's covered.

WES HARDAKER: So the question there is whether they follow the standard procedure that every DNS system uses, or they use a different one?

DUANE WESSELS: Well, there is no standard procedure. It's implemention-dependent. I think it's understanding how the different implementations make their choices.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I believe that each of the known software companies out there do it a little differently.

WES HARDAKER: I was under the impression that there was an expectation that they would pick among the available servers at random, and if that didn't work, pick another one.

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

BRAD VERD: I believe that needs to be answered, and it sounds like you're being a good member for the work party. Yes, you've been added to the work party. Kidding. Any other questions around that? Second one that had been talked about was research what a rogue operator could do. I believe that's a rogue root operator. This one is to identify what malicious behavior could be done, and more specifically, what are safeguards, gates, mitigations that can be put in place to prevent that or identify it immediately.

WES HARDAKER: I think your additional comment there needs to be added in the - - well, you just said, and so what do we do, how to we identify --

BRAD VERD: Yeah. So, Andrew, I hope you're grabbing that. But, yeah, I agree with that. Risks and mitigations. Any further discussion? No? Okay. The third one here is research geographic diversity of root servers. This was a discussion about underserved areas and how do you identify underserved areas.

Some of us have talked internally and this is a complex question. It's not really a complex problem, it's just a complex question, because there are so many variables for each given region and/or area. There is geographic questions, there is topology

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

questions, there are latency -- the list goes on and on and on, and I believe that maybe what this turns into is identifying what those questions are and giving more color and background around it so people can understand the problem set versus saying, this region is underserved.

Maybe it's not underserved because the network topology doesn't allow for it. If all circuits go to point X, maybe we need root servers in point X and not in this region. There's a whole bunch of different question there. Yes?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I think I brought this one up. This could be a problem two ways: If you look at it too simply, it's a horrible question. If you look at it in too complicated a way, it never gets done. And so we don't collude very often in things like where we put the next server, but it is not obvious, if you just put pins on a map, what is underserved. Almost every time you find a big geographic area, there's a very good explanation for how that's not actually underserved.

There are issues of, like you said, latency, bandwidth, and every other thing, and even politics. I was imagining, after we talked about this, we could end up with a prescription of, hey, somebody ought to put a server in Kazakhstan or some place

that it wasn't obvious to us individually that is underserved. But in total, we could come up with a recommendation.

BRAD VERD: I think that's great feedback. Any other comments from -- no? Yeah? Question? Please. Do we have --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, everyone. My name is [inaudible] Filomeno. I'm a United Nations youth representative under Peace Day 365. I have been working with a couple of NGOs, when it comes down to internet in impoverished areas around the world, and I am really impressed that you guys touched on this topic when it comes to servers. I'm just here to learn from you guys. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER: Thank you for your work on that effort.

BRAD VERD: Yes, thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I had something to add to this. At one of the other primer DNS meetings, that question got asked, and somebody was, like, how

many are in Africa? And it really doesn't give the proper answer. The question they want to ask is, how well-served are they?

BRAD VERD: Correct.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And I think that we probably need to come up with some way of identifying how well-served a region is, so that you can't say you have 10 of this, 15 of that. So I do think this is good work, and especially in South America and Africa, where a lot of the countries' connectivity goes out of region, they may be perfectly well-served from, say, Miami and South America. But if you just do one, two, three, four, five, six, it doesn't, you know --

BRAD VERD: Andrew, did you capture that? How well-served versus -- great. All right, moving on.

WES HARDAKER: One sec, Brad. It is worth noting that actually RIPE ATLAS has a lot of data that we can actually start with.

BRAD VERD: Would give leverage?

WES HARDAKER: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: Great. Moving on: Fourth bullet point is best current practices for hosting root instances. I believe this question came up around the physical requirements, space power ping, so physical network, what other power restrictions type of things for hosting these different nodes. Right now, that is currently defined by each of the individual root operators as they deploy their anycast clouds, and the question here was, is this something that RSSAC caucus should be looking at and defining a best practice. Any comments? Thoughts?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, I got a question. Does this include the amount of root servers that are co-located on the same instance location, or under the same host?

BRAD VERD: I think it could. I think that is a shared question that has come up quite a bit. I don't know if this was here specifically to address

this. I think it came up because -- it was a reoccurring question in the caucus meetings. It was asked yesterday in the tutorial session, which is what are the requirements for me hosting one. And so this is a bit of -- maybe this isn't a place RSSAC should go, but it was suggested, so I wanted to cover it here.

RUSS MUNDY: Brad, if you literally meant rack power wires, kind of thing, what we find people are most surprised by is the routing requirements of advertising. And that document, that would be really a great big step, because people think we're shutting them down by saying there's this hard part. And it's not written anywhere. You just have to be a member of the smart club.

BRAD VERD: Liman, then Wes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Let's try to work on this together. And if it turns out that there are too big diversities and variations and we can't agree, maybe a subgroup of us could get together and come up with something under another umbrella. Because I fully agree that there are probably common things and there are definitely

things that are sometimes difficult to explain with networking difficulties as well. So sign me up.

BRAD VERD: Wes.

WES HARDAKER: In our efforts to do the how the root server system works tutorial, it might be worth saying when we have the slide that says you should have three or four for a region, we probably ought to talk about not all on the same rack, speaking of --

BRAD VERD: Certainly. And, again, when I say space power ping, I'm not saying that this is limited to this is the cable, right, this is everything involved in getting that cable to work for that instance, which I include the routing and whatnot. I think if that's going to convey to the community that this is the bar, I think that's important and may be something that RSSAC should definitely look at. All right. Sorry, I lost my screen and I can't see. All right.

Bullet number five: tool to gather local perspective on root servers. I think this was suggested -- again, I think some of these overlap and touch on each other, this certainly could be

something for an underserved region, or somebody's question of whether or not they're underserved. Maybe there's something that could be developed that is a tool that you could launch and say, how well am I served right now, where I'm at, type of thing. Oh, look, you've got X milliseconds to 12 different servers, or different instances, and here they are, and whatnot.

Any thoughts? Would that be useful? Something for RSSAC? I see lots of heads nodding, so -- all right. And then, obviously, we published RSSAC28, which was the naming scheme study, and out of that we basically ended the document with we need to do more work to really come down to a bunch of answers. Here are three of the work items: One of them is study the current behavior of DNS resolvers, which we kind of touched on a little bit earlier. Yes, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: I think, if I remember correctly, that the actual question from this was study the current behavior of resolvers in the face of signed primary responses, and do they validate those signed primary responses and that sort of thing.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, that's important. The recommendations from RSSAC28 are well-documented. I'm not trying to change them here. This is

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

trying to get on one slide. We'll go back and make sure that they are in alignment. There was a clear question about a study about node redelegation attacks and how maybe that was the stipulation for changing the naming scheme. I think the takeaway was, we really need to look at the node redelegation attacks and make sure that we have the right motivations there.

And then, lastly, there was the study looking into how we reduce the priming response size, given the DNS and the size of that question seems to get larger and larger, with the different things that we were looking at. Is there anything else that we should add to this list?

Again, we will pretty these up, and when I say pretty them up, we will give some background and color and context, just like I did here verbally. And this will get sent out to the caucus for people to identify which ones they want to work on, and try to come up with a statement of work for each one. And then if it gains traction within the caucus, we'll do a call for a work party and begin work on that. Any suggestions? Anything that we're missing?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can I just get clarification on how we define "rogue" in the second bullet? Who came up with that question? I can look at

that from either, there's some entity out there that wants to turn up in an alternate root or complementary root to what we're doing and try to suck traffic, or there's Maurizio and I have a bad day, and we take down all of ICANN's root servers.

BRAD VERD: If I may, I think the answer is both. That's a good scenario, basically, of somebody trying to announce your IP space and doing something that they shouldn't do. That is a scenario that we should talk about, because that is a rogue operator. It's just not the current operator going rogue. It's somebody trying to hijack your space and do something malicious.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yeah, there was a mention in the Russian press this last week on what if ICANN dropped. Are you from the zone file? And they ran through the whole scenario. The idea is out there of, do you manipulate this thing? You've got to admit, it's an interesting question.

BRAD VERD: It started with a current operator going rogue and doing something. That's been a long-time question that has been addressed at the root operator level a number of different times.

We think it's important here that we document through what the different scenarios are and, more importantly, how we identify them and mitigate them.

All right. Are there comments -- I'm not in -- so, John Bond has said, in reference to the best current practice doc, it doesn't need to be said that -- said [inaudible] please. I can't, I'm sorry. Let's go back far enough. So, again, reading John's comment, he goes, I think this document could be useful -- however, it may give some people, organizations, the erroneous perception that if they meet these current best practices, they will be entitled to host a server on behalf of any root server operator. He's going back to the fourth bullet, which is best current practices for hosting root instances.

Yeah, I think, obviously, this is a generic statement that we would be making informative, maybe, versus you do these and you get it. That is currently at the discretion of the root operators, and each root operator has their own evaluation and criteria that somebody would need to meet. We're not trying to take that over at all. Thank you, John. I was typing something else.

All right. Anything else? All right. So that's the current work item. We have that as an action item. This'll be coming out that the caucus may enlist in the very near future. Tripti, do you have

anything else? All right. So we are four minutes ahead of schedule. Great. So we're a little ahead of schedule. If there's nothing else, we'll adjourn. All right. Thank you all. Wait, Jeff? We have this room until noon. I don't know if somebody else has the room. All right. Thank you all.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We are adjourned. [AUDIO BREAK]

TRIPTI SINHA: Now I'm asking the RSSAC to stay here. We never got that one item from the previous meeting. Oh, I see what you're saying. Okay. Never mind.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]