RSSAC 33, San Francisco 22march2009

Jun sends regrets.

Agenda:

RSSAC review
Crocker Placeholder
CAIDA update

Intro:

Marco Loenzoni

RSSAC review:

Harold's slides

public comment date cutoff has been moved to 17apr2009
rough timeline - end of SYD mtg (3q2009 - prelim report to board)
            end of ICN mtg (final recommendation to board)
implementation - may be 24-36 months out. - just in time for next review.

Marco - Now at the beginning of the public comment period.

A walk though of the Westlake review slides.

good work done
ICANN's version of data is flawed at best, fabricated/wrong a worst
the Liaison has been the exemplar in rssac/icann interaction
RSSAC is perceived as Reactive and Resource poor

New Purpose and role.

Relaunched as a strategy group - jointly run as an ICANN/RSO group
Goal to provide unbiased strategic advice

New function as a liaison btwn the root server ops, ICANN, and the Internet
community

Changes to the Terms of Reference

===================

Consultants report. Andy Linton remotely.

        was presented at ICANN mx, comments incorporated.
        "no negative feedback" to report. no retractions, misattributions etc

AL: relaunch as 'strategy group' co-owned ICANN/rootops

        'provide unbiased adv.'

        move to publicly open meeting, with structure. can go into closed
        session

        comment period to 27th of March. ICANN Board decision coming later

Bill: "its all good. implement it tomorrow. (all 9 in the room like it)"
        (laughter)

        accountability, why redirected through RSSAC when rootops accountable
        to the community *anyway*.

AL: clearly individually accountable.

Vix: Whose problem is being solved by this document? ICANN, or community
        or the people interviewed?

AL: All three, ICANN has expressed view, struggle with finding info about
        what to do with the root server system. Quote "they don't ask us
        anything they don't tell us anything" -cheap sound bite, but pointed.
        number of ppl in ICANN community really don't know what RSSAC does.

[lost context]

        National govs see this as critical resource. they have clout.
        transparency, being seen to do stuff, really important here.

Vix: speaking for ISC. never really cared much about rssac one way
        or another. don't need this. rootops meet independently. happy
        to have public meeting, community come and sit. rootops not
        able to get that organized. doc/research/iab etc all to come, useful
        will you get usual complaints on use of ICANN funds, tax-and-spend?

AL: possible. travel expenses. perceived as 'junkets'
        don't need people poking around. MoUs, SLAs. unless its what
        you want.

Vix: always had this, since rssac/ICANN set up. But to re-frame.
        if the root server ops were better organized, organized in any way,

doing this reporting, outreach, pay for admin support etc. If not
done through ICANN, would you feel that the problem was mostly
solved, ICANN had no work to do?

AL: Right in that, the important thing is 'getting work done' rather
           than who, under what structure. Not wedded to that. work here to be
           done is key. cooperation that has to go on between IANA, rootops
           needs to happen. ICANN are in the position of looking at gTLD,
           DNSSEC, IDN. so, somewhere along the line between rootops/IANA/ICANN
           needs to be liaison. discussion. Can be done by 'root server ops
           industry association' but wouldn't mean discussion not happening.

           attempt to provide subcommittee, wg, to address the issues.
           ask, that if you have industry assoc, would rest of world, outside
           community feel that was independent advice? is perhaps role for outside
           group.

           auditors-analogy. sort-of role, one of roles, revised RSSAC might have

Vix: so, ICANN has the problem. that answers. so we can frame discussion.
           mentioned root ops speaking with one voice. Without naming names
           we've had some crazies. Anything which looks like anyone speaking for
           anyone more than themselves, we've got a problem. Led to the
           intentional disorganization you've come upon. Can see the roots of
           management 101 in your proposal. 'This is how the rest of the world
           does this' Problems which caused us to be this way, have more complex
           and out of reach solutions than your proposal provides.

Kosters: like the organizational elements. not so much the numbers,
           can't speak on behalf of group. story: years ago, was running internic
           vix called, 'want to run root, what do I have to do' -pointed to Jon
           Postel rang: "add ISC into root server mix" -did it. informal process
           but how it worked. goes to 1st part of Q. placement/number of servers.
           but, something this group did, started, never finished is new orgs,
           succession planning. So, should that be a part of this or not,
           added to report, suggestion going forward. Leads to second Q. the
           root server ops talk to IANA, not so much ICANN. IANA housed there now
           but may not be in the future. Does RSSAC then tie to ICANN or IANA?

Westlake   Where the RSSAC fits. Creation of ICANN. doesn't tell ppl
           what to do, but provides framework for policy/discussion.
           strategic bridge between the two. Creature of IANA rather than ICANN
           itself, but the essence is, to communicate with all three, if put in
           those terms. that it happens more important than where.

Kosters: Succession planning

AL: Lots of intersecting sets in the room. Qs discussed, what would

happen if one of the root server ops went belly-up? or accountant
said 'why are we doing this'. -need to cover off on this issue.

The other piece we did talk about. given some of the entities
involved, its historical interest of individuals, 20-30years time
some of the indivds won't be there. what happens, when particular
indiv. who has championed, is no longer in the room. lots of things
happen. lots of these issues need to be dealt with

Left out of document, 99 agenda, RSSAC set itself, MoUs, between
ICANN, ops. attempt to get single MoU. then latterly, moves to
make bilateral arrangements. We (consultants) didn't talk about
that. there is an elephant in the room. separate issue. needs to be
sorted out
on 1:1 basis.

whole system needs a "what happens if" discussion. too critical to
ignore.

Kosters: constituency,

Susan: decisions about recommendations, how implementable, look at
        ICANN structure at present, mismatch.

Harald: ICANN board hat. ICANN by-laws bind ICANN, nothing else.
        initial recomm. for WG. in order to land somewhere sensible
        for structure, have to initiate process, ensure participants
        buy-in.

        recommendation, form group, definitely will need some ppl
        who have good understanding of root ops, thinking, and that
        group will come up with recomm. think should have formal
        membership, charter, independent existence from board governance
        wg.

Steve: Didn't understand. Saying ICANNs group with role here needs
        to be expanded? or revised RSSAC should have particular
        constitution.

Harold: saying off top of head, if wg decide need group to make recomm.
        then, do that. NOT board wg, exists. can't recharter to be
        different but we need something different. Not RSSAC. just team
        figure out,

Steve: less specific. sharing role you/I/bruce have. seen report from
        Westlake; public comment process coming up; borrowing imagery
        from Susan, would personally find it very important to hear what
        rootops say either collectively, individually, distinct from what

```
          other 6bn ppl on planet have to say. You guys know more about this
          than anybody else. Difficult to proceed without hearing with some
          clarity what you think.

Harold:   public review already has input from Afilias

Matt:     other comments/discussion?

Andrei:   what kind of process suggesting?

Steve:    not suggesting particular one. In complementary position with SSAC,
          feeling is, we get together, make opinions to WG without being asked.
          felt natural. Choose to do it self-organized, process, or, have no
          strong feelings. but from where I'm sitting Not inappropriate to
          figure out, say as group, as indiv. don't want to put a bias on.

Andrei:   feedback through public comment process or some other mechanism

Harold:   personal bias, long-term IETF participant. I like public. then I
          don't have to remember from whom I keep secret. so personally
          prefer if formulate in way happy to have made public. Deadlines
          are not that important. Want to speak privately, do. much rather
          hear than not hear, but public is more helpful.

Matt:     Andy?

AL:       Report has got two groups talking about what happens next, if
          nothing else achieved that's positive. Team, self who worked on this
          want to know if recommendations, having somebody looking at
          strategic advice here, have some sense, scope/bylaws work. Area
          which seems contentious, more difficult to come to agreement is
          structure. HOW. What should goals be, look at (if exists) and then
          best way to achieve things


Roque:    In report, sentence, location of servers. how this particular
          issue was part of by-law when RSSAC implemented. Comes up a lot
          in our region. In report, more individual effort by rootops
          rather than RSSAC as a whole. If taken up, how effective. not only
          technical issue, has lot of political spin. can be ICANN request
          down? all roots to have anycast, presence in the 5 continents.

Westlake:       Q is useful one for crystallizing role of RSSAC. location
          of root servers themselves may or may not present issues for ops or
          ICANN. whole purpose of RSSAC is to look at this, help with who
          controls/intervenes. Like it or not, now part of critical global
          infrastructure. We see role for strategic group. If no issue, nobody
          needs to worry. if there is an issue, lets identify it, find solutions
```

but as Paul says, not if there isn't a problem. ICANNs, rootops or
shared problem. Strategic issue that sort of Q needs to be asked.

AL: "what he said"

??   Identified gap, made recomm, go to ICANN board. Now, does ICANN
         board have authority to direct rootops to do certain things? this
         is not just 'identify problems' -but, is the group report to ICANN
         board, and does it receive recomms which can be accepted or rejected

AL: One of the things we felt this committee reports, not same formal
         sense, but will be talking to root ops themselves. Not just report
         to ICANN board. As constituted, ICANN doesn't have authority to say
         to operator <x> "we need to you install root in Latin America" but
         not everyone thinks it should. two views. What we'd hope is, this
         committee is constituted to reach consensus on issues. work with
         root ops to encourage them to find ways to act, also go back to
         ICANN to report. Issue may well be, Have roots here in NZ, copy
         of F, I, funded. reason servers can't or haven't been deployed may
         well be no funding. that may be an issue for ICANN to solve
         ICANN gains revenue from monies from domains. May be a reasonable
         thing to apply the money to fix root problems. thats not taking
         control, thats appropriate use of ICANN funds. they fund, root ops
         do tech. See this as coop/consensus based committee "this is stuff
         needs to happen: how do we make it happen" kind of thing.

         May be hopelessly altruistic.

??   The way you structure the voting recommend, 4 ops, 5 from ICANN
         community including IANA as current, doesn't lead to consensus
         necessarily.

AL: took that on board, moving to consensus not voting with casting vote

??:   saw revised report, voting structure hadn't changed

Westlake: see as adv. group. voting is minor, rare occasions. unless
         some form of consensus, nothing going to happen. self organized cttee
         and can find its own process, e.g. nothing without clear consensus.
         neither ICANN, IANA can advance RSSAC agenda effectively unless there
         is a clear consensus.

??:   so is that more along lines of IETF model, no real opposition in the
         room, not a 5:4 or 6:3, its 'nobodies opposed'

Westlake: maybe with some objections, but strong view of room, then
         can take forward. 5:4 isn't going to work.

AL: given structure of root ops, 4 members have to be able to take back
         to 12, "can you work with this" -this isn't "we decided to have to
         wear it" -if consensus, 2 ppl in room who say "no, but can live"
         then thats the approach looking for. unless everyone can work with
         live with, then struggle to make go ahead. thats the reality.

         maybe RSSAC makes recomms, changes, still a role for somebody to
         look from outside, some independence 'this is the best thing to do'
         and thats the role of this group

Matt: we've reached the 2hr mark. Point of diminishing returns. No other
         comments?

Westlake: thanks for inviting, hope value in firsthand rather than
         just read, and thanks to Harold + Team, Marco. admin support. Thanks

Matt: welcome

Marco/Marco: said enough. plenty of time to talk. got to figure out
         something which can work for all of us.

CROCKERs Placeholder:

Steve: Specific thing. For a long time, have been comments made about
         the root server ops providing "last line of defense" against
         possible misadventure, inappropriate action/mistake in the
         upstream IANA/usgov. in extreme circumstances the roots can fix
         the zone, if mismanaged from above. trying to be broad/neutral
         aggregate of things heard from time to time. usually tinged with
         concern/suspicion about usgov behaviour at some time in the future

         recently, EU commission DNSSEC, feb 5th, lars there, Sabine raised
         same point. Occurred to me, for the first time, this is something
         which should either be taken seriously, or laid to rest. post 9/11
         everyone has contingency plans, back up plans, rather than that just
         be emotional sloganism floating around, Q is: should we take it
         seriously, and if so, is the set of root server ops able to deal
         with the situation, have procedure as part of charter or not?

         so Q to Matt, the agenda item here, is this a function the ops
         think they have, and are they prepared to discharge that, or not?

Matt: everyone has an opinion. Paul first

Vix: heard claim from Sabine. I never

Johan: what is claim can? should?

Vix: that the ops can be as independent as possible in case the us gov
         goes wild and does crazy things. Never considered the issue until
         Sabine said it. in early days of ICANN, I explicitly declined.
         did NOT want ICANN to buld their reputation on support of root ops
         had battle with ccTLD on autonomy etc, didn't want any part of it
         and still don't. Don't like Sabine thinking we are some kind of
         counterbalancing force. I just want to get on

Steve: little bit more too this. hence reason for root not to be signed
         removed opportunity

Vix: I aint in this for the revolution I'm in this for the packets

Steve: real? or let it be? or ..

Liman: don't ask Qs to which you don't want to know the answer. In general
         don't ask Qs to which I dont want to give the answer.

Vix: rephrase as positive. if anyone is doing rootops with the perspective
         they can do this, please raise hand, and explain. if nobody does then
         go back to Sabine and explain

Steve: don't want to be me explaining [laughter] won't carry messages

Liman: message keep sending to layer nine. agree who is appropriate source
         for data. at the moment thats IANA. happy. if want to transfer from
         IANA, then agree where. If start disagreeing, will have to make
         a decision. lose. have to use data from somewhere to provide service
         not willing to make claim before that fact about what decision will be
         depends on situation. so many situations I can't envisage, have to
         deal with as it comes.

Steve: story: in college we had guy who made up rules for everything
         proposed, that unless see pink elephant, don't have to make up
         rules if they can or cannot be there.

Liman: can see myself having to make a decision, but can't see example
         too far fetched.

Steve: IDNs, new ccTLD, ICANN board has commissioned study on effects
         of scaling. Q asked, would greatly increasing size of root zone
         remove this 'last defense' role and does it matter and if it
         did weaken the 'last defense' role would that be a reason to act?

RobA: distinction: rootops making changes, as opposed to root ops not
         actually loading a broken zone version. two different hypotheticals

the second one is more likely. not speaking for an op, an observation

Steve: active in DNSSEC. don't just get to roll back.

RobA: if signing affects it, then. Defense against what?

Susan: think I'm comfortable, if such a situation seen as arising an
         awful lot of screaming 'don't put us in this position'

Security/Stability guy: you hear in the world as rootops, ssac, there
         hasn't been as much effective communication from RSSAC realm of
         things, out to the world, to dampen these concerns, make people
         aware, pay attention to this stuff, its thought about, but 6bn
         don't know, then, going to ask a whole lot more Qs. if nothing
         can be pointed to, then those trying to defend, having nothing
         more than 'these are good guys' group ought to figure out how
         to convey what they are thinking about, useful to handling Q
         of these nature

Liman: ppl worried about things they don't know about

Matt: took lid off pot, stirred it, now put back

Crain: weld it shut

Liman: smells as bad as we thought.

AOB:

Matt: 3hrs is too long for RSSAC. thanks and close.
Susanne: notes to bill.