
ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting - RSSAC Caucus Meeting
Tuesday, October 26, 2021 – 10:30 to 12:00 PDT

OZAN SAHIN: We'll now begin. Hello and welcome to the RSSAC Caucus meeting. My name is Ozan Sahin and I'm the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expect Standards of Behavior.

During the session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. I will read the questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of the 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're done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To review the real-time transcription, click on the close caption button in the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will hand the floor over to the RSSAC chair, Fred Baker.

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.

FRED BAKER:

Hello. So I'm the RSSAC chair. I would suggest you follow the chat. Ozan has already dropped several notes into the chat. I'm running through the agenda. We're going to talk a little bit about the Annual Membership Survey. Jeffrey Osborn is the chair of that committee, and we'll go through it. We'll talk about recent publications that we've had and we'll have people from each of those committees speaking on them. And we'll talk about our current work party, which is basically a minor revision of RSSAC047 which is metrics for the RSS as a total. And we'll have a little bit of words from the GWG. I don't know how much they have to say but we have three RSOs that are represented on the GWG and we'll give them an opportunity to talk. Then we'll throw the floor open to Any Other Business. With that, Jeff, can I turn this over to you?

JEFF OSBORN:

Fred, thank you very much. But the last time we addressed the Annual Caucus, I defer to Ozan's better knowledge of it. He did a great presentation last time. So he's offered to present it at this time as well. Ozan, thanks so much.

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Jeff. Thank you, Fred. Hello, everyone. And you may recall that the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee conducted the Annual Membership Survey in September 2021. Now I'd like to present the findings from the survey as the support staff for the Caucus Membership Committee.

We use Constant Contact as the survey tool and distributed this survey to 104 RSSAC Caucus members. We received 26 responses, which is approximately 24% less than the number of responses we received in 2020. All of the respondents indicated that they had participated in an RSSAC meeting and 85 of the respondents reported that they had participated in an RSSAC work party. And finally, all respondents would like to continue as a member of the RSSAC Caucus.

The next question is about the contribution categories. It was possible to select multiple options there. So the sum of the responses is greater than 26. We had three work party leaders participating in the survey, nine RSSAC Caucus members who wrote text, and most of the participants reviewed the text and participated in discussions via teleconferences or mailing lists.

Another question is about the meeting frequency. About 80% of the respondents were for keeping the current sequence, which is having an RSSAC Caucus meeting at every ICANN Annual General Meeting and every other IETF meeting, whereas about 28% of the respondents wanted to have the RSSAC Caucus meetings more frequently. And responses to this question are in line with the responses to the same question in last year's survey.

Another survey question is where should RSSAC Caucus meetings take place? The most popular response is keeping the same venues and meeting at ICANN and IETF meetings. This again parallel to the results we saw last year in response to the same question.

Caucus Membership Committee also asked how difficult it is to contribute to the RSSAC Caucus work parties. Half of the respondents found it easy, whereas 9% thought it was complicated, and more than 40% thought it was neither easy nor complicated.

And final question was the reason for non-participation to the RSSAC Caucus work parties. Time was a challenge for most respondents, lack of interest or lack of technical experience and knowledge or other issues. And we received a few freeform text responses mentioning the time zone challenge and inconvenient timing of the work party meetings.

In addition to the multiple choice questions, the committee received some open-ended responses suggesting ideas to increase RSSAC Caucus engagement. So thank you for participating in a survey and your feedback. The committee has been reviewing your responses and will be making recommendations to the RSSAC as needed. So with that, I will turn it back to Fred for any comments or questions about the survey.

FRED BAKER:

So one thing I'm curious about is that there were apparently some people who wanted the caucus to meet more frequently. Tell me more about that. Let me throw this open to discussion.

OZAN SAHIN: I believe this is a question to the RSSAC Caucus who responded that way, if they're on the call, of course. I believe you are reading comments from who thought that way.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. Well, I'm not reading it. I'm responding to a comment that you made in the process or your presentation. And right now, I don't see any hands so I'll leave that question go. If people would like a change in the caucus, they know where the list is. Wes, you have your hand up.

WES HARDAKER: Yes. My question about that result was, do they want more of these general caucus meetings or do they want more work party meetings and more things like that? Unfortunately, I'm not sure we can draw an easy conclusion. I have this feeling that it was more let's have meetings where work gets done, but maybe that's my personal preference shining through of what I think we need to do in the future.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. And I would agree that meeting for meeting's sake is kind of a waste of time. I see two chat messages. Okay. So in any event, if people have comments they'd like to make, they know where the list is. Please feel free to make comments.

Filling that, Liman, I believe that you have come on the call. Would you talk about your work party, please?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sure. I was hoping to have the slides, Ozan, if you have a chance.

OZAN SAHIN: One moment, please, Liman. I'm pulling them up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Excellent. There we go. Thank you. So the RSSAC has published a few publications since last time. In my lap, as being the shepherd for this document, RSSAC055 is one of them. RSSAC055 is actually just an excerpt. It's a part of the old RSSAC037 document where we listed 11 principles for root server operations. Those principles, the root server operators agreed on doing the work with RSSAC037.

We've come to understand that those principles are actually very core to the Root Server System and the root server operators all in all. So we decided to not take them out of but copy them out of RSSAC037 and make this be a separate document, and in the process also add a couple of extra notes to better explain these principles. They're not quite well explained in RSSAC037. And if you want to have them as a freestanding document, you need a bit of extra text to explain these principles.

Now we've created this document and we see it as a reference document for other documents and also something that we can point to and say these are the guiding principles for the Root Server System. And instead of having to dig down into RSSAC037, Chapter 14, subpart

47, we now have a succinct document here that describes these principles.

Some of the principles apply to the entire Root Server System as a whole, and others apply to the root server operators. They all influence the work by the root server operators to produce a hopefully good Root Server System as a whole. These are actually rather old principles. They have enabled the success of the Root Server System for many years and we do believe that they shouldn't remain as core principles going forward in the process of deciding new accountability systems for the Root Server Systems. I think I'll pause there and ask if there are any questions. Hearing and seeing none, thank you. And back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. Let me turn now to Ken Renard. Ken is—what do we call it—a shepherd for two different work parties. So, Ken, you want to take your two work parties?

KEN RENARD:

Thanks, Fred. First, I want to talk about is RSSAC056, RSSAC Advisory on Rogue DNS Root Server Operators. So you see the goals here, this came out of RSSAC037 which introduced that term rogue in the context of removing a root server operator. The goal of this document was to further define what rogue was, what were some examples. The document framed the discussion in terms of the guiding principles of the RSOs which Liman just talked about in RSSAC055.

There's descriptions of activities that might be in violation of these principles and its intent of violating these principles is a big subject. Now, the document does not go into defining or you have to [inaudible] how you would measure intent of root server operator if they were to do something on this list of bad things.

The document goes on to describe some objective descriptions, such as incorrect response data or extra response data, maybe some bad or incorrect error codes, omitting DNSSEC records when they are requested, and even incorrect protocol usage. So these are all examples of things that would violate those principles. They're kind of laid out in some specifics. Not exhaustive list here but just laying out some of the ideas that we think would constitute root server operator exhibiting rouge behavior.

There's also some subjective descriptions. We settled on one in the document. For example, there is intentionally degrading service. So one of the principles is providing equal access to the service regardless of where queries are coming from, ASNs, IP addresses, or anything like that. So if an operator is potentially degrading service to any category of users, that could be considered rouge as well.

So that document, RSSAC056 was published in early July of this year. I invite folks to take a look at that if they like to. And if there are any questions, I'm sure you can post them to the list. The document is done. I guess at this point, I'll pause for some questions on the Rogue Operator document. I don't see any hands yet.

Okay. We'll go on to the next one, which is the Requirements for Measurements of the Local Perspective. We call this the Local Perspective Work Party. This document was published in September of this year. The requirements here are for a tool that's going to give measurements that can really give an idea of what the Root Server System looks like from a particular vantage point, a particular location on the Internet. It is kind of a complement to RSSAC047 which measures specifically how the Root Server System and root server operators are performing from well-known, well-connected vantage points.

So again, we're talking about some arbitrary point on the Internet where this tool could be run and measured. We came up with use cases to define the requirements for this. Three use cases, first one was informing the determination of an underserved area. So we hear a lot about places where the Root Server System is not performing well from my location. The idea here is to be able to use a tool in such a situation to measure the performance and get some real data of how the performance of the Root Server System is from that area. It's not going to define, it's not going to directly measure an area as being underserved. It is just collecting data to inform that decision.

The other use case is evaluating third party requests. Sometimes root operators get requests for hosting anycast instance of a root server. This tool can be used to measure the current performance from that location and see if it's really necessary to put a new instance there.

Third use case was a recursive operator where a recursive operator for probably a large enterprise wants to just see how the Root Server System is performing at various locations on their network or networks, where that might inform decisions maybe for routing or for other network engineering. So given those use cases, we've kind of defined what you would need to do, what information you would need. And we came up with a list of measurements, briefly talked about them. Measurements are made directly to each root server identifier. So it's v4, v6 address, the TCP and UDP. We'd look at query latency, a couple of different types of queries. We'd look at routing and conductivity, for example, a trace route. We also try and get the address of the source, assuming that there are some measurement points that may be behind several hops so we're getting the public address, such that routes can be traced back.

The last part here of this document was about a data repository. This is something that could be built. The measurement tool could automatically submit results. We talked a good bit about whether it should automatically or just allow the user to opt in.

We want to collect as much data as we can because this data is valuable for research efforts. The data in the repository would be available to researchers. Obviously, data quality is very important to this. The idea here, the tool is not something that's going to be run every hour indefinitely. Most of these use cases are actually going to be run it for some defined period of time, maybe a week, a month, like that, and then maybe you don't need that. Maybe you've answered

your question. So it's not a replacement or an alternative to something like RIPE Atlas.

With that, again, the document has been published in September. It's available on ICANN site. Okay. Yeah, here's the recommendations. Thank you, Ozan. We recommend that the tool be built based on this and recommend setting up the data repository. With that, if there's any questions, any thoughts on the document? We appreciate them now or even on the mailing list. Thanks. I guess back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. So the next item to talk about is the annual update of our rules and procedures. That has been carried out by Andrew. Andrew, would you like to talk about that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Yeah. Thanks, Fred. The RSSAC updates its operational procedures every year in the late summer, early fall, typically, so we were on time this year. This year, it was RSSAC000v6. So that's just a version 6. And then the following bullets are just some quick information on each one of the changes. There was a bunch of small changes this year.

So the first one is that all the liaison roles are now to be listed on the RSSAC website, which has already been done but it wasn't captured in the operational procedures. Outgoing liaisons that are not explicitly called out any operational procedures are limited to two consecutive terms unless there are no other candidates available. So there are some outgoing liaisons which are explicitly called out in the

operational procedures. Ones that are not explicitly called out are now limited to two consecutive terms unless there are no other candidates available.

Incoming liaisons will now receive orientation and an onboarding presentation from the RSSAC chair and support staff. Again, that was already happening but it wasn't documented in 000. Online votes now require all material that will be voted on will be distributed to the RSSAC at least one week in advance. This was already happening for in-person votes and for votes during RSSAC monthly meetings. But it wasn't explicitly stated that this should also happen for online votes. So now it's explicitly stated.

Then finally, RSSAC documentation can be hosted on the RSSAC webpage at the discretion of the RSSAC. So this is stuff that is not RSSAC numbered publications. This is just any other document that the RSSAC might produce like the work plan or slides of the fact, any of those kinds of things. There wasn't any section in the operational procedures covering that documentation. So that's a section that's now covering that documentation.

That's it for the update. Are there any questions on RSSAC000v6? Okay. I guess it's back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Again, I wouldn't be too surprised if people now go read through the operational procedures and say, "Why is that?" or "Did you think about something?" I'll throw the mailing list open. You can access the

things and ask questions on the mailing list on the RSSAC Caucus mailing list.

So the next thing on our agenda is a minor update to the metrics document, RSSAC047. Anupam, I believe that you are managing that particular work party. Would you like to talk about that?

ANUPAM AGRAWAL:

Sure, Fred. So RSSAC047. The scope which has been fixed is limited to correction of the technical errors in the definition of metrics as identified by the initial implementation, and the second terms of reference date about addition of a mandatory review period for RSSAC047 metrics document which is every two years.

So we started work on this, with this Terms of Reference and we had one real meeting, where we discussed in detail which happened on 13th of October. To start with, there was a list of issues which was created by Paul, and then Warren also contributed to the discussion and said that he will update the list based on his experience of the implementation.

So the work party is going to discuss this running list of issues and then do the corrections as it will be agreed by the work party. As part of the discussions, it was also felt that there are certain points which might be important which will come as part of the implementation experience, but work party will definitely create a parking lot of these issues and we will take a decision on how to progress on that once the revision of 047 is done, version 2 is ready. So at a broad level, either it

will be a section within the current document which will be the input for the work party who's going to work on version 3.

Based on this, we are just starting and possibly we are going to meet the timeline, which is the submission of the first draft by November. So the next meeting is scheduled for 28. So looking forward to the work and the comments in the next meeting, and we'll take it from there, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. So question: does anybody have any discussion that they want to have with Anupam on this document? Hearing none, seeing no hands, I'll move on. I believe the next thing on our agenda is the GWG update. Hiro and Liman and Brad, I'll turn to you for that.

BRAD VERD:

I'm happy to. So far the GWG has not met. They haven't met for a number of months now. They put their work on hold as the RSOs were putting together a document of success criteria for any future governance model. The GWG felt that it was important to have that before continuing their work, and so they're waiting on that document which should be delivered here shortly. Liman, do you want to add?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Not really anything to contribute there. As you say, it's been parallel work going on and it's about to be delivered, so to speak, shortly. Thanks. We could ask if there are any specific questions regarding the

GWG or the work around that. Is there? I don't see any hands, I don't hear anything. So I guess, again, I'll turn back to you, Fred or Brad.

FRED BAKER: Thank you much. At this point, we're looking at AOB. So this is kind of general discussion. Are there any other things that people would like to discuss? Ken?

KEN RENARD: Thanks. I was just wondering if there are any additional topics for work parties in the queue, or how that process might work or people might contribute ideas to that.

FRED BAKER: Well, at this point—yes, I'm not on mute—we have a list of possible work parties but the caucus has not particularly taken any of them up. So let me just say that if people have things that they would like to work on, you're free to discuss them on the caucus list and we can build a work party around that activity.

So I think the next thing of importance to the RSSAC is the continuation of the RSS evolution, which the GWG is deeply involved in and the RSOs are preparing a document to give them some thoughts which Brad just discussed. And then we're, frankly, looking to the GWG to inform us, to tell us what the next steps with the RSS are. So that's what the RSSAC is thinking about and open to ideas from the caucus and things that people would like to work on.

BRAD VERD: Ken, this is Brad. Obviously, the admin team keeps a list of items that have been suggested in the past for work parties. Any time we kind of roll off a number of work parties, we kind of pull up. We revisit the list. We usually put it up for comments to see what people want to work on. We have not done that recently. So we could certainly go through that exercise, pull out the list that we have, ask for any additions, and then see what people want to do.

FRED BAKER: To that end, Ozan, could you post that list so that people can read it and discuss it on the caucus list?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. Yes. I'll definitely take this as an action item to share the link to share on the mailing list.

FRED BAKER: With that, I'm not hearing other voices. I'm not seeing any hands. So I think this meeting is done. So thank you very much for your participation.

BRAD VERD: Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]