
ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum – RSSAC Meeting
Tuesday, March 8, 2022 – 10:30 to 12:00 AST

OZAN SAHIN:

Hello and welcome to the RSSAC meeting. My name is Ozan Sahin and I'm the remote participation manager for the session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and follows that ICANN Expected 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 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 read the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name, for example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you don't sign in using your full name.

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.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Fred Baker, the RSSAC chair.
Fred?

FRED BAKER: Thank you, Ozan. So now the first thing I'm supposed to do is call roll.
So Cogent, are you here? DISA, are you here?

KEVIN WRIGHT: This is Kevin Wright.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And I thought I saw Terry Manderson.

TERRY MANDERSON: I am here. I was struggling with my mute button. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: That's my biggest problem. ISC, Jeff and I are both here. NASA?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Hey, this is Ryan Stephenson for DISA here. Sorry, struggling with the mute button as well.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Yeah. Barbara is here for NASA.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here.

FRED BAKER: RIPE? University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Karl is here.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry. If I'm here. I think there was a problem with my mic. Kaveh speaking.

FRED BAKER: Okay. USC ISI? ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

HOWARD KASH: Howard Kash is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad is here.

FRED BAKER: And WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Kaveh, you're the liaison to the Board. Liman, you're the liaison to CSC. Daniel, are you here?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liaison from the RSSAC, Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Good morning. Russ is here.

FRED BAKER: IANA functions operator. James, are you here?

JAMES MITCHELL: James is here.

FRED BAKER: Liaising from the Roots Zone Maintainer. Duane, are you here?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: And of course, we have various staff on the call. Okay. Let's go on to the agenda. I believe the first thing on the agenda was that we were going to have some people from the ICANN Nominating Committee make a presentation. Vittorio?

VITTORIO BERTOLA: Yes, I'm here. If you want to bring up the slides, I can start. Okay. This will be a very short presentation on the current period of nominations for the ICANN Board and other positions. I'm Vittorio Bertola. I am one of the [inaudible] NomCom members and, specifically, I was appointed by the Internet Architecture Board on behalf of the IETF.

So I think most of you are familiar with ICANN with the positions. But anyway, we really want to solicit more applications. So anyone who

thinks that they can fill this kind of profile, basically someone that has some knowledge of the entire ecosystem, has some kind of executive experience, this is especially for the Board positions. For other community positions, maybe experience with specific constituencies or stakeholder groups or parts of the DNS market may also be advisable. In general, also, some capacity for critical thinking is the position that will be appointed by NomCom usually are meant to be, let's say, not representing any specific party or stakeholder group, but more like bringing the global public interest to use this expression, or in general the views in the interest of the overall Internet community.

So I think this is a good experience. If you're already serving in ICANN committees, you might know how ICANN works. But different positions in the ICANN ecosystem are actually very useful to see different parts of this community, and they are really enriching. I mean, I've been serving in some of them and this was really a good experience. So I will just recap which positions are open and more importantly, the deadline, which is very near, it's just this Friday. So if you're interested, you really have to work in these few days between now and the end of the week. So please can we go to the next slide? And maybe to the second next.

Okay. So first and foremost, this year, we are appointing three members of the ICANN board of directors. These are usually the positions that are more sought after so there are more applications. But of course, you are welcome. We need to have a diverse and big pool of options to be able to make them the best possible choices. So

of course, [nominations] and self-nominations for the board of directors are welcome. Then next slide.

Then this is another very interesting position, especially for this group, I'd say. We are nominating one of the members of the Board of the PTI, the Public Technical Identifiers Corporation, which is basically the parent company for IANA. We are particularly interested in people that are sort of customers of IANA. So they are using IANA services in what they do. But in general, anyone familiar with what IANA does is welcome. So we're really looking forward maybe specifically for someone that would like to serve in this position. Next one, please.

Then we are appointing to regional representatives of the ALAC, which of course, I was one of the founders of the ALAC so I'm particularly interested in this. But this is more like a position advisable for people that want to represent the voice of the global Internet users. Specifically this year, we are appointing one member from Europe and one member from North America since the ALAC positions are by region. And so we are constrained in the geographical representation when choosing the people that we can appoint. Next one.

Then we are also appointing one member of the GNSO Council, so making policies for the gTLDs, basically. Of course, a very interesting position because this is usually where the most heated policy discussions are. This is a non-voting position. This year, we are appointing a non-voting GNSO member appointed by the NomCom. But still, apart from being non-voting, it is all the other prerogatives. He could even become the chair of the GNSO so it's almost full

position. I would encourage anyone interested in applying. And then next one.

We are also appointing a member of the ccNSO, so the Council for ccTLDs. And again, especially anyone interested in the ccTLD community, in the global Internet community that this could be a good position, both in terms of topics and in terms of established relationships. So next one, I think we are basically done.

Okay. So this is our recap, these are all the positions we are applying. So the next one, this will be the deadline. So this is the deadline. The deadline is basically end of the day in UTC. So there's not much time left. But still, if you want to apply, you're welcome. All you have to do is basically to go to the NomCom website or the ICANN website. There's a link to the portal. There is a portal that you can enter. You can just, if you want, to just register, enter in to it just to see how the application form looks like. You can start writing your application and then save it and start again later. But in the end, all applications must be submitted by Friday at the end of the day, etc.

So this is all. Thank you for listening. Of course, I am available to take questions even now. I'm available so you can follow up with me, or you can follow up with the NomCom secretariat another ICANN staff. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Does anyone have questions for Vittorio while we're online? Failing that, you can talk to Vittorio offline if you want.

Next thing on the agenda, I believe, relates to the RSSAC caucus membership. Ozan, oh, well, yeah. We need to talk about the minutes. So, Ozan, do you want to talk about the minutes?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, everyone. Hello, everyone. I circulated the minutes from RSSAC February meeting a few weeks ago. So we did not have any comments or questions about the minutes. This will be a vote item for today for the RSSAC. So I will hand it back to Fred for calling an RSSAC vote.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now does anybody have any changes that they would like to make to the minutes? Is anybody abstaining in the vote? Failing that, I believe we have accepted the minutes. So now, the Membership Committee. Jeff, do you want to talk about that?

JEFF OSBORN: Yes. It's actually a slow month for the Membership Committee. We have no ads or deletions. But Ken has some issues he's going to talk about.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. Thanks, Jeff. In the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee, we were just kind of thinking out loud about the membership of the RSSAC caucus. There are some fantastic people there, very technical, very eager to participate, people in the caucus. We were wondering

along the lines of what the SSAC did is took stock of what their membership was and looking at the expertise and any potential gaps in expertise that should be added, recruited or somehow be brought into the group.

So looking back at some of the documents, one of the documents about the caucus states that normally the RSSAC accepts all seriously motivated offers to participate in the caucus. Another document talks about specifically some of the points that are considered when reviewing applicants. Some of those points are operational experience running a DNS infrastructure or DNS-related Internet draft, etc., or a specific understanding of the root server ecosystem. So these may be daunting to some people that aren't hands-on keyboard with DNS. But we at least started the discussion of whether we want to expand the breadth of expertise in the caucus to maybe touch on things like legal, regulatory, or governance experience. So as the RSSAC is getting much more deeply involved into the specifics of a governance model and things like regulations, like NIS2 are sort of overlapping with our technical domain, the question becomes, do we want to add any specific expertise to the caucus?

Some of the examples that were discussed were, while this wasn't actually in the caucus, but we had a lawyer-type person among the RSO Consultation Group, which was a wild success, they were a tremendous asset. Other things that were brought up, maybe an eager graduate student that wants to watch, learn, and maybe contribute. So I wanted to open up the discussion, see what people thought about any specific expertise that we should add to the caucus, whether we

just add it to the list of things we want or actually go out and actively recruit. Basically, any thoughts on that. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much. I definitely think having more diversity in the caucus will help, especially in these times that our work is also becoming more wider. And to be honest, my way of doing that wouldn't be to add more skills or suggested knowledge because that's good. But that's basically we are trying to add diversity by adding more exclusions. So I would actually open up the language for the requirements and remove a bit from it. I mean, remove literally. Maybe not exactly removing the words but basically making it open or correct, making it more interesting to a wider audience. Not only technical people, so maybe remove the word "technical," for example. I don't know the exact wording right now but my suggestion is yes. Let's definitely go for a wider net. And we also have the Membership Committee so we have this nice filter, which is about control. My suggestion is let's open it up further by removing the requirements instead of actually adding more interest/skills. I wouldn't worry much about unwanted consequences, especially because we have a committee. So it's not just you check these and you're approved. We still have that step in place. So yeah, let's have a much wider net
Thank you.

KEN RENARD:

Thanks, Kaveh. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I am definitely also in support of this. I've always viewed the caucus as a wide body of varied expertise. As things develop, I definitely see the need to add even more diverse expertise to that group. So yes, legal is one of this branch that we need to prove on. Another one is regulatory contacts and relationships. Two more are actually registry operations, I would believe, and also barely lacking is resolver operators and people who work with the resolver sites, which are often the direct clients of the root service systems. So that's why I would like to have more of people with that experience in the group. Thank you.

KEN RENARD: Excellent. Thank you, Liman. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I'm not going to repeat what Lars and Kaveh mentioned. So I'm definitely supporting that we open this community to even non-technical skills. One comment. I think one thing we were targeting or looking at. On the technical aspect, I would say some people that have some experience in measurements since we have done pretty much work on that area. So I think if we have to look at a specific technical profile, I think people that are used to handling measurements would be good. But I think it's a very, very good thing to improve the diversity of the community and open up that to legal expert, governance expert, and so and so on, and so on. Thank you.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Daniel. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Ken. I agree that having a wider set of expertise in the caucus would be very beneficial. I think I do want to somewhat disagree with at least what I understood Kaveh to describe, and that is loosening of the requirements. I would think it would be better to adjust the wording of the requirements rather than loosen or delete some of the requirements. While pointing out that, in fact, and a caucus member does not have to meet every single one of these requirements what the caucus members would need to meet in some subset of the requirements. So if someone, for instance, who was interested in and knowledgeable in regulatory affairs who might not know very much about technical operations, could readily see themselves meeting the membership requirements of the caucus. So I think maybe trying to identify some groupings, like some of the other speakers said, and a few characteristics associated with each individual grouping of activities. Thank you.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Russ. I certainly appreciate that. This is all great feedback for the Membership Committee. We do have RSSAC public session later this week, I believe, on Thursday. We will be talking about the caucus and I think we can bring in some of these ideas as we talk about the caucus and invite people to join. Also, interested to hear more. I think

we're going to talk about this afternoon with SSAC, Russ, about their experiences with taking stock of the expertise in their group and making sure it meets a lot of requirements. Daniel and Liman, you both have your hands up. Are those old hands?

Okay. Thank you. And with that, I really appreciate the feedback. The Membership Committee will take this and work on some of the language and probably bring it back to this group for update or approval or whatever the next step is. Thanks. Back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. So our next item, we have work items, and specifically a paper on the intended users of the RSS and a potential statement on the evolution of the governance. Paul, do you want to talk about that proposed paper?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

Sure. I don't have slides or anything. It's fairly brief because this is an early idea. Basically, RSSAC has never published a statement defining or even describing the systems that are the target of the root server system. So we all know that the main target for the root server system is caching recursive resolvers. But we haven't actually said that explicitly, and I'm proposing that we do in a very short, like two-page max kind of paper for two reasons. One is that if an RSO is under attack and is able to do some filtering, they may want to filter based on trying to keep as many of the queries from the target audience going. They may not, of course. RSOs get to choose how to do this. But

if somebody said we should be doing some filtering when we're under attack, what should we filter on? This gives them something where they can say we filtered on the right thing.

But the other is to give a basis for the metrics and the thresholds in RSSAC047 or future things that might come from the GWG. That is when we say that an RSO should be able to do such and such, it seemed as we did the original 047 work, it felt weird to do that without saying who the target audience is. So again, I'm just proposing that we can take some of the wording out of 047, which we added, which was actually negative wording, not actually saying what we wanted, do it as a short document with a nice title so that people who are looking for what is the target of the root server system. Obviously, it is meant for the use of everybody on the Internet, but what's really the target, do a short document and give that out.

So that's all I have, I can read the wording that we have in RSSAC047, but like I say, it's actually not positive wording, it's negative wording. It lists the kind of traffic that we see at the root server system that we don't actually care about. So that's it for my proposal. If RSSAC is interested, this could turn into an RSSAC caucus work, whatever. I'm happy to take questions if people want to know why I'm proposing this or things like that.

FRED BAKER:

Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think this might be worthwhile. It would actually put focus on something that we haven't had in focus before, which is to actually define it, not only to describe what we think but maybe also actually investigate and see what the system actually does look like and how it's actually being used from that design, the statement that we want to do. I would, though, caution a little about using the word target because in my interpretation, the word target is something that you aim for and send something out towards. That's not really how I see the root service system because this is the service we provide where people can collect information. So they come to us and get things. We don't push things towards them. So this could be splitting hairs in my lacking understanding of the English language but—

PAUL HOFFMAN: No, no, no, no. This could be my over familiarity with the English language, and I think that's a very good point. Like, even the title of this is up for grabs, but it sounds like that you and I have the same idea about wanting to define something.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, definitely. Yes, please. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Any other comments? Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, Paul, just a quick question. I presume this came from your discussions in 047. I was just curious if there were some more context you could share as to where this discussion came up and what it was—

PAUL HOFFMAN: It really was out of RSSAC047. We added the wording there during the workshop. We hadn't really even thought of any of this before the workshop, so we sort of threw that in. We didn't work on it in the 047 v2 work because 047 v2 was on technical stuff and this isn't a technical change. But in the discussion of 047 v2, some people started questioning some of the thresholds saying, "Well, we don't care about people who can't do this," which is true and we don't really stated clearly. So I'm sort of thinking if we do this and there is future work, which it sounded like there would be for 047 v3, then we will have a nailed down target for what are we talking about, especially with the RSS. I mean, remember 047 has thresholds, not only for individual RSOs but for the whole RSS, and it's sort of hard to say we have a threshold for this when we don't even know who we want to make sure we are serving well.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, it's an interesting question because I feel like maybe on the metric side, you're taking metrics from a specific point of view, in which case, you might want to define who that user is. But I guess I'm concerned if we define specifically who our users are or users are, I guess, it would be as of today because we're assuming that things will

evolve and we don't know what the future might hold. So I just have some questions.

PAUL HOFFMAN: I think that that's actually a really good thing that if we can write all of those down in one place, that would be really good. And for example, does the root server system consider recursive resolvers that are using hyper local to actually be a client or not? I could see that discussion going in both directions. So having an answer for that I think would also be helpful. And it would point to, like you just said, there's going to be future uses for the root server system.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I just worry about being too prescriptive. That's where I'm kind of worried.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, I wouldn't want somebody to say, "I'm not a target audience member so I shouldn't access the root."

PAUL HOFFMAN: Or even to think that they can't access the root. I mean, whatever we write should be very clear that we know that there's a wide variety of people who are using the root server system currently.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Fred. The discussion that just took place between Paul and Brad covered a lot of the things I was going to say. I think that this is maybe not going to be as short or cut and dry as Paul might think. I think it's going to be a very interesting long work party or discussion because I think there's a lot of complexities again with evolutions and things like that. It sort of seems to me that, Paul, you mentioned that currently there's some text in 047 that talks about what users are not or what are not users.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Yes.

DUANE WESSELS: The obvious thing is attacks, right? We don't want to necessarily consider attacks and things like that in metrics and data. I wonder if there's anything other than attacks, or if it's really just that we're trying to exclude attacks. Are there other things that we're worried about that are not attacks?

PAUL HOFFMAN: I don't think so currently. Although, again, we haven't had this discussion focused on who are we trying to serve. We all know that we are trying to serve caching recursive resolvers. We all know that we're not trying to serve attackers. Do we need to discuss more in there? I could see that the answer is no, and I could also see that the answer is

yes. When I said that I thought this might be two pages max, I didn't want to indicate that it would be a fast development of the two pages. I'm just not sure if we need a very long document on describing all, but we might.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks. That's it for me.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Brad, you have your hand up.

BRAD VERD: I was going to add one thing. I can certainly see from a 047 perspective, from a monitoring perspective, to define your user that you're after. Essentially, we're looking at it from this point of view. Maybe it's difficult to measure from every point of view but this is our stake in the ground and this is where we're starting. It doesn't mean we're not going to add something in the future. But I do get concerned when we talk about it from all users. Because I think there's a bunch of users out there maybe that wouldn't fall into some of these definitions. So we need to be careful.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Are there other comments? Failing that, I'm going to suggest as a process that we discuss this on the mailing list, and we can decide whether or not we want to do a work party in this area in

the mailing list. Anybody have a problem with that? Okay. Let's move on to the—Ken, you wanted to talk about a potential work item?

KEN RENARD:

Thanks, Fred. This item is the potential RSSAC statement on the evolution of the root server system. This came out of a discussion from last month's meeting talking about a statement to regulators or even governments about what we as RSSAC, what we're doing, where we're going, and things like that. So I sent out—I think it was late last week—a read ahead, a link to this document. It's a Google document and you can take a look at it. It's pretty short. I don't know, Ozan, if you have that link available. But it's a statement that specifically calls out governments, regulators, and other entities to really highlight what we're doing about RSS governance, where we're doing it within the ICANN multistakeholder model, with transparency, things like that, and that we welcome the discussion to evolve the root server system governance.

Two main points of this document here that—let's see, it's in the second to last paragraph. We believe that—we're stating here that ICANN as the place to develop the model, basically, that is the GWG. And then the other statement here is that the governance of the RSS, the eventual model, should rest in ICANN, again, with its multistakeholder model, transparency checks and balances. So this document is put out to the RSSAC for discussion here and as a potential RSSAC document. Any points, any parts of this document are open for discussion. And go. Steve?

STEVE SHENG: Ken, thanks. I read through the comments from Andrew and Duane. I think those are editorial comments that bring clarity to the document. So I will just propose we accept those and then continue the discussion. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Any other comments?

KAVEH RANJBAR: A question maybe for Ken. Can you remind me? And I guess to do for the process ahead of this. So if we accept that we want to have such a statement, which I think we already did, what are the next steps? Now, we have it. We can give comments right now. But what is the timeline you have in mind?

KEN RENARD: You caught me off guard on that one. So I guess I was hoping for discussion here, either agreement or a disagreement. And the idea would be to put this out as an RSSAC statement. We have a time for editorial. As far as a timeline, I would propose that we discuss here, we can discuss on the mailing list, even within the document, to try to take a vote on this by next month's meeting.

KAVEH RANJBAR: That works for me. That’s exactly what I was looking for. So if that’s generally the idea, I think we will have enough time, all of us to look into it and see how we can contribute and get to consensus. Thank you.

KEN RENARD: Any other thoughts or discussion on the statement? I’m not seeing any hands. Please, if you do have any thoughts, through the RSSAC mailing list within the document. I appreciate your time. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Yes, please feel free. We’ll discuss this on the list and we’ll decide by next month how we want to proceed. Now, the agenda goes on to report. I’m at the top of the list.

So we have a Root Server System Supporting Organization proposed model that came from Carlos and we have discussed that somewhat. We have a group of root server operators that we’ve been discussing things with when we talk about, “Let’s talk to the RSOs.” We’re talking about that, that group of root server operators. We’ll have a presentation of that model to the root server operators and I believe that’s next week, if I’m correct. So that is coming up. Ken, you wanted to mention something?

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Fred. So the GWG, the Governance Working Group has opened up to all RSOs. We are collecting names and e-mail addresses of those

from the RSOs of new members to the GWG. That process is almost complete. We should be getting that list to the chair of the GWG, Ted Hardy, hopefully a few days early. I appreciate everyone that has responded. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: I believe you said that there was one RSO that has not yet responded.

KEN RENARD: At this point, now they have half responded.

FRED BAKER: They have half responded.

KEN RENARD: Yes. Waiting for it to be official. But yeah. So again, I appreciate everyone's responses.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So any questions for us? I don't see any hands. Liaison to the ICANN Board, Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. I don't think there is much to report. We had a meeting yesterday evening my time. So, basically, we are waiting for the appointments to the GWG and from the Board side it's basically standing to provide support, but generally waiting for the outcome of

GWG and our participation and contribution to that. So, no additional news in depth about something, which is not directly related to us but might be worth mentioning. I guess you're following the war in Ukraine and basically for ICANN vote correspondence and the request from Ukrainian representative in GAC for ICANN to take some action and ICANN's reply explaining why not. There was also Board resolution which was approved during the world workshop on Sunday. I'm sending the link. I guess you all have seen it. But as a reminder, basically providing a sum of one million to provide connectivity and support maintaining Internet access for users within Ukraine, and of course, plan to see how this can be continued for future as well. So I just wanted to make sure that you have seen that and if there's any questions or comments about that, of course, I will be more than happy to try to accommodate or send it to the right place. So thank you very much.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Liman, do you have any thoughts from CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

So a few things. We again had a monthly report with the PTI meeting, all the SLAs to 100%. So we're getting used to that now. We had a discussion with the Periodic Review Team, which is looking at the CSC and the IANA right now. We discussed a couple of issues. One is the eligibility of other people than voting members to become chair. Right now I am the chair, I'm not a voting member, so this is kind of an exception from the general guidelines in our procedures document.

And we had asked if that ought to be changed. And the response back from the review team is that “You’re perfectly able to handle that yourselves and make that decision.”

We also discussed the frequencies of meetings. We’ve now operated for a couple of years. We’re starting to see trends here. And maybe we want to lower the frequency of meetings. There was the issue raised whether we are able to attract the right type of people to the CSC, and also the general scope of activities for the CSC. If we want to change that in the future, there’s no real defined process for doing so. Also look at the regular review of the SLAs, the current ones. Where does that fall? Does it fall to the CSC to drive that review? Or is it up to the stakeholders—on whose behalf we are operating.

So the review team has taken these discussions on this input with them, and they had a meeting with the Board, I believe, according to their plan. So they had a meeting with the Board last week, and we are now expecting a draft report to appear in the foreseeable future.

On top of that, I would also like to report that normally the CSC elects its chair every year in roughly this time period in the spring. But this time, it seems like the CSC will postpone the election of a new chair until the early autumn. Because we have a rotation of members, we are getting new members on board and we expect new members to appear late to the spring or early in the summer, which means that we will have a rotational people and the members want that to stabilize before we elect a new chair. So the chair election is likely to happen early in the autumn instead. That’s my report. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you much. Daniel, do we have anything from the RZERC?
Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Not much to say. During the last RZERC meeting, we discussed the ZONEMD, our set document provided by the root zone maintainer. That's basically what the full meeting was about. The document is going to be updated and probably we'll continue that discussion. That's all we did. We also find out an agenda to recharter RZERC. And we'll keep you informed about the questions and the discussions that are going through that committee. On the IAB side, I have not received any feedbacks nor any comment.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, Russ, do you want to talk about the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Fred. Yes. No general routine updates from SSAC today. But I did want to take this opportunity to remind folks that the SSAC sponsored the DNSSEC and Security Workshop. The ICANN meeting takes place tomorrow and it starts after roughly the time that we're on now. So, check here [ICANN schedule](#) if you're interested in participating in that. I think we have a good program lined up for tomorrow for folks. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. James, do you have anything from the IANA functions operator?

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. Just by way of standard updates, the case here, it's [inaudible] in February. It was a staff-only attendance with TCRs in remote participation due to the Omicron at that stage. Resuming the normal cadence, the next one should've been [inaudible] back to TCR, in-person TCR agreements. The [inaudible] materials are yet to be published. Waiting on some materials, some sign no confirmation. One of the TCRs about having received signed, who received their keys. But yeah, they're a fairly standard procedure. Yeah. But it should be up in the coming days. Otherwise, the decision about IANA in the last five years and what's next since the transition. So that's on this afternoon for those who are interested.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Duane, do you have anything from the RZM?

DUANE WESSELS: Just complementing what Daniel said. At the last RZERC meeting, I presented the draft deployment plan for heading ZONEMD to the root zone and got some good feedback that that plan document is going to be updated and taken back to RZERC. And also there are some questions that I'm planning to ask the root server operators at their next meeting as well relating to ZONEMD. That's it. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad, Hiro, Liman, do you have anything from the GWG?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I can take a stab at that. I think it's rather brief. As you all know, we have received a request into the GWG to expand it to all the root server operators, and that process is running as already reported. I was glad to hear that we will soon hear back from our RSSAC with the names. We received that in a mail from a message from the Board, signed by the chair, Maarten Botterman. It also contained a request for some feedback with what's been going on in the past meetings, and also a bit of a timeline for going forward. The GWG is just polishing that document. As far as I know, the response is ready to go back to the Board to Maarten. I think that will be released shortly, I guess, after the next GWG meeting, but that's a guess. Anything else, Brad, Hiro?

BRAD VERD: I think the only thing I'd add is that the timeline that the GWG has put together, it looks like it's get the RSOs on the membership and on board in March. I think it's a new chair election in April, and then work would begin in May. That's the rough timeline right now.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Thank you.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro has nothing to add.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. So having concluded the reports, we're at the AOB portion of the meeting. I don't have any listed AOB items. Did somebody have something to bring up at this point?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I have one, Fred, if possible.

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: A quick announcement. So within RIPE NCC we thought it's good to have some rotation to make sure that basically the knowledge is spread over the organization. So, I'm going to submit a request to change our secondary, which is right now filled by Anand, and he has been our secondary for some time now, with one of my other colleagues, [Raswan], who's also actually joining today as an observer. So just it's good to let the group know that we are in the process of doing a rotation, and this is basically to have that change in the organization. Of course, Anand is still staying with RIPE NCC and you would meet him in rooftops and he will continue collaboration. This is just for diversification of knowledge in the organization. Thank you very much.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Is there any other AOB items to bring up? Failing that, we've reached the end of the agenda. We have another meeting coming up in May. So with that, we've concluded this meeting. So thank you. I think we stand adjourned.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, everyone, for joining today. The meeting is adjourned. Please stop the recording.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Thank you all. Cheers.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]