
ICANN77 | PF – RSSAC Meeting
Thursday, June 15 2023 – 10:45 to 12:15 DCA

OZAN SAHIN:

Hello and welcome to the Root Server System Advisory Committee meeting. My name is Ozan and I will be the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During the session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in chat. I will read questions and comments allowed during the time set by the chair or moderator of the session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comments 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 are 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's 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 do not sign in using your full name.

With that, I will hand the floor over to the RSSAC chair, Jeff Osborn.

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.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Ozan. My apologies to everyone for starting a few minutes late. I am on vacation for three weeks in 57 minutes and it shows.

Do we have a quorum?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, I'll get the attendance sheet on the screen so that we can do the roll call.

JEFF OSBORN: Great, let's do the roll call. All right. From Cogent. Do we have Paul or Brad?

DISA. I think I saw John. Jill? No?

JILL PLACE: We're on. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Jill.

From ICANN. Matt and Terry.

MATT LARSON: Matt's here. I'm online.

JEFF OSBORN: Terry? It's some god forbidden hour where Terry is, so we'll miss him.

I'm here.

Rob Carolina is here.

NASA? Barbara and Tom?

TOM MIGLIN:

Tom's here.

JEFF OSBORN:

And Barbara? No.

Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Liman is here. Patrick is not here.

JEFF OSBORN:

Excellent.

RIPE NCC? I watched Hans walk to a plane. And Paul I don't think is here either. Okay.

UMD? Karl? Karl's here. Jerry is not. All right.

USC? Wes?

WES HARDAKER:

Wes is here. I suspect Suzanne's in SSAC.

JEFF OSBORN: All right.
And Ken?

KEN RENARD: Ken's here. And I see Howard online.

JEFF OSBORN: Howard's online. Excellent.
Everybody from ARL.
We've got Brad from Verisign.

BRAD VERD: Yeah.

JEFF OSBORN: And from WIDE? I don't see Hiro. Hiro, are you online?

OZAN SAHIN: We received apologies from Hiro as he's busy with NomCom.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. He's with NomCom, and I suspect Jun isn't here.
So the liaisons. Wes is still here.
Ken is still here.
Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I'm here.

JEFF OSBORN: Daniel, thank you.
And Russ from SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, I'm here. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent.
James?

JAMES MITCHELL: I'm here.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent.
And Duane is still here.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is in the room.

JEFF OSBORN: Duane is in the room.

That is it for the roll call and the dancing agendas.

Agenda review. The review is here in front of us all. I've looked at it a few times and didn't see anything missing. If anybody wants to take a look. We have membership activities, we have a couple of votes, the usual reports. We're getting a presentation from Paul Hoffman. And other than that, this looks like a pretty standard meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jeff, if I can just say right after me there's a presentation from someone else at ICANN in number six. The review teams.

JEFF OSBORN: Exactly. Between the two of them we've got 25 minutes scheduled so we may actually fill the whole hour and a half, which we normally wouldn't.

Anything else I'm missing before we move on to administration issues?

Ozan? Draft minutes?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you Jeff. I circulated the RSSAC meeting minutes from the May meeting about two weeks ago on the mailing list and we have not received any requests for revisions or questions about the minutes. And if you have any questions, please go ahead.

If there are no questions, this is a vote item for today for RSSAC to consider.

JEFF OSBORN: Would somebody like to make a motion to vote?

KEN RENARD: I move to approve the minutes as you can.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks Ken. A second?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman seconds.

JEFF OSBORN: Nobody opposed, nobody abstaining.
That move us to caucus membership. Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: So, Jeff, I believe we have two discussions under the caucus membership committee update today. One is the RSSAC Caucus member activity tracking update. So let's start with that. I am Ozan Shaheen and I'm also supporting the activities of the RSSAC Caucus membership committee. So the committee most recently did a search on the caucus activity tracking project.

Just to remind you how this project works, the Committee tries to determine the activity of the caucus members by looking at their participation in the RSSAC Caucus meeting, their contribution to RSSAC publications, their participation in RSSAC or RSSAC Caucus work parties

and any liaison or representative role served by the RSSAC Caucus members.

This effort was put on hold for the past two years, I believe due to the travel restrictions and other hardship that people might have due to the pandemic. But in this most recent activity, the committee found out that there are 21 inactive caucus members by how the Committee defines activity. And again, if a caucus member has done three pieces of activity in terms of these contributions and attendance, they are considered to be active. If they've done less, they are considered to be inactive.

One reminder is that the caucus members who have joined in the past twelve months are exempt from this study as well as the RSSAC Caucus members who are also the RSSAC members.

In light of this, there are 21 inactive RSSAC Caucus members, and one thing the committee observed is that some of the caucus members are interested in only being observers on the mailing list although the current RSSAC Caucus membership requires all RSSAC Caucus members to be active and be contributing to the work. And that's what the committee wants to bring forward in this meeting to discuss; whether RSSAC believes it is sound to create a different class of membership member, an observer-only kind of membership on the RSSAC Caucus, or whether the committee should proceed to reach out to these 21 inactive RSSAC Caucus members and let them ... They have conducted the study, they were found to be inactive, and within the next six months, that's what the generic email says if they continue to be inactive: they would be removed from RSSAC Caucus.

So that's the question on the table for today.

JEFF OSBORN:

The issue here is we get a couple of applications for membership every month, usually. I don't think we have a new one this month but we usually do get a couple, as many as three or four sometimes. And we went back to the rules. I've been Chair for what, a couple of years? We've been trying to be inclusive but within the parameters that are set that say you've got to have some real hands on DNS experience or else it's just not necessary to us. And we very often will get people who apply who obviously have no hands on DNS experience but would love to ... It's two things. One is either learn about this from scratch or, two, you can really tell these ones who want to add to their CV because it would be another nice committee to add. And in both of those cases, we sometimes say just no, but often lately we've been saying “No unless we missed something. So please come back and let us know if we missed something that would explain why your membership would be a valid thing.”

So two things happen. One is you get people like Keith Mitchell, for instance. A lot of you know he's the head of OARC. He said, “I love getting all the mail but I don't have the time to attend. Can I just be a mailing list member?” And so I said I would bring it to this group because I think it's above the pay grade of the membership committee. Do we think it's legitimate to have a mailing-list-only style of membership? This is all public. You can go out and pull it, but it's a matter of having it pushed to you instead. And people have acted like that would be a good idea.

And this is probably a good time for me to bring the second bullet item that Ozan and I are addressing. We had somebody who on the face of it was not qualified and, when we said, “You'd have to explain better,” came back with what we felt was not any better, but I just have this Spidey sense that they're going to come and say, “I demand you make me a member.” And I wanted to let this group know before I showed up and said, “I have an angry person who's threatening litigation,” or something that there is an issue of people applying who are not happy about being turned down. And our admission criteria is relatively clear, but it's not clear enough if somebody gets very demanding.

So there are the two issues. The one is I want to make sure that the membership committee has the backing of the RSSAC to tell people no if we don't think they're going to help. And the other is, what do we think about a class of membership in which you simply get email? And I'm in favor of it, but apparently there's a lot of history to this, so I defer to history. That make sense?

OZAN SAHIN: [Wes].

JEFF OSBORN: Sorry. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Thank you. I guess two things. One, with respect to the mailing list, let me double check with Ozan on my belief that the archives for the RSSAC Caucus mailing list are publicly available. Is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes.

WES HARDAKER: That's what I thought, which means that there's really no downside to ... Somebody could go read all that information anyway. And mail readers? People have very strong preferences and I actually am not a fan of browsing archives myself. So I have no qualms with adding somebody to the mailing list. There are many other ICANN mailing lists that have read-only subscription mechanisms where they're not actually allowed to post, and I think it would be just fine for us to institute that assuming Ozan says it's not going to be a pain in the neck to switch.

Okay, so Ozan says no. For example, I'm on the NCAP list as a read-only member. I read that right.

Second thing, I like SSAC's model of that you can bring different sets of skills to the table that may help us. I'm not sure that only coming to the table with that you must be an expert in DNS is necessarily the right approach. You must have a skill that we need, and that may be statistics, it may be something else, some background that is tangential and related, but there's sort of a discussion to be had there. Now, if you're coming and you have no experience in anything that's tangential to the work that we're doing, then yes, I support you completely, and I'm really suggesting, how about you join the read-only mailing list instead or something?

JEFF OSBORN:

Brad?

BRAD VERD:

Regarding the mailing list, I'm okay with it, except I don't want it to become ... I think people need to be qualified. I think Keith is a perfect example of that, meaning I wouldn't just open this up to just letting people sign up for mail. I think they need to be qualified and have a reason. And I think Keith is the perfect example.

Regarding pushing back, you have my full support in my RSSAC role to push back on your ...

JEFF OSBORN:

The other great example is Tripti.

BRAD VERD:

Exactly. Yeah. Again, another great example. Yes.

JEFF OSBORN:

Lars? Oh, I'm sorry, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS:

I also think that it's good to consider, like, an observer role for the RSSAC Caucus. I think that's a valuable role that caucus members can play, just observing and sort of keeping an eye on things. But it starts to get concerns about work party participation because it's not clear that an observer is really contributing to the work party document. And so then we're sort of started getting into charter revisions and things like that. But I do think it's useful to have that role for them.

JEFF OSBORN: Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. I'm positive to having observer roles. And to me that's not a problem because an observer does not participate. That's kind of the definition of an observer. So if we start to see observers who participate, then we can remind them of the status of their subscription. And to have them lurking on the mailing list is not a problem at all because it's all mechanical. We don't have to engage in that because the mail server will take care of that. And as already observed, the messages are public already. So it's just a matter of convenience for the person who wants to observe to receive it in their mailbox. So I'm positive to that with respect to pushback. So absolutely, you have my support.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. I guess the other issue—I'm so sorry, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Hi, Jeff. No problem. I would suggest that it might be helpful in terms of possibly weeding out folks who just are looking to build their CV entries if there was the read-only mail list entities were actually considered caucus observers and not caucus members. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: To be clear, you're talking about rather than throwing somebody out, we change their status if they are in for long enough?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay, that works.

Ozan, is there anything we would need to do then, structurally here—
oh, the people on the list. I'm sorry.

Brad, is that an old hand?

BRAD VERD: Old hand. I apologize.

JEFF OSBORN: Lars, is that an old hand? Liman?

Okay. Is there anything structurally we need to do then to take this back
to the membership committee?

OZAN SAHIN: No. What I heard as the feedback from the group is for the membership
committee to continue this activity tracking effort. And once they find
inactive members, they reach out to them to check whether they'd like
to switch to an observer-only role or remain as contributing
participants. And then if the committee determines that they are
eligible enough to stay so that this second class of membership would
be created and they would be switched to this observer-only role if they
wanted to. Yeah, that's my takeaway.

JEFF OSBORN: Did you get the understanding the observer role is the same thing as the mailing list only role.?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes.

JEFF OSBORN: Go ahead, Andrew.

ANDREW MCONACHIE: Thanks. I guess I'm always a bit concerned when we create distinctions that we then have to track. And it sounds like we may be creating a distinction or we'll be creating two different classes of RSSAC Caucus members, and members will want to switch between those classes at different times. And if I understand correctly, we'll have to track which member is in which class, and that may actually alter the way in which we give recognition in RSSAC publications. So this is me just kind of thinking through what happens when we create distinctions like this.

JEFF OSBORN: With all due respect, I fear you underestimate the mighty Ozan. This is already tracked to a degree that the NSA would envy. He's got records going back generations. It's remarkable.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay.

JEFF OSBORN: Ozan, you don't think this is going to be hard to track, do you?

OZAN SAHIN: No, it's okay.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay.

OZAN SAHIN: A hand raised from Robert.

ROBERT CAROLINA: Just on the endpoint of this RSSAC Caucus thing, I was just having a quick look at the document RSSAC000 operating procedures. I'm wondering, is there anything that we're discussing at this point that either makes necessary or would benefit from an amendment to that document?

OZAN SAHIN: That's a great point, Rob. I think we'll be starting to update the operational procedures next month, and that's a great point to consider.

And also, the language on the RSSAC Caucus website currently reads as there's an expectation for RSSAC Caucus members to be active,

contributing members. So whether that language needs to be revised also is another question.

JEFF OSBORN:

It's within our purview though, right? And it's on track as something we were about to do anyway.

Okay, great.

Let's get back to the agenda—I'm sorry. Are there any more questions on caucus membership issues?

That's a reapplication. This is the person who came back and said, “I am too,” and we're saying, “No, you're not.” You can read this if you want. It was unanimous, though, in the group. It's certainly a smart, educated person, but there's just nothing to indicate they'd bring anything to the table for DNS. Fair enough.

Next, Ozan? There it is. We have a vote. I can introduce the candidate. Liman, what is it? This is your role and we're about to vote you in. You're running unopposed.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Competitors are.

JEFF OSBORN:

Do you want to speak a little about this? Because I've got perfunctory knowledge.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. So RSSAC is supposed to appoint a member to the IANA Functions Review Team, which is a periodic thing that happens every X years. I don't remember the exact number right now. So we have done this in the past and it's now time for another such review. So RSSAC is expected to take part in that review as we are one party who relate to the IANA in a rather substantial way, or rather the roots of operators do indirectly. And I volunteer to be that person on that committee on behalf of RSSAC. I think that's it.

JEFF OSBORN: And a vote is required. So would somebody like to move that we nominate Lars?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll nominate—

JEFF OSBORN: We elect him, actually, I guess.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I move to approve Liman as the representative.

WES HARDAKER: Seconded.

JEFF OSBORN: Anyone opposed?

Abstained?

Congratulations, sir. Thank you very much for your service.

Back to the agenda. Work items. Oh, travel support. Are we still at four or up to five?

Four. We have six slots we get for travel support to ICANN 78 and only four of them have been taken so far. So if anybody else has an interest Rob, because you work for a nonprofit, it's available.

Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Jeff. So ICANN78 is happening in Hamburg, Germany, from the 21st through the 26th of October. And as Jeff said, we have six travel slots available. Currently, we have four requests for travel support. And if you're interested in taking slots for this travel support, you have less than 3 hours now. So the deadline is today, actually. So please go ahead and submit your request via the link that I provided on the mailing list. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thanks, Ozan.

On to work items. 002v5.

Ken?

KEN RENARD:

RSSAC002v5 is the metrics collected by the root server operators. This document was updated. It's been stable. It's been out and published. At this point, we are ready for a vote to approve on that.

So Jeff, you want to conduct the vote?

JEFF OSBORN: Do we have a motion even here?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I move that we approve this document.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Lars.

How about a second?

KEN RENARD: Ken seconds.

JEFF OSBORN: Ken seconds.

Any opposed?

Abstain?

Passed. Thanks, Ken.

Hans was hoping he could call in from the airport and I don't see him anywhere—

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: [inaudible] One more document between [inaudible]

JEFF OSBORN: I am so not here. I'm sorry.

Ken—no. It's Hans Petter. What am I missing?

KEN RENARD: 5B.

JEFF OSBORN: Sorry.

KEN RENARD: Security incident reporting. So the statement of work for the security and incident reporting work party. Again, it's been out there. It's been stable. It's ready for vote. Just noting that we will have an information session on this after lunch today, but for now, it's open to any last comments and then a vote to approve this statement of work for a work party on security incident reporting.

WES HARDAKER: Move to accept it.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you without prompt.

Do we have a second?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Seconded by Liman.

JEFF OSBORN:

Anyone opposed?

Abstained?

We have a work party. Excellent.

The next item on the agenda is about the NomCom rebalancing that Hans was going to bring up. And he has shared nothing with me, so I think we're going to ask Ozan what he thinks. Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN:

So, yes, Jeff, that was actually an action item from the RSSAC May meeting to draft a potential RSSAC input on NomCom rebalancing for Hans Petter. And we sat down yesterday. There were six questions from the Board Chair, Tripti, to SO/AC leaders on that, and we created a document. And Hans Petter started putting his thoughts in this document. And shortly before this meeting started, I provided the link to this document on the mailing list.

So the first question is, do you want the NomCom rebalanced? So RSSAC does not need to be very specific in how he wants the NomCom rebalanced, if ever.

But, yeah, there are six questions there. Please take a look at the document and share if you really think the NomCom should be rebalanced. If you have thoughts on in what way, please provide your input. The challenge is that the input was [open] until the end of June, so we have only two weeks left. If you have really hard thoughts on

whether RSSAC should provide input on that, please go ahead, take the floor.

I see Wes has his hand up.

JEFF OSBORN:

Wes?

WES HARDAKER:

Thank you for bringing this up. I was going to bring it up during my Board liaison reporting, too. There's a lot of discussion around this, around the rest of ICANN. The history actually goes back quite far. There was a NomCom review that started in, I think, 2010, and the review board came up with a recommendation that NomCom rebalancing should be considered. And then there failed to be consensus for actually changes made. There was another review six years later and again the review team said, maybe you should consider rebalancing, and without many explicit instructions; just consider the makeup. And again, there was a lack of consensus around change.

So you should go take a look at the seat and do take a careful look at those questions. And if there's feedback that RSSAC wants to give on our thoughts on it, it is a very important element of RSSAC for how Board members are selected and things like that. And there's a diverse set of communities across ICANN that contribute, and everybody has a different viewpoint, and I would argue we want a very wide, diverse set. I won't go into details, but some people believe that it's not currently well-balanced because some voices have more voice than other voices

and things like that. So come to your own conclusions. I'm not going to draw them for you. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN:

Brad?

BRAD VERD:

I guess I'm a bit surprised by the timeline. Maybe I missed this somewhere and I apologize if that's the case, but I would like to hear Hans's thoughts on this. I don't know if that means we ask him to do it in email or have a call or we wait until next month and ask for an extension. But I know Hans has a lot of history with this, so I'd love to hear his thoughts on it.

JEFF OSBORN:

Yeah, I'm in a position where I really had wanted to have some input on this and I'm not going to be back until July, so I'm in a bad spot, and Hans isn't here.

I'm going to hand this off to Rob. Could you ensure in my absence that something cohesive happens?

[KEN RENARD]:

You have a vice-chair.

JEFF OSBORN:

Oh, I have a vice chair. Ken, you're around. Could you make sure that Brad gets heard, Han's message gets out and that we don't fail to get something in? We slipped. It's my fault. We slipped and had a late input

to the recent RZERC charter changes. And I fear if we did the same thing on this, we get marginalized.

KEN RENARD: Okay, I'll work with those on to try to set that up, whether it's a call with Hans for those who are interested.

JEFF OSBORN: Great, thanks. Good.

Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, and please also make a set the deadline and backtrack from that where we have to have something to speak vote on beforehand so that everyone can see that this is happening and it's happening at this pace so we don't miss within the committee when it's time to finalize this and that we can still stick to the procedures we have in RSSAC000.

JEFF OSBORN: Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Liman. Point taken. I just wanted to add that this is currently not in the form of a public comment proceeding. It's rather an email from the chair to the chairs of the SO/AC leaders. So requesting an extension on providing the input should be relatively easier, I guess. Yeah, just want to add that.

JEFF OSBORN: Or we could do both. We could provide input and say we would love to continue having further discussion on this and provide further input.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: We can do this. [They] have set the deadline. We can do this.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. Excellent. Good.

Back to the agenda then, which I fear we're getting behind on. I can't read. Duane, I believe it's your work party we're up to. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, so an update on RSSAC001v2. This document had previously gone out for a last call and then we had some meetings and found some more things to update. So it is now in the second last call for this document.

There have been a few changes and I wanted to sort of just highlight a couple of them. Steve Sheng sent out a red line copy of the document a day or two ago and it has the changes since the previous last call. It does not have the changes since version one. But I just wanted to quickly go through a couple of the changes just so people are aware.

Expectation 3.1-B originally was an expectation on each RSO to deliver service in conformance with BCP 40, aka RFC 7720. That has been changed to a collective expectation on the RSOs to deliver the service because the BCP is also phrased in terms of the RSS, not the RSOs.

There's a couple of changes that are just sort of rephrasing and wording changes. I won't go through those.

And then the other one I want to talk about was expectation was 3.6-A. Previously, this expectation said that each RSO is expected to publish documentation that describes their key implementation choices. And this has been revised somewhat significantly to now state that each RSO is expected to share those implementation details with the other RSOs in the root ops context, for example. And then the roots of our operators should, from time to time, publish sort of an aggregate or collective description of those implementation choices for the community.

During our last meeting, there was sort of a blocking aspect of this. We had feedback from a caucus member who wanted to see something a little bit different here and actually wanted to include some language about something that should specifically be called out as allowed, which was to contact an RSO to ask them about their implementation choices. The people at the meeting felt that was not necessary. We reached out to the caucus member (both myself and Steve), via email, and did not hear back at this point. So we're going forward with the version that Steve has sent out, which does not include that little addition.

I think that's it. As I said, Steve sent this out for a last call with a deadline of June 26. And assuming there's no more changes since then, this would be something to vote on at the next RSSAC meeting. Or if there's questions, happy to take questions on the work party.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Duane. I believe next we have a presentation from guest Paul.

PAUL HOFFMAN: So this is covering, again, RSSAC047. To remind folks, 147 is the external metrics being measured by outside parties of the RSO, and then aggregated monthly for each RSO with pass/fail on four different metrics, and then also combined together for the whole RSS. And recommendation one starts off: the RSSAC recommends the ICANN Board commission an initial implementation of the measurement system.

So today, this is my hand off (and I'm the one who did it) back to RSSAC saying we are done with the initial implementation, even though we know it has a couple of holes. This is ready to move forwards in another way.

The three main holes that we know is the correctness checking. We just have it turned off. Right now it's fully coded, but it's saying that there are errors when there's not. Like, clearly you can tell. And that's due to the twisty maze of requirements that we have, plus the fact that we're doing validation with a library (DNSSEC validation), and it may be that the knobs are turned wrong, but code is there. It's just not turned on.

And then the next two are related. The reports currently (the monthly reports) Duane found were hilariously wrong. And it turns out the report I believe the report generator is correct. It's just that we have seven of the instances that did not have v6 turned on, and therefore we're not getting really good RSS results for v6 because they weren't on, which brings up the third issue, which is that there's no monitoring in this

initial system. And clearly there has to be, because if there was some monitoring ... Like, we don't need to hear every time, "Oh, there was a v6 routing error here, but it hasn't been on for the last year." [That's] the kind of thing that you should be monitoring for. And we didn't do that. So that's the kind of thing that can come up in recommendation two, which is: RSSAC recommends the official implementation must also have some things.

So we're handing off don't forget that there's a third recommendation in 047. It's totally up to RSSAC now for what to do, but this is somewhat feature-complete. I'm sorry, I shouldn't say it's somewhat feature-complete because those two don't match. It's not feature-complete, but we know where there are holes. I'm willing to poke at it a little bit more. Duane has some ideas. Duane, again, is looking at it and such like that. I'm not working hard on it anymore, but we're saying we're done with the initial implementation.

RSSAC, if you want to go forward with recommendation two and three, figure out how to do that. And this implementation does meet one of the requirements of recommendation one, which is that it can be transformed. It's not ready to become, but it can be transformed into an official implementation. Or you might start from zero just looking at the code going, "Oh, we don't like Python," or, "We don't like this. Do it another way." But we've learned a bunch from doing it. So that's where recommendation two could be.

JEFF OSBORN: I don't know who this is a question to, but what procedurally do we, as RSSAC, do next with this? I'm looking at Ozan, because I don't know who else to look at. I'll look at Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, I think RSSAC needs to discuss what to do next. As Paul said, he and I worked pretty closely together on some of this. And I looked at his data, and I was particularly interested in sort of understanding if we'd gotten some of the thresholds, because we spend a lot of time on thresholds, and we spend a lot of time on these formulas about availability and things like that. And Paul shared with me a whole month's worth of data from February and [inaudible] the problems he talked about[.] I run the calculations, and we didn't meet the RSS availability threshold according to his data and the implementation. So that was one where we had five nines, which was sort of the threshold, and we got four nines.

So this seems to me like something we need to go back and talk about and see if we're thinking the right way about availability, if our thresholds are right, before we sort of kick off an official ask someone to make an official implementation of this.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Can I toss in a second one that we discovered? Just in setting it up, it's really, really hard to get probes that match the requirements in the early part of 047 in South America and in Africa. So that's just a thing that I discovered: that getting probes in different cities that aren't all in the same data center, getting probes that stay up for a few months, getting

probes that don't get readdressed out from underneath you, even though you're paying \$200 a month, that kind of thing ... So there are some other parts of 047 that can be informed by our experience.

JEFF OSBORN: I guess what I'm looking for is this—oh, Ken? Sorry.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. We had this discussion last evening about four nines, five nines, whatever. Is that a measurement of the RSS or of the measurement system? So that's a question to be answered at some point. I'll be glad to help look at code. If there's anything I can contribute, please. Also, data. Can data be made available?

JEFF OSBORN: Absolutely. No problem doing it. It's a Postgres dump. I didn't give Duane the whole year and a half that I have because it's giant, but it's just a Postgres dump. I can give as much or as little to whomever wants it and about how much.

KEN RENARD: How much in time data do we have? Because I think the next version of 047 said, “Let's wait until we have X number of months of data.” How much?

PAUL HOFFMAN: I don't remember that it said that, but we have a good year and a half module of the fact that six of the probes weren't doing v6. But I have

plenty, and it's feeling like, once I turn those off, we will be getting clean data immediately.

KEN RENARD: Okay, so we're no longer blocked from doing 047v3—not that we're dying to do it tomorrow, but great. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Ken.

Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Jeff. I wanted to express a huge thank you to Paul and Duane for doing all this work. I was very much involved with the first edition of 047, and I think that we need to realize that this probably is the first time that we have a set of data that really is heavily oriented towards giving people a view of the RSS based on real live data. It's probably not perfect, but one of the things we wanted to look at as we learned more (and Duane mentioned it earlier) is, did we get the thresholds right? And I think that's an important thing to think about as we go forward.

But the other thing I think we need to consider is, have we listed the proper set of things to be collecting and measuring? And do we need to make adjustments from the original set that ended up getting defined?

So, again, thanks a lot to Paul and Duane. I'll stop there.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Russ.

So back to my dumb question. Does this just become that we are working on 047 C or D or F or something?

[PAUL HOFFMAN]: I mean, I think we need to have that discussion—probably not right now, but yeah, to me, that would be the next step: to form another work party to see if we want to make changes to the document before we take the next big step of another implementation.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. I just didn't want to fall between the cracks, and I'm not sure how that is done. Good.

Next. Thank you very much, Paul. I appreciate all the work. It's Paul.

[PAUL HOFFMAN]: It's Paul again.

JEFF OSBORN: Oh, I was trying to figure out who the review ...

PAUL HOFFMAN: Oh, they're back there, but I've got one in between which we may or may not want to spend a lot of time on. So RSSAC hasn't seen this. The statement of work that Andrew and I worked up hasn't come out. But basically, I posed this question to the admin committee of the history of the IP addresses used by the RSOs. So some of this is in the history document, some of it is not. It's inconsistent in the history document, but I'm proposing that maybe we start up a work party to research and

look at the IP addresses that have been used so that we know how many changes there have been and also how they're being used.

Now, my original question was, well, since we know that some people don't actually do priming, and they actually keep sending queries to just whatever they get out of the root hints file, that would be interesting to see how much there is. Since I put in the initial statement work, I also discovered some RSOs respond on their old addresses. Some of them don't. That's an interesting fact. Some of them include the queries in their RSSAC002 responses. Some of them don't. That's interesting.

So to look at this ... It's in the history document now, but it's not done in a consistent way. So either we could do a new document just on this, maybe revise the history document just for this, whatever, but the idea is to have a work party to look at this as a topic, which is one that we know about but we really haven't delved into, which is what about these old addresses? What's happening with them?

JEFF OSBORN:

How long am I to get to run this new guy thing? What is our response to that? And what is the action we need to take?

Somebody has their hand up. Brad?

BRAD VERD:

Well, I'm a bit concerned by that you stated twice now that the history doc is inconsistent. If the history doc is inconsistent, we should fix that. That should be the first one on the list, rather than starting a new work

party on something else. And then clearly, if the team thinks that we should look into this, then, yeah, we should do that. But to be clear, I was only saying—

PAUL HOFFMAN: Only talking about that it's inconsistent on this topic. I don't know if it's [inaudible]—

BRAD VERD: Okay, but, I mean, if there are inconsistencies in the history document, we need to fix that. That's our document. We own that. We should fix that, and that should be brought to RSSAC's attention so that we can address that. So I would like to know what the inconsistencies are.

PAUL HOFFMAN: So some of the RSOs listed all of their previous addresses and some didn't. And it was not clear when I read the current history document if any of them had said that they were responding on their old addresses or whether they weren't responding on their old addresses.

BRAD VERD: I guess I don't need an answer right now. I'd love to get an email as to what the inconsistencies are in the document and where they're located, so that we can look at them and address them.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Sure.

JEFF OSBORN: Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Jeff. So the way I sort of think about this is I think there's maybe two potential tasks for RSSAC. One would be, as we just said, to make sure the history document captures the right information about the history of addresses used by the root server operators. But also a lot of this was triggered by the announcement from ISI about their plans to renumber B-Root. And I would suggest that maybe RSSAC should write a document on, how do you change a root server's address and how long do you respond on the old one and how much advanced notice do you give? And that kind of thing. So that would be a second work item sense.

JEFF OSBORN: That makes sense.

Anyone else?

There it is. Karl?

KARL REUSS: Yeah, I'd be very interested in that as well. We're thinking of renumbering at some point down the line, and that would be very helpful.

JEFF OSBORN: Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks. My response to Duane's last comment about a separate document is that perhaps this might be more appropriate in a root server expectations document than having a separate document, but that could be the wrong choice, too. So we need to think about whether we want more documents or more information in current documents.

[KARL REUSS]: Yeah, that's fair, Russ. That's worth talking more about.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Russ.

Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, that is fair. One thing to consider about the topic of remembering is, for those of you that followed the NANOG thread and a bunch of private threads that I've received, that there's a wide variety of opinions on what is the right thing to do.

Paul is laughing because he was in one of the threads.

[PAUL HOFFMAN]: [inaudible]

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. So the point being is I would expect to possibly document the wide consensus without necessarily a conclusion or a policy around some things, like how long should you operate a thread? One person?

And NANOG gave me a quote of 20 years, because that's like three lifetimes of machines.

PAUL HOFFMAN: And just to be clear, on the other end was me saying that you should stop responding at 49 hours after it has been removed from the zone. That's a wide difference.

JEFF OSBORN: Noted.

WES HARDAKER: If we average it, it's ten years.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. Have we sufficiently addressed the issue of addresses?

PAUL HOFFMAN: So I think from what Brad said, instead of this being a statement of work, I will turn this into an email to RSSAC with the list of where I see the holes are or inconsistencies in the history document. And then for the historical part, let's leave it at that to decide. Then do we update the history document? Do we do some more work or such? And then the other part would be from Duane coming for the forward-looking stuff.

WES HARDAKER: That should probably go to the RSSAC Caucus list. There's no reason that that shouldn't be an open discussion.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Sure, that's fine. I don't know, since the history document was sort of carefully owned by RSSAC, whether that would be more appropriate to RSSAC or to the caucus list.

WES HARDAKER: That's a valid point. The inconsistency that you're pointing out is because every RSO was told This section is yours, and you may or may not copy other people.” So we deliberately didn't have a form of (and maybe we might want to fix that now) ... But I don't think that any RSSAC member would not value the input of the entire caucus on documents like this. So to me, more opinions the better.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Why don't I send it to RSSAC and then you all can figure out what to do with it from there?

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks Paul.

And if that's it for that issue, I believe we are going to hear from the Reviews Team.

EVIN ERDOGDU: All right. Hello, everyone. It's great to see you here today. And hello to those who may be joining us remotely around the world. I'm Evin Erdogan and I'm presenting alongside Larisa Gurnick and Jason Kean, and we're part of the ICAN Org Review, Support and Accountability

Team. So thank you so much for having us here to present on ICANN reviews.

Our team presentation is split into three parts. We'll provide information about the implementation of the second organizational review of the NomCom and recent Board correspondence to the ICANN community on NomCom rebalancing, then walk through the topic of the pilot holistic review and related continuous improvement program and then finally provide information about the Lifecycle of Reviews project. And we're also of course happy to take your questions possibly towards the end of the presentation, please.

Next slide please. Thank you. And one more, one more. Thank you. So, as the RSSAC is aware, the ICANN public comment proceeding for the bylaws amendments and documents to implement the NomCom 2 review opened for public comment in April, and the RSSAC provided comments broadly supporting the proposals for the bylaws amendments in the public comment and commenting specifically on the identification of a circular relationship between RSSAC appointing a voting delegate to the ICANN Nominating Committee. The RSSAC supported the related proposed bylaws amendment for Article Twelve; that if the appointed RSSAC delegate becomes a voting member on the NomCom through this process, the ICANN Board's role in appointment of RSSAC membership and leadership be removed. So thank you for those comments.

The public comment proceeding closed just a couple of days ago on Monday, the 12th of June, and the staff summary report of all community input will be compiled and published soon after ICANN 77.

The topic of NomCom rebalancing is separate from this proceeding as a related recommendation from the NomCom 2 review to rebalance the NomCom was withdrawn by the community group working on implementation.

Next slide, please. So, if we segue to the topic of NomCom rebalancing (and I know it was on the agenda of your meeting earlier, but providing some further background on this topic) as most of you are aware, the NomCom is a committee tasked with selecting key ICANN leadership positions, including some members of the ICANN Board of Directors and the Public Technical Identifiers board, as well as other positions within the ICANN community. The NomCom functions independently from the Board, the supporting organizations and the advisory committees, and the NomCom delegates act on behalf of the interests of the global Internet community and within the scope of the ICANN mission and responsibilities assigned to the NomCom. Under the bylaws, they do not act in furtherance of the group that appointed them to the NomCom. The ICANN community has been discussing the topic of rebalancing the NomCom for over ten years. The ICANN Board resolved in March of this year to engage with the ICANN community to understand community views on NomCom rebalancing and provide an update to the Board by September 2023. The ICANN correspondence was shared on behalf of the ICANN Board Chair to the ICANN community leaders (21 chairs in total, including, of course, the RSSAC Chair, Mr. Jeff Osborn) in April 2023.

Next slide, please. So the correspondence included six questions for community input, which you'll see on the screen here. The Board would like to gauge the community's views on the questions surrounding the

possible future of NomCom rebalancing, including possible criteria to apply to measure that the NomCom is balanced, how the NomCom could be rebalanced, and how the community would prioritize this work within your planning efforts.

Next slide, please. The letter requests community feedback by the end of June, which is Friday, the 30th of June, in light of the ICANN 77 Policy Forum, and the feedback will be analyzed to inform next steps regarding NomCom rebalancing in line with the Board resolution.

Next slide, please. Thank you. So, in addition, we'd like to acknowledge the recent correspondence from the RSSAC to the chair of the Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee regarding providing status updates of recommendations 1A and 6A from the second organizational review of the RSSAC. In April, the RSSAC conveyed to the OEC that the Root Server System Governance Working Group directly report on its progress rather than the RSSAC. The OEC responded to the RSSAC via ICANN correspondence in May and will continue to engage with the RSSAC as needed.

So I'll pause here for any questions on the topic before turning over to my colleagues, Jason and Larissa.

WES HARDAKER:

Yeah, one clarification from my end because I just spoke to the other Board member about recommendation 1A and 6A. We agreed to close one of them. So one is waiting for the GWG to finish. And I'm sorry, I don't remember which number goes with which recommendation. And the other one we consider essentially done because ... The other one

was about opening up RSSAC; the visibility into how we manage the caucus and things like that. And we've taken a number of steps that have done that. So we recommended that one be closed in a letter that we just sent this week.

EVIN ERDOGDU: Wonderful. Thank you.

JASON KEAN: Thank you. My name is Jason Kean. I'm going to be providing an update on the Holistic Review and Continuous Improvement Program and introduce the Lifecycle of Reviews project. So the first two are ATRT 3 recommendations. They're separate recommendations, but they're pretty closely related. And as I give an update on the continuous—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Excuse me.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: We are not all fluent in your speaker here. Can you go a bit slower?

JASON KEAN: Oh, I apologize. Absolutely. So, although there are two separate recommendations, they are very closely related, and as I discuss the Continuous Improvement Program, I'm going to highlight some of that relationship.

Next slide, please. So, first, an update on the holistic review, also known as ATRT 3, recommendation 3.5. This stated that a new holistic review

of ICANN shall be set up. This recommendation also included four objectives for this review. And to note here is that the Board approved this recommendation with the caveat that it proceed as a pilot and be operated pursuant to community-agreed terms of reference.

So, the implementation status. A team was formed in March of 2022 to draft the terms of reference. Following their work, a public comment proceeding was opened. This reviewed some divergent views from the community. In response to this, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee reconvened the drafting TOR team to address those. The TOR team's work has been ongoing for the last few months and is expected to result in the publication of a revised TOR as early as September of 2023.

Next slide, please. Next, an update on the Continuous Improvement Program, also known as ATRT 3, recommendation 3.6. This stated that the Board and ICANN.org shall evolve the content of organizational reviews into continuous improvement programs in each SO, AC and NomCom. So it does say in each SO, AC and NomCom. However, it goes on to state that there needs to be a common base among these programs, both in terms of the principles that they operate under, the reporting mechanisms, and specific elements such as surveying their constituencies. So this needs to come together and needs to be in agreement that the groups are operating under the same paradigm, essentially.

So now, the implementation status. I mentioned before that there's a close relationship between the two recommendations. And in response to the divergent views from the pilot holistic review terms of reference

public comment, ICANN Org looked to reevaluate the work activities that were required to implement both of these recommendations and came to the understanding that because the Continuous Improvement Program is going to be producing valuable inputs to the evaluation process (i.e., what the groups are doing to address similar principles), this work should really come first, both in terms of the eventual holistic review, but also the development of the pilot holistic review as that it's an important input to that process. Based off of this information, the implementation status is being refined and ICANN Org is preparing to start the work of designing the Continuous Improvement Program with the community. We have an idea of the work activities associated with implementing this. However, the engagement with the community is paramount in defining and concluding that this is the appropriate work and determining also an appropriate schedule for conducting that work. We anticipate outreach and engagement to the community groups to define their participation and timing to start in July of 2023.

Next slide please. And last, I'd like to introduce the Lifecycle of Reviews project. The purpose of this project is to better understand the current operational challenges faced by ICANN reviews, specifically specific reviews, and effectively introduce procedural improvements to this process. This work will culminate in amendments to the operating standards for specific reviews.

Progress to date. We've compiled the challenges and proposed improvements provided by the community, the Board and ICANN Org over the past five years. This is actually a continuation of work that was currently going on under the OEC's purview, which was paused during ATRT 3, and we're now starting back up again.

This information that we've gathered has been analyzed and organized into proposed improvements for community discussion and input. The first discussion and input will happen through engagement surrounding a thought paper. This thought paper highlights the existing problem areas and introduces a short list of six targeted improvements for discussion and further development. This list is not exhaustive, but these represent the six major pillars of improvement with ancillary improvements surrounding each of them. We hope to begin engagement with the community immediately following the publication of this thought paper in July of 2023.

And that concludes the update on both ATRT 3 recommendations and introduction to this new project.

So, next slide please. Any questions regarding any of these topics discussed?

Okay, thank you very much for your time.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

And moving on to reports. What do you have, Ken?

KEN RENARD: Nothing too much right now. There's a lot to digest from this week. Email us if there's anything that you would like us to follow up on.

[JEFF OSBORN]: [Same] for me. Lehman.
Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was just wondering, is there any feedback from ... There are always pre-meetings that go on during prep week. Is there any feedback there that you would like to bring to the group?

KEN RENARD: Let's see. From the prep week? I don't think there was much going on that we heard back.
Anything that you want to share from the SO/AC?

[JEFF OSBORN]: No, lots of meetings, and not a lot germane to us.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks

JEFF OSBORN: Wes? News from the ICANN Board?

WES HARDAKER:

Well, the ICANN Board, as always, meets for many hours before ICANN actually starts. We talked about many things. I think everybody should be aware that searching for the next CEO is a paramount project for the ICANN Board. And giving opinions about that is always a good thing. We are on track to do that. Hopefully some of you attended the presentation the other day from the Board and the search committee.

We talked for 6 hours in the last week on SubPro alone, which is the next round of the new gTLD process. That is moving along steadily and obviously will affect us at some point. We don't have an exact timeline for it that is published yet, but we're still a ways out. But there is a lot of the things that are coming out of the community that the Board is slowly approving along those and having discussions about the ones that might need to change slightly.

Clearly, I think one of the biggest talking points is about closed generics, which doesn't affect us too much here, but you might better be aware of the terminology just so that you understand what it means. And that really means that ... What was my example that I wanted to use? Let's say a large book company wanted to register dot-book. They would have to make it open and available to everybody. Or if they wanted to say, "I'm going to close it," they have to have a good rationale of why that should be in the best public interest to leave it closed when it's a generic word—so hence "closed generic." And they're not supposed to do it for anti-competitive reasons. There's a framework being published by parts of the community around this. It's not actually even an official ICANN process yet, but there's a wide variety of opinions. So you'll hear a lot of discussion around ICANN about that. There's no decisions at all about it.

Have [we] talked about NomCom rebalancing? And they did a better job talking about NomCom rebalancing.

BRAD VERD: Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Yes? Please.

BRAD VERD: Sorry. Over here. On the second round, is there an expectation that RSSAC will have to update the original advice that we gave around the round or is that just being taken as is?

WES HARDAKER: Thank you. Very good question. There is not an expectation that we need to change our advice unless we feel our advice needs changing. There is, as always, no good way to sample the registry community to figure out how many. So both ICANN, the organization, is trying to come up with a new application system because the last one was sort of done ad hoc. They didn't know how many applicants they were going to get. They got twice as many as they expected, and nobody's quite sure how many are going to come through the next round. So a lot of it is trying to design an application system and a process system around everything without knowing how many they're actually going to get, which makes, of course, calculating finances for how much money to put into the development of something that may be underutilized or overutilized ...

And I actually asked one of the SubPro chairs the other day. I said, “Has anybody even”—and I knew the answer—“tried to figure out how to do a measurement of commercial interest?” And of course, commercial entities aren't willing to say, “I want ten,” right? There's no accurate measurement, so it's all very much a guess.

The end result is the RSSAC advice says you should grow by no more than 5% a month. That works for a while. At some point, that exponential curve is going to come back to bite us and we will probably want to change that. I can't imagine that that's going to happen in the next round within a reasonable period of time. I think if you look five years out, that begins to look a little more scary. For the first couple of years, it's really not.

You triggered one more thought in my head and I've forgotten and I'm sorry. So we may want to consider that at some point.

The only other thing that's sort of at least tangential related to RSSAC is the continuation of the process of phasing out of WHOIS and switching over to RDAP. That continues along and it's on schedule for the WHOIS sunset, which ... The date I don't remember, so I won't even try and quote it, but I want to say three to five years out or something.

Any questions?

JEFF OSBORN:

Ken has got his hand up.

KEN RENARD: One thing to mention with respect to SubPro is there was an IRT implementation review team. “Hey, let's make sure we can represent that 5% per month in that review team.” Well, Brad and I joined that, and their goal is to make the applicant guidebook, so they're way in the front part of that process versus the back end. So we said, hey, can you get us out of this? And Ozan wrote a nice letter and he got us out of gym class. So we are not participating in that IRT anymore as RSSAC, but, hey, keep us in the loop in when you get to that back end or if you have anything that is in reference to the root server system. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN: So, to answer Brad's question to what Kenneth said, at this point, in the next round, there's nothing that says if you apply on this date and everything goes well, you will be in the root zone on such and such a date. So the people who would be, at this point, controlling the knob for the 5% per month is IANA, not the application process, per se. And RSSAC has a very good relationship with Iana in case something like that comes up.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. Thank you, Paul. That's spot on. And in the same way that they controlled it for the last round, we didn't see a greater increase in 5% a month because that's the advice we've been giving for multiple rounds at this point.

But you actually triggered the thing that I was forgetting earlier, which is that there's still a lot of discussion on whether there will be one new round and then many rounds after that, or a continual application where it's just an open window. Because of conflicts and stuff, they have to start with a round where contentions can happen and multiple applications for the same name can happen. And then some people want first come, first serve for any names registered after that. And there's not community consensus around that yet, but that will obviously impact the continual rollout of the root zone and whether we get long periods of no changes followed by a bunch of staggered changes or whether we get sort of this continual model in the future.

JEFF OSBORN:

Lars, you have your hand up?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

In general, I'm in favor of a slow trickle of changes rather than batches, so I'm not worried about that. But given how really awful the guidebook was in the beginning on the DNS specifics, is there decent DNS people involved in creating the new one?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

No. As far as I know (and this is recent information), I spoke with a community member who's very involved in SubPro because I didn't know enough. And I was asking that exact question for OCTO, like, "We should know this." And to the best of my understanding (and she gave me all this information early in the week, and of course, our brains are all fried; I haven't digested), one of the things I got from it was that that

part of the application guidebook is pretty much going to be identical to the last time. And that's already been approved by the Board, I believe; that one, the technical aspects?

WES HARDAKER: I don't believe so, or at least I don't remember.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Okay. So anyway, I will take it on to actually try to find out more, both for OCTO, and then I would report and I would do stuff with Wes.

BRAD VERD: It seems like if they're taking what was in the original applicant guidebook and it was inadequate, it seems like OCTO would be the right place to fix it, right?

PAUL HOFFMAN: Or at least to advise on it. Remember, all of this comes from the community. And if the community says, "We are much more interested in these other minutiae than, oh, these name servers and stuff like that," that's the best we can do. But I'm taking that on for OCTO, and I certainly would have Matt pass it to you guys.

BRAD VERD: The enabling aspect of the whole business. Okay.

PAUL HOFFMAN: If people listen to us more, then ... But yeah. So I will do that. I will figure out what I think the current state is based on the information I got earlier this week and then I will check with you, especially because I think that one was in the approved parts from the Board. So let me find out if what I'm saying—

WES HARDAKER: Well, it's possible it was approved before I joined the Board, too.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Yeah. Okay.

So anyways, Matt will come back once we have figured out more ground truth.

WES HARDAKER: But it's also possible I have a horrible memory. In fact, that is true.

PAUL HOFFMAN: So we will find that out. But I suspect you're going to be, from what I know now, unhappy.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. When you do look around, can I suggest that you also talk to the people who run the evaluation of new registries? Because they are the ones who have to implement tests for these technical things. So that probably have a good feedback from that.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

In case folks on RSSAC aren't aware, that has already changed. Liman was talking about some Swedes a little bit south of him. That has already changed. Those folks are not doing it anymore. That has changed in the current round to be other evaluators. And I think the internal evaluation (that is that ICANN is the folks doing the evaluations) is what's going forwards.

But really, I think your concern is more, does the application guidebook say anything sane about “You should have this many name servers. They should be Anycast. They should do this and that.” And that’s what I believe currently at this moment has not changed and is not intended to change from the current round.

So let me do some more research before we take time on this now. But I will make sure Matt comes back to RSSAC or I'll bring it to the caucus or whatever, but with having done some validation of what I believe.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thanks, Paul and Wes.

Doing a time check. We've got about eight minutes, which we should be able to hit, but let's get rolling.

Ken? Oh, I'm sorry, Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I just had a quick comment. I mean, given that there is concern about how the next round might roll out, does it make sense for the RSSAC to maybe not give up its seat on the IRT? Does that need to be revisited?

KEN RENARD: Maybe. It sounds to me it's not ... With respect to the root zone and the root service system, it sounds like it's more just other technical checks that need to be done.

BRAD VERD: For the record, I stayed on the mailing list, so I'm still watching it.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay, good.

WES HARDAKER: From my perspective, it's not going to change. Our advice was no more than 5% a month, and that's what we can handle, regardless of how that happens.

BRAD VERD: Again, going back to the IRT, the amount of DNS discussion in the IRT you could count on a grain of salt. Right. So let's just make sure that the expectations are level-set.

JEFF OSBORN: All right, so all hands up now are old?

No worries. Great.

Ken?

KEN RENARD: All right, CSC. Real quick. May numbers were all 100%. Again, nice and boring. They did a tabletop exercise of remedial action procedures at the Cancun meeting that was successful. They tested some things. They're looking to do another test of that sometime next calendar year to test other parts of it. So things on the CSC are good.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Ken.

I guess we're not going to hear from Hiro. So that's two out on the NomCom. That's kind of ominous.

Daniel? RZERC and then IAB.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Hi, everyone. So I have nothing to report from the IAB.

And from RZERC, I just sent an email, as mentioned by [Tim], during the SSAC/RSSAC meeting. He has sent a report where it is mentioned how RZERC is addressing all the comments received during the public comment period. So I'll provide you the analysis, the response, and I am collecting the feedback for, I would say, as soon as possible. We do have on June 23 an RZERC meeting. So if I could have those comments by that time, that would be great. If that is too early, I wish I can have the comments by the end of the month so I can transfer those to RZERC because I probably won't be able to attend the July meeting.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. Thank you, Daniel.

Any questions, any comment?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Any comments?

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you very much.

Russ.? News from RSSAC. We just met.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, everybody that was able to make joint meeting. And no further updates from that.

But I would like to ask Paul and Wes if they hear in terms of the feedback from the new round things, especially if there are security related aspects that are technical that show up. I'd ask that you just keep them in mind and maybe let me know to go poke on SSAC about things also.

I think that's it today. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Russ.

James? News for IANA.

JAMES OLORUNDARE: Hi. No updates for me this month.

JEFF OSBORN: All right, thank you. Short and simple.

Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Jeff. I just wanted to sort of quickly remind folks about ZONEMD. The ZONEMD record is coming to the root zone this year. September 13, I believe, is the target date for the first phase. And then December 6 is the target date for the second phase. I know we've talked about it before. I just wanted to put out a quick reminder. So that's it.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Duane.

It says all, but I'm going to put Brad on the spot for the GWG.

BRAD VERD: I'm not sure there's much more to update other than we met here. And we had four topics, four sessions. We got through two topics in four sessions. We will reassess the work going forward and figure out a plan.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks for that.

Any other business, Ozan? I don't think we have any other business.

I believe we might adjourn a few minutes early then, if that's it. Thank you all for coming—oh, Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Jeff. I just wanted to speak to the timing of the next RSSAC meeting. As you know, the RSSAC monthly meetings are scheduled for the first Tuesday of the month. Since the first Tuesday in July is less than three weeks now (the 4th of July is less than three weeks. now), the RSSAC admin committee is proposing to defer the meeting to Tuesday, the 11th of July if that works for everyone.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

It has nothing to do with the fact that it's July 4th.

OZAN SAHIN:

It has nothing to do with that.

JEFF OSBORN:

I'll be at the baseball game in Milwaukee.

Anybody have a problem with that.

Great. Any other issues?

Ozan?

Great. Thank you all for coming. It's been fun. I'm going to miss this session this afternoon with Ken and everybody. Have a good summer. Take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]