
ICANN78 | AGM – RSSAC Meeting
Tuesday, October 24, 2023 – 2:00 to 3:30 HAM

OZAN SAHIN:

Hello and welcome to the RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) meeting. My name is Ozan, and I will be the remote participation manager for the session. Please note that the 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 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 are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view 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.

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 the RSSAC Chair, Jeff Osborn.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Ozan. I believe our first order of business, now that we've established we have a quorum, is to do the roll call. And I have not seen Paul or Brad. Last chance. Paul Vixie. Brad Balenger.

John Augenstein or Jill Place, DISA.

[JOHN AUGENSTEIN]: Yes. John is online.

JEFF OSBORN: John is online. And Jill?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I saw her in the list.

JEFF OSBORN: Joe is here as a guest, and if Jill can pipe up at some point, we'll still go through the rest of the folks.

What am I looking at? Where's the list? There we go. Okay. And Jill is here.

For NASA, Barbara and Tom.

BRAD HARRIS: Hey, good morning. My name is Brad Harris, attending for NASA. I'm the new rep.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay, thank you. We'll have to make the correction on the sheet.

For ISC, I'm Jeff Osborn.

And there's Rob Carolina.

Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here. Patrick is not.

JEFF OSBORN: All right.

And for Ripe NCC, I believe we have a replacement for Hans Petter.

DANIEL KARRENBORG: Yep, I'm Daniel Karrenberg. I'm standing in for Hans Petter Holen at the moment.

JEFF OSBORN: And Paul is not here?

DANIEL KARRENBORG: Paul is not here.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. And for UMD, Karl's here. Gerry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JEFF OSBORN: Not expecting Gerry. Okay. Ken Renard.

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

JEFF OSBORN: And Howard.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Online.

JEFF OSBORN: Howard's on the call. Verisign. Brad.

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

JEFF OSBORN: Present. And for WIDE, we have Hiro.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro's here.

JEFF OSBORN: And Jun is with us in spirit, but not here today.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [USC ISI].

JEFF OSBORN: I missed that one, too. Okay. USC ISI for Wes.

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here. I don't see Suzanne at the moment. She's in SSAC, I bet.

JEFF OSBORN: And who else did I miss?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: ICANN.

JEFF OSBORN: ICANN.

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson's here. Terry is not.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent.

Okay. For liaisons, Wes is here. Ken. Daniel? Daniel is not paying attention. There he is.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I am. I'm [always here].

JEFF OSBORN: Russ not here for SSAC. Russ. Not here.

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. James is here.

JEFF OSBORN: James is here. Hello. And Duane Wessels.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

JEFF OSBORN: He's absolutely here. Excellent. Staff is all here. I don't see Danielle or Stephen. Andrew with a full head of hair is here. Excellent.

So our next item is the review. We have a fairly standard list of items today and an hour and a half to do it, so I suspect we're going to beat it. But I thought the last meeting was going to beat its deadline too. So I've been wrong before.

Ozan, I believe we need to have a vote on the draft minutes from last time.

OZAN SAHIN: That is correct, Jeff. So I circulated the draft minutes from the October meeting two weeks ago. We have not received any requests for revisions. If there is any discussion about the draft minutes from the October meeting, this is the right time to do it. And then I think we'll proceed to [...]

KEN RENARD: I move to approve the minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I second that.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent. All opposed?

Any abstentions?

So passed.

The RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee update is fairly short. We have a NextGen mentor selection and a list of candidates. These are voted on by the RSSAC, the larger group. But we had a discussion in the membership committee and have a recommendation. Harish is a new applicant. Ali has served one term well, and Dessalegn has done it before. So in just the simple math of how we normally do this, we find that serving two terms in just about any role is usually a good thing because you get to maintain doing what you know how to do, but you're not old. So it was our suggestion that we reelect Ali Hussain and let

Harish know (should certainly apply again) and thank Dessalegn for his continued service.

So do I put that to an actual vote then? Do we discuss?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. If there are any discussions about any of the candidates, we will have that and then we will start an online vote.

JEFF OSBORN: Ali has done a good job. I discussed it with him. He's very interested in doing it again, so I really don't see a whole lot of surprises.

Would you like to run a vote?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. So I'm putting, again, procedures around the vote, online vote, in the chat. And in a minute I will be circulating an email on the RSSAC mailing list where you will be able to find the link to the online vote. You will have 72 hours to vote, and the vote will close on Friday 27 October. And I'm also putting again procedures in the chat. So thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: So to be clear, are we able to do the entire voting online and so we don't need to pause for that?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Per operational procedures, we will take an online vote in the next 72 hours.

JEFF OSBORN: Great. So moving to the next item, vice-chair election process.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Jeff. I started the vice-chair election process by opening the nomination period on the 21st of October. So we will have a one-month nomination period which will close on the [20th] of November. And then we are planning for starting an online vote on the 5 December RSSAC meeting. And if we happen to have one candidate, RSSAC may elect its vice-chair by acclamation. But if that's not the case, there will be again a 72 hours online vote which will close on the 8th of December.

JEFF OSBORN: If I'm not incorrect, there has been a nomination made and seconded?

OZAN SAHIN: That is correct so far. We have a nomination for Ken Renard and we have a second for that. So Ken Renard will need to let us know if he accepts the nomination.

JEFF OSBORN: For what it's worth, he does a phenomenal job. So I think unless he fights extradition, we need to keep him on for this another year.

There's a leadership training post. I'm going to get the days wrong if I don't think about it clearly. Is this the two days before Cancun?

OZAN SAHIN: San Juan.

JEFF OSBORN: The leadership training?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Two days before San Juan meeting, ICANN 79.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. So Ken and I attended—what?

OZAN SAHIN: [inaudible] [March].

JEFF OSBORN: Right. We attended a meeting that ICANN puts on a leadership function for the incoming SO/AC chairs. And it's quite a group of people, and it was an interesting two days and got to know a bunch of people and found it very interesting. They are asking for if any two people in RSSAC would like to attend this year's. It's apparently something that you don't repeatedly go to. So they're looking for new people to do it. And both Ken and I as the Chair and Co-Chair have kind of run through the group of them. So we're looking for volunteers. It means you spend an extra two days in Cancun. It's a small-ish group—

[LARS-JOHAN LIMAN]: It's not Cancun. It's San Juan.

JEFF OSBORN: This is hard without a script. Teleprompters would be such a great addition to these meetings.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you. So it's another two days in San Juan. It's a very pleasant time, I thought. It was a very nice chance to sort of meet the people you see in the halls at an ICANN that you don't really run into. I think they said if it came down to it, I'd probably attend it just because the slot's there and it's paid for. But I really would strongly recommend it if somebody wants to broaden who they know and who they've met and some of the ways ICANN works. It's a good thing to do.

Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Having went to it at the same time you did, two things. One, it is useful. Two, when they say it's in a really good location, note that we were in a basement sub-level. So it doesn't make it sound great that it was in Cancun or San Juan. You may not actually get anything out of it.

But the real question was to Ozan or anybody else. I assume this would be for somebody that was already getting travel funding or was able to

attend on their own. Right? You don't get guaranteed travel because you want to sign up for the leadership training?

OZAN SAHIN:

That is true. This support does not provide any transport support. So it does provide an accommodation support per diem. That's why it's important for somebody who is already planning to attend ICANN 79. They will be getting this support.

JEFF OSBORN:

So to be clear, you wouldn't get tickets that you didn't have, but you would get nights in a hotel that you didn't have. And you really need to keep your day job because, I'm sorry, being in the basement of a tropical island is still being on a tropical island. Don't go into marketing.

I'm wondering if I should just leave this open to see whether anybody wants to do it, but like I said, I'm going to fill in just because I felt it was really valuable and I probably met half the people there, and meeting more of them is valuable. But if anybody has any interest in going, please let us know.

Is there a deadline, Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Yes. I actually might be interested in that. Believe it or not, I've never been to such a training through all my years in ICANN, but I have some experience already. So if you have two more people, I will definitely step down. But if you have slots over, I might be interested.

JEFF OSBORN: I would step aside for you doing it. You would find it really valuable. I mean, you're definitely the kind of person who would make the most of getting to meet all the people and everything else.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I will have to double check my schedule, but general interest definitely.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay.

Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Jeff. So Liman, if you can ... All right. There's no Google form, so I think your interest in this meeting is a legitimate notification for the leadership. Thank you for that.

But if anyone is also interested and we cannot find the second person during this session, please let the leadership know by 30 October because there's a deadline related to that.

JEFF OSBORN: And if you're vaguely interested and have any more questions about it, you could ask Ken or I. It was fun. It was a lot lighter than most of these meetings. It's fun. You get to meet other people. You get to find out what other functions do. I found it extremely useful in that you can now name any of the acronyms inside this organization, and I know at least two people in them, and I found that really useful.

Where are we now? Travel support.

Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN:

I circulated a note for ICANN 79 San Juan meeting travel support for RSSAC. So RSSAC has six travel slots available. One is for the chair, one is for vice-chair, and four are available for the RSSAC members. If you would like to apply for travel support, I had circulated a form on the RSSAC mailing list. Please make sure to complete it by Thursday. So it's closing in two days. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN:

Okay. Obviously if there's anybody who wants to do that and hasn't yet, please get a hold of that. Thursday is going to be here any minute.

Caucus meeting at IETF—I'm sorry?

KEN RENARD:

[inaudible]

JEFF OSBORN:

Of course.

KEN RENARD:

There was agenda item four B, the Caucus Membership Committee. So the Caucus Membership Committee is the gatekeeper for essentially caucus applications, makes recommendations, and then the RSSAC votes on it. There are, what, four people on that committee? I'll let you

explain why you're offering to step down, but we'd be looking for an additional member to serve on the Caucus Membership Committee. And it's a very lightweight job. I think we meet once a month, and it's 15 minutes or so looking through statements of interest for prospective caucus members and making recommendations to RSSAC.

JEFF OSBORN:

Yeah. Done right, the Caucus Membership Committee meeting is really one of the more pleasant meetings around here. We go 15 minutes, 20 minutes on a long day. It's made up of people you may or may not know currently. Shailesh Gupta is a senior guy from Tata who's just started coming around. Really interesting guy. Dave Lawrence. I've worked with him for decades. Most of you know him well. Ken serves as the pro temp president.

And then I was elected to it before I became the head of ICANN. And I've just had a couple of people say, "That's weird, you're head of the Membership Committee and you're the head of the group." And so I'm concerned about the optics.

So it's not like it's a whole lot of time, but I thought I might as well step down. And if somebody wants a position, it's something else to tell your boss you have extra work to do on. It is not a big time commitment. It's a serious job, but it's not a big time commitment. And it's really fairly pleasant. You basically follow the guidelines of people who are applying to see whether they would be a positive addition to the caucus or if maybe they're just CV polishing, and we have polite ways to let them down if they are. Ozan runs it very ably, and so there's very little heavy lifting.

So if somebody would like to step into that role ... I'll do it if absolutely nobody else steps in. But I feel awkward that it looks funny that I'm somehow the doorman and the chairman.

Anybody obvious?

Okay, there will be arm-twisting then.

There's no deadline on that, right? Because it all just starts January 1 again?

[OZAN SAHIN]: Yeah.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay.

WES HARDAKER: Not it.

JEFF OSBORN: If you have any interest at all let me know. Otherwise I'll try to promote it. Worst case, I'll do it again. It's not horrible.

Thanks for throwing us out of order. We're now to RSSAC at IETF in two weeks.

What is the content other than the fact that we are having a caucus meeting at the IETF? Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Jeff. So we just had an RSSAC Caucus meeting today, and the next RSSAC Caucus meeting is in less than two weeks on the 5 November in Prague during IETF 118. This is because the RSSAC Caucus meets at every annual general meeting of ICANN and even-numbered IETF meetings. And I think based on the discussions in the RSSAC Admin Committee in the RSSAC Caucus work parties, an important portion of this meeting will be given to the Security Incident Reporting Work Party. But if there are any issues left from today's RSSAC Caucus meeting, leadership can consider it. But if you want to discuss upcoming caucus work or the like, we can also add that to the agenda and we will circulate a draft agenda soon on the caucus list for further input on the agenda. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Well, at some point that's going to have to come up because it isn't obvious what future caucus work is queued up. So at some point we need to sort of start filling up that hopper. I guess that's as good as any time. It seems like a short period but it's toward the end of the year. Any reason we shouldn't add that to the security incidents reporting?

OZAN SAHIN: [inaudible] Paul.

JEFF OSBORN: Paul?

-
- PAUL HOFFMAN: I forget, are the caucus meetings that are held in conjunction with IETF meetings open to everybody or just caucus members?
- OZAN SAHIN: If I may respond, Jeff, that's a good question, Paul. We saw participants from non-caucus members in the previous caucus meetings happening in conjunction with IETF meetings but this is not a large participation because we only promote it on the RSSAC Caucus mailing list.
- PAUL HOFFMAN: Well, that's precisely my question: if we want other IETFers to be there and then we can say what caucus membership means as well, which I think is a reasonable one, we can do a little bit of promotion beforehand. If that's not so important, we don't need to.
- OZAN SAHIN: So maybe this is a good time to discuss whether you want participation from ...
- JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. And if so, how? Self-promotion at IETF sort of feels counter to the way IETF works.
- PAUL HOFFMAN: The 118 attendees mailing list has lots of things like this that just show up. So one message on the list would not be considered onerous. But again only if RSSAC wants that as a way of inviting people who are not caucus members who might be future ones to come.

JEFF OSBORN: Well it'll probably get buried under a discussion of which SIM cards are best that runs on for pages and pages, but maybe that makes sense.

Wes, you have your hand up.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, I did. It's an interesting question. I vaguely remember in the past we didn't verify caucus membership before allowing people to speak. And I think that's the right thing to do unless it got off the rails at which I'd expect the chair to fix the problem. But the IETF is full of smart people. If they wander in the door, maybe we can get engagement. I don't think I would mail attendees. I think that would go above and beyond the type of engagement that we want. It's not like we're hiding it, but I don't think that we want to advertise it to that level. If we only had two caucus members, maybe, but we have 100 and something, right?

JEFF OSBORN: Brad, you had your hand up.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I feel like this question comes up before every IETF, and I feel like Paul Hoffman asks the same question every time. Sorry, Paul. But historically the door is open. Anybody can walk in, but not everybody can come to the mic historically. So I feel like rather than debate this every time before an IETF, maybe we should document it somewhere and just put it down.

WES HARDAKER: I do think we should document it. I think we did let anybody speak last time, though. So I think the history may have changed recently.

JEFF OSBORN: Isn't it generally at the very beginning anyway, before everybody else has gotten there? So it's not like ...

WES HARDAKER: No, because it's right before the banquet or whatever. [Resound cue.] Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay, so no guards at the door, but hopefully you only get to the mic if you're a member. And is there some way of monitoring that other than by chance?

[OZAN SAHIN]: [That's you].

JEFF OSBORN: That's me? Okay, so I'm going to need a list.

WES HARDAKER: Liman has his hand raised.

JEFF OSBORN: Liman, I'm sorry.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I suggest we address that problem when we meet it, cross that bridge when we reach it. If we have a problem, we address it. If we don't have a problem, fine.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Let's not try to create problems we don't have.

JEFF OSBORN: Fine. Good. I'll look to you for help if I have a problem.

WES HARDAKER: I would like to second Brad's notion. He was absolutely right. We should document it and make sure that it's well understood.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. So for the next time this comes up, we'll have something that says it is open doors but closed mic or something like that. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll note that the RSSAC is currently reviewing RSSAC000. Is documenting how RSSAC Caucus meetings happen at IETF meetings something that should go in there? Or by documenting this, do we just mean, like, casually documenting it at our next caucus meeting at an IETF?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I suggest we actually put it in RSSAC000 because that's the only place we will remember to look at in the future. And it's not like we're not changing the documents. If it doesn't work, let's change it next year because it's a recurring thing. So yes, please.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Did you have your hand raised, Rob?]

JEFF OSBORN: Rob?

ROB CAROLINA: I thought I would disappear in the ether. On that point, if we're going to revise triple zero to deal with this, Andrew, I'd be happy to sit again and make some suggestions on how to tidy that up to address this issue because there's a certain degree of flexibility that you want in situations like this. And I have like 101 suggestions, none of which are worth spending time on now.

JEFF OSBORN: So are Robert and Andrew forming a task force to address triple zero?

[ROB CAROLINA]: We already have a work party.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. And by the next time we do this, Ozan will be able to refer to something that tells us how this should be done. Great.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Then I guess what I'm making is a request. If there's a triple zero work party, may I come and play?

[ROB CAROLINA]: Yes. Danielle is running it, but I'll take notes for this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

[ROB CAROLINA]: Thank you. And Brad had his hand up.

JEFF OSBORN: Brad?

BRAD VERD: I was going to add just for clarity that it's a closed mic at the discretion of the chair, obviously.

JEFF OSBORN: It'll cost you a donut, minimum.

All right. I think this gets us rather messily to work items. So Ken, the recent security incident reporting.

KEN RENARD:

All right. The Security Incident Reporting Work Party is going on. It's been going on for a couple of months now. I think a lot of us in this room have been involved already this week online as well.

There's a document out there. It's a very rough draft. I would encourage everyone to look at it, comment on the RSSAC Caucus mail list. You're welcome to come to the next meetings. So we're doing this for transparency to give the community an accurate representation of the security of the root server system and hopefully give them the warm fuzzy feeling that everything is good. It's a lot of fun. Come join. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN:

Excellent. Thank you. Danielle's not here. Does somebody else want to speak at all on triple zero?

Ozan?

JEFF OSBORN:

Thank you, Jeff. So RSSAC had a meeting to continue reviewing triple zero earlier in October and did some updates on the document. And this is still a working document. So there are still open items like clarifying the multi-winner, rank choice, voting and the like. So there's an action item, open action item, on Danielle and me to schedule the next meeting for that. And this will likely happen after the IETF meeting. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay, thanks.

Are we going to hear from Matt on 028?

MATT LARSON: I am happy to talk about it, but could I ask for a show of hands? Who did not hear Paul Hoffman present about the RSSAC028 study in the caucus meeting? Who did not?

Okay. I suggest we move on and I would be happy to talk to Liman and Robert.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Excuse me. I just wanted to say that I was there, but I didn't understand it. But I know that I want to.

MATT LARSON: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But I feel like I should give credit to [Analnet] Labs and [SIDN] Labs. They did a fabulous job over and above our expectations. Well, we had high expectations to begin with with that crowd, and they did even better. So we're very pleased with the study and I would encourage everybody to look at it if you haven't.

And as Paul said, but I'll say it again, RZERC has recommendation two that we're almost certainly going to have them do a follow up study on.

JEFF OSBORN: Good. So, Rob, is that sufficient? Are you going to follow Matt around and bug him until he tells you?

ROB CAROLINA: [inaudible]

JEFF OSBORN: All right.

James, do we want to hear about the draft report of the root zone (this is a long phrase) DNSSEC Algorithm Rollover Study?

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. ICANN published the root zone or a draft report for the root zone algorithm rollover study last week. So that the design team met and first sort of convened in January this year. Had a few meetings weekly throughout the early half of the year.

The report has, I guess, two objectives. The first objective is to look at how to select an algorithm. It doesn't recommend a selection of an algorithm but looks at things that need to be considered in the selection process. It also has the second part, which is how to conduct an algorithm rollover. Now that's a high-level look at the algorithm. The process to change the algorithm. It's not a detailed implementation plan.

There are a couple of interesting items in the draft report. One of the notes that [it] references is changing from RSA to, say, ECDSA, which would increase the packet size. Following a classical sort of rollover approach of double signing would increase the packet size sort of beyond those TCP boundaries or the UDP fragmentation boundaries and then drive up all NX domain traffic to TCP. It does look at a couple of mitigations for that. And there's a couple of proposals or alternate strategies that will need work through the IETF in order to do rollovers sort of with a minimal increase in packet size.

That's pretty much it. The draft reports, I think ... It's an open proceeding period, an open comment, that's to close on the 4th of December. So if RSSAC want to write a comment, I can help support your understanding of the document or any idea there. So that's it for me.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thank you. James.

Any questions?

Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Hi, James. Can you drop a link to this document either in an email to the group or in the meeting chat?

JAMES MITCHELL:

Yes. [You've all seen it in the invoice]. I'll send you an email as well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

JAMES MITCHELL: Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: All right, no hands, no questions. We move to the simple part, reports. Chair's report is pretty simple. We've been at ICANN and it's going well.

How about you, Ken?

KEN RENARD: Yeah, just one thing. I think I brought this up last time. The ICANN strategic plan for 2026 through '30 is being developed. There was a session this morning about that. This gives anybody a chance to comment on that. Previously, “do good things for the root server system” was in the strategic plan. I'm hoping they continue that. But there will be another virtual session, I believe, in early November if you'd like to attend and make comments on the ICANN overall strategic plan. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Wes? News from the Board? We've actually seen them around a lot more than normal on one of our meetings.

WES HARDAKER:

Yeah, similar updates to the [past]. The next round, of course, will continue to take all of our efforts going forward and all of ICANN up until ... I think the current target date is something like Q2 2026 for the first opening of the application process. There's a lot of implementation of various aspects to be done before then and continued things to work out.

Also, quite a little bit less relevant to the RSS, there's the continued discussion with respect to the rollout of the next WHOIS RDAP-related platform and specifically how to allow law enforcement access to otherwise restricted registration information. It doesn't affect us directly, but it affects basically all the TLDs and everything else underneath us. So we should be aware of it.

I thought yesterday's discussion with the Board went fantastically. I got a lot of positive feedback from the Board. They really appreciated our switch to non-generic questions and diving down into it. So they thought that that went very well. The Board was very happy with it, and they said that they really liked that switch. And I said RSSAC agrees because I think that we do. I really appreciate everybody that gave comments related to the discussion. Jeff [inaudible][point.] Brad's additions were fantastic as well.

So thank you, everybody that made that wonderful. I certainly want comments and I already see Brad raising his hand.

BRAD VERD:

Well, I'm going to raise a little concern. I was really disappointed in the Board, to be honest with you. I was disappointed in really how it ended,

which was, “So everything's good. We can do whatever we want.[”] The answer was yes. And they were like, yay! And that was it. That's what they wanted. They heard what they wanted. And I was a little disappointed in that response.

WES HARDAKER:

That's fair, and thanks for bringing that up. The Board is made up of a lot of non-technical people, and so getting them to understand ... I think one of the things that came out at the end that was a good breakdown of the problem space was highlighted by your comments, which is that there are elements that ICANN can control. That is the rollout of new gTLDs. That's all that's within ICANN's remit. All of the other things that we were talking about, like alternate namespaces and DDoS attacks and everything else, they have no control over. That's our responsibility.

BRAD VERD:

There are three things that they have control over, right? There's the variance, there's the rollout of the new gTLDs and then there's the SSAC rollout of names from the NCAP collision stuff, which is a whole other set of names. So it seems like they do have their thumb on the scale and they can't affect it.

WES HARDAKER:

Yeah, when I said that they had control of that, I was actually grouping all of those three things. The NCAP one is interesting and we should probably bring that up as a topic for discussion sometime because of the way NCAP is going forward and doing blind delegations up front.

I'm not sure anybody's done a detailed analysis of what the traffic load to us would look like by rolling out a TLD that does not yet exist. But their plan is to roll out ... I would think it wouldn't be more. They're adding more delegations, but they still have to stay within our 5% cap. They're not going to go over that. So it's essentially as if they're just rolling out faster is how it will feel to us, even though they're actually rolling out at half the rate that we would actually see new entries. So basically they're delegating to an address that will just log queries to stuff.

And so the goal of NCAP is to determine are there conflicts? And the way they're going to determine conflicts are not looking through root logs, but rather to say ... And I'm summarizing stuff that I have not followed at 100%. But they're going to delegate to an address that will log everything that might go look up some future TLD so that they can figure out, is this a really bad set of conflicts or not? Then they close that and then if it was okay, then they add it back to a real TLD operator at some point in the future. So it's like adding a fake TLD for a while.

JEFF OSBORN:

Brad, is there something we need to do to address your concern or is this just a water under the bridge?

BRAD VERD:

I don't know, it's just a feeling. When I walked out of there I was a little disappointed and I had concern.

So I think Daniel's got his hand.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Hi. Very-high level comment, not at the technical level that was just discussed. I also went off from this discussion with, “Oh yeah, that went well,” but I had the nagging feeling comparable to Brad's. Hopefully they didn't get the message that they can go on at lib with the next and next and next round without talking to us.

So my advice to the liaison would be to make sure that they know that when they're tweaking the parameters in unforeseen ways that they have to talk to us. And I'm not sure whether that misunderstanding happened, but I had a feeling in the same direction. So my advice would be that we instruct or ask the liaison to make that clear that, when things change, please tell us as early as possible. Involve us in this. I don't doubt that will happen, but still, let's make sure. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER: No, thank you very much for that comment. I will note two things. One, that's why we have a liaison in the room in the first place; so that we have that knowledge transfer. And then two, I actually did make that statement during the meeting. I said that we need to stay informed of every plans, and the liaison's job is to ... Because the rest of us don't want to track every document that goes through the ICANN process. That's a hard thing to do, and the GNSO discussions are long and lengthy. Somebody needs to track that and it should be the liaison's job to say, “Oh, look, there's major things coming,” which is actually why we're on the agenda item of the liaison's report from the Board.

But thank you. I think your point is very valid.

DANIEL KARRENBORG: Wes, don't take this as criticism. At the point where you said that, I nodded vigorously, but I didn't see any reaction from the Board.

WES HARDAKER: They've heard it before because I tell them repeatedly. But you're right, I'm not telling them in a way that's public.

[JEFF OSBORN]: Okay, I'm going to rudely jump in front of Matt briefly, just to answer the both of you. What I was responding to is the number of times I have heard from the Board, When is RSSAC going to be able to accommodate the things that are necessary?" It felt like we are a stumbling block to them doing something. And I felt every time I had one of those talks, I would listen to somebody with a math degree explain to somebody with a poli-sci degree in words they did not understand that everything was fine and it didn't sound that way. So that was my bad where I've been trying to overcome that misunderstanding. So if I overshot, we can start becoming more cautious now.

And Matt, you had your hand up.

MATT LARSON: Yeah, I just wanted to go back. Wes was making some comments about NCAP Study 2. I mean, the study is not finished. What you described might or might not be what ends up in the study. Then it'll go to the Board, and the Board will have to decide what it thinks of it in terms of staff implementing it. So just because it's currently written down in

draft form, that doesn't mean that's what's necessarily going to happen.

WES HARDAKER: Brad, sorry. Matt's 100% correct. Thank you for the correction.

JEFF OSBORN: Brad, is that an old hand?

BRAD VERD: No, it's a new hand. If I could solidify my point (and I'm not trying to beat a dead horse here; I apologize, but that's how it's coming across), I felt like the questions being asked were being asked in a microcosm of like, “Is this okay? RSSAC 32. Are you guys still good with this? Jeff? Yes” and then, “Variants. Are you guys good with this? Yes.” And it wasn't clear to me that anybody was looking at the bigger picture. In the individual microcosms, I think the answer is yes, there's not a concern here. But when you overlay all the microcosms, including NCAP, including alternate namespaces and all this stuff, we don't know what we don't know, right? And when there's a commercialization of the root zone, we don't know what we don't know. And so there's always this risk of just like, “Okay, the route is different. Just do what you want. Do it diligently. Be careful.”

Anyways, that's all.

WES HARDAKER:

If I could respond, let me tell you the timeline of how these questions came about. They came to me on a Tuesday during something else that was going on. Jeff was on vacation, and they said, “Give us answers by Friday,” for, like, questions. So I got an extension, and we came up with the questions of like, well, let's have a discussion about this namespace. And part of the questions that we came up with were specifically so we could say “Yes, we're ready,” because for what they're planning and the way that Jeff worded, it was correct. Everything they're planning within our scope. One sec.

And so we sent the questions to the RSSAC list, I think, at one point, but there was no way to hold it for a meeting because we were supposed to turn them around. To be fair, it was an unreasonably fast expectation from the Board that we could turn questions around that quickly.

BRAD VERD:

If I may, Jeff, I was fine with the questions. I was fine with the answer. And really, I was fine with the meeting yesterday up until the very end when Edmund kind of did his thing and everybody went, “Yay!” And then I was like, I'm not comfortable anymore. That's all.

[JEFF OSBORN]:

What did Edmund say? I must have missed that.

BRAD VERD:

It was at the very end of the meeting. He goes, “I just want to make sure. So we're good with everything, right?” And there was this kind of “Yes.” And then kind of all the Board members went, “Yay! All right!” It felt like

they just wanted that answer and they didn't care for anything else we said.

WES HARDAKER:

So I think that the context at that particular point ... And Edmund is in charge of the universal-acceptance-half of the Board. And so what's coming out of universal acceptance is that, in the new application round, applicants can apply for four to five variations of a name in other languages or whatever that will end up with XN-- type prefixes within the root zone. And they can get those four or five other names, whatever the limit is (and Edmund wasn't able to quote it, and I certainly can't) for free under the same applicant fee of checking everything. That does not mean that they're going to grow the root zone at four to five times the 5% that we have already stated in 2018. That's the context as I remember it.

But your point is valid that we don't want to give them a blanket statement forever. Everything that comes to the changing of the root zone in any way should absolutely go by RSSAC. That's our job.

JEFF OSBORN:

The horse is not even twitching anymore. It's been beaten sufficiently.

So let's see what Ken has—is there any further discussion?

All right, Ken—Rob?

ROB CAROLINA: Man, never let a dead horse go. Since we now know that this is going to be the recurring format or is very likely to be a recurring format for our contact meetings with the Board, could I ask our friends in the ICANN Org staff to remind us or to remind the chair and vice-chair perhaps three months prior to the contact meeting; if you could make a calendar entry in something that just reminds the chair and vice-chair that we're very likely to be asked this question? And then that will give them the opportunity to consult widely and over a long period of time so that everyone will feel they've had the opportunity to shape the form of the questions.

WES HARDAKER: Well, you have about three months. At this point, it's actually about four months, but, I mean, this is going to be the recurring theme. The new direction is weirdly that we are being asked the questions that the Board should ask us, and in part because the Board doesn't have ... Again, in a nontechnical board, to a large extent, they don't have the context around what it is they should know. So it's our opportunity ... And they can add questions, but the goal is we can give them leading questions based on what we think.

ROB CAROLINA: I appreciate that. My only purpose in commenting was to address an internal RSSAC process that perhaps we could find a slightly different way of approaching, which would give us all a little bit more lead time. It's just remembering it's coming up so that we don't end up in a position where we have to say we were given very little notice. We've

got notice now, so let's just find a way to structure it so that we all have that feed in time.

WES HARDAKER:

I will take it as an action item on my responsibility to go check with Katrina and get her to push that deadline out further so that she gives us notification in advance. She's the Board representative that deals with creating all of the liaison-ships between them.

ROB CAROLINA:

Well, indeed. I don't want to give the Board management team more work than they need. I just think we just need to internally know that we should be talking about this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

So I think the ask here, Robert, is for the RSSAC to just have an internal discussion before they go meet with the Board to talk about the Board's questions, like, a couple weeks ahead at a time.

ROB CAROLINA:

It doesn't have to be a discussion. It just has to be a prompt.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Sure. A mailing list discussion, let's say.

ROB CAROLINA:

Yeah, it can be. Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. That way everyone has, like, weeks to think about it. No one sort of feels like, oh, my gosh, if I don't come up with a question in 12 hours, I'm lost.

ROB CAROLINA: Right. Like, a month ahead or something.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sure. Okay.

JEFF OSBORN: Or it could be the new item, 7Q, on the monthly agenda, the list of the next three questions. Okay. Thanks.

Ken?

KEN RENARD: The CSC met this week. The numbers for the last month was ... September was: 100% of the SLAs met again. Again, very boring. That's good. But the main thing that the CSC looked at is they are going to review all of the SLAs. There are, what, 50 or 60-some metrics—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 63.

KEN RENARD: 63 that they measure every month. Most of them are automated, so a lot of them are historical based on the implementation early on. So they're looking at reviewing all of those. Are they still necessary? Are

they still relevant? Things aren't going to change just for change's sake. But this review of the SLAs and all the metrics will be discussed at the next ICANN meeting in the spring. And I believe (correct me if I'm wrong) it will go out for public comment after that if there are any changes.

That's it.

JEFF OSBORN:

All right, thank you.

Questions? Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I was at the meeting, and I cautioned against ... There seemed to be some push for changing the procedure, for changing the metrics. And that was something that we worked on very hard during my tenure in that group for several years; to get that into a working state. So keep an eye on that, would you please, so that they don't go into that rat hole again.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Is this something outside of ICANN? I understand.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thank you very much.

Daniel? IAB and RZERC.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I don't have anything to say that has not been already said.

JEFF OSBORN: All right.

And SSAC. We're aware that Russ is not here. Did somebody else choose to speak for SSAC? I don't think so.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think, for the record, we should say we had a joint meeting.

JEFF OSBORN: We had a joint meeting, for the record.

James. IANA.

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. Nothing further to add. Short and easy.

Duane. RZM.

DUANE WESSELS: Also nothing new to report.

JEFF OSBORN: I don't know why this always says “al” on it when I always pointed at Brad. But Brad. The GWG.

BRAD VERD: I'm not sure we need this update on here anymore. But it's all on here because we're all members of the GWG, meaning the RSOs are. But we're meeting on Wednesday and Thursday. So bring your discussion hats.

JEFF OSBORN: Now, Naveed is here and I had given him the option. We are changing how the structure of the RSSAC is so that we're going to get a vote on the NomCom at some point on. It is premature, but when we spoke, I said, at some point, you should probably ... I think it would be valuable for us to get a little bit of a "Here's how the NomCom works. Here's how our role is changing." And with Hiro stepping out of the role and Naveed stepping in, that's going to make some sense. But I think he convinced me it might be premature now.

You think that's still the case, Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Even here, that change into a voting position also comes with the changes to the bylaws for how the RSSAC is appointed. Who's involved in that process? Because I hope they're not going to change the bylaws without consulting with us.

OZAN SAHIN So, as you remember, RSSAC already published a documentation on that and requested these changes. So what's happening now is that ICANN is changing by those as it has been requested by RSSAC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, that's fine. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: I was trying to make it ... I wanted it to be public when it comes up.
Whose hand is up? Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I was going to say, we've discussed this a million times and
unfortunately, we solved this, I want to say, two years ago. Is that right,
Ozan? Like two years ago. And then we were told we needed to wait for
the ICANN bylaws to be changed to implement our change.

So this discussion that you're asking for we did two years ago, and it's
already been solved. And we just need to implement the change.

OZAN SAHIN: It's so long ago I forgot about it. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: And when it is timely, we'll hear about it; that it's going on in a timely
time, because it's apparently still too early to talk about it. Got it.

Who's next? Naveed. So just on the NomCom.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Hello, everyone. So on that aspect, actually, earlier this week, we got a
presentation from the Implementation Committee of the ICANN who's
doing this, and they have confirmed that this is going to be in effect from

next year. That means the 2025 NomCom. So RSSAC would appoint another person for another term.

And to start with, they have chosen some organizations within ICANN who would start one year and some with two years. So RSSAC is going to start with a one-year term and then it would continue to two-year each time.

So this is what my understanding is. So this does not apply for this year. So this year I stand as a liaison, and we don't have voting on the NomCom as far as this year is concerned. But that would go into the next year's AGM and it is constituted again.

So I just put one slide here on the tentative timeline of the NomCom this year. So it's actually divided into five phases: where we are into phase one right now in this week, where we are in the planning phase, where the application is going to be reviewed and all the things. So the application is put to the website in the start of January, and the deadline is going to be 15th of March, so that's two and a half month, almost. So otherwise this final selection is going to be around June, and as things move on, I plan to update the RSSAC on the things, the generic things about the NomCom, about the state of things and all that, in the future meetings.

So if there are any question around that, I can answer. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thanks. And yeah, as we get closer, I think it's going to be interesting where a vote matters and what it is we have to do. This is all kind of opaque to people from the outside.

Do you have a hand up, Ken?

Thank you. Any other questions? And we are to the ICANN Fellowship Selection Committee. Is Gaurav on the phone?

GAURAV KANSAL:

Hi. I am a nominated member from the RSSAC side to the ICANN Fellowship Selection Committee. So my term is from ICANN 78 to ICANN 83. So this time we are reviewing the application for ICANN 79, this event. So we received 378 applications, this time for ICANN 79, where each application will be randomly allocated to three out of the five selection committee members. All three has to review each application. So around every reviewer will receive around 200 applications, which need to be approved within a period of three weeks.

Around this time, the timeline was to finalize the fellowship selection fellows for ICANN 79, but due to unavailability of one of the member, we are still not able to review all the applications. So maybe in around two weeks or so, we will finalize the fellows for ICANN 79. So a total of 40 fellows need to be selected across all the regions.

So this is what I have from the Fellowship Selection Committee side.

JEFF OSBORN:

All right, thank you. And Abdulkarim with the two items, the ICANN Fellowship Mentoring Committee and the NextGen ICANN Selection Committee.

[WES HARDAKER]:

[inaudible]

JEFF OSBORN:

Oh, I thought he was here before.

Okay, Ali Hussain on the NextGen ICANN Mentoring Committee.

Nope. Liman was here last time I looked. Oh, there he is.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Yes. So I am the representative to the second [IFR] review team. We had our first kickoff meeting yesterday, so we haven't really gotten that far yet. So we were shaking hands and looking at time schedules and starting to look at the documents that we all have to process in order to get our heads in shape. So not much has happened yet, but I do expect a rather dense schedule of telephone conferences. And you will hear from me for the coming, what, 14 or 18 months? Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN:

Better you than us. Thank you.

Rob. Work Stream 2.

ROB CAROLINA:

Oh, look at that. I'm on the agenda. I've been attending the Work Stream 2 cross-community ... (It's got more initials in it than almost anything else we attend) for a long time now. And I don't know if there's anything of significance to report to RSSAC. It's been a little bit of a confusing walk because a lot of what they're implementing has to do with things like ... The first chunk of things we were talking about are

things like making sure of accessibility standards for related to diversity. And part of that discussion got tracked into a discussion of disability versus lack of disability. And then we've been moving into other criteria.

And the main concern that I've raised with that group that I will flag for discussion is that at one level, it may well be that almost everything we're discussing is not anything that requires action or attention from the RSOs as such because it seems to be more directed at supporting organizations within ICANN that have to manage community interaction, which this advisory committee does not. We don't have a thousand constituents. We have to engage with productively who vote on things. And that's not a part of what we do.

It also seems that it is not immediately directed to operations, if I've understood particularly the back-and-forth that we had on a recent meeting. So I don't think there's an issue there.

The one gray area is that I haven't ... I don't know if there's a reason to focus on this or not. I think probably not. There is some continuing haziness in my mind about the boundaries of whether or not whatever this implementation of this policy is could be used to fashion a complaint not about how we treat people, not about how we engage with people, but about the very constitutional structure of the Advisory Committee itself. Could a complaint about what is essentially a constitutional question rise to the level of a complaint about the inclusiveness policy in the ICANN bylaws? And I don't think there's a direct answer to that. And we've had presentations ... And this is not something that that group is focused on necessarily. It's just something

that has sporadically appeared. And whenever it appears I try to pursue this issue that ... Subject to being corrected by this group, I've pushed the position that this is not the kind of policy discussion or implementation that can or should interfere with constitutional line drawing.

And at the moment, I believe that to be the case. I'm not sure that every member of that particular work group believes in the same way. But at the moment I don't forecast a direct impact on how RSSAC operates or on how the RSOs operate. And my continued position with them is that the things that they're talking about so far just don't apply to the things we're worried about in this room.

The only way that would change would be if somebody attending one of our meetings complained that they were given poor treatment because of their gender, because of their ethnicity, whatever it was. That is the sort of thing, of course, because we're being hosted by ICANN, that is the basis of a legitimate complaint. There's someone just down the hall who has that job and that's absolutely appropriate, but I don't think anything coming out of that process has a direct impact either on how the RSS is run or on how the RSOs operate, or on the constitutional structure or nature of RSSAC itself.

So having not prepared anything, that's my statement.

JEFF OSBORN:

Words escape me.

ROB CAROLINA: My recommendation is that we don't linger on it.

JEFF OSBORN: Good. The sooner we start not lingering, the better.

So on other business, we have the ... This is a funny one. It's the 25th anniversary of RSSAC, and I'm not sure what to do with that other than having a cake. And they denied my permit for indoor fireworks in here, which I was very upset about. We could just start it up anyway, and we have some matches. It's kind of funny because I guess if you're young enough and 25 years seems like a long time, then it's a big celebrating thing. But I was trying to think of, like, when did I first hear that there was going to be an ICANN and what was my first thought about it, or what were we doing 25 years ago? Any of these have been raised as things that would be interesting.

So I was trying to remember what did, I think, when I first heard about ICANN? And I'd been involved with the internet for 15 years by then, and my first and only thought was, what the hell does Esther Dyson have to do with this?

Since you laughed, do you recall?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I have a few memories from those days because I was a member of the Policy Oversight Committee for the over ... What's it called? The IAHC, the International Ad Hoc Committee?

[JEFF OSBORN]:

The IAHC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Yeah, this was the system that eventually negotiated setting up ICANN as an organizational structure. And yes, it was an interesting ride. Many interesting meetings in many interesting places and lot of people who didn't agree about anything.

I specifically remember a meeting in Geneva walking behind two persons downstairs. There were meetings on several floors and you had to walk a stair to get to the lower floor. And one said to the other, “This bloody meeting is a circus.” And the reply back, was, “No, you don't understand. A circus has a very clear purpose and it's also quite well-organized.” So that was the feeling back then. But that was in the beginning of the process and it actually honed in pretty well.

And I also remember thinking that this will be a policy body that deals with policy. So, yes, there will be an RSSAC. And do remember, those of you who haven't attended that far, that the RSSAC meetings used to take place at the IETF conferences, not at the ICANN conferences, for ten years.

So I was there for ICANN number one, and ICANN number two. And okay, this ship is now sailing in the right direction, so time to get off. Then ten years later, someone hauled me back on board again. But during that time, we had the RSSAC meetings at the IETFs. But then we received, I would say, legitimate complaints that we were inaccessible and we didn't engage with the rest of the community and whatnot. And we started to have them here instead, which I will say is a good thing

because we now have a much better relationship with the other constituencies in ICANN.

JEFF OSBORN:

[inaudible] really right there at the birth of it.

Although he's known for reticence, I'm going to ask Daniel if he could give us any recollection.

DANIEL MIGAULT:

Well, it's very short. There's two stages, basically three stages. The first stage was that the root server operators were afraid actually to talk to each other in order not to be seen as a cabal, and also in order to prevent any inadvertent similarities in the operations to keep diversity. Then we talked to each other, and then we had to talk to ICANN. We talked to each other and we talked to IANA, and by the time we had to talk to ICANN, RSSAC was created. That's the way I see it.

And I'm not sure actually, at which point in the history of ICANN that happened—not at the very beginning. Did happen at the very beginning? Oh, gee, I am getting old. I forget things.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I do remember. Now we have the GNSO and the ccNSO, but that wasn't the case from the outset because you will note that they've celebrated their 20th anniversary, not the 25th. So in the beginning was the DNSO, the Domain Name Supporting Organization. And then they realized that they had so different views of things that they needed to split that into two after five years.

But I was at the meeting where the DNSO was formed and created in Barcelona, and that was the meeting where everyone received the news of Jon Postel's death. So that put an interesting twist on that meeting. It was a whisper in the hallways as people were presenting stuff on stage, and that kind of turned the entire meeting into, “Okay, this is serious now. We don't have something behind to rely on anymore. We just have to push forward.” And that was in October of 1998. And the first meeting of the Roots Over Operators was in December that year. And the first meeting of RSSAC was in the spring of, say, February at the Singapore meeting.

JEFF OSBORN: Of '99.?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Of '99, yes. That was the first RSSAC meeting. We had a bit of a discussion over email before that, but the first physical meeting was in Singapore.

JEFF OSBORN: Wow.
Karl?

KARL REUSS: I was going to say I wasn't part of any of this back then, but my colleague Gerry Sneeringer was there. I believe he was part of the first email discussions and then attended, I believe, Singapore. But I think

he and Jun Marai have both been officially on the registered list of RSSAC reps for the entire period, although we haven't seen Gerry in ten years.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: [inaudible]

KARL REUSS: Yeah. You stepped away from RSSAC for a while, then came back, or were you always ...

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I didn't step out of RSSAC. I stepped out of the series of ICANN conferences, but I was still in RSSAC at the IETF meetings.

KARL REUSS: So you're also a 25 year member?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes.

KARL REUSS: Excellent.

JEFF OSBORN: The one story I bring in I wasn't there for. I left you. I was retired and building boats in the Caribbean somewhere and you guys were still working. But Rick Adams tells a great story about what I think was

supposed to have been the first ICANN meeting, and it was going to be in Singapore. And the concern was that due to Jon Postel's grooming habits (him having a beard and long hair), he would not be allowed into the country. And that the location had to be changed to ... I think it was Honolulu because of that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that's a myth.

JEFF OSBORN: It's a good myth though. There are a lot of myths that don't need to be challenged or changed, and as far as I'm concerned, that's a good one. So I'll stick with that.

KEN RENARD: I just think this is a time to recognize ... I don't mean this term in a negative way: the elders of the RSSAC. And thank you for starting that and I'm hoping we're carrying the torch the way you envisioned it. And again, thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Obviously, the internet turned out exactly like you expected it would have.

[KEN RENARD: Of course.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: But I would like to say that the RSSAC has improved since we did the overhaul in 2010, 2011, 2012-ish. It has become a very much better organization, and we have structure and work processes that are so much better than what we had back then. We produce so much better results. So it's been a ride in the right direction.

And by the way, my formal title is Dinosaur.

JEFF OSBORN: Well, I don't want to take away the whole hour and a half, but I was asked to have some sort of authentic mention of the historicity of going through this thing. So thank you all for playing along. Thanks for allowing me to point microphones at you.

And with that, I believe if there is no other issue, we have our next meeting on the 5th of December.

Ozan, anything else?

OZAN SAHIN: No. Today's meeting replaces the November meeting. That's why there is no next meeting in November, but in December. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Ozan, thanks as always for making this all possible.

And everybody else, we will see you at the next one.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]