ICANN81 | AGM – Root Server System Advisory Committee Meeting
Tuesday, November 12, 2024 – 13:15 to 14:30 TRT

OZAN SAHIN: Hello and welcome to the Root Server System Advisory Committee meeting. My name is Ozan and I'm a participation manager for the session. Please note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. 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. If you would like to speak during the session please raise your hand in the Zoom room. When called upon please unmute in Zoom, state your name for the record, and speak at a reasonable pace. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak.

Please also note that this meeting is intended for interactions between the RSSAC members and any invited guests. Similarly, the chat space is exclusively reserved for the interactions between the RSSAC members and invited guests. Observers are welcome to observe the meeting but unlike invited guests, they do not have the privileges to speak or use the chat feature. With that I will now hand the floor over to Jeff Osborne.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you Ozan. We'll call this meeting to order and I believe it's time for the roll call. Here we are. From Cogent is Paul. I haven't seen Paul or Brad here. Nope. DISA, John or Peter. John is online. Peter's online too. All right, thanks, guys. ICANN Matt and John.

MATT LARSON: Matt's here online.

JEFF OSBORN: Hey Matt. John. John Crane. Nope. ISC, I'm Jeff. He's Rob. We're here from NASA, Jose and Brad. Guys from Netnode.

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

JEFF OSBORN: All right. And from RIPE NCC. Hans Petter or Paul. Not remote. Okay. UMD. Karl.

KARL REUSS: Karl's here. And Kevin is remote.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent. Hi Kevin. USC, Suzanne and Wes. Is Wes here?

SUZANNE WOOLF: He's going to be a little bit late but he will be here.

JEFF OSBORN: Terrific. Thanks Suzanne. Army Labs. Ken and Howard. Howard you online? I'm going to believe Ken saying Howard's online and he's missing the mute button. Verisign, Brad and Afshaan.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Brad's here.

JEFF OSBORN: Afshan.

BRAD VERD: Pretty sure she's asleep.

JEFF OSBORN: It's pretty early in the morning there.

HIRO HOTTA: And Hiro. Yes. Hiro's here.

JEFF OSBORN: And June is not. All right. Liaison to the Board. We expect Wes here any minute. Hiro's here. Liman is here. Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Daniel Magault.

JEFF OSBORN: Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Good afternoon on Zoom.

JEFF OSBORN: Hi. How are you, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: I'm okay.

JEFF OSBORN: Good. From IANA. James.

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. James is here.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, James. And RZM, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

JEFF OSBORN: Duane is here. Excellent. Agenda review. We have a pretty normal agenda with a couple of exciting highlights. We're going to hear from Liz Field the new ombuds and other than that it's pretty normal. Does anybody have a change or addition to the agenda comment? Nothing. I believe at this point Liz Field is going to tell us about her role.

ELIZABETH FIELD: Good morning, this is Liz, oh, good afternoon, this is Liz. Can you hear? Okay. This is Liz. Thank you. Elizabeth Field, I go by Liz. I'm the new ICANN ombuds. In my introduction, I'll be very brief, and then there'll be some time for questions if you want. So just a few minutes to say who I am and a little bit about the role. And I'll just share a few ideas I have for evolving the office in case any of you have any thoughts on that.

So the role of the ICANN ombuds is set out in the bylaws. It is to handle complaints from the community who believe that they've been treated unfairly. I also handle complaints under the anti-harassment policy, and I have a role to play in the requests for reconsideration. All that is set out in the bylaws. I am also an advocate for fairness. So in addition to the responsive elements of the role, handling complaints, there is a proactive and promotion and prevention aspect of the role, which I will be taking very seriously in terms of building a community of the-- well, building on the community of respect and dignity that is there.

I think just a little bit about me, background. Well, first of all, I'm based in Geneva. You can probably tell from my accent, I'm North American from the States, but lived outside of the U.S. for a very long time, so London I've worked all over. I have my country experience in every region. I speak French and a little bit of Spanish. People can contact me in those languages.

So I've got 20 years' experience as ombuds, conflict resolution, mediation. I've worked, and I think maybe critically for ICANN, those roles have all been in the context of global, international, multilingual, but also I've worked in social movements. So that means there's similar organizing model, bottom-up consensus building, multiple stakeholders, the very complex and rich environment that you find at ICANN.

I think I also have a background in anti-harassment, and that is not just, again, handling complaints, but how do systems prevent harassment in the first place. And I've worked also within the UN system. So just a couple of thoughts, I think, about what I'd like to do with the office. There is a good position of stability in the office to take it forward, to take the work forward.

One of my primary aims is to respond to the needs of the community. So data is very important to the work that I do, ensuring that I am measuring and monitoring what I do. So the community is part of helping me identify what the services that are needed, how they're working. So a data-driven strategic approach that has prevention as part of it. So that's one of my principles.

Another principle is around communicating and engaging with the community. And the third principle is really around support. And it's not just responding, but promoting positive behavior and looking at ways to do that beyond words on paper. So I want to work collaboratively. That's my aim. So I'm really looking forward to hearing from all of you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you very much. Any questions? Rob.

ROBERT CAROLINA: Rob Carolina, ISC. Welcome. Really glad to see you here. Thank you so much for coming in. I have a question for you concerning scope of jurisdiction of the Ombuds office. And forgive me for this, because I was involved in a WS Workstream 2 cross-community working group party that we touched on this briefly, and I never, I'm not really sure I ever understood it. I'm trying to figure out the scope of your jurisdiction, how it extends with respect to, let's say, complaints about a behavior arising under code of conduct.

I got the impression that there was some distinction to be drawn between what Ombuds office handles and what somebody else handles. And I might be wrong about this, but I thought the difference had something to do with ICANN staff itself, maybe, or maybe I had that wrong. So I guess if you could comment generally on the scope of your jurisdiction to handle behavioral complaints, and then specifically, I mean, luckily, we enjoy such a strong relationship with every member of ICANN staff we've ever met. I can't imagine it coming up.

But if we ever had a complaint about, let's say, a member of ICANN staff or a member of the Board of directors or someone who was actually involved in the ICANN community in that way, would that fall inside or outside the scope of your jurisdiction as Ombuds?

ELIZABETH FIELD: Those are great questions. And I'll answer the best that I can with the information I have available. And I guess it comes with a little bit of a partial understanding of the system. And so one thing to say is that, I don't know, we are evolving the office. We are evolving the processes in the office. So things will be kind of firmed up. I'm very familiar with the recommendations in WS2. And they look very sound to me in terms of process and making them clear and highlighting, answering some of these questions. So I don't have a full answer.

But my understanding of a couple of things that might be helpful. So one of them is a distinction between formal and informal. And so my understanding of the formal is when someone acts as a third-party decision maker and somebody else makes a determination. That is separate. Informal is when the issue rests with the individuals. In this, there's a broad scope. And so this is around problem solving. And there's quite a lot that I can do to support. And the scope is very broad. You can come to me. We can problem solve, identify options. Some of those options might be, okay, you're going somewhere else. How can I backstop or support you to follow another process?

And then the formal is there is the expected standards of behavior. And there is the anti-harassment policy. And I'm still working out how that looks in practice. But again, that will put down more firmly on paper. I think, again, the staff and community, we are looking to close that gap that's been identified as a gap. And we're looking to have a solid, I mean, we don't want there to be any gaps. We want everything to be addressed. That's the principle. And then I hope that helps answer to some extent.

JEFF OSBORN: It does. Thank you very much. Thanks for that, Liz. Any additional questions? Well, thank you very much. We look forward to best of luck in your new role. If there's anything we can do, please reach out. And good luck with it. It's quite a handful. There's a lot to do. Take care. Moving on to the draft minutes. Our first vote.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Jeff. Hello, everyone. This is Ozan. And I circulated the draft minutes from the October meeting about two weeks ago. We haven't received any requests for revisions on this draft minutes. And the action items from this meeting were to publish the minutes from September meeting and send them to caucus mailing list, which were completed.

Share the caucus membership survey results on the RSSAC mailing list. That was completed. Start the nomination period for the RSSAC chair election. Also completed. And also, to publish the RSSAC operational procedures, triple zero version nine. That's also completed. So this draft minutes are for RSSAC to approve today. And I think it's time to open it up for discussion now. If there are any questions or comments about the minutes.

JEFF OSBORN: Any questions on the minutes? Open for the vote, then. Any opposed? Anyone abstained? Passed. Thank you. Caucus membership dat.

OZAN SAHIN: Hello, everyone. This is Ozan again with 5B1, appointment of RSSAC representatives to ICANN committee excellence award selection panel. ICANN committee excellence award is an annual award given to an ICANN member or two. Typically, during the March meeting, the community forum. And what is distinct about this award is that there's a community selection panel which reviewed the nominations and then come up with the recipient of the annual award.

And there has been a recent ask to all supporting organizations and advisory committees to appoint up to two members to the selection panel by 9th of December. And there's also a request related to this ask, which is if possible, to refrain from appointing a panel member that has served in the two previous years in a row.

So we open the call for volunteers on the RSSAC caucus mailing list. And I think we have four candidates for this now. It's just this item is not for vote today. It's just informational. But there will likely be a vote around the RSSAC December meeting on this item. So if you have any questions, I'm happy to address them. Thank you. Would you like me to continue with 5C, Jeff?

Okay. Moving down to RSSAC chair election process. Again, as an update, the election process started on the 18th of October and is closing on the 18th of November. So far, we have one candidate, Jeff Osborne. And then we received a second for this nomination from Paul Wixie. And again, the nomination period will close on the 18th of November. Thank you. Any questions?

JEFF OSBORN: Just to make the brief statement, it's been an honor to serve for the last two years. And I'm allowed two terms. If you'd be willing to have me again, I would be interested in doing it. I've got the full support of my Board of directors, my family, and my employees. So I'm ready to do it again if you'd have me. Thanks.

OZAN SAHIN: Okay. Let's continue with 5D, RSSAC work plan review. The RSSAC admin committee typically reviews this work plan towards the end of the year and comes up with suggestions for RSSAC to look at. And it's also on the work plan that RSSAC reviews this work plan on an annual basis and updates this as necessary. So this year, the admin committee found some items related to the fact that RSSAC agreed to align its leadership terms around the ICANN annual general meetings. And that's why I suggested starting the leadership election period earlier in the year. That's why we highlighted some sections of this work plan that we moved earlier in the year that are related to the election timeline.

So you see under July, the Board chair, vice chair election process starts. And then what's going on? Okay. Maybe scrolling will help. Oh, Brad said I'm scrolling too fast. Okay. So in August, all right. Let's go back to July. We begin the chair, vice chair election process in July as suggested. And then in August, the selection process continues. And the target is to have the selection results in September so that the leadership transition would happen during the ICANN AGM, which typically happens in October or November.

There's also one update related to the bylaw changes that happened about a year ago about the Board confirming the appointment of RSO representatives to RSSAC. So there was a related item. Let me find it. Oh, wow. Okay. I'll refresh. Yes. In September, it says receive appointment letters from executive point of contact at RSOs and prepare, submit ICANN Board papers. So that was related to the ICANN Board confirmation of RSO appointment process. Since this is gone, we also suggested striking that. And these are mainly the updates suggested to this work plan.

So if you have any additional updates, suggestions, please work on the document at your comments, and RSSAC, again, will review adoption of the work plan in December. Any comments, questions?

KEN RENARD: We go back to the agenda. Jeff says to me. So for the security incident reporting work party, that work party met yesterday. There's some decent progress being made on the document coming down to roles and responsibilities of the incident reporting process. But an interesting comment was brought up yesterday that about essentially the recommendations that are being made.

There's potentially a lot of significant recommendations being made to ICANN, which would put a lot of this on their roles, on their responsibilities. And I don't think that that's the intent of the group. So I think we need to really work on rewording the document to make sure that this is advice to an eventual governance structure, not recommendations that ICANN complete all these tasks. So that was a good guiding comment there. So any questions or thoughts on the incident reporting work party? All right. Seeing none, then over to Duane for the job.

BRAD VERD: Sorry, I'm just going to say it again. I feel like that work party is trying to boil the ocean and create something that is perfect out of the gate. And I don't think-- I think that presents a number of different challenges, specifically the way that it's using the idea or the deliverable of the GWG or the RSSGS. I think most everybody in this group is also on the GWG, and everybody should know based upon conversations in the GWG what is being delivered or what would be delivered from the GWG would not be able to do what is in this list of recommendations coming out of this work party out of the gate. So I think that there's a real disconnect there that I feel should be thought about.

KEN RENARD: Thank you, Brad. That's very, very valuable. Over to Duane for the other work party.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, thanks. So I'm co-chairing a work party with Ray Bellis on guidelines for changing routes of addresses. This work party also met yesterday. We called kind of a little bit of a special meeting because in our draft work party documents we have a couple spots where we talk about policies and procedures relating to regional Internet registries. For example, maybe after a route server operator changes an address, maybe there's a need for that address to revert back to an RIR, or also if a new address is requested, maybe that address should come from some kind of specially designated pool of addresses.

So we invited representatives from the ASO and the RIRs to answer some very specific questions that we'd had, and they gave us some great advice. I think that session went really, really well, and we'll take our notes and the advice from those representatives to the next meeting of this work party and hopefully be able to wrap up the work party relatively soon.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Duane. I had a number of people come up to me and say that was great, good job, well done. I think having all those people in the room was really terrific exercise.

The next item is public comment proceeding, and because he's so much more on top of this, I'm going to throw Rob under the bus and talk slowly so he can catch up. I think you would introduce what we want to say or not about comments on the ICP-2 better than I.

ROBERT CAROLINA: Hi, it's Rob Carolina for the record. And ladies and gentlemen, this is one of the many joys that comes of working with Jeff, is that sometimes you're told well, it's time to swim, and without any warning. Thank you, my friend. We had this joint meeting with the ASO yesterday who are who are asked currently asking for commentary on ICP-2 updates. And obviously, I think many if not, all of you were in that meeting the other day.

But for the benefit of those who were not attending or observing who were not, the ASO's which is the club and formally the club, or the community of regional internet registries have been going through a long process of developing the next stage or refreshing updating their understanding of a policy document which explains how do you create a new regional internet registry?

And they've come up with a list of principles that spread over four pages and they're asking for commentary on that. And the question before us in this group is does RSSAC as an advisory committee want to produce comments on those principles. There may well be a good argument for RSSAC to frame some very narrowly tailored comments on those principles.

But I think the thing that we're discussing right now, it's a little bit unclear whether that's something we want to do or don't want to do.

And with that I could either throw somebody else under the bus or wait for him to volunteer what sorts of things we might want to comment on. Or I could just look at him. Yeah, Brad, if I'm going to go swimming, we're all going to get wet.

BRAD VERD: I mean, I have not looked at like what the ask for the comment is. Obviously, I've read ICP-2. I think the issue they're trying to address here is the parallels are very similar to the parallels that the GWG sits in, which was chartered essentially by this group. So I think we need to look at it through that lens and just dot our I's, cross our T's, and make sure things aren't getting off the rails anywhere.

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah, my feeling on this is why I threw it to Rob-- I 'm sorry I intended to give you warning, but come on, that's why I pay you the big bucks. I think we would be harmed by not commenting. I don't know what to comment, but I think we'd be harmed by not commenting. I don't want to let this get away, but I'm not sure what to do with it. Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here. As I mentioned in that meeting, I think what we could do at least is if they come to us with a formal request to comment, is to say that we don't object or even that we support. Because that might give them a little extra grease to get this going in other circles, so they can say, we've checked with these and these and these and RSSAC, and none of them objected to this. So that could help them a little.

JEFF OSBORN: While you're talking, is the ball in our court, or are we waiting to be asked for advice?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, clearly.

JEFF OSBORN: That is the case that we're waiting to hear from them.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm sorry. Either, I'm not sure yet, but we should, I think, contact them so that that becomes clear in which court the ball is, yeah.

BRAD VERD: My understanding, which could be wrong, is the principal's document is out for, do you strongly agree, do you strongly disagree? I think there's five different levels, right? And anybody can go in and reply to that type of thing. And then the next step is they're going to be doing a draft, some update to ICP-2, so I don't think we're currently in the position of being asked to comment on a draft yet.

Right now, they're giving us heads up of the principles that they've come up with that they are then using to draft the version two. And all this process, I think, should be familiar to all of you, because we went through something similar in the GWG.

ROBERT CAROLINA: It seems to me that, whether the time is now or later, there is scope, I think, for commentary, or where we might want to focus our effort would be on potential commentary on two issues. One of them would be to comment on anything in the principles, or indeed absent from the principles, that we feel are an important aspect of this difficult question of how does one create or indeed anti-create a regional Internet registry is something that I think we have a legitimate thing to comment upon. I suppose I have a thought of a third.

The second would be, it might be sufficient on the governance side for us, if we feel so inclined, simply to make a strong statement that, as so many others have recently, that we feel strongly that a strong and independent community of regional Internet registries continues to be an important aspect of health, to the health of the Internet infrastructure as a whole. Those two obviously fall within the governance rubric.

The third thing for us to think about, and this is something that was mentioned in the room yesterday in passing, is that each of the root server operators, of course, when we talk about our infrastructure that we rely upon, one incredibly important part of that infrastructure is a healthy regional Internet registry. The root server system doesn't work particularly well if IP addresses don't resolve properly, or if they're not pointing in the right direction.

So if there were anything in these principles that any of us felt might jeopardize the security or the stability of the, what we think of as the IP number space, or certainly the addresses that we rely upon, that would be worthy of comment if we thought there was anything like that.

JEFF OSBORN: Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, thanks for saying that, Rob. I forgot, I should have, on those same lines, on the technical side, which this group should very much enjoy, the relying party factor on the RIRs is imperative for the IP space. And with the introduction of RPKI, this relying party risk is there. It's not vaporware. And so having stable and secure regional Internet registries is imperative for the operation of that.

JEFF OSBORN: Any additional input? Do we need to do something other than just stay on top of waiting to hear from them, or do we have an action item somebody needs to take?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So the public comment is open until December 6th. So if the RSSAC wants to give comment on the principles document, they would have to draft something and get it into them by December 6th. You have basically three weeks.

BRAD VERD: Is it public comment, or is it just you agree or strongly disagree? Beyond that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It's free form as well, but it is, yeah, you can. Yeah, there is basically strongly agree, agree, and that kind of thing, disagree for every single principle. And then you can also give free form answers for each principle, or free form answers at the end.

BRAD VERD: So it isn't like, here's a document in a public comment. You normally would submit a RSSAC states whatever, whatever. This is on a per principle basis right now, correct?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah, you could do it like that. I mean, if the RSSAC wanted to, they could just write according to comments. Yeah, you guys can basically do whatever you want. But if you just want to, if you want to be-- I wouldn't say by the book, but if you just want to do precisely what the public comment asks for, you could just go down every single principle and be like disagree, strongly agree, stuff like that.

JEFF OSBORN: Lars.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, Liman here. I think we should do this. I think we should make ourselves a task to actually go through this. And I suggest we do it by having someone or maybe a small group look at what's actually out there and what they expect comments on and propose something to our lists. And then we can try to coalesce around that on the list and finally submit it as something from RSSAC as a whole, because I think that that carries more weight than the rest of us doing it individually. I would be willing to help out with that if that's.

JEFF OSBORN: Are you volunteering?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I am volunteering.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay, how many would you like to help?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Two more, I think.

JEFF OSBORN: Rob is in and Daniel. Is that all right?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent. Thank you, guys, very much. We're going to go out of order if that's all there is on this item. We're going to go up-- I'm sorry. What? I'm sorry.

ROBERT CAROLINA: Yeah, I just wanted to ask a process question. If we are preparing to make a statement perhaps a very brief statement, but nonetheless a statement as the RSSAC, do we necessarily need to feel bound by this December deadline? I mean, I can't imagine whatever this policy is, is going to be fully formed and adopted and born and approved in less than, somebody from icann.org help me, how many months are we away from this thing going into force?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So if you want it to be considered as part of their process, you have to be bound by the December 6th deadline. I mean, of course, the RSSAC can publish anything anytime it wants in this process will go on but they're going to be considering all of the comments received as this public comment proceeding, as well as there's an additional consultation going out via the NRO to all the RIR communities.

So they're going to be looking at the feedback via this and via that other one starting January and then planning based on that. So if you want this to be considered as part of that with all the other things they're getting back, yeah, you should really be bound. You should really consider yourself bound by the December 6th deadline.

ROBERT CAROLINA: Okay, so I'll put a bit of spin on that in return. It sounds like we should aim to have something concluded and in their hands in that timeframe, which I think is achievable so long as we keep it short and to the point. However, since we are RSSAC, we can publish anything anytime we like as a recommendation to the community and maybe it'll be ignored and maybe it'll be accepted. Something like that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I mean, that's true because they still have to write the actual update to ICP-2 and that's going to take probably at least a year. So during that process, this is not going to be the last time that the RSSAC will have an opportunity to comment on this document, I'm sure.

ROBERT CAROLINA: That is exactly what I was hoping I would hear. Okay, thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Brad, is that an old hand?

BRAD VERD: No, yeah, I don't think this is going to be the last time we have a chance to comment, but I mean, they shared with us the timeline on Sunday in our meeting and it's aggressive, especially when you lay it up next to the GWG or the work we've been doing there. So, I mean, I guess what I'm saying is, I don't think you should miss the December 6th date if you really want to say something, that's all.

KEN RENARD: Yeah, just a point of procedure. Ideally, we would have, if we want this to come from RSSAC, have it ready for the RSSAC monthly meeting on the 3rd of December for us to review, vote on, and all collectively agree to. That was just a few days earlier.

JEFF OSBORN: Are we getting nods from the new committee? Is that reasonable? Okay, great. Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So, based on Ken's comment, if we want to have something ready to be voted upon for the December 3rd meeting, it needs to be ready by November 26th. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's totally fair, and I think we should get the first stab at this week already. So, I mean, we're not talking about hours upon hours of work, are we? Because then I need someone else to volunteer.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. All right, is that it on the ICP-2? Naveed has asked to get to the top of the list because he's got a time commitment. Naveed, sorry, I've been trying to rush in my head, but it's hard to do when the whole herd of cats has its own ideas, and this is Istanbul, so we have to listen to the cats. Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Yeah, thank you, Jeff. Hello, everyone. I hope you can hear me.

JEFF OSBORN: Yes.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: All right, so, yeah, I thought about taking this opportunity to talk to the RSSAC group about an update on CIP, and here's an update from PHR. So, both I am representing RSSAC on these both important groups. So, while CIP is concluding, PHR is just being launched, and there's a strong relation between both of them, as you see. So, next slide, please.

As CCG, the CIP-CCG is tasked with the four objectives, mainly revolving around the recommendation 3.6 of the ATRT3, and I list them just as a recall. And we have exchanged a few remarks and comments on that. Generally, to come up with a continuous improvement program for all organizations that is expected to replace the normal organization reviews that we are mandated to hold from the bylaws of ICANN. We are going towards replacing those organizational bylaws to the CIP program subject to the Board approval. Next slide, please.

Just as a recall, CIP-CCG actually had 23 substructures and structures participating from different parts of ICANN. We have around a total of

22 substructures and structures, and 23 of them are participating in that. So, it was a big group, right? These were the end of diverse opinion and their own priorities, etc.

So, these were the main considerations that the group had. We needed to have flexibility while maintaining some kind of uniformity in the framework. The CIP process has to be efficient, right? It has to be not reinventing the wheel and building on the existing work, taking advantage of that. Plus, it should help us improving or identifying those areas for improvement for each SO/AC, NomCom, and the substructures. Next slide, please.

Here we are after a number of deliberations. These principles, these five principles, I have presented a few times already, but this is now the final drafted principles that is agreed upon by the group. There have been a number of changes, specifically around Principle 4 and five because of difference of opinion that different structures or substructures have.

One of the main bones of contention is the word accountable in Principle 4. Some substructures were not agreeing upon having the word, the strong word of accountable. They would rather prefer to have some light words like adheres to or something like that, but with majority the CIP-CCG decided to keep the word accountable since it is in line with the with IANA transition and with the bylaws, and with ATRT recommendation.

The other thing that has been extended previously to Principle 4, and then it was actually removed from this Principle 4 is that there was an extension phrase which says that it should be in the benefit of the overall internet community. And then the group debated on that and finally removed that part from Principle 4. And then there is now an agreement that this in the benefit of overall internet community should be rather be not a recommendation, rather should be suggested to include in the assessment and not directly in the principles.

As far as the Principle 5 is concerned, there were a few changes about that. Some were debating about there is an additional word you see that was incorporated because of some structures coming up with that, that is bottom-up, although this is inherent. But they explicitly mentioned this ICANN bottom-up multi-stakeholder model now.

And actually, some of the groups had the opinion that the first half of the sentence actually implicitly goes with the second half of the sentence and we might not need the effectiveness of the ICANN bottom-up multi-stakeholder model at all because we are saying they collaborate and to further the mission. And one of the missions of ICANN is the bottom-up stakeholder model effectiveness. But anyways, the community then decided to fix these principles as is.

So why I'm presenting these principles again because the community has finally drafted the draft framework, which is to be put to public comments at the end of ICANN81 meetings and all the community will be invited to put comments on that, including RSSAC if we want to. So that draft framework actually composed of 9 to 10 pages. It includes the principles, but not the indicators and the criteria that we made for and we did that exercise.

But thankfully out of those 23 groups participating, we are one of the four groups whose work has been put in the public comment draft as an illustrative example. So in the public comment draft, there will be a link to our work that we did as one of the four groups. The other groups include APRALO, I think, and IAAC and one more that I am not recalling that. Now also it mentions other things like participation from different groups. So RSSAC has 100% attendance to that. So it is actually a whole framework that invites community to comment on. Next slide, please.

Sorry, my voice is not 100%. So what are the next steps? As I said, the next step, the first step would be, it would be put for public comment right after the meeting. So it includes one of the four illustrative examples. RSSAC is one of them. The process of CIP is expected to kickstart from June 2025 onward, subject to the public comments that we receive and subject to the adoption by ICANN because it requires change in the bylaws and the Board has to agree upon along with community. So each CIP cycle will be supposed to comprise of a three-year span that is divided in three phases, which I explain in the next slide.

These are the three phases that are part of the public comment document. The first year or the first phase is named as assessment and prioritization phase. It will include the assessing the work of the SO/AC, NomCom or substructures as per the criteria and indicators that the community or that group comes up with. It includes having the survey. This survey, it will be a survey of three years. So if we start in June 2025, we are actually including all the things from 2022 to 2025 cycle. So we might have to include things from the past. And later on from 2025 to 2028 will be the next phase and so on and so forth.

The second year will be including, getting out the prioritized improvement work by each SO/AC, how they come up with the improvement task and all that to feed into the process. And the final year will be the reporting year or the reporting phase, which includes publishing and reporting the findings and action taken by the SO/AC on that. So this is super important because these outcomes, these reporting will actually serve as an input to the next three cycle period will start. Next slide please.

As I said there is a strong relation between CIP process and the holistic review, and just two months ago we had the pilot holistic review team starting its work. Actually, it's a not even one month. This pilot holistic review is expected to make the guidelines and considerations for the holistic review to take place once that CIP process for each SO/AC is done.

They will consider the inputs coming from all SO/ACs and this holistic review team will analyze that and will decide on the outcomes, will comment on allies around these four objectives that I listed here. So I don't want to read them. But one of them is to see if SO/AC is meeting its purpose and if we have a continuous improvement program working, and if we are following good practices and so on and so forth. Next slide please maybe the last one.

Here is the update from the pilot holistic review. The task is to frame and draft the considerations that holistic review has to include going forward. We had a couple of meetings already. One of them is in engagement with the CIP. So CIP is different team, and then PHR. Luckily, I'm on both of them, that helps me understand that more than maybe someone who is serving on one of them. Currently, there is a strong engagement in this meeting between the CIP group and the PHR team because of the objectives that I mentioned. They have to take the input from CIP.

Right now, the status is that where we have come up with the four deliverables for the PHR process and the final report is expected to be concluding by December 2025 or January 2026. And I think I'm done with that. If there is any question, I can take that. Thank you. Thanks for the opportunity.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks Naveed. Any questions? And coincidentally the next item is NextGen. Naveed.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Actually, it has to be a pilot holistic review I think, because NextGen I'm not currently on NextGen. NextGen process for me starts from ICANN82. So this is a short report from for me. So currently for this meeting Ali is still serving as the mentor on NextGen. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: All right, thanks for your time, Naveed. I appreciate it.

NAVEED BIN RAIS: Before I move on that my last thing would be like I would really want RSSAC to consider whether we are going to public comment on the CIP process because this is important for us as well. How do we feel about being accountable or words like this. Do we want to expand it to larger ICANN community or want to stick to the ICANN and things like that. If we have something like that, I would encourage all RSSAC members and even the caucus members to read through that draft framework and then we can decide whether we need a public comment on that or not. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks again Naveed. Moving to chair and vice chair. The only thing I wanted to mention was most of you probably knew it we culminated the way too long process of getting messaging together and had a presentation of the GAC on Monday that I thought went pretty well. It was what we were trying to accomplish. So thank you to everybody who put all the time in on that effort. I'm meeting with Tripti this afternoon at 545. If anybody has anything you'd like me to transmit to the chair let me know, I'll do it. And other than that, thanks, it's been a good week. Ken. Nothing from vice. So, Wes.

WES HARDAKER: Thanks, Jeff, and by the way, your GAC comment just triggered the second thing that I was going to talk to you about earlier, so remind me later. So first off apologies for delay in my arrival. We thought we picked a restaurant that looked like it was going to be fast. It was not, even though it wasn't very crowded, maybe that was the problem. So anyway, I can go into greater details on any of these. There's a number of bullets I'm going to read across.

Starting with prep week, a couple of weeks ago was always a very busy time. The Board tries to attend all of the prep week sessions and it's a lot of Zoom meetings. And there was lots of prep of course going on by the Board for this meeting that includes we're constantly looking at the strategic plan which has been released in part for people to read and comment on. And then the review of the ICANN risk framework is also under serious consideration at the moment.

There's been lots of discussions around the various resolutions related to TLDs. Something that RSSAC doesn't need to be directly concerned with but minutes will come out from our Board meeting the other day where we did make some resolutions related to TLDs. I try and stick to things that are exact like guilty related that we actually have care about. Most of the time though, even the decisions that are made are not something that we-- it's either in the route or it's not right.

The next round speaking of which, does continue to be an extremely hot topic regards to especially the complexity of what is an acceptable string, how do we handle contention sets and the applicant support program to help those that are in underserved regions that probably can't stand up one on their own? I don't know if everybody here is familiar with the RDRS system.

So one of the things that came out of the withdrawal of information from WHOIS and RDAP with respect to being able to contact domain owners or figure out who the domain owner has always been a problem.

A year ago, the RDRS system was stood up as an experimental system for basically managing contacts between law enforcement researchers and anybody else that needed to know who a domain owner is, and it acts as a ticketing forwarding system more than anything else.

We've gotten a lot of feedback on that after releasing surveys. We've looked at the data, we held a feedback session that I actually ran two weeks ago. The biggest takeaway that we've heard if I was going to speak at a high level, is we've generally heard it's not perfect. It would be hard to create a perfect one. It's better than what we had before. So don't turn it off and ideally it really needs an authentication mechanism which will be very difficult to build to say this agency or whatever that's requesting data is entrusted in some way by somebody somewhere hence the reason it's difficult.

Also, the new ombudsman has been hired and it's Liz Field. She is here this week if you run into her. Oh, she was here earlier. Okay so you already know that. You probably also know that Curtis was here at the beginning of the week. He is certainly very familiar with the RSOs having been one. He is a well-integrated with the tech field over his career, I think he will fit in nicely with this group.

Hopefully, some of you had a chance to talk with him this week before he left. And his official start date I want to say is December 6th or 8th or-- 6th, okay. So that's coming up. And I think everybody is very much looking forward to getting his feet on the ground. Remember that he will have a transition period. There's been a lot of work by the transition team to make that possible and give him some ramp up time, but he's very excited on getting started. Any questions?

BRAD VERD: I think remember. Y es who creates the risk assessment document that you mentioned? It was discussed in the Board but where does it stem from? Who creates it and what's the process around that?

WES HARDAKER: I mean the Board has the responsibility of-- there is a Board risk committee that has a responsibility of overlooking ICANN organizations entire risk profile, and that includes everything from technical to-- there's a lot of topics that is being-- we have a regular process of reviewing that on a regular basis. It's a multi-year process and that really has only been undertaken for the last year, I think, is when it started. It might be two years. I need to review a timeline. But it all that type of stuff to some level will go to some level of public release and comment but not at the detailed level of course. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks Wes and as always thanks for the difficult task of liaising with the Board. We really appreciate it.

WES HARDAKER: Here one point I wanted to compliment Naveed. He's taken on a couple of very difficult roles too so my gosh Naveed thank you so much for the dedication you put into those roles. That is not an easy set of stuff to do.

JEFF OSBORN: It's a lot of work. We appreciate it. Next up either Daniel or Hiro on the CSC.

HIRO HOTTA: Yes. Hiro will report about the Customer Standing Committee. After the last RSSAC meeting, CSC had two monthly meetings and PTI performance on naming function against SLA, but not 100%. 98.4% of both September and October and ranked satisfactory. This means one out of 64 metrics exceeded the threshold in both months. A September case was that temporary technical issue prevented successful transmission of the test result to the results collection system. And automatic rerun of the test 15 minutes later succeeded that time. So it's not it seems not the PTI issue.

And October case was that in updating labeled generation rule set in IDM practices repository, IDM repository, the process was stalled waiting for an update to the root zone database on who could authorize the update. The elapsed time was just longer than the SLA threshold seven days. And this is also seems not the PTI issue. So causes were investigated by PTI and the failures to meet the SLA were both regarded as not serious and not continuously occurring. So that's the result. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Hiro. Question?

KEN RENARD: Yeah, question. So the anything below 100% it's usually something very minor. That's a web server couldn't get this so it was delayed by three seconds. There was an attempt to update some of the SLAs to take some of the risk of the external risks out of those measurements. How's that process going about updating the SLAs?

HIRO HOTTA: I believe that they're not the SLA but how to measure the SLA result will be changed as a process.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you. Liman, IFR2.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. The IFR2 has now concluded going through the IANA contract and the IANA statement of work and that generated a good number of comments and observations that we are now trying to condensate to see if what comes out of that process means that we want to suggest changes to either the contract or the statement of work. Most of the things were nice to have this would be good if a future version of the document had this instead or came from it at this angle instead. But I can't remember anything that led to comments of the type we really need to change this. But that process is undergoing right now and we will have a meeting tomorrow here at this conference.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. RZERC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So RZERC. Again, I reported last time nothing much has happened. It's a very slow-going committee. The only thing that I know it's ongoing is the actual-- what's the right phrase here? We need to have a new chair, elect a new chair because the old one has timed out. We are in the situation where a new one has been, not appointed, nominated thank you and we need to officially accept that person as the new chair, because we have only one nominee. So it is a small and easy process but we have to conduct an actual meeting for doing that. And I think that is upcoming. And we're looking at Steve in the corner. So yeah, we'll be coming in the foreseeable future.

JEFF OSBORN: All right thank you Liman. Daniel. Oops, I'm sorry. Brad.

BRAD VERD: It was the last meeting I asked this question I'll ask it again do we know who the nominees are?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Tilt. Yes, please see Steve if you—yeah, that's right.

BRAD VERD: Okay. So it was stated that you didn't know if you could share it last time so that's why I asked who it was. So it's Geoff Huston.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I do know now but I can't share it, but I forgot the name. Sorry.

BRAD VERD: I just want to remind everybody that RSSAC made a statement to keep RZERC in check that it should be a no op group, and so quiet is good. We emphasize that want that to change after the chair changes.

JEFF OSBORN: To be clear, did I hear it, Geoff Huston is the nominee? Okay, thanks. Thanks, Liman.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Some clarification; is he the only one? I think so, yeah.

BRAD VERD: Yes, he's the only nominee, yes.

JEFF OSBORN: The betting is not interesting at this point. Daniel your card says IETF but I've always said IAB, so I'm just going to say Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, that's me then. So the IETF has the nominee, I mean they were recruiting some IAB persons now. So I pointed the need to have someone that is familiar with ICANN or at least understand what the root servers are. That's what I basically did with the IETF.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, so let me add there's a proposal, and so remember that SAC113 produced a document that created .internal that was improved that will never be added to the root. There is now a draft in the IETF that has been proposed to DNS op, it's unclear exactly where it's going to go through to put .internal on us, potentially the special interest. Paul, would you like to take over?

DNS op doesn't have a conclusion yet but it was proposed on Friday last week to potentially put it through as a DNS op document. There is not consensus on exactly where it will go but one of the points is it needs to be listed in special use. There's people that would like to potentially have it listed in the root zone with a signature or there's people that would like to have it not listed in explicitly with an NSEC record and things like that.

It's just be aware that it's upcoming, and one of the threads that has come out about it is should we list it with an alternate record so that it exists but doesn't have a delegation? So could you put an h-info or d name would be one of the other things or something else that that makes it so that there is no delegation and the advantage of that being is that people will be less confused maybe. There's obviously complexities.

The big thing for a root server perspective is that it would be another type in the root zone that we don't have in the root zone yet. We just added zone MD. It would be akin to that but with an existing record, I don't know text or something else. D name would be the biggest one that I don't think people consider. Note that IANA doesn't have the infrastructure and Verisign doesn't have the infrastructure yet as the RZM. I shouldn't speak for Duane to actually do that. So it's a longer development process than just we can do this tomorrow.

JEFF OSBORN: Any other questions or input? Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Wes. A lot of what you just said I had not heard before. I think some of those ideas are not maybe in Kim's or their draft. So these sounds like maybe hallway conversations that you've been having with people.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, a lot of hallway conversations but I want people to be aware. Because I would like you to participate in the conversations as an RSO.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, okay. Thanks. I just wanted to clarify that there really hasn't been like-- that has been formalized in any way in any documents or any requests to anybody at this point. It's all just sort of rumors, I guess.

WES HARDAKER: There's a lot of brainstorming happening, and it's unclear what direction it will go but we should be aware of it.

JEFF OSBORN: Wear a raincoat or bring an umbrella rainstorms. Russ, SSAC.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Jeff. We have the DNSSEC and security workshop tomorrow. The somewhat unusual schedule is it's split by the plenary session, but I hope a lot of folks will be able to attend and that it's a useful session. And that's really all I have today. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you very much, Russ. James, IANA.

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. Two things from me. First, the key ceremony to sign the record set which will introduce the new keys key that was cleared last month. So we're on track to introduce that new case key into the root zone January the 11th. And second, I've just lost my notes here. Here it is. So IANA is undergoing its, going through its five-year planning cycle in alignment with ICANN or PTI, I should probably say. A couple of dates for everyone to be aware of. Strategic plan opens up for public comment at the end of November and closes 29th of January.

And the annual operating plan and budget opens in mid-December closing in mid-February. So sort of two months on each one of those. Obviously, RSSAC's input is desired in those two documents. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, James. We are critically out of time so I want to skip ahead to something because I really would be remiss if we missed out on it. Those of us who have had the pleasure over the last few years of working with Steve are really, really going to miss his quiet knowledge leadership and all the rest of it. I learned very quickly that Steve is one of those people who doesn't say much and he doesn't say it loudly, but when he starts talking, I shut up and lean in because I'm going to learn something. So I will miss your quiet judgment and wisdom and leadership and the fabulous team you've put together. Thank you very much. Best of luck in your new ventures. They're all very fortunate to get you. If we want to try to get through quickly let's get the rest of this. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Nothing to report.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. GWG. Brad doesn't want to say anything.

BRAD VERD: I still advocate that we remove this.

JEFF OSBORN: Erum. Oh, Erum is not here. Erum is working really, really hard on the NomCom. If you see her thank her for her time. Gaurav. I don't think you reported in. Abdulkarim? Ali? Liman? Which of your responsibilities? Second IANA naming function review, IFR. You already did that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's already up there.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. Thank you, everybody. I apologize for being a few minutes late. Thank you very much. See you next month.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]