
ICANN81 | AGM – RSSAC Caucus Meeting
Tuesday, November 12, 2024 - 15:00 to 16:00 TRT

OZAN SAHIN: Hello and welcome to the RSSAC Caucus Meeting. My name is Ozan and I'm a participation manager for the session. Please note that the session is being governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Committed Anti-Harassment Policy and is recorded. 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 Zoom. 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. I will now hand the floor to Jeff Osborne.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Ozan, and thank you everyone for coming to this meeting of the RSSAC Caucus. Let's open with attendance, and if I understand correctly, we're going to just go around and state our name and affiliation, starting with Mr. Carolina.

ROBERT CAROLINA: Robert Carolina, ISC.

AMIR QAYYUM: Amir Qayyum, Capital University.

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.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Lars-Johan Liman, Netnode.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Abdulkarim Oloyede.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro Hotta from WIDE and JPRS.

WES HARDARKER: Wes Hardaker, USC/ISI.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Daniel Migault, IAB Liaison.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Paul Hoffman, RSSAC Caucus.

ANDREW MCCONAICHE: Andrew McConachie, ICANN staff.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane Wessels from VeriSign.

KARL REUSS: Karl Reuss, University of Maryland.

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard, ARL, RSSAC.

JEFF OSBORN: Jeff Osborne, ISC, RSSAC Chair. And in the back, there you go.

YAZID AKANHO: Yazid, ICANN staff and RSSAC Caucus member.

SHINTA SATO: Shinta Sato, JPRS.

DAVE KNIGHT: Dave Knight, UltraDNS.

SACHCHIDANAND UPADHYAY: Sachchidanand Upadhyay, RSSAC Caucus.

EDDY WINSTEAD: Eddy Winstead, ISC.

HUGH DIXON: Hugh Dixon, Nominet.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible – 02:23], JPRS.

TIMOTHY SHORTALL: Tim Shortall, D-root.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you. And I'd like to go to the Zoom room as well, see who's there.

RAY BELLIS: Ray Bellis.

OZAN SAHIN: Was that Ray Bellis?

RAY BELLIS: Yes, it was, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Ray. And we have Arjun Sharma, as I see. And Dessalegn Yehuala and Rolla Hassan, Hafiz Farooq, John Augenstein, John Bond, Kazunori Fujiwara, Kevin Hildebrand, Kunle Olorundare, Peter De Vries, Peter Martin, Naveed Bin Rais, Ray Bellis has just introduced himself. Robert Story, Russ Mundy, Shinta Sato, Wataru Ogai. And these are the RSSAC Caucus members in the Zoom room.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Ozan. It's really impressive the way you can pick the members out of a list. I'm always amazed at how well you do that. I'd like, again, thank you all for coming. And we'd like to introduce, we have three new RSSAC Caucus members. So, welcome aboard Afshan Abdul, Darren Kara, and Dr. Rolla Hassan. Welcome aboard.

OZAN SAHIN: Rolla, I see you're in the Zoom room. Would you like to do a brief introduction, if you're available?

ROLLA HASSAN: Hello, do you hear me?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, we can.

ROLLA HASSAN: Yes, good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Greetings from here, from Cairo, Egypt. I'm Rolla Hassan. I'm a Ph.D. in Management of Technology, Nile University. I'm from NTRA, Egypt. My position is a Manager of International Regulation at NTRA, the strategic sector. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you very much, Dr. Hassan. Afshan, would you like to say hello and introduce yourself? Okay, sorry about that. I don't see Darren either. I misunderstood. She dropped. That's what I thought. Okay, this is the agenda. It's in front of you. It's a pretty normal agenda for the caucus meeting. I don't see anything outstanding. Do we have any additions? We had a late addition from Duane that already made it in. Anyone else? All right. I believe that takes us to RSSAC000. Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONAICHE: Yeah, so this will be just a quick update on recent publications. The only publication the RSSAC has had since the last RSSAC Caucus meeting is RSSAC000V9. The RSSAC reviews its operational procedures every year and produces a new version if it feels necessary. In this Version 9, really the only updates are previously the outgoing liaison to the CSC and RSERC were required to be RSSAC members. And in version 9, this was changed to allow them to be RSSAC Caucus members. This aligns them with the other outgoing liaisons with the exception of the liaison to the ICANN Board. There were a couple other changes with regards to timing, but the liaison change is really the only significant change. So, I think back to you, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Andrew. Next, we'll get an update from the membership committee. We have two items. Ozan is going to cover the membership survey, and then I'll make a statement about the statements of interest and keeping them up to date. Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Jeff. Hello, everyone. This is Ozan Sahin. Thank you to all RSSAC Caucus members who participated in the 2024 RSSAC Caucus membership survey. This year we received 31 responses, and last year that was 36, in 2023. So, some general themes coming out of the survey, we had 97 respondents who participated in RSSAC Caucus members previously. This number was 92%. There's a slight increase in how the respondents were familiar with the RSSAC in a sense. 87% of the respondents would like to keep current sequence of RSSAC Caucus meetings, and that was 96% in 2023. And 90% of the respondents participated in an RSSAC Caucus work party. And we see a slight increase in this account as well, and that number was 81% in 2023. And all of the respondents indicated that they would like to continue as a member of the RSSAC Caucus.

If you would like to see the results, a comparison over the years, and see each question and look at the results, I just talked about the number of responses we received, and you can see how this changed over the four years. This is regarding the question whether the respondents participated in an RSSAC Caucus meeting previously. We see this number jump back up to 84% this year. Indicating that there were some familiar respondents this year.

Meeting frequency, keeping the current sequence got popular again this year with 81% people choosing this response. In terms of keeping which meeting many RSSAC Caucus should look at to meet, 96% wanted to keep the current venues this year. And then we asked

whether the respondent participated in a work party previously, and 90% said they did.

In terms of the contribution to the work party, the most popular response was that the respondent participated in discussions and then reviewed text. The number of respondents who wrote text remained about the same. The number who acted as a work party leader, again, remained about the same. We asked if the contribution to the work party was difficult or not. So, here, nobody thought it was very easy. So, 50% of the respondents thought that was-- okay, thank you. So, thank you, Jeff, for correcting this. So, 4% actually thought it was very easy this year, 0% coming from 2021. So, 36% thought it was easy, whereas 50% thought it was, they were neutral. And then 10% said it was complicated, whereas nobody thought it was very complicated.

And then if they didn't participate in RSSAC Caucus activities, we asked what the reason would be. At this time in 2024, 53% had no time to contribute. That was the most popular reason. And then we see with 33%, no interest in topic, and 27%, no technical experience, and 20% that goes to other sections. But one interesting finding is that there was no reference to communication barriers this year. Although we received a response indicating communication barrier in the free-form text, which I will discuss later on. And everybody wanted to remain as a caucus member. We had one member wanting to be removed from caucus last year out of this survey.

So, these are the results for each response. As I said, we also have some free-form text responses, which the membership committee discussed.

So, you can see the responses here on this form. But I would like to highlight some of the themes coming from these responses here again. So, regarding the difficulty of contributing to RSSAC Caucus work party. Again, the time zone issue is raised here. Some members indicated that they were unable to contribute because of the timing of the meeting. And one suggestion that came for this question was that a better summary of and actions, action items that summarizes the RSSAC Caucus and work party meetings. So, especially the work party meetings. The suggestion says it would be better, easier to catch up if a summary would be provided.

Also, one thing that was highlighted in these comments was that there is already a group of people within RSSAC Caucus who know each other and get along well. And it's not easy for newcomers to get into this group and discussions that are already being held. So, that's also another comment received.

One suggestion with respect to the frequency of the meetings came and the caucus membership committee spent some time on that. Instead of having an RSSAC Caucus meeting at every even numbered IETF meeting, the suggestion is to have one RSSAC Caucus meeting at an IETF meeting each year. So, caucus membership committee found this suggestion interesting and also wanted to bring it to the discussion of the entire RSSAC Caucus because they actually liked the suggestion.

And then, there were additional suggestions with respect to the upcoming work or potential work items. A suggestion on studying existing RSSAC metrics needing an operational focus. So, another

suggestion that RSSAC047 may need a revisit. Some suggestions to have presentations related to RSS traffic engineering deployment strategy.

And I see hands are being raised in the Zoom. Do you think I should finish this and go to questions, Jeff, or do you think? Naveed, please go ahead if you would like to make a comment about any of the points that have been raised so far.

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Yeah, thank you, Ozan. There are two remarks from my side. One is, I find it somewhat interesting and to be considered by RSSAC to, for example, the last of the question, would you like to continue as RSSAC members? We get 31 responses. All of them are interested and that is perfectly okay. It could help us eliminating by volunteering those who don't find interesting.

But I would ask myself, what about those who did not even participate in the survey that is held once a year and requires 5 minutes to 10 minutes to participate and they don't even want to fill that kind of thing. Maybe they have no interest left in RSSAC or its activities. So, how do we interpret that? Should we say that we need to engage with them to get to know whether they want to continue as a member of RSSAC Caucus or we need to find some other way? That's my first remark.

My second point is about the reason of not participation in RSSAC activities. And I remember I made this comment last year as well, when we were in Hamburg and such survey was posted. I understand that we

need to compare the result from the last year, but I think at some point we need to change the question. Because the question include an option that you have no technical experience, yet you are a member of RSSAC, right? I find it interesting that 27% of people, which is around 8 out of 31, say that they have no technical experience and they still are RSSAC Caucus members. And 50%, more than 50% of them say that they have no time to work, right?

So, if this is the same pattern over the years and maybe the same that we find it over the years, maybe we need to reflect on that and think about our strategy of maybe tweaking the question or maybe engaging with them to get more information about what do they expect and what do they want as RSSAC Caucus members. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Naveed. Jeff, did you want to respond?

JEFF OSBORN:

Yeah, let me respond to that. Naveed, I'm actually the chair of the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee and four of us, Ken, Dave Lawrence, Shailesh, I can't remember his last name, and Tata, the four of us spend a lot of time every month reviewing applications, and we are pretty tough graders. If you apply and your statement of interest doesn't show that you have a lot of hands-on experience with DNS or some very specific thing that is slightly different, like a state-level use of diplomacy to do some DNS great thing, you don't get in. We ask for more information in the cases where we don't think there's a strong

enough candidate. I think less than half of the applications are accepted by themselves.

And then when we feel like we still don't think they have enough technical chops, we'll write-- and we've offered a new thing this year. We have a mailing list only membership where you're invited to sit in on the caucus but not contribute and you get to be part of the mailing list. We felt like we needed to be inclusive, but this is a member of experts. This is a member of experts who do hard work. So, I wonder whether there's a communication thing missing or something, because the idea that anywhere near 30% of the people in the caucus are technically not capable, it kind of escapes me.

The other one is about people not attending. We paused briefly during COVID, but another thing the membership committee spends time on is ensuring that if you have not attended a meeting, contributed to a meeting, it's all on a scoring system, you get a note asking, are you no longer interested? Because if you're interested in staying, here's what you need to do to get back in the good graces. Otherwise, we politely let you know it's been fun, but you're literally no longer a member.

So, I think we have a fairly rigorous process in place and I think Ozan and I can go take a look at the data, but I think it might be more misunderstanding than fact. We are very rigorous about who gets in and then you have to perform to stay in. Does that help? And I think Ozan is going to clarify because I never get everything right the first time.

OZAN SAHIN: No, Jeff, I had no intention to clarify actually. I think Amir is not able to raise his hand, but he would like to chime in. So, I was checking the queue. And Amir, please go ahead.

AMIR QAYYUM: Thank you. Amir Qayyum here. You mentioned that there was a suggestion to reduce the number of meetings from even number IETF meetings to once in a year. And then you said that it was accepted or considered. My question is that whether the agenda was thin and we don't have too much things to discuss, that way we are reducing the number of meetings, or the attendance is very low. What's the reason behind?

JEFF OSBORN: This is probably still an open item. I don't think we've made a solid decision. For me personally, we've been doing a lot of talking about the cadence. And cadence is an interesting word. But the idea is how frequently we have meetings of things. For instance, RSSAC is not meeting with the board this time. We realized, you know what, if we have to meet three times a year, it's very expensive putting all of these people together in a room doing things. And so, we made the step not to. We're not meeting with the SSAC, for instance, at this meeting.

So similarly, we thought when you do every other IETF, do we have enough to use the time well or would once a year make more sense? I'm wondering whether we shouldn't, in hindsight, take credit for this being a budget saving mechanism, which is not the idea. It was just easier to

remember. We do this once a year for IETF. We do this once a year for ICANN. That's where the thought came from. But again, any discussion or input, I think, is still interesting. We're still trying to figure out how best to serve. It's such a problem, because if the world was perfect, everyone in the caucus would get tickets and hotels to everything. And that doesn't work. Does that help? Oh, I'm sorry. Duane, hand up. No, Wes is first. I'm sorry, Wes.

OZAN SAHIN:

Duane can go first if he likes. Fine. Go ahead, Duane. Duane.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay, sure. This is Duane. A couple of points. So, I was going to say the same thing that Naveed said about the response rate of the survey. And I wondered if the membership committee had considered something like completion of the survey as a requirement to continue in the caucus or something like that. You don't have to answer that right now, but that's just an idea that I had.

Along the lines of changing the schedule at the ITF meetings, one thing I worry about there is that I think, and maybe someone can correct me, often the first meeting of the year is always in Asia, the second one's always in Europe, the third one's always in North America. So, you would be sort of biasing that a little bit, I think.

JEFF OSBORN: That is a really good point I had not thought of, Duane. That's really a big deal. Wes?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Actually, Duane asked if someone could correct. I don't believe that that's correct. I think that is a pattern that has happened, but I don't think it is an intentional pattern. And I know there was discussion about mixing it up because some are in Europe every year, sort of. Yeah.

JEFF OSBORN: That's a good point. Because the spring one is always for my birthday, and I've had my birthday at IETF in Chicago, Prague, and Japan. So, okay, good point. Wes? Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Just with the cycles, there are strong patterns, even though it's not always the rule.

WES HARDAKER: The LLC is sort of responsible for making decisions on where they can book venues within the IETF, and that is subject to contracts. It is subject to-- we try and do three a year in different places. There is no requirement that they be done exactly in the same, but it does absolutely end up on a pattern all of the time, and that's very visible when you look at the sites.

But what I was going to say was actually a couple of things. I mean, one option is we could go to one physical and one virtual or something like that so that we actually pull in more people. We don't hold many virtual caucus meetings, and we could adapt to that. With respect to-- Sorry, I'm pulling on like three threads for the past five minutes. With respect to the members' technical skills, I agree that I think that we have always looked at, do they have the requirements to actually serve in the committee? So, it's very interesting that some now feel that they don't. And I actually wonder if once you get inside, it's a lot more technical than you were envisioning, right? We dive into deep rabbit holes sometimes in this group.

Let me finish with one more, and then we'll go on. So, the last one was about-- It's interesting that people say they have a difficulty getting started. That's understandable. One of the things I think we should do for our future survey is ask for suggestions. I would love to get some feedback on what do they think would improve or-- Unfortunately, they're the ones that most likely know once they've figured out how to spin up, how did they do it, and how could we make use of their knowledge of coming in?

JEFF OSBORN:

That's all really good information. And I'm not padding the current membership committee on the back, but literally, for four and a half years, I know we've made the conscious decision, let's be hard about this. And before that, there was a lot more of an inclusivity tendency. So, that's why. I don't know what the whole pool looks like, but I know

what the last four classes looked like, if you know what I mean. So, it would be interesting to go back and look. Which leads to, if we're done with the membership part. Let's go Rob and Naveed first, and then I'm going to close the queue.

ROBERT STORY:

Yes, thank you. Just following up on the suggestion earlier of linking continued membership to response to the survey form, I'm thinking two things. One, perhaps add a question to the survey form that just says, do you wish to continue to be a member of the RSSAC Caucus? And then tell people that the answer's possibilities are yes, yes I do, or no I don't.

But tell people, if you don't answer affirmatively yes, then perhaps give them one follow-up and say, you didn't return this, so it doesn't look like you want to be. Just find a way to push it into an annual opt-in to put more onus on. Because I know that I've been a member of committees on a couple of other organizations that have nothing to do with ICANN. And I occasionally get emails from them, and I ask myself, am I still a member of that? And I do wonder if perhaps sometimes some of these folks just end up getting carried along. So, that's idea one.

And the second one, why do I have a feeling I've said this before? And why do I have a feeling there's a reason we don't do it? And that is, would it be possible to just hang a specific term on admission, let's say three, four, or five years long? Give people a good long time to run up and get familiar with. And then at the end of that, actually ask people,

now that you've gotten to the end of that three, four, five-year period, please reapply for another period of membership.

Now, that obviously puts more strain on the membership committee. But it sounds like the membership committee is already doing a lot of effort to look for people who are, let's say, not participating. I'm wondering if that might be a way to aid the process of figuring out who's really serious about participating and who's not.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thank you, Rob. Naveed?

NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Thanks, Jeff. I just I'm curious about knowing whether membership committee considers adding new questions or updating the questions in the survey. It is good that we get a comparison from the past. We have a comparison over four years. But it would also be good if every year we introduce some new question or some modification of an old question, which might not allow us to compare from previous. But we go towards an improvement in the questions, like these kinds of issues that we are having. So at some point, maybe if membership committee can consider adding something to the survey or updating. I don't know how it works. So just a suggestion. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thank you, Naveed. I'm going to move to the second half of section 5A and go to 2, because I think it addresses both questions. About the

adding questions thing, every year we have the survey and the question comes up, should we change and add them? I've got to say, my training is in economics. And longitudinal studies are valuable to the degree that you're asking the same thing.

So, I have a real tendency to push back for changing questions just for the sake of changing questions, because I think longitudinal data with the same question is a valuable thing. So, it's simply a prejudice of mine. I'll take any input. But that's why we don't randomly just change questions. I think the data is more valuable.

So, from the discussion on step 1, I think I'm going to change slightly what I'm going to say in step 2. We are intending to add a requirement that everybody update their statement of interest on an annual basis. And I think this is a really good time to say, while we're at it, we're going to enforce that you complete a survey. So hadn't thought of that before, but it's a really good idea. So, whoever said it, thank you very much. And then that will be a requirement, I think, at the end of the calendar year that makes a whole lot of sense.

Rob, to your point, there already is a question that says, would you like to remain a member of the survey? And we literally, over the last four years, have had exactly one no. So, people are currently saying they want to do it. I think adding the requirement that you have to complete the survey and you have to change your SOI on an annual basis is important.

I would like to throw in, additionally, not just changing your SOI at the end of the year, but in the event of a major life change. If you change a

job, it's probably worth doing. There are situations where there can be appearance of a conflict of interest if we don't have a current workplace configuration on your SOI. And if anybody needs that explained, I can do it. But I think it's kind of obvious.

So, this is really something that, just as a matter of practice, we would do. And also, I think if you want to view membership in the caucus as something that is honorable and to be thought of highly, then the idea of doing something as simple as updating your SOI should not be onerous in filling out a survey. Anybody see this as an onerous addition to the task? I mean, no. Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I don't see it as onerous at all. I would suggest, when I looked at the SOIs, they don't have dates on them. So, can we make it a requirement to put a date stamp on SOIs as well?

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah, absolutely. That all makes sense. I don't know whether we'll be able to roll that out before the end of this year. But that was the intention. And then events happen. Anything else while we're on it that would be good to put on an annual update while we're thinking? Oh, I've got a hand. Dr. Hassan. Maybe that was an old hand. Sorry. All right, where are we? We are on.

ROLLA HASSAN:

Sorry, I was muted. Regarding the statement of interest, I suggest that there is like endorsement or from inside the committee to receive from the requesting new member. So, they have already some endorsement or some support from somebody inside this committee. So, they have, he knows their work and etc. So, it would be good. I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thank you for the input. I think that's something we'd consider. But there is the constant concern that we are somehow not inclusive for all people of expertise. And so, my first thought would just be requiring an insider makes it sound a little bit like a club. So just for all the time I've spent on the membership committee, we're trying to create fewer barriers that are not technical and based on experience. But we'll definitely bring that up in the next meeting. And thanks for the input. Any other questions on caucus engagement, Ozane and I? Next is, I believe, security incident reporting. So, Robert or Kim? Robert? Robert, you there?

ROBERT STORY:

Yeah, I'm here. So, we met yesterday, I think, with the time zones. It's a little fuzzy. And we're continuing to make progress. But we're also continuing to, I want to use the word, stumble over stuff that has been in for a while. I guess new participants come or have questions or people review texts they haven't reviewed in a while.

And so, I keep thinking we're getting closer and closer. And then we'll stumble over something that turns us back into a lot more discussion. But I think we are making good progress. And I do think I see a light at the end of the tunnel. So, I encourage people to come and contribute text or at least review, make sure they're keeping up to date with current changes and what's going on in the current discussions. Kim, you want to add something?

JEFF OSBORN:

No hands here. Ken, what? Oh, Ken is putting a link to the document in the chat. Thanks for that, Robert. And guidelines for changing root server addresses, Ray or Duane, who wants to do that?

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, Ray and I were just negotiating. He deferred to me since I'm here in person, I guess. So, this work party met yesterday. And we had a very, very good meeting with representatives from ASO and RIR communities. And we asked them some direct questions that we had from our document. And I feel like we got some very good responses. And so, we'll take that back to the work party, hopefully have a follow-up meeting in two to three weeks. We'll discuss that feedback from the RIRs and then hopefully begin wrapping up our work party document.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thank you, Duane. RSS messaging. Just to recap, two years ago when I took on the role of chair, I was told that I had a couple of weeks to prepare to tell the GAC about how DNS worked and why the root server

and everything else. And I panicked and said, please defer three months. It ended up deferring for two years. This was never intended to take this long. But it was literally a one-shot thing. We gave the shot on Monday. It went well. I haven't heard any feedback that was particularly negative. A lot of style issues, but I'll live.

So, we have provided that as a deliverable to the government group inside of ICANN. We gave it to the GAC. We may do additional things with it, but I think the messaging work party is complete at this point. So, thanks to everybody who contributed. Appreciate it. Any comment? You have a furrowed brow, Rob. Is there a reason? Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

The question is, so what are the next plans on that? Since the GAC is probably not going to want to hear it again anytime soon, what are your thoughts?

JEFF OSBORN:

The literal point was I had a speech to give. And it snowballed into a work group and a committee and a thing and everything else. But based on the original mission, it's completed. The eagle has landed.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

That was not exposed to the caucus. I didn't realize this was all. We keep seeing this on the minutes, but we didn't know--

JEFF OSBORN: You keep seeing it and I keep canceling it and it keeps coming back up. We were done about six months ago and it was just a scheduling issue of when can we get around to giving it. So again, thanks to everybody for the help. That was a one shot. There may be some messaging thing we do in the future, but this one was literally keeping our scope narrow. Done. And he just looks like that. Naveed or Aram on the CIP or did we--
- Oh, we already got--

NAVEED BIN RAIS: I'm here. Yeah, so just be quick about the update. So, CIP CCG is actually concluding its work and drafted a draft framework actually to be put for public comment, so which will be done at the end of ICANN81 meeting. So, the committee will get a chance to look at the framework, the principles that have been drafted, the illustrative examples that are there, how to proceed with the CIP. And we expect after the public comments are incorporated and the consideration by the Board, we expect the CIP process to kickstart by June, 2025. So, that is it for now. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Naveed. Let's see. I think Hafiz is on. Do you have an update on the document repository?

HAFIZ FAROOQ: Hi, Jeff. Hi, everyone. Yes, I'm here. Let me just share my screen. Well, I just have a few slides to show, but I think I cannot share my screen. Ozan, can you--

JEFF OSBORN: I think you're sharing. Never mind.

HAFIZ FAROOQ: Let me try now. Let me know once you see my screen.

JEFF OSBORN: It looks like it's starting up.

HAFIZ FAROOQ: Can you see now?

JEFF OSBORN: It says it's starting, but it hasn't started yet.

HAFIZ FAROOQ: Let me stop sharing and try again. I really apologize. I think my Zoom is kind of hanged up.

JEFF OSBORN: We see your screen now.

HAFIZ FAROOQ: You see my screen?

JEFF OSBORN: Yes.

HAFIZ FAROOQ: Okay. So, there are just very few quick updates about the repository. Why this is again popping up? Just give me one sec. Okay. Do you see the slides?

JEFF OSBORN: No. It just dropped. I think we lost you again.

HAFIZ FAROOQ: Let me try once more.

JEFF OSBORN: There it is. That works. It's a slide.

HAFIZ FAROOQ: Okay. So, this is just an update about what we discussed last time. My fellow Caucus member, Mr. Arjun, actually discussed the repository last time. And we agreed that we will actually recategorize our research repository into four different categories. And these are research papers, RFCs, talks, and blog articles. And also, we agreed that we were only going to keep documents which are very much related to research, related to root DNS servers. And based on that, Arjun actually did a huge effort and he actually categorized 115 documents so far.

So, all these documents have been uploaded on our online portal, the research repository portal. I can quickly show you that. Just give me one sec. Yeah. So now if you go to the library, you will find now on the left side, you can see we have different categories. We have divided these papers, these documents into these categories. This is for the research papers. And for example, this one is for the talks related to OARC. We have actually uploaded till OARC41. Anything related to root DNS server is there.

There is another folder for DNS symposiums. Anything discussed related to root is there. This one is for RFCs. And then we have some articles related to DNS, root DNS. And anything which is general DNS, not very much specific to the root, this has been put under general subfolder. So far in total, we have 115 filter documents, including all of these four categories plus 59 general documents.

And these are some new documents which we added since we discussed last time. These are some new research papers related to root DNS. These three are research papers. We found another RFC which is not directly related with the root, but still they have some discussion about the privacy related to root DNS. So, we included that RFC also. There are a couple of blog articles which we have added as well from the RIPE labs. So, they are also now part of the repository.

So, this is just a very quick update. And I just wanted to highlight one thing that now we are keeping references in the repository, but we are not keeping the original document as of now. So, what do you guys think? We should still live with the reference of these documents or we

should start attaching the original document because sometime in future, these links, these references may not be available anymore? So, what do you guys think? Open for comments. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN:

Nice work, Hafiz. It's really interesting. Any comment from the room? Wes is reaching for the mic.

WES HARDAKER:

There's three people actually with their hands up. I happen to be first, so that's okay. So, Hafiz, I have not really looked at this as much in the past and the more you're restructuring it and the more you're adding to it, I'm thinking I really need to start using it. It looks like a great resource. So, thank you very much for putting it together. I will be honest, in the very beginning, I was wondering how valuable it would be and I'm now sort of convinced it's valuable.

With respect to whether attaching the documents or not, that is absolutely what I would like to do. However, there are copyright issues with doing so and different journals allow you to do that and different authors allow you to do that. So, I'm afraid that that's probably not easily within scope and certainly prone to error and therefore problematic in a number of ways. But I wish, I think. I think if you give a link to it, then people can either access it themselves or through their institution based on whether or not they can follow the link.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thank you. Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Yeah, thanks a lot for doing all this work, Hafiz. I know we talked briefly about the possibility of attaching the documents. Unfortunately, with Zotero, I think because of the copyright situation that Wes alluded to, if you want to attach documents into your library, it becomes a closed group. So, then you would require a login in order to see the library. Also, there's like a small amount of money we'd have to pay for storage, but that's not really the issue. I think the issue would be that if we change from this, the inability to attach documents to the ability to attach documents, then you wouldn't be able to just view it without a login and that would be kind of too bad.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thanks, Andrew. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks. I've been a proponent for a long time in the area of if you find something really interesting, you should have a way to make sure you have it when the original document disappears from the web, because many times they do. But as Wes well been pointed out, there's lots of restrictions about that.

So, I think it might be worth examining the possibility of, though remaining with links and not a required login, as Andrew just pointed out, if it is a viable thing to have something like a README or something

that would give people looking at the repository, instructions on how to get their own copies of the documents because many documents like this are just fine with a personal use kind of download, but it's the group picture that's a problem. So, that might be a possibility that's kind of in the middle between having the documents on the site and just having links. And again, thank you for all the work and those folks working on this. Very helpful.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thanks, Russ. Yeah, and thanks again, Hafiz, and let Arjun know as well, we really appreciate the work. That looks really great. Yeah, thank you very much. Moving on, I think Duane has a statement on RSSAC047.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Thanks, Jeff. Since we're getting close to the end, I'll try to be quick here. So, this year, or I guess starting last year, Verisign and ISC funded a study by a team of folks from Netherlands to do an analysis of the initial implementation of RSSAC047, which Paul mostly did, or all entirely did. So, that study has happened, and that report is nearing completion, and we expect it to be public by the end of the year at least, maybe even sooner than that.

I would suggest that we schedule a caucus meeting at some point in the coming months for that study team to present its report to the caucus. And I also expect that around that time there will be discussions within the caucus about things we may want to change in 047. So, it may lead to a future work party. It may lead to some other discussions about 047

or the metrics in general. So just a heads up that this is coming, and we'll work with you, the chairs, and the staff to get that scheduled and presented.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Duane. It's really nice work. It's really, really interesting. I'm just going to say, because that way Ken can slam the door shut when he's done, we'll meet next in Bangkok, but Ken first has a piece here, and I'm going to give him the mic.

KEN RENARD: All right. Thanks. Going along with some of the statements that were made earlier about the caucus membership and the ease of participating, let's try to have some time at these caucus meetings for caucus members to ask questions, help make it easier to participate in work parties to help ease that transition. So, the idea is if you have any questions on either how the caucus works, how RSSAC works, any of the ongoing work parties, or anything just about RSOs themselves that may have questions. So, we have very limited time, but I just wanted to open the floor as a last part of this meeting to field questions that hopefully we can try to answer. Ray, go ahead.

RAY BELLIS: Okay, thank you. Ray Bellis from ISC. This is not a question, but more of an observation. I think something that might help this respective participation is that there's been an RSSAC document, which is a simple statement for caucus members of the interrelationship between the

RSSAC Caucus, the RSSAC, and the RSOs, and indeed ICANN, bearing in mind that the RSSAC itself is an ICANN advisory committee, and the RSSAC Caucus is therefore contributing to that. I think a lot of people don't necessarily correctly understand the relationship and then have unrealistic expectations of what RSSAC Caucus documents can actually achieve.

KEN RENARD:

Thanks, Ray. Is there something on the caucus website? Yeah. Ray, if you take a look at the RSSAC Caucus website to see if there's anything there that addresses that. I'm looking for hands here in the room or not. All right. I'll get back to Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN:

All right. If there are no additional items, we will see you in Bangkok 2025. Thank you all for attending, and you can have your 60 seconds back. Thanks all. We'll see you soon. Take care.

OZAN SAHIN:

Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]