OZAN SAHIN

Hello, everyone. Thanks for joining today. We will start momentarily. The session will now begin. Please start recording.

Hello, and welcome to the Root Service System Advisory Committee meeting. My name is Ozan, and I'm a participation manager for this session. Please note that the session is being recorded, and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Committee Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in chat.

If you would like to speak during this 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.

And I'll now read the script for RSSAC meeting observer participation. 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 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 chat feature. So, with that, over to you, Jeff

JEFF OSBORN	Thank you, Ozan. Welcome, good morning. I guess, if there's remote people, good afternoon, good evening, and all the rest of those. Welcome to the monthly RSSAC meeting at ICANN82. We will start with a roll call. There we go. I don't believe Paul or Brad is here. Give you a second. John or Peter?
PETER MARTIN	Peter is here.
JEFF OSBORN	Peter is here. John?
JOHN AUGENSTEIN	And John also.
JEFF OSBORN	John here, okay. Great. Thank you. I see Matt. I don't see John. Is John on? John Crain? Jeff, I'm here. Rob Carolina?
ROB CAROLINA	Here, Rob Carolina.
JEFF OSBORN	Is there from NASA Jose and Brad? Not here. Team from Netnod, Liman and Fredrik. RIPE NCC, Hans and Paul? Hans Petter, there

you are. And Paul is not? Okay. And UMD, Tim and Kevin. There you are. ISC we have Wes and Suzanne.

WES HARDAKER

Suzanne is at SSAC and said she may drop in later. But it's ISI not ISC. You're too used to saying your own organization's name.

JEFF OSBORN

You have signs that say ISI and USC, and when I concatenated them, it came out ISC. I'm sorry. My bad, I'm sorry. Howard? Not Howard, Ken.

KEN RENARD

Ken's here.

JEFF OSBORN

Ken's here. And Brad. Afshaan I think is online. Afshaan?

AFSHAAN ABDUL

Hi, Jeff. I am online.

JEFF OSBORN

Hey, there. And we don't have Jun, but I bet we have Hiro.

HIRO HOTTA

That's correct.

JEFF OSBORN	Excellent. So, going to liaisons, Wes is here. Hiro is here. Liman's here. Daniel Migault?
DANIEL MIGAULT	I am here.
JEFF OSBORN	Thank you, Daniel. Good to have you. Russ?
RUSS MUNDY	Russ is here. James?
JAMES MITCHELL	James is here.
JEFF OSBORN	James is here. I think this is my first putting a face to a voice. Wow, hi. And Duane? Duane is not here. Great. Invited guest, Karl, are you online? Karl is not. That's all right. He's invited. He can come if he wants to. So, here's the agenda, and it is a relatively normal agenda for our meetings. We have a couple of things we're going to hear from the NomCom. We have simple voting just for the prior minutes. So, there's no way this is going to take a full 90 minutes, but I appreciate you all being here anyway. Any comments on the agenda, any input? Ozan, do we want to provide an opportunity for the NomCom outreach, folks?

OZAN SAHIN

Yes, please. So, we have today, I guess, Eyitayo, Amir Qayyum. And is Dave here? Okay, welcome.

JEFF OSBORN

Yes, thank you for coming. We're looking forward to hearing about this.

EYITAYO IYORTIM

Thank you very much. Good morning, everyone. Good morning, Seattle time. My name is Eyitayo, and I have Dave with me. I have [Ariola] with me. We also have the chair and the co-chair, 2025 NomCom, Amir and Tom in the room. So, it's really great to be here.

So, the NomCom is an independent committee. We're tasked with selecting members for the ICANN Board of Directors, the PTI Board of Directors, the ALAC, ccNSO Council, and the GNSO Council. The NomCom is designed to function independently of the board, the organization, the supporting organizations, and the advisory committees. So, the NomCom delegates do act on behalf of the interests of the global internet community, and within the scope of the ICANN mission and responsibilities assigned to the NomCom by the bylaws. And NOMCOM does not act in furtherance of the groups that appointed the delegates to the NomCom.

I'm slowing down because I realize there are probably interpretations going on, and I think I was talking too fast. What leadership opportunities, positions are open for the 2025 application cycle? We have three members of the ICANN Board of Directors. And I hope that everyone in the room received this. We hope that you will use it. We have one member for the PTI Board of Directors, three regional representatives to the ALAC, one from Africa, one from Asia, Australia, and the Pacific Islands, one from Latin America and the Caribbean region.

We have two members for the GNSO Council, one from the Contracted Parties House, one from the Non-Contracted Parties House. We have one member of the ccNSO Council. Now what type of individuals are we seeking? So, we're looking for individuals that will exhibit critical thinking. Obviously, the multistakeholder model requires certain very specialized skills. Cultural awareness, we're very focused on the inclusivity in ICANN. We need a knowledge of the internet ecosystem at that level, expected at that level.

Executive board experience would be preferred, so that it is probable that you have actually participated at that level, and this is a little bit more than just being at the C-level of an organization. We're looking for relevant experience specific to the roles, the empty seats on the boards, in legal, in finance, specifically for example, audit experience for example in the PTI Board. We're looking for business experience in the non-profit sector as well.

Why should you apply? Well, the global internet policy is constantly changing. We have processes in view as we speak, things are changing. I think the entire world is changing, and we would like that ICANN in line with these changes is also positioned for the future. Most of us, hopefully, we're at the welcome session, and we listened to the board tell us about what they're looking at and where ICANN is going. You have to be somebody who's truly interested in impacting the revolution of the internet.

We want to look at somebody who is interested in growth professionally. It will be good to know that the ideals of ICANN, the ideals that ICANN stands for, and all the groups that we are selecting members for would align with your professional goals as well, and the way that you see yourself growing within the global community. Having said that, I'd like to also speak about whether the positions are paid. ICANN board members selected by the NomCom have the option to receive compensation, but it is not required. All the remaining positions are voluntary.

In terms of reasonable, direct, and properly documented expenses incurred in the course of service by board members and volunteers, these will be reimbursed. What is the time commitment for the positions the NomCom fills? Time commitment varies depending on the position. These positions require, for example, regular participation in virtual meetings via telephone and Zoom, and other third-party communication platforms. The positions may also involve significant international travel. ICANN Board commitment, for example, will be equivalent to about 50 percent of a full-time position annually. This includes attending the three annual public meetings, lasting up to 10 days each. Participating in two to three board retreats per year, spanning three to five days, and serving on board committees, and the other board-organized groups, all within regular teleconferences and preparation.

In terms of the PTI board, the time commitment states that applicants must be able to devote a significant amount of time to the basic responsibilities, which could be up to 10 percent per work week. For the GNSO Council, time commitment consists of meeting 12 times per year, four times face-to-face including ICANN's three public meetings, and eight times their webinar. ALAC, the ALAC time commitment consists of eight hours per week in online working groups and committee meetings including the Consolidated Policy Working Group and so on.

For the ccNSO Council, time commitment consists of three to six hours per week or more, perhaps double on committees or task forces, and significantly more if you're chairing one of those groups. For more information or advice that you please visit the icann.org/nomcom2025 page, and the application link is also there. I need to mention that applications close on the 28th of March, 2025. I hope that a lot of people in this room and people that you know who qualify to be part of these boards will be invited, and we look forward to seeing your applications. Thank you very much. I think Dave will be able to field questions if there are any.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you very much. That is a tremendous opportunity. I have always personally been so impressed by anybody willing to serve in a NomCom because the amount of time, effort, frustration, angst, sleeplessness, et cetera, et cetera rarely go appreciated, so we really thank you. That is tremendously difficult work. Thank you for doing it.

EYITAYO IYORTIM

Thank you very much, Jeff. I didn't know about the work before I applied, so thank you. I have since realized the folly of my decisions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Here, here. Thank you very much.

JEFF OSBORN

I actually learned—okay, I thought I knew my way around ICANN, but what I learned from you that's interesting is that they're now admitting that being a board member is half of a full-time job. Because I kind of always suspected that, and I never heard anybody say it out loud before. That's very interesting. Are there any questions for the NomCom? Was that a hand? Do you have a question? Do you want to go to a mic over here?

ROLLA HASSAN

Thank you for your presentation. And good morning, everyone. This is Rolla Hassan, ICANN Fellowship, and I'm speaking by my own capacity. Sorry, for ignorance, but I have a question. If anyone applying for NomCom have to be in one committee like RSSAC or SSAC or something like that? Sorry for this question. I'm so sorry, I'm still new. Thank you.

DAVE KISOONDOYAL	Not necessarily to be in a committee, but the application of this on the positions, on the leadership positions that we have, as mentioned by Eyitayo, we have three positions for the ICANN Board. We have for the ALAC, for the ccNSO, for the GNSO. So, it's not—if you do form part of an SO or AC, it's an advantage to you, but our selection is to be based on the existing leadership positions that we have.
JEFF OSBORN	Thank you. That's it? Well, thank you very much. We really appreciate it. Have a lovely week. Ozan, I believe the draft minutes from 4 Feb is up for a vote.
OZAN SAHIN	Thank you, Jeff. This is Ozan for the record. I circulated the draft minutes from RSSAC February meeting two weeks ago, and we have not received any requests for revisions on this draft minutes. So, if you have any questions about draft minutes or any revisions, please raise them. Otherwise, this will be a vote item today, so we will need a motion to move in a second.
JEFF OSBORN	Do we have so moved? Wes moves.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	Second from Liman.

JEFF OSBORN

Liman seconds. Anyone opposed? Anyone abstaining? I believe we have approved. The next item—do you want to do this?

OZAN SAHIN

Sure. Under RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee update today, we have the removal of inactive caucus members, so that was a discussion during the February meeting that the membership committee found eight inactive members in 2024, reached out to them. And then, actually, the committee found more members as inactive, but eight of them have not responded back or noted they show activity, and that's why they've been removed from RSSAC caucus. So that's just the update part. But since, Jeff, you asked me to add this to the agenda of this meeting to discuss how the membership committee actually reviews the activity of the caucus members, and then maybe get some feedback from RSSAC Caucus, I have one slide to just discuss that.

JEFF OSBORN

I think it's probably worth adding the updating of the SOCs as well. SOIs.

OZAN SAHIN

Yeah, the SOI topic is particularly for the RSSAC Caucus meeting and coming up this—

JEFF OSBORN

Never mind, [inaudible] my meetings. No, no, no, no problem.

OZAN SAHIN

So, since we also have some new RSSAC members here, let me briefly talk about how RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee reviews the activity of the caucus members regularly. So, this is an annual process, and the RSSAC caucus members who have joined our caucus in the past 12 months are exempt from this process, so are the RSSAC members, who are also automatically the members of RSSAC caucus. And when the membership committee looks at the activity indicators, they consider attendance to RSSAC caucus meetings as activity. And also, any RSSAC Caucus Work Party Memberships is also a sign of activity, and contributions to RSSAC publication is also a sign of activity, and serving in the RSSAC outgoing liaison representative roles. That's another piece of indicator for activity.

And I guess, anyone who have achieved less than three pieces of activity in this exercise is considered to be inactive, then the committee reaches out to them, bringing this up. So, one thing, the committee actually wanted to get feedback from RSSAC is, this applies to the entire membership of the RSSAC Caucus members. So, once they have joined and showed at least three pieces of activity there, a caucus member would be considered active forever. And I think the membership committee would like to change that, and maybe specifically focus on the activity of last two years, three years. So, I guess, that's the feedback that the membership committee is seeking here. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Is that clear to everybody? And if nobody is going to have a comment or an input, we the membership committee will go off and draft something and just use it. And then if it doesn't work out in the first year, we'll change it in the second year. But the idea was, we had people who showed up six years ago, and under the current requirements, they are still active. And then, we were very remiss to start throwing people out for not showing up during COVID. So, we kind of went through a slip period. It's been five years since the end. So, we thought it's time to get a little more rigorous about what is an active member.

So, if people have input, this is the place for it because otherwise it's a good group. The membership committee I think is really kind of on top of this, and we'll be able to come up with something. But we wanted to make sure there wasn't very active input first from this group. And this being an RSSAC meeting, actually, technically it's just the members of the RSSAC that contribute. So, we always love having guests but it's kind of, there's a pre-approval process and all the rest of it. Keeps it a lot shorter. Thank you. Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah. Since you were asking for feedback, I thought I'd give positive feedback and say that I support this. So, keeping active members there is, of course, important. I agree with you that we shouldn't throw out people that can be valuable, but then, we don't want a long list of people that contributed 10 years ago and then never since. That does something to the reputation of the group.

JEFF OSBORN The irony for us and where we thought it was important is one of the first people we have to throw off is Tripti. So, we did want to run it by some people because the optics were complicated. There's another issue you've had before that Ozan is reminding me is going to be a caucus issue, and that is the updating of that work through that in the caucus meeting.

OZAN SAHIN Yeah. And to add to that, I have some ongoing organizational changes. So, I haven't informed RSSAC about them, but that will come shortly. So, I will make sure that I'll tell all my staff internal shuffling, but then still they should update their SOIs with that.

JEFF OSBORN To the [inaudible] and get your people to do that, that's a big help because herding the cats to change their own paperwork is challenging. Sorry, I'm not looking at the Zoom page. Who's up? Rob?

ROB CAROLINA Thanks, Jeff. I know I'm going to be sorry I asked this, but did we—I'm trying to remember. Did we consider and then reject or did we not consider the idea of just appointing people to the caucus for a fixed term of three or four years, and then having people reapply at staggered. Again, I sincerely apologize. I just can’t remember what we did with that if we—

JEFF OSBORN I couldn’t remember it, and Ozan doesn’t, so I trust his memory more than mine. I don’t think we have.

ROB CAROLINA Okay. Well, then—

JEFF OSBORN Are you proposing or just asking?

ROB CAROLINA No, no, no. I don’t want to get in the way of a process that’s already moving, and I suspect has good results. I just wanted to flag it as another way to solve the same problem.

JEFF OSBORN Yeah, we're not getting log jammed or anything. It's just I wanted to stop and make sure somebody didn't have an idea that was out of the range of things we were thinking about. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Thanks, Liman here. I think I would recommend against having a limited time because that creates a lot of extra work for people to reapply when it's not really necessary. It's reasonable to observe whether people are active or not. And if they are, I would say that they're welcome to still be in there. So, the process that we're entertaining right now seems to be the right balance for me. But I would also support the idea of looking at activity maybe two or three years back, and avoid the perpetual—appointing people perpetually. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN Thanks, Liman. Wes, is that a new hand?

WES HARDAKER Yeah, it is a new hand. I agree with Liman, but actually, from an opposite perspective which is that it also creates a lot of work for the committee and the RSSAC to consider all those candidates. I don't think our system right now is really broken, so we shouldn't change it.

JEFF OSBORN It is not that onerous. Yeah, I'm on my second term as the chair of the membership committee, and it's a good bunch of people, who really do a lot of hard work, and review the documents, and it works. I think it works.

Back to the agenda, I think. We have upcoming appointments. You will get the details better than I do, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you, Jeff. So, we have two upcoming RSSAC appointment processes. Starting with the liaison to the ICANN Board of Directors. Wes will be completing a three-year term by the annual general meeting in Oman this year. So, we will start a call for nominations on the 28th of March. We'll close on the 28th of April, and then we'll be ready as a vote for the RSSAC May meeting. So, this is coming up.

And then the other appointment process here is the delegate to ICANN NomCom. RSSAC is one of the groups whose delegates started with a one-year term after the revamp of the NomCom. And currently Erum Welling is the delegate. And of course, we will go through an election process for appointing a delegate to the NomCom. But this delegate will be serving in 2026 and 2027. Moving forward, the term will be two years.

JEFF OSBORN

Is it inappropriate for me to ask whether Wes and Erum are running again? Your hand is up, Wes. I couldn't tell if it was an old one.

WES HARDAKER

It would be a new hand.

JEFF OSBORN

New hand.

WES HARDAKER	I mean, the nominations start later, so technically the official period is later. I would be happy to serve again if needed. I was just going to say that if anybody wants to consider it, either now or in the future, I'd be happy to talk with them about the level of workload that it is. I underestimated it, even knowing how much Kaveh did ahead of me. But you should walk into it with your eyes open. But more people is always a good thing. So, I encourage anybody to consider the role. It is an interesting one, certainly, but I'd be happy to help fill you in on what it takes to serve in this role.
JEFF OSBORN	That was the first time I'd heard at all the 50 percent job, and I had always suspected as much, so it was interesting to hear that out loud.
WES HARDAKER	It's not minor.
JEFF OSBORN	It's a 50 percent job if you work 80-hour weeks, got it. Anything else on that upcoming? All right. I believe we have a vote on the results of this document, right? Do you want to tee that up, Ozan?
OZAN SAHIN	Okay. Thank you, Jeff. So, the first item here is the guidelines for changing IP addresses, work party document. It's gone through the RSSAC Caucus review process and Andrew sent out notes on the mailing list. So, then it made it to RSSAC review process, which also

	concluded. And the document is up for an RSSAC vote today. And again, we would need a motion to publish this document and a second to do that.
JEFF OSBORN	Do we have a motion? Ken so moves, a second?
WES HARDAKER	Second.
JEFF OSBORN	Wes with the second. Anyone opposed? Anyone abstain? I believe we've passed the guidelines for changing the IP addresses. Excellent.
OZAN SAHIN	Okay. Staff will take the action item to start the process to publish the document then.
JEFF OSBORN	Great, thank you. Everybody who did all the work on that, that was a lot of work. Ken, do you have an update on the security incident reporting?
KEN RENARD	Speaking of a lot of work. The Security Incident Reporting Work Party has had a stable document. I believe that's still in the caucus stable period. That document will come out probably at our next

monthly meeting. So, it's a big document, there's a lot in it. There's a good bit at stake. So, I'd encourage everyone to read that document before the next month voting on it. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Ken. We are running a rocket doc. Ozan, help me with my memory. There was something we were going to bring up that we stuck in this slot.

OZAN SAHIN

The chair, vice-chair update?

JEFF OSBORN

Yeah.

OZAN SAHIN

I think that was the progress on how we meet discussions and the upcoming public comment proceeding about the—

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you. Okay. I have been the designee, for lack of a better term, to a group that is, how we meet. And we have met weekly for something insane like seven weeks. And you can see me individually if you want a lot of feedback on how that works. It's been a little—pardon? Good question. It has been variously represented as quick; we need to save $2 million, and we haven't looked at how the meetings are organized in 10 years. Let's work on it. This was an offshoot of an SOAC requirement where we were asked if we would come up with ways to change the meetings. And then it kind of devolved into ICANN staff told us, here's a list of things you can do. Your other ideas aren't really workable. And we sort of said, this is not acceptable.

So, it's kind of being a weird process, but it is going on. So, just so you're aware, I am not selling this down the creek behind the scenes, but it's being a really weird process. I think having the heads of the various SOACs acting together as a group is something that is not going the direction they hoped it did. And we're turning out to have opinions and, like I said, it's a funny process, but it is ongoing. So, if you see that there's [inaudible] who are meeting about how to do meetings, that is the case.

But we are not simply writing a bunch of rules without input, it's literally, I think, almost back [inaudible] one after seven weeks of meeting very intently. So, I wanted to put out there that that's what's happening if you've heard anything about groups involved with meetings. But the actual work being performed is a little frustrating. Liman and then Hans Petter.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Thanks. Liman here. Can you see a role for RSSAC here? Is there something we can contribute or are there some issues that you would like to bring to the group?

JEFF OSBORN There was a meeting yesterday that Mary Wong chaired in the big ballroom. It had a really neat interactive voting process to it, but other than that, I'm not sure where we got. And they asked a number of the questions that had been there. To the degree it's possible, and I can understand what input they want, I will come and ask you for the input they want. But it's Jello nailed to the wall at this point. It's kind of hard to figure out.

There are two separate things that need to go on. One is that ICANN has a budget problem and there is that every 10 years, it's probably a good idea to review how meetings are run. There were previously four meetings a year, as some had pointed out. Should we have two physical ones and one virtual one? These are all good questions.

I'm actually the guy who asked the least popular question which was, there are some parts of the ICANN community that make gobs of money by attending here, should we be charging them? And that got watered down to who the hell wants to pay money when they don't have to, and it got a resounding ass kicking. So, it's a little frustrating what I'm seeing going on. And I don't know what else to say. Does that help at all? Okay, thanks. Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN I've followed it from the side, not because I'm on the committee, but because the number of people spent almost until only the chairs that are there. My observations was that not everybody necessarily understands how the current meetings are planned. So, it was a large curve there. I kind of know that that's in the hands of the chairs to request sessions and when they're on. So, there may be tensions there from participants that they don't understand this.

I think if one wants to look at the fundamental principles, this points back to a meeting strategy that was a long time ago. And I saw that from the numbers community. It was two random community members that volunteered to be part of that. Now, from the numbers part, it's very simple. Our need at these meetings are really just to meet with others, right? Which is very different from, for instance, this group where we need to meet in the group, but then sometimes also with others.

And I think that's part of the big puzzle here. What's the most effective and efficient way of doing that? So, many emotional things like, oh, I hate to say it, but travel support and all that kind of things. How long do meetings are? Oh, can we keep them to [inaudible] and all that stuff? So, if somebody has brilliant ideas, I'm quite sure that Jeff would like to hear them, so he can bring them back, but…

JEFF OSBORN

Please provide input because I, on occasion, have an outsized voice just because I have an outsized voice. And so, it'd be really great if I could attribute it to somebody else rather than them just assuming it's Jeff talking again. I got to say, the most—talking about outsized voices, Jonathan Zuck never fails to entertain. And he came up with what I thought was really one of the most interesting ideas. It's flying people there, putting them up in hotels, and then having this whole venue thing. And he said, skip the venue thing. For the people who want to, fly them into a hotel, and then do everything by Zoom from our rooms. And then we can still have the hallway track. You got to admit, that's really an interesting idea. You'd have to run through the numbers.

If that saved 80 percent of the price though, it might be brilliant, because you literally would have the hallway track and we would have gone out still last night and had drinks which would not have happened in a virtual meeting. So, anyway, it's not being completely useless, but it is being interesting. And I have Hans Petter, Wes and Ken with their hands up.

WES HARDAKER

So, actually Jeff, this wasn't what I was going to say, but you just dovetailed on something I've been telling people for two years, right? The one thing we learned during the pandemic was that meetings actually worked. It was the hallways that didn't. And so, I've thought we should actually restructure our in-person meetings, have a virtual conference. And I was speaking about IETF, I think when I started this originally, have a virtual conference, which is all meetings because that works. And then when you actually get together in person, you completely restructure how you interact for basically having all hallway type tracks. So, you and I are actually on the same page. Interested in that for a couple of years at this point.

But what I was actually going to pipe in for is, of course, the board has been heavily involved in how do we meet in this whole discussion. And I think that the presentation the other day outlined the real topics that the board is being forced to think about. There are essentially a number of drivers that include cost efficiency as ICANN tries to figure out how to balance its longer-term budget. Interaction efficiency, which we just talked about. How do we interact better? And that includes how do we interact better with remote colleagues? The hybrid meetings do work except for time zone issues as you've heard during the meeting the other day. Climate efficiency is a big driver, as ICANN tries to work toward becoming more green.

Even health efficiency. Is traveling around the world that much for your time zones [inaudible] your bed for you. That's subject to debate in many directions. And then of course, equity efficiency of, if there are people that can't travel as easily, how do we make sure that they can participate? And so, all of those things are driving. So, the board is trying to collect information from all these different avenues, and it's not an easy decision, of course. I'm not on the finance committee, so I actually don't plan the travel cost and things like that, but it's not cheap that's for sure.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Wes. It is definitely not a matter of this is simple, they should just figure it out. This is really complicated. I spend a lot of time with people at other organizations that do similar things, and everybody from NANOG to OARC and the rest of—this is very difficult. The coronavirus really harmed a lot of things, and it's going to take a lot of people, and a lot of work to figure it out. Ken, do you have anything else for your update?

KEN RENARD

Yeah. Just something somebody whispered into my ear, or in the chat back. Submit something as a group or individuals, those are options on the table.

JEFF OSBORN

Like I said, I don't think I've missed a meeting, so if there's any question—Ken?

KEN RENARD

Okay, I re-raised my hand. Other things for the chair, vice chair report. A similar public comment about the pilot [inaudible] the SOs and ACs. Just giving everyone the heads up that this will be coming. We'll hear a little bit from Naveed in a little bit. If this does come about, there are some closing, and we expect probably a pretty quick turnaround requirement for those answers. So, I don't think we'll have a chance to discuss it.

JEFF OSBORN

I believe next up, Wes. Anything going on with the ICANN Board? Are you guys just playing shuffleboard this week?

WES HARDAKER

We're bored. Yeah, so bear with me. This is a few updates. My meeting with the board is later today, and I hope that everybody has been thinking about how to answer the questions about what keeps us up at night and what doesn't. We are encouraging a dialogue, and that will be the primary topic that RSSAC members should be speaking to. For RSSAC members, especially those that are planning on speaking, please do come to the front table and sit up there. There will be a mic on the floor too if we run out of seats, but we do like to have a full table when possible.

As people may know, the board delayed the ATRT for ICANN review a year ago, and have been polling all of the constituencies about what we think, what our thoughts are on how the review process should go in the future. Typically, RSSAC is a very small body of people, and we don't have a whole lot of time and energy. We will be asked, I have believed, I've verified, it probably won't come up in our conversation with the board later, but they are sort of expecting an answer from all these. Reading something out of the questions that I will later send to the group via mail is the board is interested in engaging community appetite and bandwidth given the anticipated ATRT4, and where there's questions about what we want the review to concentrate on.

And so, where the group would place the priority among the various topics, and I can cover that better in mail than it's worth covering right now. But just know that that's coming, and they want us to think about that as well. I believe I have made sure that it is not on the agenda for today because I don't think we're prepared to answer that. And then lastly, I'll remind everyone that there are many topics that occur in hallways and in meetings about the contents of the root zone, whether it's the next round or whether it's zones that may be coming or going. RSSAC has long documented that we serve the IANA root, and that generally we stay out of the politics, and the decisions related to what is or isn't in the root zone. That serves really well as an answer.

If you point to RSSAC055 states we serve the IANA root in order to remain independent of what goes in it. We don't typically take a position on that. So, it's a very easy answer to give. It can be very useful as pointing out that's not in our remit essentially. So, just food for thought if somebody asks you what your opinion is on dot whatever and whether or not it should be in the root zone. You can just point to that and say, we try and be independent from that decision-making process. I think that's it for me unless anybody has any questions.

JEFF OSBORN

For Wes and the board? I have one addition. I just wanted to make sure I was the one who initially got asked the question what keeps you up at night and what doesn't keep you up at night when I spoke to the board in Marina Del Rey in January. I wanted to make sure that people were or weren't comfortable with it. So, I have asked and got Bill to answer this. So, if you don't mind, I just want to check and make sure I got it right. So, I have Wes, Tim and Kevin, me, Lars, Hans Petter. You're willing to answer the question what keeps you up at night as a root server with the board today?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Nothing.

JEFF OSBORN

Say yes or no just now.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

I answered the question, nothing.

JEFF OSBORN

I'll take that for a yes, we can ask you. And then, Matt? You can still say no. I have seven people. I don't need that many. Whoever is editing this document, because I don't think I am. You want to put a no in there, so I remember. And then, Hiro had offered as well to answer, or would you like to say no now? You're yes, okay. Great.

So, six of us, hopefully they don't keep asking down the list. I just wanted to ensure that we were comfortable and prepared to answer the question.

WES HARDAKER

Okay. Given the timing, I think—sorry for jumping in. I think what we'll do is, we'll ask the questions from us to the board first because that should be short and then that gives us free reign until the end of the meeting. If it looks like the discussion's going to go on for a long time, we can let that be and that would actually be a good thing.

JEFF OSBORN

You are shepherding this meeting, right? It's your—

WES HARDAKER	I am. The slides are put together by staff, and they often don't always put—I'm not always consulted about the order, but I can make it happen.
JEFF OSBORN	I just wanted to ensure that you are aware of the sensitivity that I would rather not put people on the spot who don't want to be put on the spot.
WES HARDAKER	Absolutely. Hands raised is the right way. We won't go around the table.
JEFF OSBORN	That’s all I’ve got on that, and I’ve now lost the agenda page. It's in Zoom. I need a bigger monitor I can drag around. I'm always jealous of you guys who do. The next item then is Hiro on the CSC.
HIRO HOTTA	Ah, yes, CSC. The Customer Standing Committee met in person on Sunday and two items to update here. One is the meeting approved the CSC report that in February this year, SLA for IANA naming function was again 100 percent satisfied, yes. And the second one is election of CSC chair and the vice chair is held in ICANN March meeting every year. And in the meeting on Sunday Rick Wilhelm held from gTLD Registry Stakeholder Group [inaudible] was elected

as chair, and I was elected as vice-chair [inaudible] one year. This is a report from CSC.

JEFF OSBORN Congratulations. Liman, you have RZERC and IFR2.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Yes, thank you. Liman here. For once, I actually have updates from both, or I have some substance from both, I should say. So, for the IFR2, we have now reached the point that we have or will within days submit a draft report for public comment. So, the basic work is actually done with the IANA functions review team. So, we will issue the draft report for public comment, and then we will of course take into account the comment to a final report. But we're over the hump. We've done the major part of the work. So that's it for IFR2.

For RZERC, RZERC is recommending that the zone rootservers.net be signed. There has been a number of investigations over the years, and RZERC has kind of looked at this, and come to the conclusion that it is possibly or even probably a good idea to sign the rootservers.net zone, to recommend that it be signed. So, we're at the point of contacting the various parties that are involved in that, and solicit input to see whether this will be a good recommendation or not. And RSSAC is absolutely high up on that list. So, expect communication from RZERC regarding this issue soon, I would say. That's my take of the situation.

JEFF OSBORN

All right. Thank you, Liman. Brad?

BRAD BELANGER

What's the incarnation of that one? Where did it come from? Because stuff from RZERC has to come from a community member as an issue and raised at RZERC. I'm curious who raised it?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

I don't know that off the top of my head, so let me figure that out and get back to you.

BRAD BELANGER

I am worried that RZERC is creating work rather than responding to a community case. Then it should be addressed.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Fair comment. I will try to get back to you on that. But in addition to that, we should keep that in mind when RSSAC receives this request for comments.

BRAD BELANGER

Just to recap history, we had to push back on RZERC pretty—we are RSSAC had to push back on RZERC. Remember, they wanted to include pretty much everything that RSSAC had in their scope included in their scope when we created it. So, we wrote a pretty stern saying, no, your scope is very limited to the contents of the root zone. And anyways, I'm curious where that's coming from. Given that we've done studies here, and the recommendation was the value isn't there.

JEFF OSBORN Wes?

WES HARDAKER I was trying to remember what the recommendations were, and the RSSAC documents where we looked at this. And I know that it was inconclusive like there was—we didn't come to a full list but we boiled it down to two. And I think one of them was, it might have value. So, to some extent, I always thought that what RZERC was diving into was actually because of RSSAC, but somebody else likely knows better than me.

JEFF OSBORN Matt?

MATT LARSON So, I actually did just look into this having heard that RSSAC was potentially going to ask this and—

WES HARDAKER RZERC or RSSAC?

MATT LARSON

Sorry, RZERC. Thank you. And it's RSSAC, whatever the RSSAC document is. Is it about the root server naming?

WES HARDAKER

Twenty-eight.

MATT LARSON

Thank you. And so, one of the things that that document recommended was that there be a follow-up study. So, ICANN org and OCTO, me, we commissioned a study, and had a fantastic result from SIDN Labs and NLnet Labs. And in that report, one of the things that they did was they tested all of the possible recommendations that were in RSSAC028 for how does commonly deployed resolver software deal with them? And one of the things I was going to bring up whenever appropriate was that the particular solution signing rootservers.net, at least as tested by those folks, has issues as opposed to at least one of the other naming conventions.

So, if the desire is to have the zone that holds the root server names signed, or rather to have those be signed responses, I would suggest that signing rootservers.net is probably not the way to do it. But as Brad said, that assumes we want that at all. So, to summarize, I guess, based on my initial research, I have a little bit of concern with that argument, with that proposal of signing rootservers.net on purely technical grounds, what would the impact be? Would it break things?

WES HARDAKER

Which leads me back to the original question is, where did this request of incarnation come from, or was it self-created?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

They're all fair points. Maybe we should postpone the discussion until this has happened. This was a heads-up that things are going on. I hear you. I will take this back into RZERC. But I also think that we should maintain a good relationship with RZERC, and we should save push back until we know exactly what to push back on. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yeah, apologies for not teeing this up better. So, earlier this week, the RZERC sent this correspondence, and you probably missed it, because it was in the middle of an ICANN meeting. But it gives a bit of the background of what the RZERC was actually asking. And Ozan, if you could scroll down. Yeah, that's the history right there. Stop right there.

BRAD BELANGER

So, just based upon my brief glimpse here, it looks like this is self-created by RZERC.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Well, it goes back to RSSAC028, and then there was, I guess, there was a recommendation to do a study. And then, NLnet Labs did a study. So, it isn't necessarily self-created. This correspondence is self-created from RZERC.

BRAD BELANGER

As I understand RZERC, the community members who are members of RZERC, the Root Zone Evolution Review Committee, RZERC, right? That the way that I believe the charter, and I don't have it in front of me, but again, I spent a lot of time in this because I was in Jeff's seat [inaudible]. And so, community members are supposed to bring issues to RZERC and raise them. So, my question, which community member did this? And if they didn't, sounds like somebody in RZERC did it, then that's interesting.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Well, the RSSAC asked for a study in 028.

BRAD BELANGER

And Matt addressed that, right?

MATT LARSON

Yeah, we did the study, full stop. I mean, I don't think the study doesn't necessarily call for anything.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

I can't spare RZERC. It's a shame Geoff Huston isn't here. He could speak to this better. But I mean, this is what's been sent to the RSSAC, and you guys can respond to whoever you want to respond to it. I think it's better. Maybe I should send this to the whole list, and it sounds like we need to have a continuing discussion about it.

JEFF OSBORN

I'd be blaming my mail reader, but I just went and found this was an unread thing in mine, and the way this letter was done as an enclosure, it kind of really hidden the weeds. So, that's kind of unfortunate. Sorry, I don't have to Zoom that.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Just a follow-up since the letter is up on the screen, and since it does say, I guess, I would take issue with the sentence that says, near the bottom, the report found that adopting naming scheme 5.2 would not add negative impact. Having just looked at this study, after having seen this, I would disagree with that. That's not the conclusion of the study.

BRAD BELANGER

It sounds like something needs to be drafted and sent back, either from ICANN org, or if it's not ICANN org, then from RSSAC referencing this study that said, hey, not a good idea.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE	Let me send this letter to the RSSAC list. And then, it sounds like we need to get started drafting a correspondence back to the RZERC for next steps.
JEFF OSBORN	It sounds like a great idea, Andrew. I'm kind of pissed how this slid between two hedgerows.
ANDREW MCCONACHIE	I should have flagged it for you, but it happened during an ICANN meeting, so we were both too busy.
JEFF OSBORN	Agreed, and no fault of yours at all. It’s just irritating. So, that is your action, and thanks. Ozan, back to the agenda. Erum is not available, right? Okay. So, in spite of all the hard work she does, she's not here now. Daniel, the IAB.
DANIEL MIGAULT	I don’t have anything to report.
JEFF OSBORN	Thank you, Daniel. Russ, news from SSAC.
RUSS MUNDY	Thank you, Jeff. Nothing new or substantial directly to report. So far, it's been some good meetings, and we had some good inputs on the SSAC realm from various RSSAC members in the earlier

sessions. Thank you for that. And I wanted to remind folks that the afternoon three blocks are the DNSSEC and security workshop. I know the first one is—there’s a conflict with the RSSAC and board session, but the other two should be hopefully mostly free. And hopefully, a lot of folks are interested. I think there's a good program that will be part of the last three blocks of the dates. And I think room 702, if I remember correctly. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Russ. Now, we'll hear from James in real-life.

JAMES MITCHELL

Hi, all. So, three updates from me. So last year, I think I mentioned that the IANA 2030 strategy was up for public comment, and I probably should have done a little bit more announcement on that. But the public comments have been or the summary report has just been published. I think there wasn’t much too there. I don’t think there’s anything contentious there. Obviously, the three focus areas of operational engagement sort of seem to resonate with the community. As I said, the public comments are there, and that's going to go to the PTI board in April. Feel free to have a look at those.

And one is that we will be, in the next few months, publishing a SOC3 report that covers our registry systems. So, all of our systems that go into making the changes to the root zone, and also, the protocol parameter side as well. IANA has been running internal auditing on that with a SOC2 program, but that's, as I said, in the next few months.

And then finally, as part of the current rollover, and I think on about the 21st or 22nd we'll be headed into the root zone. At that point, I think we would expect priming queries. The queries for the [inaudible] to start being truncated and flipping over to TCP.

JEFF OSBORN

Duane is not on the call. Okay, Duane's out. Naveed, with the complicated story of the continue—

NAVEED BIN RAIS

Hello, everyone. So, basically, since our last discussion on the topic, where the CIP framework was put for public comment, the public comment period was from 21st of November to January 9, actually. And since January 9, staff were compiling the outcomes of the public comments, and now they have drafted that in one document, and CIP is working on reviewing that document. Overall, CIP framework got eight public comments from the structures of ICANN, and three individual comments. So, four of these structures are from GNSO, two from ALAC, and one from GAC, and one from ccNSO, right?

So, I just tried to summarize what these main were about. So, basically, in the public comment, three main questions were asked from the community. The first one is, do they support the framework overall? Right. The second was, do they agree with the five principles that we drafted? The third one was, do they agree with the timeline of assessment, which was composed of a three-year assessment cycle? So, these were the three main questions asked to the community.

So, overall, we got support for the framework with some decisions, and some concerns that were reported. So, some of the community structures, they asked for elaboration on the wordings accountability and the wording of collaboration that are part of principle four and principle five of the framework. So, they want more clarification on when we say accountable to ICANN community overall, what does that mean? And when we say that the SOAC is collaborating with other communities, so what level of collaboration is required? So, just that clarification is sought.

Some concerns were on the resources that may be needing for this assessment cycle of CIP followed by PHR. So, some concerns were raised from the community members that, do we have resources available at ICANN that support this framework as well as the PHR that follows that. Also, the clarification is sought whether the CIP is just a replacement of the organizational reviews or whether it's some kind of enhancement, which they thought is not clear in the framework, or whether we are just going to replace the organizational reviews with CIP process. or it provides some kind of enhancement, which I believe it is doing because it is adding more which were not before in the guidelines of the organizational reviews.

And one final thing I noted is that some concerns were raised about ensuring consistency of the review process itself because the process is to be done by the SOACs itself. So, what kind of consistency and application of the same kind of process would be done between two cycles of the CIP because they might be done by completely different individuals, right? So, a set of individuals. So, how we maintain that kind of consistency in the process. So that was more about it.

I would just like to share a document with you quickly, and then I will [inaudible]. So, here we kind of summarized all the public comments that we received so far, right? So, you can see that these were the categorization. This is for question 1A, for example. 1A is whether you support the framework or not. So, just wanted to share that we are realizing it that way and addressing the concerns point by point. And if you see the right side of that, here we have a place where each SOAC representative can put comment on that.

So, for example, you can see that RSSAC has a column to fill there. So, currently, I'm reviewing that document and I will come back for any question or clarification only for those points that I think should be a concern to us, and not because there are some points about sub-structures and others which does not apply to us.

So, maybe in the next meeting, I will summarize that one and come back for any specific guidance or any collective decision based on that, so that we can provide it back to the group, right? So, this is just a summary of A, B, 1A, 1B and 2. So, that is pretty much the status of CIP at the moment. I'll be happy to take any—or I'll move to next one and we will…

JEFF OSBORN

No questions? Thank you very much. This is a huge amount of work. We really appreciate it. Am I doing this at the right part now?

We have an award. Naveed has gotten the RSSAC Caucus Member Recognition Award. And so, I am unaccustomed to doing this. I'm unaccustomed to doing this standing and handing a thing somewhere, but I think applause is in order. I'm not sure. Do you have a second section?

NAVEED BIN RAIS

Yeah. I will move on. So, thank you for the appreciation. I really appreciate it. So, I will move to PHR which is Pilot Holistic Review. So, there has been a pause in last three months on PHR process. Basically, we are still deciding between three options that the community is considering. The first one is we continue as the CIP process is still not finalized because PHR is basically based on the outcome of CIP process, right?

The second one is, we continue with some deliverables and pause some later since we have some data available from the CIP process. And the third one is completely pause the process, wait for at least one cycle of CIP before we start drafting the guidelines because that is what the mandate of PHR is, to draft the guidelines, framework kind of how the holistic review, the future holistic reviews are going to take place, right? So, the discussion will open, I think, or resume, I should say, on 20th of March, so after almost three months. So, I look forward to see what we have in place there. So, no other update as of now for that.

JEFF OSBORN

Again, thank you for all the work. It's a lot of effort. Now, am I stepping back to you because of the mentoring committee? Yes. The agenda…

NAVEED BIN RAIS

Yeah. I'll just be quick on that. So, this is my first meeting as mentor for the next-gen program. I had four mentees, a good bunch of students from North American region. They were from very good top universities. One of them from USC, for example, a PhD student, who is actually doing research on B root server right now. So, he presented yesterday in the next-gen presentations. And some other from the US, Maryland, Georgia Tech, and one from Canada, so they were very good bunch of students doing some good amount of research.

The only pity that I see is that right now they are having another presentation session. So, I wanted to invite them to RSSAC meeting, for example, just as an observer to see how things move here, but I could not because the timing conflict. This may be something for future meetings to see because if we want them, the onboarding and all, to take place, then we have to make sure that such sessions, especially those are mandatory sessions for them, so they should be able to participate or at least observe our meetings. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN	No shock. Scheduling is difficult. Ali Hussain?
OZAN SAHIN	I don't see Ali in the Zoom room.
JEFF OSBORN	Okay. Abdulkarim?
ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE	Thank you very much. So, for this cycle, I had seven mentees. So, for the fellowship, one of them was from—I had one from Ghana, one from Kenya, two from Nigeria. Unfortunately, one person from Nigeria couldn't make it due to visa issue, and also, one person from Rwanda couldn't make it. So, I was supposed to have seven mentees, but eventually I ended up with five mentees. Generally speaking, I think the fellowship program, the mentoring process is something which—[inaudible], she's doing a lot of work trying to make sure we speak to these fellows before they come here, and we speak to them when they are here, trying to know what is going on, and trying to help them as much as we can. And also, at the end of the fellowship process, there's going to be an evaluation whether they would submit a report of what they have done. Generally speaking, there has been no challenges, and I think it's going on fine. And this is going to be my second to the

last mentoring process that I'm going to do. So, the last one is going to be during the next ICANN meeting. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you for all the work you've been doing. We appreciate it. Did I see Gaurav in the room?

OZAN SAHIN

This is Ozan, Jeff. Gaurav couldn't make it because of the huge time zone difference, but he sent me a report in writing which I'm pasting in the chat.

JEFF OSBORN

Oh, great. Okay. Thank you. And as is traditional, even though it says all for the GWG report, I'm going to point to Brad because I think he spent yesterday on the GWG.

BRAD BELANGER

The GWG met this week. We're making progress, and again, I will suggest removing this from the agenda.

JEFF OSBORN

Let's see. We have the member recognition. I'm sorry. Pardon? Rob has a hand up. Rob?

ROB CAROLINA

Yes, assuming that we concluded our discussion of the GWG, I think I got this—I'm wondering, is there time for me to deliver just a couple of brief points about the WSIS+20 discussion?

JEFF OSBORN

This would be an excellent time to do that. If I remember our schedule, we're going to be early anyway you look at it. I have 13 minutes left. Talk fast.

ROB CAROLINA

Okay. I didn't want to put this on the agenda unless we had a little bit of time. You may recall that RSSAC sent two of us to what is an ICANN informal discussion group about the WSIS+20 ongoing process. And what I'm about to say to you is not in any way attributable to that group or to ICANN. This is a series of personal observations and opinions gleaned from participating in those discussions, as well as I had the opportunity, not on behalf of ICANN or RSSAC, but just on behalf of my company attending the IGF in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia in December.

So, things picked up in those fora. Those of you who are interested or follow the WSIS+20 process are probably aware that it is due to wrap up, essentially, by the end of this calendar year. It's a multi-year review of this program established by the United Nations 20 years ago, hence WSIS+20. From what I've seen and from what I've heard, I think it's a bit of a—oh, sorry. I'm being told I'm not close enough to a microphone. The good news, in my opinion, and the thing that I've been mostly focused on, borrowing one of Jeff's hats as a root server is to look for anything that might threaten the stability of the single name and numbering system that we think of as the internet. That is the heart of everything we work to maintain.

And the good news is, I haven't heard or seen anything coming out of the current discussions, either at the IGF or more generally, that seem to put that in any significant or even minor risk of being at jeopardy. The discussions in the hallways seem to be that there's still strong support for the multistakeholder system that we all participate in, and there doesn't seem to be a desire to make a fundamental change to that subject. Keeping in mind that WSIS is about much, much, much, much, much more than just the internet. The internet is only one part of their program.

Having said that, I think I would be remiss if I didn't point out that certain recent changes in global politics, particularly the change in the administration in the US, have caused some degree of concern about some other aspects of the WSIS realm, particularly sustainable development goals, and a series of issues that I'm just going to broadly lump together as being related to human rights, perhaps in a more narrow focus. I don't propose to say anything more about that other than to say that there are obviously a number of people who are disappointed about what that might do in the WSIS program.

I'm not going to give you my opinion on that. I think my job here is to tell RSSAC that I don't see anything at present coming out of the United Nations treatment of WSIS+20, or the IGF that appears to raise the specter of threat to the stability of the single naming and numbering system that we know and—

JEFF OSBORN

We are at our dramatic conclusion. Does anybody else have anything before we close up? Wes?

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, really briefly. So, we've been meeting all week in multiple groups over Zoom and raising hands. The board session will not go like that this afternoon. There will be a Zoom room. You're welcome to join it. Probably not many people will be watching the raise hands. The board has the habit of raising flags. Most of you will have names printed with flags, or you can raise your hand physically to indicate, and I will look for that and spot it. Zoom is less used during that session.

JEFF OSBORN

As many of those meetings that I go to, I'm still baffled every time I see somebody's card sideways and I never remember what it is, so I will try really hard.

WES HARDAKER

It took me a meeting or two to realize that's how I should be doing it, yes.

JEFF OSBORN	Got it, okay. Ozan is gesturing at me, and I'm not understanding it. Did I do something wrong about [inaudible] out?
OZAN SAHIN	No, I just wanted to speak to 9A, which is the 2024 RSSAC Caucus Member Recognition if we are in this part of the agenda.
JEFF OSBORN	Yes, we are there.
OZAN SAHIN	So, RSSAC recognized Erum Welling and Naveed Bin Rais as the recipients of 2024 caucus Member Recognition, and Jeff has just presented the glass award to Naveed, but since Erum couldn't make this meeting, we will be shipping her glass award to her mailing address. Thanks.
JEFF OSBORN	Thank you, Ozan. The next meeting is scheduled for April Fool's Day, because of course it is. I have no pranks planned. I'm suggesting in the year 2025 they might not be recognized as such, so maybe we'll just avoid that. Nobody has anything else. I believe that is the end of our meeting. Thank you all for coming.
OZAN SAHIN	The meeting is adjourned. Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]