DANIEL GLUCK

Hello, and welcome to this RSSAC Meeting on Thursday, the 12th of June at 10:45 local time. My name is Daniel Gluck, and I am a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

So, this meeting is intended for interactions between the RSSAC members and any invited guests. Similarly, this 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 privileges to speak or use the chat feature. If you would like to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute microphones in Zoom. On-site participants will use their physical microphones to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Dan. Appreciate it very much. Wrapping up here at 83, we have a pretty standard RSSAC meeting for all of you who attend these things. The first item is a look at-- Wait, that jumped. First thing I was going to do is a roll call. So, consider this call to order. Does this need a hammer to be done right normally, or can I just say call to order?

SUZANNE WOOLF You need a gavel or you need the gong that Aaron asked for.

JEFF OSBORN I will take either, Suzanne. This could get better and better. Thank you.

SUZANNE WOOLF You may live to regret either suggestion.

HANS PETTER HOLEN No, but the Board chair has a four-note xylophone, so you should go at least to a 13-note scale so you have one for each root server, right?

JEFF OSBORN You're going to hate me when I come back. I'll have that many hats and many tools. It'll be--

WES HARDAKER Can I move we stop holding meetings on Thursdays of ICANN when we're all too punchy to actually talk?

JEFF OSBORN	Let's get right to the roll call. Everybody has to do a four-minute interpretive dance after their name is called, so I'll start alphabetically by height. Where's the roll call?
DANIEL GLUCK	Let me get that up. Oh, are we good? Okay, we're good. There we go. Very small, but let me zoom that in.
JEFF OSBORN	Excellent, there we go. All right, I hadn't seen them yet, but from Cogent, do we have Paul or Brad? I don't see them. I saw John from DISA remotely. Peter?
JOHN AUGENSTEIN	Yes, I'm here.
JEFF OSBORN	That's John and not Peter? Okay.
PETER MARTIN	Peter's also here.
JEFF OSBORN	Oh, Peter, thank you. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to miss you. From ICANN, I see Matt. I don't see John.

MATT LARSON	Matt's here. John is not here.
JEFF OSBORN	Terrific. ISC, Jeff Osborn, I am here. Rob Carolina is over there.
ROBERT CAROLINA	Here.
JEFF OSBORN	NASA, Jose and Brad? Jose and Brad, hopefully they're asleep. Netnode, Lars?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	Liman is here. Frederick is not.
JEFF OSBORN	Frederick is not. RIPE NCC, the esteemed Hans Petter Holen is here. Did Paul make it? We don't see?
HANS PETTER HOLEN	No.
JEFF OSBORN	Okay. Wes and Suzanne, both proudly representing USC ISI. Howard or Ken from ARL?

KEN RENARD	Ken's here.
JEFF OSBORN	Heard Ken. Okay. Howard?
KEN RENARD	Don't forget UMD.
JEFF OSBORN	I thought we were going to do this alphabetically by height. I'm really getting confused. Okay, so for UMD, Tim and Kevin. There's Kevin. Tim? Tim, not there. Sorry about that. And Ken for ARL. Brad, Verisign. Afshaan?
AFSHAAN ABDUL	Good morning.
JEFF OSBORN	Good morning, Afshaan. And Brad is not here?
AFSHAAN ABDUL	Not yet.
JEFF OSBORN	Not yet. Okay, we'll hold him a place. Thank you.

AFSHAAN ABDUL	Thank you.
JEFF OSBORN	And WIDE, we have Hiro. And we're missing Jun. All right, liaison to the Board. Wes, and Hiro's still here. And Liman is still here. Daniel for the IAB. There he is, Daniel. And the always remote, Russ Mundy.
RUSS MUNDY	Hey there. Yes, Russ is here.
JEFF OSBORN	Hey, Russ. Nice to see you. James for IANA.
JAMES MITCHELL	Hi. James is here.
JEFF OSBORN	Hi, James. And Duane.
DUANE WESSELS	Duane is here.
JEFF OSBORN	Excellent. No apologies. No invited guests.

DANIEL GLUCK

Naveed is an invited guest.

JEFF OSBORN

Naveed is an invited guest. I'm sorry. I saw Naveed on the way in. And we're thinking Brad might make it in yet, but he's more than just an invited guest. All right. Does it say anything else at the bottom I'm supposed to--? Okay. And we'll go back to the other. There we are. Agenda review. As I said before, the agenda is pretty normal. There are two items to vote on, the prior minutes and the recommendation of a highly recommended candidate by the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee. And then we have some minor discussions that will explain themselves. Does anybody have anything they'd like to be added to the agenda? I believe with that, we go to Ozan in the draft minutes and a perfunctory vote.

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you, Jeff. Hello, everyone. This is Ozan. I circulated the draft minutes from 6th of May meeting two weeks ago. We have not received any requests for revisions. And the minutes are up for an RSSAC vote today. But we'll pause first for any discussions or questions about the draft minutes from the May meeting. There's none. Back to you, Jeff, for the vote.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you. I can never remember. Do I need a motion and a second? Yes, I do. I need a motion. Wes. And a second? Lars. Do we have any no votes? Do we have any abstentions? The prior minutes pass by a claim. Thank you very much.

Next on our agenda, caucus membership update. The caucus membership, I've had to miss a couple of meetings. I had not been well, and then I'd had a bad schedule. However, for the vote, we're having a highly recommended person, Mohibul Mahmud, is working at Microsoft as a cloud engineer and had done extensive work at the national, I believe it was at a root server, the DNS in his home nation. So, this was getting wild approval from everyone. We will need to vote on their admission to the membership, the RSSAC membership committee. And as I said, it was a unanimous vote of approval by the membership committee. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT

So, as I mentioned on the mailing list, I do strongly recommend that candidate as well. So, yeah, I know him and I've met him multiple times. Yeah, I can state that he's very knowledgeable in the DNS area. And I recommend him strongly.

JEFF OSBORN

Excellent. This could be a very simple vote.

WES HARDAKER

I move to approve him. This is Wes,

JEFF OSBORN Thank you. Asking for a second.

KEN RENARD Second from Ken.

JEFF OSBORN Terrific. All opposed. All abstained. Unanimous by acclamation. Welcome aboard. Great. So, Mahmud will be informed of this new membership, and we'll see him next time we meet. Excellent. I believe Ozan is best qualified for 4.b.ii., the Activity Tracking. Okay.

OZAN SAHIN Thank you, Jeff. Hello, everyone. This is Ozan again. There was some discussion about this agenda item in Seattle. The Caucus Membership Committee, when they conducted the activity review of the caucus members, so far looked at all of the activities of the caucus members since they joined caucus. And if they identified at least like three pieces of activities which are considered as attending to the caucus meetings, the contributions to RSSAC caucus work parties, contributions to the RSSAC advisories, these were all counted as pieces of activity. And if they achieved at least three pieces of activities, they were considered to be active.

But during the discussions in the Seattle meeting, RSSAC recommended that the Caucus Membership Committee would start looking at the most recent activities of the caucus members because if somebody joined caucus around 2016, 2017 and achieved three pieces of activities and didn't do anything since then, they were still considered to be active based on the previous approach.

That's why RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee recently started a new round of this review, and this time focusing on the last activities in the last three years, and identified 32 caucus members who were found to be inactive. And currently what's happening is that the Caucus Membership Committee is reaching out to these inactive caucus members, basically sending them a letter saying that they were found inactive and reminding the expectation for caucus members to be active in the caucus and basically expecting them to be active within the next six months, otherwise they would be removed from the caucus. So, this is what the membership committee is doing, and this is the update. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Ozan. The next item is actually another Ozan, shockingly. This is the issue where we have the IETF and specifically the AGM meetings smack back to back and do we do duplicate meetings in a seven-day period. Ozan, want to frame that?

OZAN SAHIN

So, once every two years, the ICANN annual general meetings and IETF meetings, even numbered IETF meetings are almost back to back or with like one week and two-week gap. And this results in a situation where we have an RSSAC caucus meeting at an ICANN annual general meeting and then have another RSSAC caucus meeting at the even numbered IETF meeting.

In the past two cases of this within the four or five years, in one case RSSAC decided to cancel the RSSAC caucus meeting at the IETF meeting, even numbered IETF meeting in November because caucus was already meeting at the AGM. But in another case, the caucus meeting at the IETF was converted to like a work party meeting. So, since this is recurring every two years, the RSSAC admin committee discussed this to see if there's still value in having the caucus meeting at IETF right after the one at AGM. And there have been suggestions to propose a new format for the even numbered IETF meeting that's happening right after the one at AGM. This could be lightning talks, I guess. And I, again, invite the rest of the admin committee to share their suggested formats for this change.

JEFF OSBORN

The interesting comment that had been made for me, I thought, why have two meetings in a row with the same two people? But I think you get a different population who comes to each of those. And so, it's not just a complete over the Venn diagram is not a Japanese flag. So, to have both of those sessions, I think, would make some sense. One of the things that was included, too, was I think we're increasingly, we, the RSSAC, increasingly operating in informative sessions with other groups.

I sat through the SSAC Lightning Talks. I guess that was just yesterday. And I was jealous. That was like, that is a really interesting thing to do where somebody picks an area of great expertise and interest to the group and provides it. So, I went from saying, why bother having two meetings to I think it's a good idea, but the format might need to change. And lightning talks, I think, are a really good, at least partial program, of course, based on experience this week. And Wes?

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, I think when we talked about this the other day, I was originally it makes sense not to meet, but really, the audiences are very different. We actually are getting increasing participation at IETFs from IETF members that come to sit and listen. And I think I think even the RSSAC administrative meetings are fairly boring. Even the RSSAC caucus meetings are somewhat boring because we're just reviewing the same kind of stuff.

So, the concept of reducing the meeting time to just the quick reports and then diving into three hot topics or lightning talks that people can do, I think will actually help enlighten the IETF community about the RSS as a whole. And I would even argue that we should invite people from the IETF side to give presentations on DNS-related things that they think is relevant to the route as well.

JEFF OSBORN

Are you suggesting we need a PC?

WES HARDAKER

I'm suggesting you should be on it.

JEFF OSBORN

That's not a bad idea. I was sitting here listening to you, Wes while agreeing more and more with you, I thought, oh, hell, this needs a structure. I would volunteer to act as the first pro forma one just to have somewhere to hang an email. But that's a great idea, especially the invitation of in as well as out. Ken, and then Liman.

KEN RENARD

Yeah, thanks. One of the concerns with having back-to-back meetings was not having enough material to make it worthwhile. But yeah, the lightning talks was one thing. And SSAC did a fantastic job with that. The other thing is let's see how well the Q&A, the open mic session goes in the next meeting slot. And that could be another possible agenda item for one or both of the caucus meetings at ICANN or IETF. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Sorry, I was reading Brad's comment, which is a good one. It would be easy to fall into that trap, Brad. You're right. SSAC has a particularly broad remit, and we have a famously narrow one. We would really want to make sure we stick to our knitting. Good call. Andrew. I'm sorry, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Thanks. I really like a lot of this. I think there are areas of contact with other groups that can be important and bring us forward. But I also see a risk of, actually riding on Brad's comment here, treading into areas where DNS-OARC and other groups already play a significant role. Making contact with the IETF community around the DNS protocol and its involvement is really good. So, if we can limit it, as Brad said, to root-related stuff, I think I'm all for this. But please don't make the structure too heavy. We don't need another committee. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

I'll cancel the monkeys and the circus clowns, and we'll see what we can do. Again, I think Brad and Liman are making really good cautionary points. We could really make a dog's breakfast of this if we weren't careful. Any other input on that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

Yeah, my only concern is we won't find people to give lightning talks. So, the last time we opened this up, we didn't really have anyone step up, so I gave kind of a short little lightning. Well, I guess all lightning talks are short, but I gave a lightning talk. I'm happy to do a song and dance again for the RSSAC if that's asked for, but if we open this up for lightning talks and nobody responds, it just ends up being dead in the water anyways.

JEFF OSBORN

I think that you're absolutely right. That is the what if you threw a party and nobody came? On the other hand, I think there is enough of an imagined difference of how these issues are perceived by ICANN and IETF, that there are people on each side who wish the other guys would figure this shit out and I would like to explain it to them finally. So, I kind of feel like people have a little bit of a chip already and would like the opportunity to explain it. If I'm wrong, then we skip one round of, oh, well, nobody did this and it wasn't any good.

The other thing we're trying to do is fill in a, what do you do every two years when you have a funny conflict? And so, given that the groups come from two different areas, if all we did was do the two meetings, I think we determined it was better than skipping one of them. So now, I think we're trying to fill in on that and how do you make it more useful. So, the point is taken, this could be a complete disaster and if so, we had two years to fix it for the next time. And hand is up. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Thanks. I don't think we can expect people to be lined up at the door waiting to make presentations for us. We probably have to reach out to people. We have to be around, we have to identify people who work on interesting issues or make interesting presentations in other forums and actually do some active work here. I doubt that SSAC just sat there and opened the door. So, we probably are looking at some legwork.

JEFF OSBORN Are you volunteering to be on the PC? Welcome, partner. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY Yeah, I can say from experience for both SSAC and for the DNSSEC Security Workshop that it does take a bit of organizing in advance to make sure you have useful things and having folks that, the ones that are doing that best suited are those that are tending to watch the broad community and see things that are going on. So, yeah, I think that Liman is exactly right. There's at least some bit of work here, but I think it would be useful for both caucus members as well as the community that we're in at the time to give this a shot for things and see what we can get.

JEFF OSBORN Excellent point and well put, Russ. Dan?

DANIEL MIGAULT But I'm just missing something. Where do we want to have those lighting talks? Hold at the IETF or at ICANN meetings?

JEFF OSBORN IETF I was assuming because that's the backup one.

DANIEL MIGAULT Okay, good.

JEFF OSBORN The other thing, I'm going to put words in Liman's mouth, I think we are both realists enough that if we got to be a month ahead of this thing and it looked like it was a disaster and nobody was available, we would let you know that's not going to work. We'll simply have to have either a shorter meeting or do something else. I think neither of us is afraid to say that didn't work. Okay, fair enough. Any other word on that before the PC goes off and spends a lot of money on uniforms and parties? All right. Where does this get us to? Travel support, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN Thanks, Jeff. ICANN84 Annual General Meeting is taking place in Muscat, Oman in the final week of October this year. And I shared an email on the RSSAC list for those seeking to get travel support to go to this meeting. Since we talked a lot about IETF, for avoidance of doubt, this is completely separate from the IETF meeting or RSSAC caucus support to attend the IETF meeting in November. So, this is only for the ICANN Annual General Meeting. And if you would like to request travel support, the deadline is tomorrow. So, if you haven't done so, please do that by tomorrow. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

I see no other hands. Any other questions on that? Off record, did you see one from me? Good. Thank you. Where are we? We are at Item 5. So, Daniel and Duane, Work Party Update.

DUANE WESSELS

Okay. So, there was a 001v3 Work Party, I don't know, a couple days ago, Tuesday, I guess. And it was pretty short. We really only talked about a couple of things. One, there was a proposal to merge two sections or two expectations in the existing document into one. I think we didn't really come to a conclusion on that because some of the proponents for that idea were not able to participate in the meeting.

And then we talked about how to reference other RSSAC documents that I'm going to use the wrong word, I wanted to say place, but I'm not allowed to say place expectations, describe expectations. So anyway, we did a little bit of editing in the document and that, and again, we'll wait for feedback from others who are not able to join the meeting. So, that was it, I think. Did I miss anything, Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT

I don't think so. The number of documents that are included are two, so it's not-- Yeah, it's a revision.

JEFF OSBORN	That's it, thank you very much. Liman?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	Yes, thank you. Regarding an RSSAC meeting regarding discussions around signing the root servers .net zone. We talked about having a meeting, I believe early in May or early June, and that was a little too short lead time, if I remember correctly. And now there is a doodle out for another meeting late in June. But I see Daniel, and I would like to give the word to you to discover the situation.
DANIEL GLUCK	Thanks, Liman. I actually sent a calendar invite out for that, for the 2nd of July at 20:00 UTC. That should be in everyone here's inbox as a .ICS file to download, just so we don't have any issues with the calendar. But if you would like calendar invite, definitely let me know. But yeah, that's 2 July, 20:00 UTC, that avoids the IGF, it should avoid the IETF after that, and all other meetings. So, I know there might be some issues with attendance there, but I think this one should work for most people.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	Thank you, and sorry for having missed that. It's probably in a different mail folder.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Liman. Moving on to six, reports from the chair and the vice chair. I've given you everything I know. Unless there are any questions, I'll move it on to Ken.

KEN RENARD

Nothing from me, thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

All right. Wes, news of the Board. Nothing much ever happens. Anything going on this week?

WES HARDAKER

I haven't seen them all week. Obviously, this is the Policy Forum. The nice thing about the Policy Forum is the Board members have less conflicts with our own work and we try and get out and attend a lot of the community sessions, including have interactions with the other constituencies. So hopefully you've seen Board members around. I encouraged them to come to RSSAC meeting, but none of them showed up. But they have been in a lot of other meetings, which it's been good to see them interact. And they're highly interested in a lot of the technical stuff that we do.

We have a good number of people on the Board right now that are highly interested in technical stuff, even when they're not experts themselves and they want to learn more. And in fact, one of the things that the Board has been increasingly talking about is open-source software and things like that. So, it was actually very beneficial. I could refer them to the recently published diversity report that the root server operators put out about the software that we use to run the root server system, not just for the DNS software, but for routing and for everything else. And they found that interesting.

The big thing this week that I'm sure everybody has heard is the ICANN Review Process, which has been a large source of discussion both in the Board and in the ICANN community. Traditionally in the past, RSSAC has refrained from having many opinions about reviews. As a quick reminder, there are multiple reviews that happen in the ICANN world. The purpose of them is to build a multi-stakeholder model that has an accountability mechanism. And that means reviewing ICANN as a whole. It means reviewing individual constituencies like RSSAC. If you remember, we had a fairly deep RSSAC review a number of years ago. And the community as a whole is split as to how useful those have been.

And in fact, so the holistic, the larger review of the entire ICANN ecosystem, which is ATRT, and I am blanking on what the acronym expands to, but the end result is one of the things that came out of the ATRT3, which was the last one, was that they actually recommended that we don't do them every five years and that we change our pacing structure—because they're expensive in terms of resources, community resources. I'm not talking just finances—to start at a slightly slower rate based on the implementation of the previous recommendations and various things. I won't go into the detail and I'm not the person to speak in detail about it.

The end result is the Board deferred the start of the ATRT4 last March, I believe, if my dates are right. And we just deferred it again this March. And so, there's some consternation in the ICANN community about what are we doing? How long is this going to go on? How long can we push it off forever? That doesn't seem like a right thing to do. And the community is very split about what the right thing to do is. ALAC has strong opinions that we should start it immediately. The ccNSO has offered up some good suggestions about how to make a path forward where we can decide how useful are the reviews, what are they, what's their purpose, and how can we start them again in a way that makes them fit for purpose and executed in a reasonable timeframe and with good results.

So, all of that is going forward. It's heavily discussed. I'm assuming that RSSAC probably doesn't want to have an opinion about it, but if we do, we are more than happy to publish something. But my guess is that I'm actually hopeful that there's been a lot of progress this week with ideas from the community about a path forward that hopefully will achieve the best consensus for moving forward that everybody will be happy with or at least agree is the best path forward even if everybody doesn't think it's their own best path. So not an easy subject.

If you haven't heard about it this week, it's because you are isolating yourself into RSSAC discussions where we don't hit it very much. But if you've been to any of the rest of the meetings, it's been on almost every agenda for every group this meeting. And I believe, Jeff, you have certainly been inundated as the SO/AC group as well. So, if you want to add anything, you're welcome to. That's the end of my Board report unless you guys have questions for me.

JEFF OSBORN

It was so important. We had special dawn meetings called the day before. I really object to those. Ken is up and then Hans Petter.

KEN RENARD

Yes, thankful that I didn't have to get up at 1:30 in the morning for those. Wes brought up an interesting point. The couple of us said on the NextGen talks yesterday, it's apparent that the RSS is still misunderstood. There were some of the myths and some very inaccurate things in there. So just mentioning that outreach is still needed and getting the word out on how the RSS works is definitely a good thing. Need to keep doing it, thanks.

WES HARDAKER

Ken, thank you for bringing that up. I meant to bring that up. It was unrelated to my Board position, but the NextGen actually had a bunch of interesting presentations. And because I wasn't conflicted for once, I sat through a couple of them, was able to comment on a couple of them. One of the continuing misconceptions about the root server system is that latency is the key metric.

I think we have all agreed that resilience and availability matters a gazillion times more than latency to the root because you just don't send that many questions to the root. Rob is shaking his head based on the presentations we've put together on the subject. We still cannot get that message out easily and access to the CDNs, access to the TLDs, access to the lower-level stuff matters a lot more.

Ken, I actually did just get contact addresses for the authors of some of those presentations. So, I will be reaching out to them and sending them some academic papers that are proving our point. Because their end goal of improving availability within regions of the world that don't have as much internet availability and accessibility, their end goal is right. It was just the points that they were using to make it because latency to the root is bad, therefore that's the problem with accessibility in their region of the world. That's not really quite the right conclusion technically, but I still want to support their goals. So, I'll try and help them do that.

But in general, if you guys can attend the NextGen sessions, they're interesting. They're highly motivated young newcomers that really want to make a difference and it's good. They will likely be coming to the RSSAC-SSAC open mic later, because they were directly invited to come, ask questions to us. So, I would expect those types of questions to appear. And I hope they do come, but we might have a lot more questions than we were thinking. So right now, this session is open to observers. This is our official meeting. Please do come to the open mic session, which is in what, 45? Daniel, thank you.

DANIEL GLUCK

Right after lunch.

WES HARDAKER

Right after lunch. So right after lunch, we're having an open mic and anybody can come ask questions. It will be an open session.

JEFF OSBORN

Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah, so on the topic of reviews, I think on a principal level, reviews are important. We shouldn't just go on for years and years and years without reflecting from time to time. From what I've followed, and I must admit, I left the discussion on Saturday when they started to discuss reviews and I did not get there to the 8:00 o'clock meeting on reviews. So, I've just followed it from the side and read the minutes.

I think RSSAC needs to follow this closely and we need to make sure that we're involved in reviews that affect ourself. What others shared with me is that there is a lot of, you said, interest in ALAC, but they also have a lot of capacity to do reviews. But then the recommendations usually hit on other parts of the ICANN structures like the GNSO or on others. And they are the capacity or even the involvement and buy-in to these improvements may not be that well. So, if there is a review of the RSSAC, for instance, I hope we send our very best there so that we at least get the factual information right and we get our point of view heard as well.

And then doing them regularly, I do see the point that we shouldn't do them too often. Now, if a review takes more than one year, then it leaves less than four years to implement the findings. And if there is one recommendation, that's not a problem, but if it's 10, 12, 15, that may be a stretch. So, there is also something with a review team can't just-- you need to prioritize the important things to suggest to improve also. So, there may be things that needs to be done with the ambition of review teams in general and focusing on the most important things. And I think it's important that we keep an eye on this at least for reviews that will affect ourselves.

WES HARDAKER: Yes, certainly I have to have eyes on it. So at least I will come back. But I want to highlight one thing you said that they're important. The good news is that everybody believes they're important. It's just a question of how best to execute them.

JEFF OSBORN	Just to maybe relax your mind a little bit, I, along with Wes, had spent inordinate amounts of time on this. And I think you called it fairly where there are friends at the ALAC who would love to do nothing more than lots and lots of reviews all the time. And there are other, let's call them more pragmatic groups of which we're firmly in the middle, which would like to do as many reviews as are required to be prudent and legal and fitting and not one more. So, I think we're in that camp pretty firmly. That's been the statement made. And nobody is trying to miss out on a responsibility, but neither are we looking to pile review on top of review, which is what it, to some, was starting to feel like. Let's see, we are in the middle of the list. We are at Hiro, I believe, on CSC. Wes, if that was it for the Board. All right, Hiro.
HIRO HOTTA	Yes, this is Hiro. For CSC, SLA for IANA naming function was again 100% satisfied for April and May PTI performance. That's it.
JEFF OSBORN	Nice work. Liman, IFR2.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	Thanks. Liman here. So, for the IFR2, we have mostly concluded our work. Our draft report has been out for public comment. We didn't receive any substantial comments. There were things that were outside the remit of the review team, which we have

responded to, and also a few that were in line with what we already said. So, we now have a draft final report, which is on circulation to the ccNSO and the GNSO, I believe, before we submit it to the Board. And essentially it concludes that with the IANA, just like Hiro just mentioned, it's working fine. They are doing a good job. They are responding to the needs from the TLD community quite well.

And the only two tidbits that we are suggesting as recommendations going forward, they fall into two categories. One is that there are certain things that we found as issues that we wanted to look into. And it turned out that these had already been addressed earlier, but it wasn't quite transparent that that had happened. So, things were actually already good. So, we suggest that it be published in a more transparent way so that future review teams don't have to fall into the same trap.

And secondly, we comment that maybe we can relax the interval between the review. It says now that one review should start five years after the previous review started. And we suggest since a review can take up to 18 months, that the following review starts five years after the first one has concluded, because otherwise it's a little too dense. So, that's our proposed recommendation. But that's about it. We haven't really found any issues that we need to delve on. There's nothing untoward going on there, and there are no performance issues that we can see on the contract.

Yes, there's one more thing, actually. We also recommend a change, that there is a reference in the actual IANA contract to specific DNSSEC methods. And I don't remember exactly if it's crypto methods or something. And time moves on, and this will need to have evolved over time, and they shouldn't be locked down by a contract from 2016. So, that's all, again, it's a minor detail, and it's absolutely not a performance issue with the IANA. But that's one thing that we observed. Thanks. Questions?

JEFF OSBORN If there are no other questions, we move to E, and Liman, RZERC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Ah, moving to RZERC. Actually, we did talk about that just a few minutes ago, and that's about the only thing that's happened in RZERC, planning for the joint meeting between RSSAC and RZERC regarding signing on the root server .net zone. But that's it.

JEFF OSBORN Thank you very much, Liman. I thought I saw Erum around. Is Erum here?

DANIEL GLUCK She's not. She's in the NomCom meeting.

JEFF OSBORN Of course she's in the NomCom meeting, because that's what she does. God bless her. That's a lot of work. Back to Daniel for the IAB.

DANIEL MIGAULT

Hi, everyone. For once, I have something to say on the IAB. So, we had a meeting, a joint meeting, where various IETF delegates to the ICANN could exchange their perspective or the IETF perspective for ICANN. So, I think it's moving in the right direction. I'm very glad. I think this kind of mailing lists and exchanges is something I've suggested for long. Well, some translate my suggestions to have been complained for a long time, but I think that Wes also has been carrying that to the IAB, and I'm glad to thank Wes that finally happened. So, this is good. Good news.

One other thing. So, we had this WSIS session at ICANN, and ICANN was inviting the IETF to join in the USCIB session. So, there is a roundtable. So, this is something I forward to the IETF leadership to see if they want to collaborate with ICANN. We'll see. And maybe the last thing, not related to this IAB, but it's the North American Global Stakeholder Engagement. So, I sent an email to collect the feedback from RSSAC to what we should try to convey. I'm waiting for your feedback on that. My intention is to try to make the strategy plan to be a little bit more tangible. And this is what I'm going to work at. I think I'm done.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Daniel. Next from SSAC, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY	Thank you, Jeff. The only thing I wanted to mention today, and it's already been brought up a couple of times, is the joint open mic session with SSAC and RSSAC that's in the next block. And I hope that as many of the RSSAC members as possible are able to be there and contribute, and we'll see how it goes. Thanks.
JEFF OSBORN	Thanks, Russ. I know I'm looking forward to it. From IANA, James.
JAMES MITCHELL	Oh, yeah. No updates for me this month.
JEFF OSBORN	Thank you, James. Duane, RZM.
DUANE WESSELS	Thanks, Jeff. I actually do have an update this month, which you may have already seen via email. So as a Root Zone Maintainer, we are in the process of transitioning to new hardware security modules for the root zone, zone signing key. The current vendor is not supporting that product past, I think, 2027 or so. So, starting in July, we will begin signing the root zone with keys that are held on Thales HSMs. And in order to make this as smooth a transition as possible we certainly don't expect any problems, but out of prudence, we are increasing the post publication period for the zone signing keys. So

normally that would be 10 days, but instead we're going to take advantage of the whole quarter and there will be two ZSKs in the root zone for all of Q3 coming up. That's basically it. I'm happy to take any questions about that if there are any, and you've also seen it on email, so you can respond there.

JEFF OSBORN Thank you, Dwayne. Naveed, news from the CIP.

NAVEED BIN RAIS Hello, everyone. This is Naveed. So, I have a couple of updates about CIP. We have gone through the public comment process on the framework. So, the CIP is currently addressing those comments and almost finalized that. I think it will be put to SO/AC and NomCom chairs for implementation and approval in the first week of July. So, we are almost done with that.

There are a couple of figures that I wanted to highlight here. So, I sent it to Dan, I think. This is the addition to the framework. The first one is the high-level diagram of the implementation phases of the CIP process. So, this is now added to the framework. So, the community wanted to visualize things. So, as you can see, there are three phases that are important here. One is the Assessment Phase, the other is Improvement Phase, and the last one is the Reporting Phase.

And if we go to the other one, that is also being made part of the framework itself where we give example of how and what are the processes that are involved here. And we put two examples here because as part of the public comment process, the community wanted it to be flexible. So, the CIP group has decided to make it as long as three years, but if some SO/AC wants to conclude it before three years, so they can do it. Before we were implementing phase one each year. So, we have eliminated that year restriction and we provided the--

If you see the second figure, which is down there, so this is year based. So, as you can see, year one, year two, year three. And then year four comes the cycle itself. But if you see the second picture, which is down there. So, just scroll down, please.

Yeah, so here you can see that these are not concluding on years. So, this is an aggressive kind of, if some SO/AC want to conclude their cycle before that, the framework now allows them to do that, but they are not obliged-- They can even finish the whole three phases in one year, but they are not obliged to report that. So as per the obligation, they still have to have the final report of the CIP process every three years. That can include one cycle, two cycles, no matter how many cycles they've gone through, but it should be at least one cycle in three years. So, we have changed the context regarding that.

The second thing is we have a little bit changed the wordings based on the community feedback, some English level update. And the third thing is we have added a new appendix in the framework itself, which is the guidance to implement that. So before, we just had one appendix, which is the examples of different SO/ACs, one of the examples we created as well in last July. So, that is also part of that.

But now we have added an Appendix B, which is the guidance to community how to implement these phases. And that's a long document, which will be around 20 pages. So, it details all the processes, what you have to go to implement all these phases, both the assessment and improvement and the report. So, I just have that update. So, it should be finalized by next month, hopefully. Thank you. If you have any question, I'm here. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

Any questions for Naveed? Thanks for the work on that. I know that's a lot of effort. Thanks, Naveed. GWG, is Brad here? He's online but muted wisely. What's to say about the GWG report? I believe we're wrapping things up in quite a manner. I feel irresponsible of being the person to say it because it's sort of pretentious. Liman, thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Liman here. My take of the situation is that we've now finalized the document to a position where we're sending it off to a technical editor to fix up the language. And if there are any issues that come back from that that are of any substantial rank more than moving a comma or adjusting font size or whatever, that we will do a final take on the document before submitting it for public comment. Do the rest of you agree that that's a good assessment of the situation? I guess you.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Yes. Rob for the record. I think that was a great summary of where we've gotten to with one seemingly minor exception but since we discussed it for 15 minutes, it's worth mentioning. I think the phrase you were looking for is sent out for copy editing. The concept of technical editing was not the concept that was adopted. And our friends at ICANN will find someone to do the copy editing before it comes back to GWG for final approval.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Thank you for that.

JEFF OSBORN

All right, fair enough. If no one else chooses to comment on the status of GWG, we'll go on to any other business. Is there any other business other than our next meeting, July 1st? Our next meeting is July 1st. I believe with that, we're good to go. I'll give you back your half hour and thank you all very much. Looking forward to the RSSAC-SSAC meeting this afternoon. That should be good. And anybody who wants to join in, please come. I'm sure we can use all of your expertise. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]