
ICANN83 | PF – RSSAC Work Session
Monday, June 09, 2025 – 10:45 to 12:15 CEST

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Thanks, everyone, for joining. This is Andrew McConachie from ICANN staff. This is the RSSAC001v3 Work Party meeting. This is our, I think our second or third meeting. This Work Party is pretty recent, pretty new. We have the agenda up on the screen. We had a bunch of activity on the list. I also started a working document. I don't know, Abdulkarim, I know you're one of the chairs. I know Robert was supposed to, supposed to lead this meeting, but he's not online and it's 4 a.m. where he is. Do you want me to turn over to you? Do you want to run this meeting? I could go either way, whatever you want.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yes, I can stand in for him.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Then in that case, I don't know if you want me to walk through the working document or if you want to discuss the list stuff first, but your call.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yeah, I think we do the roll call then.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

OZAN SAHIN

So, this is Ozan speaking for the record. Just a few reminders before the roll call, and then we'll go to the roll call. Note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and ICANN Committee Anti-Harassment Policy.

During the session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the proper format as noted in the chat. And if you'd like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon. Virtual participants will be given the permission to unmute in Zoom and on-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. And please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace.

So, let's see, let's go to the roll call. In the room, we have Daniel Migo, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Brad Vard, Kevin Hildebrand, Matt Larson, Duane Wessels, Wes Hardaker, Robert Carolina, and Hiro Hota. In the Zoom room, we have John Augenstein, Kazunori Fujiwara, Ken Renard, Peter Martin, Shinta Sato. And from support staff, we have Dan Gluck, Andrew McConnachie, and myself, Ozan Sahin. With that, back over to you, Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you very much, Ozan. Let me welcome everybody to this meeting. And it's good that we're meeting face to face for our third

meeting. So, I would like probably, Andrew, if you can just, the documents so that we can then go to item number 2.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Do you want me to kind of introduce the document and talk about the one change I made?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yes, that's fine.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Sure. So, we had our admin meeting last week for this Work Party, and because of some of the discussion that happened on the list, we decided it was just a good idea to open up a working document for this Work Party. I know this Work Party had been kind of discussing whether or not we would update 001, and so that was kind of an open question. But based on some of the discussion happening on list, we decided, well, it looks like we are going to be updating 001, or at least we wanted to open up the document and have a working document.

So, what I did was I took 001v2, which is the current version published on the RSSAC website, and I made 001v3. It is basically the exact same thing where there were changes, like, for example, here where it went from two to three, it's in suggestion mode. Otherwise, everything except for, like, the dates and whatnot is the same as 001v2.

And the only change, let me scroll all the way down, is here. And because the discussion on list was around adding a new 3.9, I just kind of picked one of the suggestions. There was really no clear consensus on list. So, I picked one of the suggestions that was made on the list, hoping this would spur some discussion. And I guess that's where we're at.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Andrew. So, just like what was mentioned, we started having the discussion about if we need to have a v3 for 001. And based on our last meeting, Paul suggested I was going to suggest some of the edits that can be made. And the first one was on merging 3.1a and b together. And I don't know if Paul is here to probably start discussion on that. Okay.

So, Paul sent a mail regarding that, and also the section 3.9. So, I think those are the two areas we probably need to focus on today. And also, maybe before we move to those two, I don't know if there is any comment because during our last meeting, we were still probably not 100% sure if we're going to go ahead with this Working Group. But based on this, I think we have to probably resolve these issues since we started this discussion. So, I think we're 100% sure we're going ahead now, Andrew, am I correct on that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

I think we're like 99% sure that we're going ahead with actually opening up this document. But we've never stated in the Work Party. This would be the first time we've stated that in the Work Party for sure. But I think basically we've come to the conclusion that yes, people have opinions about the document, and that the document needs to change at least in some fashion. And I guess now would be the time for someone to say no, the document really, really does not need to change. So, if somebody has any issue with that conclusion, now would be the time to voice it.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Yeah, so I think we should probably start with that. And if there is any comment on that, then we look at those two edits, then we see how far we can go.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, it actually suggests you just proceed with edits. And if we end up in the state where all edits have been refuted, then we don't open the document. So, just consider for now.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you. So, apart from these two edits, is there any other thing that's coming up probably based on the last discussion or after having an afterthought on other areas of the document that needs to be amended? None? Okay. So, let's start from 3.9. Paul made some suggestions, and there was back and forward on the mailing

list. So, I think I will probably allow us to have that discussion here. I don't know who wants to start, because Paul is not here.

DUANE WESSELS

This is Duane Wessels, I can start. So, Paul and I were exchanging ideas on the mailing list. The text that Andrew added is essentially what I was advocating for. Basically that 001 should list any other RSSAC documents that have expectations or hints of expectations. Paul was asking for a little bit stronger language. But I think some of us, including, well, I won't speak for too many people who aren't here. But I think one concern I had with Paul's stronger language is that it started in the direction of creating circular references. So, that's why I think what's currently before us is pretty good.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So, one thing to add to that, we got a note from Ray Bellis who couldn't be here today. And he said, this is from Ray's mail, as expressed in the last call and on the list, my view is that it makes no sense to add an explicit expectation of adhering to RSSAC061, but the document should just refer to it to draw it to the reader's attention. So, my interpretation of Ray's comment is that he's actually good with this language.

And I think, he kind of agrees with you, Duane, that we should just reference it here so that we don't get stuck in this kind of circular reasoning about expectations or documents placing expectations

on other documents which place expectations. So, my understanding from Ray is that he also agrees with this text.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Andrew. Yeah, please go ahead.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, I actually like this text. I think it works really well. I don't think that we should close this until Paul has a chance to weigh in on the discussion. That would be kind of unfair, but it seems like consensus is leaning toward this text works well. I don't have a problem with the circular reference issue. I mean, that happens all the time.

I just got in a big battle with the AESG over whether circular references were allowed to reference historic documents, which later updated other things. And I proved that that already existed. So, people can solve that problem. That's just a human readability problem. I don't think it's a big deal, but I also don't think we need anything stronger than what's here.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you. Do we have-- Yeah, please go ahead.

ROB CAROLINA

Hi. Rob Carolina. I apologize because I'm a little bit new to this document, and I'm also just trying to make sure that I understand

where we are in the current process. Is this the moment to suggest sort of like generally a possibility of amending anything in the document, no matter where it is? Is that appropriate at this time?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Yes, I think.

ROB CAROLINA

Okay. Well, if we're discussing 3.9 now, then I'll make a specific comment about 3.9, but I think you'll see, Wes, that it becomes a generalizable comment about two other places in the document. And I'm a bit hesitant around the phrase, the publications, place additional expectations on, to place an expectation on RSOs. There's something about that form of words which feels uncomfortably like something beyond an expectation and starts to drift into language that hints at the creation of an obligation.

Now, I don't want to get into-- I don't think we need to get into how many angels can dance on the head of that particular pin, but what I would like to suggest is that in the, I was just doing a quick count of this in the document, I think there are either two or three places where something, or a similar phrase is used, as it is here in 3.9. Rather than using the form to place an additional expectation on, I think what we're trying to do is merely describe expectations of RSOs, or to describe an expectation.

So, we're describing expectations, and we can publish advice about expectations. And I think that's the way that 3.9 should be, if we're

going to adopt 3.9, then we should phrase it that way. And I think there's, like I said, there's two other places in the document that I can identify later that I've been able to find where I'd like to see a similar revision.

WES HARDAKER

Can you put suggested text into the comment?

ROB CAROLINA

Yeah, happy to.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay. Thank you. So, probably we'll just wait for the suggested text. And I think, is there any other comment on 3.9? Yeah, okay.

NAVEED BIN RAIS

Yeah, this is Naveed. I just wanted to say that once you mentioned the circular reference of document number, we should refer to anything like latest version, or most recent version of that document. Because if we mentioned like V2, V3, that can keep changing, and that could disturb the document going forward, right? So, in order to read it well, it should read like latest version of whatever that 0047 or 0061 is, because that could also keep changing over time. And that would disturb this document once you make that version embedded into this document.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Naveed. Well, I'm thinking the challenge with that might be the newer version might have some content that might not be intended to be part of this. So, I don't know. That's just my thinking on your suggestion.

WES HARDAKER

Well, if I may, so this is Wes. I think, Naveed, you bring up a really good point. And we don't really have a standard language in RSSAC for this or any other version. We started versioning the documents to make sure, you know, five years ago, or I remember the history, right? But to deal with things like this, we would always have the same number associated with it. With respect to these documents will always be expectations.

And if this language is kept simple to say, you need to go read these other documents for other expectations, it doesn't matter really if they have new expectations, they're still going to be expectations of the root server operators or the root server system, one of the two. So, I don't see an issue with the forward reference to things that may be written in the future, because they will still be expectations.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Do we have any other comments? Okay. I think moving forward, there was also a suggestion about 3.1, one second, 3.1 A and B, if that section can be merged together. Yeah. Do we have suggestion

on this? I know Paul was saying something about this, but there was no firm agreement. Okay. Yeah, please go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS

Thanks. This is Duane Wessels. I understand that these are similar and probably when RSOs publish documents describing how they meet these expectations, their responses to those questions are also very similar. But there's a challenge with merging these two that as written, they apply differently. The first one is written to apply to each RSO, and the second one is written to apply to RSOs collectively. So, my opinion on merging these is that it's not worth the trouble, that we should leave them as they are, because it's fine. It's not harming anything to have them separate at this point. Yeah. Thank you, Duane.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Do we have any other comment on this? Okay. So, probably we'll go back to Rob, who said he has some other suggestion on some other parts. And Rob, we're probably coming back to you on the other suggestions.

ROB CAROLINA

Okay. Sorry, give me 90 seconds and I'll show them to you. Revision is in 3.9. I'm now working at the beginning of 3.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

So, probably while we're waiting for that, I just also wanted to mention that I know that during our last meeting, there was a discussion about not opening up the entire document. And we kind of didn't reach a conclusion on that. So, I think that's probably why we feel we can still open up the entire document. Am I right, Andrew, on that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yeah, I think whatever this group decides to do now is fine. If this group finds a section that they would like to edit, now is the time to call it out. So, I guess in a sense, that kind of opens up the entire document to edits. Yeah. Do you want to talk about edits now, Rob?

ROB CAROLINA

Sure. We've got the one at the beginning of 3 open in front of us now. Again, my concern, having come to the document only more recently, is that this phrasing of the claim that this document somehow places, imposes, creates an expectation on how RSOs do things veers, to my way of thinking, uncomfortably close to describing the language of obligation. And so, what I'm trying to achieve with the redraft is to simply say, what we're doing is we're describing expectations.

We're not so much placing expectations on RSOs, as we're describing a series of expectations on how RSOs are meant to be operating. So, the change in 3 would begin by saying, this

document describes the expectations on how RSOs carry out the service they provide. So, placing upon is no longer the operative language. It's simply describing expectations on how RSOs carry out the service. There's no imposition. There's also no discussion of where the expectation comes from, but it's, well, the ultimately it comes from RSSAC.

The same but different kind of thing you can find if you scroll down to 3.9. Assuming that we adopt something like 3.9, the language can be modified to simply say, these other RSSAC publications describe additional expectations in specific circumstances. I think that describing RSOs here, I think, is unnecessarily redundant. And then, at the beginning of 4, similarly, rather than this document places expectations on individual root server operators, it would begin with, it is expected that root server operators will publish the following.

So, it's describing an expectation rather than placing or imposing. And, in the sense of what RSSAC does, given that this is an advisory document, ultimately the interpretation would be RSSAC is advising that this is the kind of expectation that one should have with respect to what RSOs do. It's a modest distinction, I'll be, I'll freely admit. And, if the decision were taken that we don't want to make any changes at all to RSSAC001, I wouldn't lose any sleep over not making these changes until at such time as we do decide to change it. But, if we are going to change some stuff, it would be,

I would just feel a little more comfortable if we said these things in these three places.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Rob.

WES HARDAKER

I understand your point, Rob. And, we've run across this all the time. I mean, we actually, the 002 metrics are a good example where we describe metrics that we hope everybody implements, but there's actually no hard requirement because there's no governance system yet. I would expect that maybe once a governance system is set up, these would turn into expectations if you do these or else, right?

We'll leave that for down the lines. But, with respect to your edits, I think your edits for three, nine, and four make sense to me. I have no problems with them. I need to think about the 3. I don't like the wording. It seems weird to say an expectation on how you operate or something like that. The wording just seems a little strange, but I'll think about it and come up with other wording.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you. Do we have any other comments? Okay. I think, we still have some time, but we might not have anything to discuss. So, we might probably wait until probably the next meeting where

we'll have more comments on this suggestion. So, probably we'll move on to any other business.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Okay. This may very well go down as the shortest Work Party in RSSAC caucus history, which is fine. We seem to have really short meetings, which is also great. Maybe it's an idea that I send this document to the list saying, we made some additional edits to the document in the last call. Please review them, just to the whole list for all the people that couldn't be in the meeting.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

I agree with that, Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Okay. So, I'll do that. And then, if my Zoom room will let me go back to the agenda. Okay. Our next meeting is June 24th. That meeting will be online. I believe that's it. And then, we're good to go. You're good to go, Abdulkarim? Close the meeting?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Yes. Thank you very much.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

I think Wes's hand is old, right? Okay. Then, this concludes the meeting. Thank you, everyone.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]