
ICANN84 | AGM – Root Server System Advisory Committee Caucus Meeting
Wednesday, October 29, 2025 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

DANIEL GLUCK

Hello, and my name is Daniel Gluck and I am the participation manager for this session. This is the RSSAC Monthly Meeting. This will be the, I guess, the November monthly meeting taking place on October 29, 2025. Please note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, the ICANN Expected Standard of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in the session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. This is a meeting for the Root Server System Advisory Committee, so only RSSAC members can participate in this session. If you have any questions or if you'd like to raise your hand, please do so in the Zoom room or post them in the chat room. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to RSSAC Chair, Jeff Osborne.

JEFF OSBORN

My name is Jeff Osborne. I am the RSSAC Chair. Okay, good. Is something funny with other people? I don't have this visible. It's saying it's pausing. Thank you. Okay. Thanks, Daniel. Does that mean the first thing we're going to do is say good afternoon, thanks

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.

for being here, and good day to everybody who's in remote. I don't have the remote up yet.

We're going to do roll call. I was covering for my inability to remember from meeting to meeting what I have to do. So let's do the roll call. From Cogent, Paul or Brad here? John or Peter? I should have looked at the list before I started. My apologies. Matt or John? John isn't here, Matt.

MATT LARSON

Matt's here. John's not.

JEFF OSBORN

Matt's here. Good. ISC, I'm here.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Rob is here.

JEFF OSBORN

Rob is here. From NASA, Jose and or Brad? From NetNod, Liman and Fredrick?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Liman is here.

FREDRIK LINDEBERG

Fredrick is here.

JEFF OSBORN Fredrick is here. Far from the mic. RIPE NCC, Hans and Paul? Paul?
Paul is not here. From UMD, Tim?

KEVIN HILDEBRAND Tim sends his regrets. He was supposed to be here, but he got sick,
and Kevin is here.

JEFF OSBORN Oh, and he's not going to be on the call, so he can't hear us say nice
things about him.

KEVIN HILDEBRAND Looks that way.

JEFF OSBORN That's too bad. Okay. Wes?

WES HARDAKER Wes is here.

JEFF OSBORN Wes is here, and Suzanne is not. She's definitely somewhere here.
ARL, Ken?

KEN RENARD

Ken's here.

JEFF OSBORN

Howard?

HOWARD KASH

Howard's here.

JEFF OSBORN

Howard's here. VeriSign, Brad and Afshaan?

AFSHAAN ABDUL

Hi, Afshan is here.

JEFF OSBORN

Hi, Afshan. I don't see Brad physically. Brad, you online? I think he's on his way home, yeah. And from WIDE, we have Hiro?

HIRO HOTTA

Hiro's here. Jun's not.

JEFF OSBORN

And Jun is not. Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Lars Liman here. I happen to know that Suzanne has a conflict in time, so she is in the building, but in a different meeting.

JEFF OSBORN God knows it's a miracle any of us make these. So, liaisons, everyone. Daniel? Daniel Migault? How about Russ from SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY Russ is here.

JEFF OSBORN Hey, Russ. Glad to have you with us. And James? James from IANA? Somewhere busy in the building, I'm sure. And Duane? So, James is not here, and Duane?

DUANE WESSELS Duane is here.

JEFF OSBORN All right. Invited. Erum? Did you make it? Erum? Okay. And the fabulous staff that make this all look so effortless.

Back up to the schedule. Agenda review. We have a fairly normal agenda here. I don't see anything really outstanding. Anybody see anything missing you want to bring up now before we try to force things into AOB? All looks normal. We'll go to admin. Daniel, you want to bring up the draft minutes?

DANIEL GLUCK

Yes. These were the draft minutes from the 30th September RSSAC meeting. And I just wanted to say, I think there was no comments in the email list after this was circulated. So, this will be up for a vote if there is a motion and a second.

JEFF OSBORN

Do we have a motion?

KEN RENARD

This is Ken, I move to accept.

JEFF OSBORN

And so moves. A second?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Second.

JEFF OSBORN

Anybody think this is a horrible idea and wish to vote against it? Any abstentions? I believe we have unanimous consent. Thank you all. Oh, sorry. I'm stepping ahead of myself. Caucus membership committee. I think we have the caucus membership committee. I think we're due for elections, I think. I can't talk into the mic and look Daniel in the eye at the same time. So, pardon me. Passing it to Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you, Jeff. This is Ozan for the record. Per RSSAC operational procedures, RSSAC confirms the composition of the RSSAC caucus membership committee each year. And we are getting close to the end of the year. So, this is the time support staff will check with the RSSAC caucus membership committee members to see if they'd like to continue to serve for another year and report back to RSSAC. But Jeff, you can share whether you'd like to continue or not for next year and start discussions if you want to.

JEFF OSBORN

Right. If anybody would be interested in it, I've been the chair of the membership committee for a few years. And it's not a huge time uptake. It's really interesting. The people involved in it are really good. But I'm trying to cut back on my commitments to stuff like this just because, just because. Wes is looking at me, he has no idea what it's like to make commitments to ICANN and then have your life reduced by a third. If somebody's interested in doing it, I just want to open it up. I'm definitely going to step down the end of the next term. But if anybody wants a shot at it now, I'm just going to let it go. Somebody feel the need to get more involved? Feel guilty you're not doing enough? No?

KEN RENARD

This is Ken. I'll be officially off that committee as vice chair, but I'd be happy to serve if nobody else is interested.

WES HARDAKER

Seconded.

JEFF OSBORN

Awesome. Do we have to vote on this? Okay. Does anybody think it's a bad idea having Ken do something he's not qualified for?

KEN RENARD

Hold on. I think we still have an open invitation, so I'm just volunteering and I think the process will continue.

JEFF OSBORN

Pardon my glee. Great. Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN

I believe in December, RSSAC will revisit this to confirm the entire composition of the membership committee for 2026.

JEFF OSBORN

That's terrific. Thank you very much, Ozan. And thanks, Ken, for standing. I'll get the bumper stickers and lawn signs out immediately. Travel support for Mumbai. That's probably Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you, Jeff. This is Ozan again. ICANN85 will take place from 7th through 12th of March in Mumbai, India. Again, we have travel support slots for RSSAC members. We have six travel support slots. One goes to the chair, one goes to the vice chair, and four to the

rest of the RSSAC members. We have circulated a form for those wishing to request travel support. I think two days ago, pardon me, on Monday. So please fill out this form by Monday, the 3rd of November, if you would like to request travel support for ICANN85.

JEFF OSBORN

Do you know how many you have so far?

OZAN SAHIN

So far, we have received three applications.

JEFF OSBORN

We're traditionally able to fill the need for everybody who has it. So, don't feel guilty. If you work for a nonprofit or another poor company, no shame in stepping up to that. And that's Monday. That's Monday coming up next week, right away. Okay. Thanks, Ozan.

Next item, the leadership program. This is something where we get two slots for this. And I had recommended to Hans Petter that he might find it useful, as I had when I'd been to it before, just for getting to know the people who are going to be the SOAC chairs in the coming time. So he and I had stepped up to it. And then since then, they've asked me to be on the staff side rather than the student side. So I'm going to be a facilitator at that program, which means we have another seat open. So I believe they cover. Oh, geez, I don't want to step in.

DANIEL GLUCK

Oh, sorry. They will cover your hotel and they'll give you a daily stipend, but they cannot cover your flights.

JEFF OSBORN

Confirming what I what I thought. Anybody want to comment? Liman, you look like you want to comment.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

No, I want to ask. I admit I tuned out to have a quick dialogue with my boss about the Mumbai meeting. So what was the--

JEFF OSBORN

Okay, the leadership program in Mumbai is a two-day program. It's useful. I talked Hans Petter into joining it because I think the meeting the other people are going to run the SOAC gives you a real jump up when you're in the position like he is. And for you, it would be obviously a refresher. Somebody is going to have to take the chair job because I'm not going to do it after next year. And you'd be a shoe in if you wanted to do it. So if you wanted to go, we have the slot is the point. He and I were the two slots, and I've I'm now in a different category somehow.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Now I'm with you. It was about the leadership program. I'm sinking. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN We put it up there in writing and everything. But multitasking is a lie and we all fall for it every time.

HANS PETTER HOLEN Clearly you would benefit from the train.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Multitasking is a lie for men.

JEFF OSBORN All right. Out of four and into five. Duane, this is entirely your frying pan. I think Daniel's not around.

DUANE WESSELS Okay, and this is Duane Wessels. So, yeah, what a frying pan it is. So this work party had a meeting on Sunday and kind of got wedged into a discussion. Well, the discussion ended up talking about sort of asking for clarification on the focus of the scope of work for the work party. And as we heard in yesterday's caucus meeting, there was some concerns expressed about how work parties work and that sort of thing.

So what's going to happen next, I think, is that Andrew is coordinating sort of a description of the state of this work party. We'll come back to this committee, to RSSAC at the next meeting, asking for clarification on the scope, how to proceed with this work

party or even maybe if to proceed with this work party. And then after that, I expect that we'll also have further discussions about talking about how RSSAC and RSSAC caucus can maybe improve its processes for work parties in general to not have this problem again.

JEFF OSBORN

Questions? I was just going to say very well and diplomatically. Thank you, Duane. Questions? I've got nothing to add that really. That was the whole point, I think. I am lost. Here we are. Public comment. RSSAC comment from the RIR governance doc at Daniel.

DANIEL GLUCK

Yes, so this is the public comment for the second draft of the RIR governance document. Andrew was so kind to draft an initial response, which is based off of the RSSAC response to the first draft of the RIR governance document. This was circulated on list, I believe, on the 6th or 7th, and the date given for comments was the 13th of October. No comments were received. So we have a draft comment here that is very tiny on the page that I will try to. There we go. And if RSSAC desires, this can be voted on with a motion in a second and then submitted to the public comment.

JEFF OSBORN

I just want to insert a comment at this point that is kind of crossing function a little bit. This is the RSSAC. This is not the GWG. Having said that, they get conflated enough that in hallway conversations,

I want to make sure we're all aware. We're looking for people being supportive of the governance process for the name and number communities. So this is a nod to the cousins that we're names and numbers. That's the two ends in ICANN. And so we want to be supportive of the work they're doing as well as the work we're doing. This was a statement where we were trying to be positive without sort of intruding much. So I'll take a vote on this if nobody's got anything else to say. Anybody with another hat want to say something?

KEN RENARD

This is Ken. Sorry. Go ahead.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah, thanks. So just to share some of the concerns that floating around in the in the corridor. Last time it was that this process is too rushed. This time is that this process takes too long. We're still within two years from starting. So the Council is meeting in a couple of weeks in Montevideo to go through all the comments and out of that will come recommendations on whether they will have a third final draft or a third draft for public comment.

Some of the more serious concerns that I've heard around is on the decision-making process for including and whatever. There is an appeals process there if some of the decisions is which relates back to the discussion we had in the CWG. And there is also chatter in the corridors among the concerns of creating more RIRs while there

on the other hand are people that would see more RIRs and breaking up the closed club, which is I guess different perspectives on what this is a system for bottom-up coordination or something that should be a competitive market.

So I think any support for stability and that is for me it's kind of like, is this document good enough now to start to get it there and execute on it? Because it comes with audits and stuff, which is, I would think much more interesting to see the outcome of that than to spend more time on making the document marginally better. So I just wanted to share that. I don't think that will affect our decision much more, but it's give you a piece of the backdrop here.

JEFF OSBORN

We're in similar enough situations that anybody who's following the governance work that we're doing would find it interesting to watch the other part as well, because it's not the same, but it rhymes. Ken?

KEN RENARD

Yeah, I mean given the, again, the courtesy to this group, the fact that we haven't gotten any comments on the document within our RSSAC and the mailing list in the past week or so, I would move that we approve this to send to their public comment.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks, Ken. Is there a second?

ROBERT CAROLINA

Second, Rob Carolina.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks, Rob. Anybody think this is a horrible idea and want to vote it down? Anybody abstain? I believe we have unanimously passed it. Thanks all.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

I think the next two are mine.

JEFF OSBORN

Fair enough. Thanks, Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So there's two new public comments out from ICANN that I thought may be interesting to the RSSAC. I sent them to the list and I'll just kind of briefly discuss them here. The first one has to do with controlled interruption, IPv6. So in the 2012 round, ICANN did this thing where, before actually delegating a TLD to an actual name server, they have this funny address 127.0.53.53, and they delegate it to that. And this is to see, like, if network administrators might be using that TLD in their local network, then they will hopefully notice this funny address in their logs, Google it, and then come to ICANN somehow and change their configs. I think that's basically the idea with controlled interruption.

They didn't do IPv6 in the 2012 round, but now that there's going to be a new round coming up, ICANN thought, well, we'd like to do this for IPv4 and IPv6. So this public comment is, hey, we're going to do this for IPv6, and we're going to use this IP address, ffff:127.0.53.53. That's pretty much what the public comment is about. I don't know if the RSSAC wants to comment on this. That's your decision. I'm not bringing this up to suggest that you should comment on this or that it's within the RSSAC's remit, but I wanted to give you an opportunity and just tell you about it so that you could make that decision for yourselves.

JEFF OSBORN

Questions for Andrew? Opinions? Yes, Lars.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Yeah, Liman n here. I don't really see a need for us to comment on this, but if the case is that RSSAC would benefit from having a supportive comment, I could imagine that as a good idea.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So this doesn't come from RSSAC. This comes from Org. So the history here is ICANN Org sent out a research, and it was done by Sinudun, I think that's how you pronounce it, and they came back with their research, and they suggested this IPv6 address. So RSSAC hasn't been involved in this.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	So who's calling the shots here?
ANDREW MCCONACHIE	Org is planning on using this IP address. So you mean who is actually launching the public comment?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	No, who is actually launching the research? .
ANDREW MCCONACHIE	ICANN Org paid Sinudun to pick an IP address, to do the research and choose an IP address.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	So some part of CTO, either OCTO?
ANDREW MCCONACHIE	I think, yeah, it's either OCTO or GDS. I'm not sure, actually. This is Francisco's team. It's GDS within ICANN. Francisco Arias, to be specific. Okay.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	Then I rephrase my comment to be, if the party who is launching this would support from, sorry, would benefit from a supportive column from RSSAC, I would consider doing that. I don't really get that feeling here and now, so I lean towards that we don't have to do anything, but it's not a strong opinion. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Andrew, I think that was a soft action item to check.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Check on what? Check to see if they would like a comment from the RSSAC?

JEFF OSBORN

I don't want to step in front of Lars, but that's what it sounded like.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Okay, I can ask Francisco. Would you appreciate that, basically?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Would it be helpful to him if he had support from others? Would that kind of bring his project forward or give it more weight?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Legitimacy in a sense. Yes. Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

And then Warren.

WARREN KUMARI

Warren Kumari. I'm not sure if this is the right place to note it, but this should probably also be sent to the IETF and v6 ops because some people view this as squatting on an IP address or using an IP

address for something that was not designed. And so getting feedback from not just ICANN would probably be good.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Can you do that?

WARREN KUMARI

I could. I mean, I could. It feels like it would be better if it were to come from ICANN saying, we've got an open public comment that might be related to your stuff. Yeah. Tail could do it. Or I mean, I could do it. I can do it.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yeah. I mean, anyone can do it. It feels a bit weird for me to do it.

JEFF OSBORN

Hans Petter.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

So I think the question we should be asking us is, does this have a negative impact on the rest of the system? My gut feeling would say no. So we could definitely state that and therefore be supportive in that context.

JEFF OSBORN

Makes sense. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Can I put a sign on my mailbox saying FFFF 170 27 0 53, not here, go away. Because there might be complaints about the roots of a system not working. If the delegation. I'm quite sure. You have no idea how people's minds work.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

So therefore, this is actually an extremely good idea. So we don't get those complaints afterwards that the root service system isn't working with the new TLD that might have this. So we should actually be very supportive of this.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So now it sounds like RSSAC would like to make a comment in support of this. So maybe don't, maybe I won't even ask Francisco then if, yeah, it's okay. So do you want me to draft something which says, yes, please do this. This is awesome. Thank you. Essentially.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Liman here. Yes. But in the right language. Yes.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Okay.

JEFF OSBORN

All right. Oh, Matt.

MATT LARSON

So I think, no, I guess that's okay. I mean, what they're really soliciting comment on is they want to do controlled interruption for V6. We have to pick the best address for some value of best, and that's what's in the paper. So did we pick the best address? So I think unless someone comes and says IPv6 controlled interruption is a horrible idea, no matter what address you pick or that address you picked is completely inappropriate. If neither of those two things happen, controlled interruption V6 is going to happen. So I don't know that RSSAC making a comment saying, hey, this will-- I mean, I guess it's benign, but I just wanted to make sure that give the context for the public comment.

JEFF OSBORN

Warren.

WARREN KUMARI

I think Matt largely said what I was going to say, this is actually asking, is this the right address to use if we're going to do V6 controlled interruptions, not should we do V6 or should we do controlled interruptions?

JEFF OSBORN

My question is just, Andrew, do you have enough to draft something?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE I'm getting the impression that we just want a generic input in support of this, not necessarily for this specific IP address. It doesn't sound like RSSAC has an opinion about that, but RSSAC is generally in support of the idea, and this is a fine IP address.

JEFF OSBORN Does that represent the consensus in the room? Hans Petter, I'm sorry. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Yes, I was going to say just about that. We don't see any problems with the address.

JEFF OSBORN Okay. Is that sufficient?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Yes.

JEFF OSBORN Good. I think it's Andrew again.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE It's me again. This one is a lot easier to explain. The ICANN org has posted their meeting dates for 2029 to 2033. This is called forward planning. The locations aren't chosen, obviously. These are just the dates for the meetings. We're all impacted by meeting dates,

and this is a big opportunity to have an opinion about that and to see if these conflict with anything generally. I don't think the RSSAC would want to comment on this, but I'm putting it here in case you really hate these suggestions and you're like, no, these meeting dates are terrible, then a comment would be in order.

JEFF OSBORN

Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

I leave you with a carte blanche from my side. At least from my side, I will be retired by that.

JEFF OSBORN

I will not be retired, but you're all invited to my 70th birthday party, which apparently will be in Asia.

WES HARDAKER

I'm tired of them being placed right next to IETF meetings. It's a really, really long two weeks, and I noticed that the 2029 dates are back to back again for two of them. If I was going to make a comment, that would be it.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

I mean, that is the kind of feedback that they're looking for, Wes.

DUANE WESSELS

I would also support a comment along those lines.

JEFF OSBORN

I would as well. It's challenging all the time.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So the comment is stop putting ICANN meetings immediately before or immediately after IETF meetings? I mean, that's a fair comment.

JEFF OSBORN

Yes. I think if we're going to have input, I can't think of anybody who likes having them smashed together like that. It's hard.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, and actually it comes well from us, right? Everybody knows that the root server operators also convene around the IETF. So we are the logical organization that would have a comment about that.

JEFF OSBORN

So Andrew, is that something you can describe at the very least?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yeah, I think that's the only comment the RRSAC has. We don't like having the ICANN meetings either before or after IETF meetings. Yeah, adjacent, sure. Or wouldn't it be nice if they were on the same

continent at least? If they're going to be right next to one another, please don't put them on opposite sides of the world.

WES HARDAKER

As a second fallback, yes.

JEFF OSBORN

Is this a published document somewhere?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yeah, this is, I believe, supporting material for the public comment.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So it's linked to, yeah, it's linked to from there.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay. Oh, thanks. Excellent. I like plugging those things in. Some of us expect to be doing this at that timeframe, Liman. All right. I think that's it. Back to the agenda. That was you, Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Oh, yeah, yeah. I'm done.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay. And that gets us to reports. I usually have nothing to say, but this time I actually-- never mind. I got nothing. This was a valuable week. Hope you thought so too, Ken.

KEN RENARD

Yeah. We have a review of reviews later, but this will be my last meeting as vice chair. So thank you for trusting me with a position. I hope I've done you proud and thanks to Hans Petter for taking over.

JEFF OSBORN

Appreciate it, Ken, very much. Liaison to the Board. Why doesn't it have a name there?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Liman. No, I just wanted to thank Ken for his very long and very supreme service to the group. I've very much enjoyed your leadership there and thank you very much.

JEFF OSBORN

Still squeeze some things in. There's a section at the end for that part. If I'm not being effusive now with my praise, it's because I scheduled it incorrectly. Wes, ICANN Board.

WES HARDAKER

We haven't been busy at all. So, I mean, as you know, the ICANN Board meets the three days before ICANN even starts. We have a

three-day workshop, which of course we just completed. Tripti has actually a really good blog post generally before about what we're going to talk about and then after about what we did talk about. So the before one's definitely out a while ago and the after will come out later.

I'll remind everybody that three Board members are leaving. They're all very awesome people. Say thank you to them if you see them on holiday. That's Becky Burr, who has been around longer than ICANN existed. And Martin Botterman was on the Board for nine years and Chris Chapman is the current vice chair and stepping off and was the one for getting a root server operator to be appointed as the CEO. So he definitely deserves some congratulations.

We have been listening to community opinions about the review of reviews. I know that's a hot topic for a lot. The RSSAC doesn't care too much, but the Board really is trying not to have an opinion of our own. It's a hard subject and we really have been trying to figure out what the community wants. That includes what the right bylaw changes should be required.

We've of course been carefully watching the option proceed allocations and the success of that. I'll remind everybody that the grant program was designed, the initial round was designed to be sort of a test case for how well this worked and there will be a consideration in the future for what to do with the next set of funding. A lot of people think that the ICANN bank account has the

complete set of funding from the grant program. I will remind everybody about half of it is tied up in so it's actually not available. There's legal proceedings that have not yet been resolved.

The next round, of course, speaking of which continues, that is still slated for being on track sometime in 2026. I don't have the dates in front of me, but obviously that will affect us because we'll get more entries into the root zone slowly percolating out. I've ensured them multiple times that that's not going to be a problem for us. The concentration on WSIS+20 continues to drive everyone everywhere to ensure that the multi-stakeholder model exists.

We met with the draft facilitators from Kenya and Albania and had a really good meeting with them. It's nice that they are extremely supportive of the technical community's participation in the multi-stakeholder model in general. Hopefully that will continue and the next version of the WSIS+20 draft statement will continue to push the governance for IGF and generally supportive of the multi-stakeholder model in general.

We actually had a really good overview presented by the IAB participants from the IAB who gave an excellent overview of what the IETF is to the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board is very diverse, not all of them are technical, not all of them have much clue about how the IETF works and they got a really good overview and a really good dialogue because of it. It's a public session so it was actually recorded if anybody wants to go back and watch it, but I think people here are generally fairly well knowledgeable about the IETF.

The Board of course gave their new assignments. Just FYI, I'm going to continue being the risk committee co-chair and I'm now also the data protection and privacy chair, not co-chair, chair, which is heavily related to RDRS. It doesn't really affect us, but RDRS is the resolution mechanism for filing a complaint where WHOIS doesn't work anymore, so you need to know information. That is a very hot topic in the community, which is the only reason I bring it up.

Then finally, as you know, the Board meets this ICANN session with most of the constituencies and the joint meeting yesterday was definitely a good success. I heard from people in the audience that they found it interesting and so there actually were people out in the audience and they actually did find it interesting, so thank you all for the good dialogue that happened there and for everybody's participation. Any questions?

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks, Wes, for facilitating it. I thought that went well. Hiro, anything from the CSC?

HIRO HOTTA

Yes, Hiro is speaking. PTI's September report states that the SLA for the IANA naming function was satisfied at 98.4%. This indicates that one out of 64 SLA criteria was not met, so according to the report, a test routine initially failed but succeeded during its automatically initiated retrial in 15 minutes. PTI was unable to

identify the specific cause of the failure. To prepare for potential future occurrence of a similar issue, PTI plans to enhance logging mechanisms to better pinpoint the root cause and ensure such failures are avoided in the future. CSC will meet tomorrow here in Dublin. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Hiro. Used to hearing 100%. Liman, anything from RZERC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Liman n here. RZERC had a meeting on October 15th discussing the response from RZERC regarding signing the root servers. net zone. It was a bit going back and forth. I tried to explain the stance from RZERC. I honestly don't remember if we had any strong outcome of that. I don't remember that we decided to do anything, any further steps regarding that. So I think the idea is still percolating inside RZERC, but that we will see next meeting if we go further with that. I'm looking a bit at Dan because I don't have the minutes in front of me for that meeting, but you're not in support. But that's what I would say.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you. Well, we trust you to keep an eye on the percolating. Erum was not on the call before. Erum, you showed up? Or Daniel? Daniel was out? No. Okay. Russ, I think is still on the call. News from SSAC.

RUSS MUNDY

Well, I think we had a good session earlier today. And thanks to everybody that participated in the mic for SSAC and RZERC. And coming up in the next following three sessions today is the DNS Second Security Workshop. So being on the program committee for that, I think we've got an interesting program this meeting. And hopefully, a lot of folks in this room will be able to come and participate and engage in the workshop. And as a side note, that also means that the last RZERC session with ccNSO, I won't be able to make that. So my apologies. I need to be in the DNSSEC Workshop. That's it. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks, Russ. James, news from IANA. Oh, James not there. Liman understood. Liman, is that an old hand? Okay. We'll let James sleep in. RZM doesn't have a name up there, but I'm assuming it's still Duane because it says so on his card.

DUANE WESSELS

Yeah, this is Duane Wessels. Nothing to report from Root Zone Maintainer.

JEFF OSBORN

All right. And GWG report. I think Brad is on a plane or already home. Oh, he's on. I'm so sorry.

BRAD VERD

That's all right. Everybody knows what's going on. I don't think there's any update. I think everybody knows what's going on.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks. Review of reviews. Okay. I was going to mention this when Wes was speaking. Ken and I are your cheerful representatives in the review of reviews on a reviewing basis when reviewing is required recursively to review the review. It is an exciting venue. I usually have to take anti-anxiety pills during the course of the thing and abstain from coffee.

We don't have much of a dog in the fight, really. There are some interesting struggles going on and people have some fairly strongly held opinions, and I don't think we do, but Ken has attended even more meetings than I have, and I've only missed like one. So, we're being present, but I don't know what else to say. We don't seem to have much of a dog in this fight, and I hope we're representing you. And if we're not, we're here. Let us know. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Liman here. Can I at least hope that the tendency and the aim is to lower the number of reviews in the system?

KEN RENARD

It's to make them more efficient, effective, transparent, and all those buzzwords. So, yeah, I'll get back to that. So far, the group

has come up with the draft purpose of reviews statement. So, I could paste that in there. It's pretty generic.

Reviews are important for ICANN and the community, and we get that. But yeah, my personal approach is to make the reviews effective. I don't think RSSAC wants to be reviewed in the same exact way that GAC is reviewed in the same exact way. So, make it work. Do the review. Let's get to the purpose of the reviews, but not the drawn-out process. And a lot of the previous issues were timing the three-year review period where a review takes four years to do. So, now you're doing at least one, whatever.

So, there was a meeting on Monday or Tuesday open to collect input from the community. There's another one tomorrow. Yeah, tomorrow's Thursday. Open to everyone to discuss some of the results of that. Yeah. It's not as fun, as exciting, as talking about zone transfers and packet sizes, but it is important and we're trying to keep up with it and bring back to you guys in case there's anything. So any questions, anything that we should be representing would be, input would be appreciated, thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks Ken. Wes.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, I was trying to refrain earlier from too much dialogue about it, but it is important. The ICANN's legitimacy is founded on the fact that are, just like most constitutions for most governments, there

is a mechanism for change and there's a mechanism to ensure that the system is valid and is up to date. And when the IANA transition came around, the way of doing that was to do regular reviews. Like most constitutions, they require some twiddling over time because the wording was not quite as precise as you would like.

So whether the review starts exactly five years after the other one started or ended is even confusing. And generally the consensus was, they were important, especially for the first few years to prove yet again, we're serious about this whole governance system, but can we tone down the level of effort that it takes to get through these? And I think that's the biggest piece in my mind. I'll also remind everybody, there's sort of two different halves of reviews at ICANN. There's the review of ICANN and the whole procedure, and then there's the review of each of the constituency groups. And I'm shortening that description by a lot too.

JEFF OSBORN

Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Yes, just don't get me wrong. I am in full support of doing reviews, but it seems to me at times that there are a little too, too many and too detailed reviews here. So I am very supportive about making them more efficient and possibly less time consuming so that they can be held at more regular intervals in an easy way. So reviews, I

totally agree, is a very important part of the democratic foundation of this organization and any organization actually.

WES HARDAKER

I don't think anybody's trying to make them more frequent, right? I haven't heard that.

KEN RENARD

One quick thing. In the bylaws, reviews have to be X number of whatever. They have been pushed off. There will be a public comment on amending the bylaws to push them off again. And a public comment is, do we push them off two years or push them off one year with a one-year renewal? It's fun, but just that will be coming out. And I don't think there's too much that affects this group. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

So the challenge with this, and I haven't followed it lately. But the intro to this is that if you're doing a review every N years, and if the sum of the time it takes to take to the review and the time it takes to implement recommendations is larger than N, it kind of piles up, right? So either you need to put time limits on the review, you cannot spend more than 12 months, then you complete your report and you're done. And then you would have to implement within N

-1 years, or you would have to put the timeline after the report or something like that, but then all of that has different aspects. And this is where people get theoretical versus practical and so on. So I do not envy you for this.

KEN RENARD

Yeah, those are all issues that have been discussed to date and definitely will be taken into consideration when the sort of the new design of reviews, but yeah, thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Anything else on that issue? And let's see, this takes us to AOB. Somebody's got to remind me what the placeholder for RSSAC caucus items meant.

DANIEL GLUCK

Well, I think actually it's repeated in C, but we have our two November RSSAC caucus meeting agenda that we discussed at the RSSAC caucus meeting and just wanted to see if there was any additional thoughts here. Might be a good time to also discuss the proposal from the Board session yesterday, from the ICANN Board chair, who was also an RSSAC caucus member.

JEFF OSBORN

Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

On that second part, it was only a question of whether we would discuss it or not. I hope we're not going to discuss the actual subject here.

KEN RENARD

You know what's going to happen.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Can I just clarify before we go much further, what's the current item that we are discussing? Because there's two that have been raised now. There's the agenda for the RSSAC caucus and there's the proposal. So what's the subject for discussion at this moment?

DANIEL GLUCK

So the RSSAC caucus agenda is what's for discussion and there is the caucus agenda item for potential future RSSAC caucus work item suggestions.

ROBERT CAROLINA

So now presumably where we are in terms of the discussion is that during the joint meeting yesterday, the chair of the Board of ICANN in what she described as an off the top of her head moment made a suggestion of something that RSSAC might wish to consider. So now the question becomes whether or not to put a discussion of that topic into the RSSAC caucus agenda for discussion in Montreal. Is that right?

Okay, so should we do it? And I'll end that question with a statement. My answer would be no. If we're going to discuss that, I don't think it should be discussed in the RSSAC caucus. I think the place to discuss whether or not to put something together on that is within RSSAC itself. Please, let's not have that discussion in the caucus. If we're going to have that discussion about whether or not to go forward with that, let's have it in RSSAC itself.

JEFF OSBORN

Liman, I'm assuming you're ready.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Yes, please. I fully support that. I would even go further to say that we shouldn't have it in RSSAC until the new government structure is put in place because until then we don't have any mechanisms to do anything about it. And we will have a totally new strategic committee that is being put in place to deal with exactly that type of question. So I would say punt on this entirely, but if you disagree with the punt thing, then definitely not the caucus.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Since we are long on time available to us, I will tease my friend Liman by suggesting his last comment is not currently the agenda item under discussion, only whether or not to give it to the caucus. Now, perhaps we should have another agenda item here on any other business as to whether or not we should discuss it. But the

current item is what should we put on the agenda for discussion within the caucus in Montreal?

JEFF OSBORN

I'm going to suggest that we keep this item off of the caucus agenda in Montreal. Does anybody have a problem with that, Wes?

WES HARDAKER

So a couple of things. Certainly, that topic has been kicking around for a long time. And we don't need to debate it or get into it. Everybody agrees with that. Certainly, we shouldn't debate the solution to said problem in that meeting. Having said that, the agenda item for the caucus is I consider somewhat of a brainstorming of what does the caucus want to do? And we want the caucus's input on what work items do they feel that they want to take on. I heavily discourage eliminating topics from that conversation. That's not the point.

Now, it's up to RSSAC to actually establish those work parties and take into consideration all of the input that we get. But to eliminate a topic entirely just because we don't happen to like it. Now, I think, Liman, you're 100% right that there's no way we could even take any results from that. And if we really are going to greenfield, then we could add the topic of, well, how are you going to redesign everything from scratch from the DNS too? All of that is sort of within game. It's up to the caucus to come up with good ideas. And

that includes us. And it's up to RSSAC to say, are these even a biteable problem?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Can I respond?

JEFF OSBORN

Liman, and then Warren.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Yeah, I agree. We should not ban any subject from a brainstorming session. On the other hand, we don't have to put it on a label either. So leave the floor open and don't direct it in either direction

JEFF OSBORN

Just because it's not compulsory doesn't mean it's forbidden. Hans Petter.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

So if the question now, is this a good agenda for the caucus meeting as it is? then we don't have to make any amendment. It stands as it is, period. Because this is a brainstorming session asking the caucus, is there anything you want to bring up and discuss? And that's what we're looking for. So we don't have to refine it with any suggestion from us.

JEFF OSBORN

I would agree. Ken, and then Andrew. Warren, Ken, then Andrew. I'm sorry, Warren.

WARREN KUMARI

I put my hand down. From a transparency standpoint, it does look a little strange to keeping in mind that this is open being recorded to have the like, no, we don't want the caucus to talk about this because we might not like the answer. It's sort of what it looks like. I understand that that's not being said, but it does feel like there is a live third rail. Let's not have the caucus talk about it in case they say something we don't like. Just for transparency and optics.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay, I would argue very strongly that the problem is, as Hans Petter put it so well live, that it was a question that was problematic just in terms of physics. You got to get the water before you freeze it. And it was literally just a matter of process where that's not a valid question to ask yet just because we're in the process.

WARREN KUMARI

Yeah, that's a perfectly great answer. Just the way that it kind of sounded before was that sounds like something we don't want to talk about. So let's not have the caucus look at it. And I understand, I'm just trying to make sure for transparency that people understand that it's not, the caucus is not allowed to talk about this because we might not like the answer.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay, well, if you feel like we've sufficiently aired it. And I'm sure Hans Petter will do a better job of explaining than I did.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah, I kind of completely agree with Warren here. I just tried to summarize this as what we're discussing now is the agenda for the caucus meeting. There is an open item there that the caucus can bring up any ideas they may have be. So we will take that input. And then since there was something mentioned in the public session with the Board, it's not on the agenda at this meeting that may come up in the agenda at the future meeting and we will discuss it there. I don't think we should entertain that discussion here. And now that's for December or January discussion that we have on what we should do with that suggestion.

Now that was a personal suggestion from the ICANN Board chair. Before that time, we may also know whether that's a formal request from the ICANN Board for us to do. And we don't know that yet. So some more clarity in that before we start to dive into it would be clear. So I think this agenda point here and now is this agenda good to go for the caucus? And I would say yes. And then that's it for now.

JEFF OSBORN

That's pretty reasonable. Ken and then Andrew have their hands up.

KEN RENARD

Okay, yeah. On specifically the caucus meeting agenda, we have 60 minutes and we probably will have to pare this down a little bit. But I think the highlight here with the things we really want to do are the lightning talks. That's probably about half of that hour. And maybe some of the caucus engagement work. So we might optimize this or just change things, change the order around just to make sure we get the higher priority things in first. This is a good problem to have. Usually, these caucus meetings run short. We've got some good content with the lightning talks. So now we have the opposite problem. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yeah, Ken kind of stole my thunder. We have 60 minutes and I don't think we're going to get through this whole agenda in 60 minutes. So if there's something on the bottom kind of after, I take it we'll get all the way through four and into five. Beyond that, it's kind of like, I don't know. We're definitely not going to get all the way down to like eight and nine. So if there's something down there that people want, higher up in the agenda which would increase the probability of us actually having those discussions, then now is the time to speak.

JEFF OSBORN

Yeah. Oh, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS

I'd like to suggest that maybe we don't need item five on the agenda, recent publications. These aren't all that recent. We've just covered them this week. I think those could free up some time.

JEFF OSBORN

The irony for somebody trying to organize this, so this is the staff and me and Ken, is everything up here minus the lightning talks had to fill 75 minutes the other day and now it's got to fill half an hour, the same information. So we are definitely not going to review the already published publications. And there was another issue or two where they didn't need to be as wordy as they were with a longer session to fill. Hans-Peter.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

When is the next caucus meeting after this?

JEFF OSBORN

Sunday.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

No, after that.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Oh, next AGM.

JEFF OSBORN

Really?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Or IETF 126, yeah.

JEFF OSBORN

In Shenzhen? Okay.

KEN RENARD

And twice, Vienna.

JEFF OSBORN

Oh, Vienna, gee.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

But then food for thought for the future is if we have two caucus meetings with a week in between, we may want to well ahead of those, actually say that this meeting will have these topics and that meeting will have these topics rather than having the same agenda for the two. But that's for next year, right?

JEFF OSBORN

That's a really good idea. This is the introduction of lightning talks, which I think is a good idea. And in hindsight, if we'd had two, it'd be easier to schedule instead of three, but we don't want to dissuade anybody from having input. So I think this will all be fine.

And I'm a little more optimistic than Andrew that I can flog this thing into 60 minutes. We'll just have to be jerks and cut people off because, because, so. Anyone else, anything on this? Kevin.

KEVIN HILDEBRAND

I was just going to say seven and 10 are probably the most important because that actually, since we have the whole caucus present, that's us soliciting more information from them versus the rest of the things that we're just giving status updates.

JEFF OSBORN

And those currently show up right after the lightning talks, which are nearly the first thing. Can we scroll up? Above lightning talk is just administrivia. I mean, that can be really fast. Kevin, does that seem like that gets to it about as quickly as we could?

KEVIN HILDEBRAND

Well, I was just saying, well, you already struck out the recent publications, but I was saying, yeah, just the 7 and 10, both are soliciting feedback from the caucus.

JEFF OSBORN

Right, agreed.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

We move seven up to be five.

JEFF OSBORN

This is an example of a meeting where we don't have time pressure. Does that work? Anybody have a problem with the agenda? I think it looks good. This is for Sunday, right? This week. Okay, if that's good enough, we don't need to vote on an agenda, do we? Okay, why don't we go back to the current agenda then? And we are, IETF 24 agenda. Nope, thank you.

Yeah, we're losing some people. Paul's not on the call. Tim isn't on the call. Just Ken is on the call. So this, see, this is the part where we're going to do the applauding and things. And then it happened before, and I was like, do I hang fire or what? Because, huh? We can do it three times if we do it right. Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you, Jeff. This is Ozan. Just to make a distinction between 7 D, 1, 2, and 3 is that Paul De Weerd and Tim Shortall are there because they're leaving RSSAC. But Ken, I think, will continue to be on the RSSAC, but he's completing this vice chair term. So just wanted to make this distinction. And if with respect to Paul Deweerd and Tim Shortall and their replacements, if there's anything to say or discuss, Hans Petter, one is RIPE NCC and the other one is from UMD, we could do that.

JEFF OSBORN

Hans Petter.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah, I can just share that the reason Paul is leaving is that his responsibilities within the RIPE NCC have changed. So he's now in charge of the measurements team and not the DNS team. Florian Opser, who is the specialist engineer on the root server ops teams, he will then be the alternate here. And he's also already on Root Ops and already on the caucus and has contributed to some of the work parties, I understand. So I would like to welcome him to this.

JEFF OSBORN

Yeah, I think almost no introductions will be required. Florian's good, of course.

WES HARDAKER

Thank you to all for who have served and for all who are onboarding, we greatly appreciate it. It's welcome to the team.

JEFF OSBORN

Ozan. Kevin.

KEVIN HILDEBRAND

I was just going to say, Tim, similarly, his job duties have changed somewhat and with the amount of time he had available, it didn't feel like he was able to do a sufficient job with taking on RSSAC as well. So that's why we're stepping down.

JEFF OSBORN

Well, tell him we appreciate it. We'll miss him. And I'm hoping we could do that in person. Well, finally. What we don't have here yet is the engraved fabulous ICANN traditional. I can't believe this is the first time I'm getting to hand one of these around to somebody thing, but we're going to act like this is and Photoshop it in later with a full AI video of the whole process and dinner later. So, oh, geez.

So Ken, thank you very much. It's been a lot of fun. I'm glad you're not leaving the organization, but thanks for everything you do. You've made it this tremendously easier role than it would have been otherwise.

KEN RENARD

Yeah, thanks. I guess it's been an honor and to work with going back to Fred and everybody here. So it's just, yeah, fantastic staff and look forward to continuing to work with you guys.

JEFF OSBORN

Well, it's nice you're not leaving. You know, that really would have, that would have been a much harder step. So I'm glad.

KEN RENARD

Well, no.

JEFF OSBORN

Scrolling down, I think we are literally at the point where we get to give you 20 minutes back for lunch. And as slowly as I've been

finding the lunch service most places, I think we can use it. Anybody have anything else? Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN

Thank you, Jeff. This is Ozan again. Just one quick addition for 7D. Tomorrow during the ICANN Board meeting, the last thing on the schedule, we will have the commentary recognition session. And we will be recognizing 46 ICANN community leaders, including the ones from RSSAC. So this includes Paul DeWeerd, Tim Shortall, Ken Renard, and also Fred Baker. So I just wanted to announce that.

JEFF OSBORN

All right, thanks.

DANIEL GLUCK

Actually we can, we can stop the recording now and then I'll give an update on the dinner tonight.

JEFF OSBORN

All right. Thank you, Daniel.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]