

---

FRED BAKER: So we start out with our traditional roll call, which – okay, [inaudible].  
My goodness.

Cogent? Do we have Paul or Brad here? DISA?

KEVIN WRIGHT: This is Kevin Wright.

FRED BAKER: ICANN?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. ICANN? ... ISC? I'm here.

JEFF OSBORN: I'm here. This is Jeff.

FRED BAKER: NASA?

KEITH BLUESTEIN: Keith Bluestein here.

---

*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.*

FRED BAKER: Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here.

FRED BAKER: RIPE?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh is here.

FRED BAKER: UMD?

KARL REUSS: Karl is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. USC?

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here.

FRED BAKER: ARL?

---

PAUL VIXIE: I'm sorry. Did I miss it? Vixie here.

FRED BAKER: Hi, Vixie. ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard is here.

HOWARD KASH: Howard Kash is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad is here.

MATT WIENBERG: Matt Weinberg.

FRED BAKER: Okay. WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay.

TOM MIGLIN: And, Fred, this is Tom Miglin from NASA on as well.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. I missed that.

TOM MIGLIN: This is Tom Miglin from NASA.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. So liaison to the Board. Kaveh, are you here?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I am.

FRED BAKER: You are. Good. Okay. Liaison to CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is still here, yes.

FRED BAKER: Yes. RZERC?

---

BRAD VERD: Yeah, Brad is still here.

FRED BAKER: SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Russ is here?

FRED BAKER: IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, Daniel is here. But I think Ryan Stephenson is also here on the bridge.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yeah, Ryan is here, too.

FRED BAKER: Okay. IANA?

NAELA SARRAS: Naela Sarras.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. And root zone maintainer? Duane, are you here?

Okay. So I guess that's the roll call.

For an agenda, you've got that sitting in front of you. We want to go over the draft minutes. The Caucus Membership Committee has an update, and we have a discussion regarding the vice-chair election. Then we have a statement on the threat mitigation for the root server system from Andrew and, also from Andrew, a public comment on the KSK rollover. We have a couple of work items and then various reports and AOB.

Anybody have any comments on the agenda?

STEVE SHENG: Fred, this is Steve. I'd like to have one AOB on staffing changes.

FRED BAKER: Okay, sounds good. Then let's talk about the draft minutes. Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Hi, everyone. I circulated the draft minutes from the 6<sup>th</sup> of November RSSAC meeting at ICANN 66 two weeks ago. We received feedback from Wes Hardaker on one of the action items. This is basically about whether an action item can be assigned to an RSSAC member or not. Based on this feedback, I updated this action item.

Other than that, if you have any questions, please let us know. [Fred], this is [boarding] item for today.

---

WES HARDAKER: This is Wes. I move to approve.

RYAN STEPHENSON: It's Ryan Stephenson. I'll second.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is anyone opposed?

Is anyone abstaining?

Well, then they carry. Matt, did you want to discuss the RSSAC Caucus?

MATT WEINBERG: Yes, please. There were two statements of interest that came in. They were disseminated in advance for review. The first one was a candidate named Ali Hussain. He's a student at the University of Malaya. The Membership Committee did review both applications and we felt that both [the candidates] seemed okay to [move forward] with. Again, Ali is, like I said, a student. He attended IETF. He did his workshops at ICANN and [inaudible] meeting. He's interested in participating.

The other candidate is Joey Salazar from Costa Rica. He, too, is [inaudible] Studying Modern Resolver Behaviors Work Party.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Joey is a she, by the way.

MATT WEINBERG: I apologize. Anyways, those were the two that we reviewed. The Membership Committee's recommendation was to move forward with both.

Is there any questions?

FRED BAKER: Well, one comment. Joey is a former ISC employee.

MATT WEINBERG: Okay.

JEFF OSBORN: In that role, I can vouch that she is a woman from Latin America, which helps. She's fluent in Chinese, which helps. And she's a very hard worker. We actually let her go because she didn't have the depth of experience in coding that was going to make her a team member on BIND. But, for this, I'd have to say I'd be in favor of voting for her.

MATT WEINBERG: Is there a motion to prove Joey's statement of interest?

JEFF OSBORN: So moved. This is Jeff.

---

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:                    Seconded by Liman.

MATT WEINBERG:                    Okay. Thank you. Is there a motion to move forward with Ali Hussain's statement of interest?

RYAN STEPHENSON:                 This is Ryan Stephenson. I'll go ahead and move.

FRED BAKER:                         Do we have a second?

WES HARDAKER:                     Wes will second.

FRED BAKER:                         Okay. I don't know what Robert [inaudible] would think of having a vote with two motions on the table, but I'm going to combine those two and say, does anybody have any objections to either one of them?

Is anybody abstaining?

Failing that, it carries.

MATT WEINBERG:                    Thank you.

---

FRED BAKER: Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Fred, quick point. Because ICANN is not present and because of this type of voting, I think it's important to note in the minutes that ICANN was not present for these votes.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now, moving on to the vice-chair election, we have a complicated situation here. According to our rules, RSSAC 0 Version 4, we have now, starting in 2020, a chair and a vice-chair. We ran the call for nominees in November and got no nominees. So, before we go too far, I need to ask, does anybody want to self-nominate here on the call? Or does anybody want to nominate somebody here on the call.

PAUL VIXIE: I nominate Fred Baker. This is Paul Vixie.

FRED BAKER: The Chair can't serve as the vice-chair.

PAUL VIXIE: Apologies.

FRED BAKER: Okay—

RYAN STEPHENSON: This is Ryan. This is going to be a longshot and I know it's probably going to be shot down fairly quickly, but technically, Brad has never been a vice-chair. He is a Co-Chair. He hasn't been a chair. He's a Co-Chair. So technically, in a unique loophole, Brad [can] serve as a vice-chair since he's never held the title for that position. Sorry to announce that, Brad, but just FYI.

FRED BAKER: Which leads us into the next step in the flow chart. Brad and I had some discussion a couple of months ago. Over the last few days, Steve and Liman had a conversation when I came back from the Thanksgiving holiday that I got brought into. There's at least two options with regard to Brad that we talked about. Brad, if I say something wrong, I need for you to jump in.

What the rules say is that the Vice-Chair cannot not serve more than two terms in a row. What the old rules under RSSAC 0 Version 3 said was that the Co-Chairs could not individually serve more than two terms in a row.

One way to look at the rules is that, going from co-chairs to chair and vice-chair, we're creating a new position. Another way to look at that is that Brad has been serving in whatever we call this role for quite some time – quite ably, I might add.

---

So Liman has suggested that Brad's term as Co-Chair becomes Vice-Chair and extended for a year. My suggestion was to go ahead and accept Brad as Vice-Chair for two years.

The issue that I have with having him serve for a year is that that means that, next year, we're electing both a chair and a vice-chair at the same time. They're synchronized. Frankly, it has been very nice to have [an offset] between Brad and I. So, at this point, I feel like I know a little bit what I'm doing.

So let me just throw the floor open to discussion. Does anybody have any opinions one way or the other on that?

STEVE SHENG: Fred, this is Steve. If I may.

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Fred. From the operational procedure perspective, I think what you described and what Ryan described is correct. I think, from the staff perspective, we would recommend against just creating a one-year term. I think, if RSSAC agrees for Brad to continue to serve, it's best to stick with the procedure and exercise this one-time ambiguity in a procedure but not create a separate class of one-year because then next year we'll be ending up in a similar position. So that's our perspective, but it's up for the RSSAC to discuss and decide. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad, do you want to weigh in on that?

BRAD VERD: I think the easy way to say this is I'm happy to serve. [inaudible] pleasure of the group. If I can help, I'm happy to help. [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: Fred, my hand is also up.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. I'm looking at the wrong screen, obviously. Yeah, Ozan? I'm sorry. Kaveh, go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Basically, first of all, I think it's fine if you make it clear. We can also make it very clear in the vote that it was explained that this is basically reading the [inaudible] in that way or basically [inaudible]. If we make it clear and we made sure that the vote was clearly understood by all the members who voted, then I think we are fine. I'm really not worried about the mechanics or how it would look. I think it will be watertight and [inaudible].

On the second point, if we agree with what was said by Steve – because I think we should just follow that. We say, "This is our understanding of the terms of RSSAC 004." Basically, that would be a normal term, which

---

would be a two-year term. So I support that interpretation and I support the normal reading of the text.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, did you want to get in?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Thank you. I just wanted to quickly say I can absolutely live with a two-year term appointment. The one-year thing was just one proposal, and I'm happy to go with the two-year appointment. No problem. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Ryan, you've got your hand up.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Same with Liman.

FRED BAKER: Okay. The only hand I see up right now is Liman's. Anybody else have any comments at this point?

Daniel?

---

DANIEL MIGAULT: The only thing I'd like to mention is that we see that the rules are blocking us a little bit from doing what we think for RSSAC. So maybe we should think of updating that document later.

FRED BAKER: Add in a sentence regarding this case?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Anybody else?

Then let me take this as two questions. The first question is, do we want to select Brad as the next vice-chair? Is anyone opposed?

Does anyone abstain?

I'm sorry. What?

PAUL VIXIE: This is Vixie. I'm not opposed to Brad, but I feel some opposition to [two terminus] terms. So, if we get Brad for a year, that's a good year. But then, if we have to elect a chair and a co-chair in one year, that makes me wish somebody other than Brad would do it first.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, that goes into our next question, so let me set that aside. For right now, are you okay with having Brad as vice-chair?

PAUL VIXIE: Oh, yeah.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, hearing no opposition – did I ask about abstention? Is anybody abstaining?

Hearing no opposition or abstentions, then Brad will be the next vice-chair. The next question is, one year or two years? Paul, you just made a comment. If I understand your comment correctly, you would prefer that it is a two-year term?

PAUL VIXIE: I would.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is anybody else opposed to a one-year term?

Is anyone opposed to a two-year term?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry. I was a bit slow. I support a two-year term.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. So we have a statement against a one-year term and a statement in favor of a two-year term.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can I suggest – oh, let me propose this. I propose that we appoint Brad for a two-year term. That’s the proposal on the table. Would someone please second that?

RYAN STEPHENSON: I’ll make a motion or second.

FRED BAKER: Okay. With that motion and that second, is anybody opposed to appointing Brad for a two-year term?

Is anybody abstaining?

Brad, welcome aboard. Or welcome to continue. Now we’re moving on. Brad is going to be the vice-chair. By the way, let me say personally, having served now with Brad for a year, I’m very happy with that.

Andrew, let’s talk about your statement about the threat mitigation document.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: This document has been – I just posted a link in the chat – stable for over a week. Before the RSSAC votes on it, is there any discussion that needs to happen on this document? That’s the only thing going on

---

here. Is there any discussion, any points, that someone would like to raise on this document?

Okay. Not seeing any, I believe this document is ready for a vote.

WES HARDAKER: I move to approve it.

FRED BAKER: Do I have a second?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Second by Liman.

RYAN STEPHENSON: This is Ryan Stephenson.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is anyone opposed?

Do we have any abstentions?

Fine. We accept the document. I presume then that this gets a number and gets sent to the ICANN Board?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Correct. It should be published up on the ICANN website within 40 hours or so once the Board has seen it for 48 hours.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Andrew, now you've got a public comment item, #6.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. I'm posting another link to the chat. This is a really a question to the RSSAC. IANA has published a proposal for future root KSK rollovers. The question to the RSSAC is –we have until January 31<sup>st</sup> to reply to this public comment – would the RSSAC like to reply to this public comment? Would the RSSAC like to send input to the IANA on this public comment proceeding?

FRED BAKER: Well, if the IANA is asking for comment, it seems like we should at least something like, "It's okay with us." My first thought there would be to go through Naela. Am I correct on that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I see a hand from Liman.

FRED BAKER: Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I agree with you, Fred, that this is something that we should definitely respond to. Or there should be a response, either a joint response from the root server operators wearing that hat, or one from

---

---

RSSAC wearing the RSSAC hat. I really don't care which. I would probably argue that one from RSSAC is slightly better because, in this context, that might carry more weight and it will be obvious. We have a process for producing documents, which is stable and works well.

So I definitely think that we should produce a response. If there is a strong majority doing it wearing the root ops hat from the other members, I'm willing to go that way. But I think it would prefer to go with the RSSAC hat.

We could probably, in that response, include, if we so wish, that this has been endorsed by all the root server operators, if we get to that point, which I hope we do. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Russ, you've got your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thank you. Finally found the mute button here. I would encourage RSSAC to provide some kind of input, even though there was no formal request for it, as I understand it. I am very, very willing be liaising between SSAC and RSSAC on this. I can say with a high degree of certainty that SSAC will be saying something. Generally, I think it'll be all the positive kind of things. Some of our earlier discussions have resulted in some folks saying, "Well, what about this? What about this kind of thing?"

So there may be some items pointed out in the SSAC response, but generally, so far it's a positive discussion. Like I say, I'm quite certain

---

that there will be an SSAC response before the 31<sup>st</sup> of January closure date. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So may RSSAC see the SSAC response in the process of development?

RUSS MUNDY: I think I can probably arrange for that as we get closer to the end. So far, no one has come back and whacked me over the head for what I did with the new post-quantum algorithm rollover, which was to take the document that was near-final and provide a draft copy as a draft to RSSAC. So I'm pretty sure that I can get at least that much of a preview and, possibly, an earlier preview. I will endeavor to do that if that is the RSSAC's request from me as the SSAC liaison.

FRED BAKER: Well, I suppose I'm speaking out of turn because I'm the first one to speak, but – oh, Naela, you've got your hand up.

NAELA SARRAS: Thank you, Fred. To your earlier question, as staff, while it's a public comment and everyone is, of course, invited to comment, I can tell you that, from the staff's perspective, a response from RSSAC, yes, would carry weight. Yes, I agree with what Liman said.

---

Two, it's good for us to receive different comments into this forum because, when we put something out for public comment, the more comments that come in to exercise what we're thinking in terms of the proposal that's being put out, it helps refine it and make it only better. So putting out things for public comment and receiving sufficient comments makes it really hard to decipher where this is not the right way to proceed or not.

So, absolutely. If this group can put together a comment to submit to IANA, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. I always get worried when I hear the word "the" because "the" is singular, as in there's only right way. My personal opinion is that this is a right way – three years, two years, four years, five minutes. There's a discussion. The point I think is to pick a time. Speaking for myself, three years is probably a reasonable amount of time.

So there are a couple of things we can do as far as an approach to this. One of them is that we can go ahead and discuss it here. I doubt that we're going to come up with anything resembling a final conclusion discussing it in the meeting, but I'm quite willing to have that. But ultimately what I'd suggest is that we all go read the IANA commentary if we haven't read the proposal yet and then comment to the RSSAC list. We can read the SSAC document when it comes. Then we can formulate a group opinion on the mailing list.

Does that work for people?

---

Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'm thinking back to RSSAC039, which is the RSSAC statement regarding ICANN's updated KSK rollover plan. I think that was a caucus document, if I'm not mistaken. So there's a question here of, should we involve the caucus in developing this public comment reply?

FRED BAKER: Well, I don't have problem with involving the caucus. That probably would be a good mailing list to do that on.

Is anyone opposed to having it be a caucus document?

Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No, I'm not opposed to involving the caucus. We just have to do it in a way that we don't waste too much time because the end of January isn't a whole lot of time. But I would welcome involving the caucus. So let's give the working party the thing that we sometimes do. But definitely the caucus list, yes.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. So I think the approach here would be to simply make a note summarizing the issue and pointing to the document and asking for commentary on the caucus list as opposed to all the mechanics of

---

having a work party. I think, if we try to have a formal work party, it'll be February before we get a shepherd.

Russ, did you want to comment?

RUSS MUNDY:

Yes. Thank you. In fact, I'm in favor of working this in the caucus space, but I would like to point out one of the interesting what I'll describe as anomalies or different situations that I'm fairly sensitized to as the liaison but also a caucus member, and that is that the caucus mailing list is a publicly archived mailing list, so discussion on the caucus mailing list are available for anyone who wants to go see. I think that's a good idea, but, if we have the discussion strictly as RSSAC on the RSSAC list, that is not an open list and it does make it a little bit more challenging to do the coordinating of what is being discussed between the two groups.

So I'm pretty strongly in favor of doing this with the caucus on the caucus list. Frankly, I think it's better, but it also makes my job as liaison easier. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Now let me ask you a question. Since it's a public archived list, would that affect your sharing of the SSAC document?

RUSS MUNDY:

It might make it a little bit more complex, but it would also be very simple for the sharing to be restricted to just RSSAC and on the RSSAC list. It would deprive the caucus of seeing it before a final [draft], but I

---

don't know what sensitivities SSAC would have about that. That's a question I have not raised with them previously.

FRED BAKER:

Well, may I suggest that you talk with Rod? Talk with the Chairs about that – Rod and Julie – and see what the sensitivities might be. I'd be okay with having the general discussion on the caucus list but the sharing of the SSAC document restricted to the RSSAC list, if that's what they want. I'll leave that to them.

Kaveh, you've got a comment.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yes because the way we organize work in the caucus is via work parties. I think we can actually have a work party with a closed list if needed, but I think we should SSAC if they're okay with sharing okay with sharing it with a closed work party. Of course, we can make that clear that they should not share outside of the work party, although there are no contracts. But I think that should be enough. So I think that's another option.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. If we're going to do that, then I'm going to suggest that we short-circuit the mechanics of setting up a work party. I'll be the shepherd. Maybe we can make you be the chair, the point being to get the discussion rolling.

---

I think we've agreed to have the caucus involved. If the SSAC Chairs need us to have a closed work party list, we can do that.

Does anybody have further comments on the proposal right now?

[ANDREW MCCONACHIE]: Fred, in thinking about how to manage this work, whether we have a work party or not on the caucus, whatever we do we need to start it pretty soon because we don't have very much time.

What would you like me to do to kick this work off? Should we start a work party immediately with you as the shepherd? Or should I maybe send a mail to the caucus list asking for feedback? How should we proceed from now?

FRED BAKER: Well, I really only want to go through the mechanics of a work party if the SSAC Chairs want to restrict the distribution of the SSAC document in development, which I can imagine that they would like to do.

Let me suggest this. Could you go ahead and send a comment or an e-mail to the caucus, pointing to the thing and inviting commentary on that proposal? State in that that a very short work party may be developed around it and that that will say so in the future in the event that we decide to do that. But you go ahead and send an initial e-mail.

Does anybody have any objection to that procedure?

Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Not an objection. I was just going to propose exactly that. So, yes, supported.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Let's go ahead and do that then: get the balling rolling. With Christmas coming up – Christmas and New Years – it's going to be a very exciting time for the next two months. Let's keep the discussion going.

Anybody have further comments on this topic in the agenda? If not, I'm going to move on.

Okay. Moving on: work items. Duane and Russ, do you have comments on the RSS metrics?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. This is Duane.

RUSS MUNDY: [inaudible] unmuted. Oh, is Duane here too? Yay!

DUANE WESSELS: I'm here. Should I go, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Go ahead. You're on now. I didn't hear you at roll call. So go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Yeah, I was a little bit late. Sorry about that.

The Metrics Work Party document. We had a couple of caucus meeting recently at IETF and at the ICANN meeting. That was also a good time for some hallway conversations with some people. The document, I would say, stabilized a little bit. There's a few outstanding comments and additions.

Let me just run through them quickly since there's only a few. There's a new paragraph in the introduction, which hopefully everyone has had a chance to see. If you haven't looked recently, please take a look. The key point of that paragraph is that it says, absent any contractual obligations, none of then metrics are binding on the root server operators.

There's a newer comment from, I think, Paul Hoffman is Section 3.3, which talks about vantage points. There's the commented areas about diversity of connectivity providers. Right now, the document says that, for example, when you have vantage points in the same region – say, North America – they should try to have different ISPs or different connectivity providers. Paul thinks that is maybe too prescriptive or overly difficult. So we need some input on that.

There's a note about something [Ray Belus] brought up recently, which is that software such as BIND, when it starts up, if it has an old copy of the zone, will serve that zone as long as it's not expired until it can refresh the zone and that this may have some impacts in our metrics for correctness and publication latency. So, in the document, we just note

---

that that's a problem. We don't try to address it otherwise but note that it's a problem and maybe that we need to address it in the future.

Lastly, in the publication latency metric, there was a proposal to change what is currently the median. We take a median value of a bunch of measurements. There's a proposal to change that to the mean value. The rationale is that, with the median, you can have some situations where, say, more than half of the measurements wildly exceed – you could have stale zone data for weeks and weeks and weeks on half of your sites, half of your measurements, and still meet the median threshold requirement. So switching to mean would address that situation, so we're going to take that discussion to the list as well.

As I said, the document is pretty stable. It's been locked for edits. We asked people to make comments on the mailing lists. We have a Metrics call scheduled for, I think, December 16<sup>th</sup>?

RUSS MUNDY: 19<sup>th</sup>.

DUANE WESSELS: December 17<sup>th</sup>?

RUSS MUNDY: 19<sup>th</sup>.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Oh. Anyway, that week. At that time, we hope to finalize it and then get moving on the final drafts and voting and things like that.

Anything else, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: One thing that I think is important to point out here is that I don't believe that there have been comments posted to the list since we locked the document. At least I haven't seen any. So I'd encourage people to look and contribute their comments?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. If you do look at the documents, you will see that, since it is locked for [editing]. It's in View Only mode right now. In that mode, you won't see the comments that you would normally see up to the side. So I'm going to try to work with Steve to get people a version where they can still see the comments. Or maybe we have to unlock it, Steve. I'm not sure.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. It'd be nice to be able to read the comments that were made and reply to them and to make new comments, if people have new comments to make.

---

DUANE WESSELS:                    Yeah. We wanted to have those kind of [comment-y] discussions on then list. But I do agree that you need to be able to see what sections are still up for discussion.

That's it from me.

FRED BAKER:                    Okay. Whenever you have that new link that allows us to do that – I assume that's a new link – let us know.

DUANE WESSELS:                    Okay.

FRED BAKER:                    Russ, further comments?

RUSS MUNDY:                    No. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:                    Okay. Moving on: modern resolver behavior. Basically, this is in FIN-WAIT. We're waiting for a report from Paul, and then we'll be closing the Modern Resolver Behavior Work Party. There's not much more to report at this point.

Andrew, you want to talk about updates?

---

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. There's three documents we're updating: RSSAC002v4, RSSAC023v2, and RSSAC026v2. First, on RSSAC002v4, I've merged all the comments that we got at ICANN66 into the document. We made it about halfway through at ICANN66, so we still have another half of the document to go through. There's an outstanding request to Paul Hoffman to do some research into compatibility of the [aml] versions with what's out there. I think he's going to test different versions of parsers on the data that's being published right now.

But, beyond that, all the action items for ICANN66 have been resolved in the document.

I think there's an action item for staff to send out a Doodle for another call so we can continue to work on the document.

Does anyone have any comments on this document before I move to the other ones?

FRED BAKER: I would agree that we should have a call if we have the other half of the document to go through. Let's put that in January.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay.

FRED BAKER: December is getting a little crowded, I think.

---

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. We don't have very much time left in December before Christmas break.

So staff will take that action item to ... We'll send out the Doodle this week for a call in January.

RSSAC023v2. This is the history document and received a lot of good feedback at ICANN 66. We've also been getting a lot of input from the RSOs updating their individual sections. I don't know exactly which RSOs we have left because, in the last few days, we've gotten input from three or four. We might even be done, surprisingly enough. So that's really great. That moved along very quickly.

I see that Danielle has updated the section on Jon Postel's experiment. We cut that section down considerably. There's still some more work that needs to be done in this document. There's a lot of new text, so we're also going to need a call.

I see Ryan's hand, but first let me propose that we send out a Doodle this week for a call in January on this document as well. Ryan, go ahead.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Hey, Andrew. Thanks. Hey, sorry it's taken us so long to get our updates to you. We will probably get them either this week or next week. It's just there's a lot of approvals since we're highlighting and detailing information about the agency itself that it just has to be approved prior to it being into a public document.

So, like I said, either this week or next week. I'm going to try to really shoot for this week. Okay?

ANDREW MCONACHIE: That would be great, but next week is also fine. If we're not going to have a call until January, then I think you have the rest of this year to get those updates in.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Excellent. Thanks.

ANDREW MCONACHIE: Thank you very much. Any other comments on RSSAC023v2?

JESS OSBORN: Yeah. This is Jeff. ISC – we finished ours yesterday. I have another group that isn't until Thursday to approve, but I'll have ours in on Thursday.

ANDREW MCONACHIE: Excellent. Thank you. So there's an action item to staff: to send out a Doodle for a call in January on that document.

Moving on to RSSAC026v2, this is the lexicon. This document is basically just in a holding patterns until the metrics work gets done. It was agreed that we'd finalize some of the definitions around root server identifier, root server instance – that kind of thing. So no work is being done on this document until that metrics document is done. Otherwise, the other definitions in this document are all pretty much stable at this point.

---

Does anyone have any comments on RSSAC026v2?

Okay. I'm going to assume that's an old hand from Ryan, so, I think, back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Thank you. So now we're into reports. The first one is from Brad and myself. We had a big discussion earlier on the vice-chair election, and we re-elected Brad as vice-chair for the coming two years. I'm not sure I've got anything else to report. That's been the big item over the last month.

Brad, do you have anything to add there?

BRAD VERD:

No. I don't think there's been anything new or anything that's gone since we met in Montreal and shared with everybody.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Also no big news since then, just, as I guess, as you're all aware, that, after passing the resolution, the work has been started to select [GWG] members. I have seen the call in different groups, including IAB and also the [inaudible]. I'm sure you've seen the root ops call. So that's happening but, no, nothing more than that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I have only one thing. We usually have our calls on or around the 15<sup>th</sup> of every month, but since the Montreal meeting happened early in the month, we decided to have our meeting there. So we haven't had an actual meeting since Montreal, but we've had some feedback and process. One of the changes that we have underway is to establish a metric for label generation for IDN labels and tables for that are handled by the IANA. That was a substantial change, which had to go through approval processes within the ccNSO and the GNSO. Now that part is done. So we have received the [formal] approval from those two groups, which means that we are now at the final step, where I've requested [to] the IANA to actually implemented. After that, we will be done with that part. So that's the only thing that's happened that I can remember. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad?

BRAD VERD: With RZERC, we had our first meeting in a while in Montreal. As it turns out, the group identified a challenge with the appointments and the terms, as in every group, as it turns out, sets their own term limits for their appointee and also when they're appointed. So, as it turns out, it's very difficult for RZERC to elect a chair because a lot of the members

---

wouldn't necessarily be there for the length of the term that a chair would need to sit.

So RZERC is going through an effort to compile each of the seats, their terms, and what their limits are for each of the seats to see how big the challenge is, I think. They might come back and ask for some of the different groups to maybe change their start date or whatnot for terms. But that's still being reviewed, I think, by staff.

Other than that, there's a lot of discussion. A number of things were brought up on work that RZERC could do. So far, RZERC has been really a no-op group. There's been really no work to do. That's been reflected in my reports. So we're like a brainstorming session on maybe things that we could start work [on] [inaudible] [but nothing has been] finalized yet. That's all I have.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Fred. With SSAC, in terms of ongoing activities, I think the important ones that folks here ... We've already discussed the KSK rollover. I did make mention earlier of the post-quantum algorithm comment that SSAC is planning to submit. Having not seen any substantial feedback one way or the other, although we still have end of – I don't remember; it was either the end of today or tomorrow – that I asked if RSSAC wanted to say anything or join in on the SSAC comment.

---

That's the main set of activities that are going on between the two at this point.

If anybody does have any thoughts on the post-quantum algorithm rollover SSAC comment that I sent at the end of last week, this might be a good time to say what you're thinking or if you think we just proceed without RSSAC. I would appreciate some feedback there, if folks can give me some.

FRED BAKER: Question. How do people want to proceed there with SSAC? Do you want to tell them to just go ahead and file their comments?

WES HARDAKER: I think, if we are going to be filing comments anyway, then, unless SSAC specifically wants our opinion, we might as well create a separate document. Originally, it was because we weren't going to submit something.

RUSS MUNDY: The specific request at this point, Wes, is on the algorithm rollover comments that SSAC is going to send to NIST, which are due Friday.

WES HARDAKER: My bad.

---

RUSS MUNDY: So it's this super-short timeframe, which is one of the complicating factors. It's as simple as if RSSAC says, "No. Go ahead and say what you want to say. We'll just watch and see what happens but not join our names." I'm fine with that. I just wanted to be sure to give RSSAC a chance to join in the comment if there was a desire to do so.

BRAD VERD: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I haven't seen the statement from RSSAC going to NIST, but it's basically stating that there are limitations within the SSAC, and some of the keys you're looking at are [inaudible]. Is it more than that? Or is it just what I just said?

RUSS MUNDY: That's really the essence of it, Brad. I did send it last Friday. I think it was Friday. Thursday or Friday. Anyway, it was last week sometime. It's, like, two pages. It does have a bunch of technical, descriptive details in it, but the essence is, yes, if some of these algorithms were chosen, it would be very difficult to use those algorithms in DNSSEC because of the key [size].

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I don't know. I would be in favor of RSSAC endorsing it. I don't know how to do that: if it's just a comment or if it's just some bolt-on. I don't know. I don't know how to do that with this stuff, but I think that's pretty important and would have a direct effect on us, should [inaudible] keys [inaudible].

---

FRED BAKER: I agree with that. Steve, you've got your hand up.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Fred and Brad. One thing is that the SSAC Admin Committee meeting had a brief discussion about this prior to the Thanksgiving break, and they're meeting this week in Los Angeles, where we can also bring up ... Last time, Duane mentioned he has some comments on a document itself. Then I chatted with Rod and Julie. They have no problems for Duane to suggest those changes in the document directly. But, in the end, the SSAC will go to those comments and most likely would choose to accept all of them. But they reserve the final right to the [disposition] of a particular comment. So I think that's one way to improve the document. Any RSSAC members that have any feedback and comments on the document itself can make suggestions to the Google Doc.

For the SSAC to sign on to the document, I think probably it's worth a background discussion between the Chairs, [one] with the RSSAC input. Maybe RSSAC can be added as a joint statement or sign onto that statement. Thanks.

BRAD VERD: Steve, I'm not suggesting a co-document between SSAC and RSSAC. Is there a way – I'm not familiar with the NIST – for RSSAC to make a comment and endorse it? I think it's great that SSAC has [inaudible]. Obviously, it's an RSSAC document, so they get final say on what the content is, but I'm just curious as to if there's a way to reaffirm it [inaudible].

STEVE SHENG: I think that's a great idea, Brad. When the SSAC and the committee discussed this, they felt that, instead of doing a joint statement with different groups, [they'd be] submitting the comments as more weight to it. So I think, after contributing to the SSAC comment, submitting something very short, saying RSSAC endorsed the comment made by the SSAC, will be helpful and impactful in my perspective. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Assuming that we agree to that – I'll ask that question in a moment – it seems like we need to delegate somebody to literally dream up and make a comment because we haven't got time to go through a formal process. Is there anything more than that that we would need to do?

BRAD VERD: Well, it sounds like [inaudible] one or two sentences that says RSSAC endorses the SSAC document, but we need to get approval from RSSAC before we can say that.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. I'm imagining taking a week on a vote. I think we need to do it here on the call.

Duane, you've got your hand up.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Fred. I was going to say, as Steve mentioned, I read through the SSAC document pretty carefully. I liked everything I saw there. There were a couple of sections where I was considering rewriting things a little bit for clarity, but since it wasn't really my document or even an RSSAC document, I was reluctant to do that. So I think the SSAC document is good to go as is. If there was more time and the situation was a little different, maybe I would do some rewriting, but I don't think that's really necessary.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Andrew, you've got your hand up.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Just a note on the mechanics. Submitting a public comment to NIST involves sending an e-mail to a list. I don't think anyone needs to be subscribed to anything in particular. I can check on that, but I believe anyone ... The SSAC document contains in the two-line of the letter two mail addresses. That's where the SSAC comment will be sent when it's approved. What the RSSAC could do, if it approves some language, is send language in the form of an e-mail or in the form of a PDF or whatever to those mailing lists, endorsing the SSAC document if they so wish. So I think, mechanically, this is how this could work.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, let me ask a question. Duane read the document. I read the document briefly, but my head was off in a Holiday Land. Did anybody else read the SSAC document?

---

Okay. Seeing none, what's our opinion? Do we want to issue a statement that we support the SSAD document? Let me put that in the form of a motion. I move that – I'm sorry? Go ahead.

BRAD VERD:

Before you do that, what if, since we don't know [inaudible], we would need [inaudible]. Here's what I'm thinking. I'm trying to get the right words out. I apologize. If it's just via e-mail, what if an e-mail came from the Co-Chairs – just an e-mail, no formal RSSAC document, obviously with the approval of RSSAC, though – to this list, stating that we're in support and endorse the document presented by RSSAC? That would be a way forward.

FRED BAKER:

That's more or less what I was about to propose, so that works for me. Andrew has just put a pointer to the SSAC document into the chat.

Let me suggest this. This is not at all per our procedures, but we don't have time for our procedures. Let's each go read the SSAC commentary. If we have any comments on that, then we can discuss them on the list. Please post to the list.

In any event, tomorrow, Brad, could you send a note from the Co-Chairs to the NIST list summarizing whatever RSSAC comments there are?

BRAD VERD:

[inaudible], as long as everybody is okay with us endorsing this [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: Okay. So I'll put that in the form of a vote. The motion is that RSSAC endorses the SSAC commentary and empowers the Chairs to send a note to that effect to NIST.

Do I have a second on that?

JEFF OSBORN: This is Jeff. You have a second.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

JEFF OSBORN: And, looking at the document, I realize I also read it on Thanksgiving.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Is anyone opposed to that?

Abstaining?

Okay. Let's follow that procedure then. Everybody, please go read it. If you have comments, then post them to the list. A posting to the effect of, "We have no further comments," would also be welcome, just to make sure that everybody got their views in. Tomorrow, then, Brad will send a note to NIST.

---

RUSS MUNDY: Just one very slight sequencing thing. I think probably it might be good if the RSSAC sent the endorsement after the SSAC after sends their comments.

I didn't know if Steve or Andrew knew the exact timing for when they were planning to actually submit the comment. Is it the 5<sup>th</sup> or the 6<sup>th</sup> or has it not yet been decided?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I can answer that, Russ. I would be two days from the end of today. So it would be on the 5<sup>th</sup>. I can inform the RSSAC Chairs when it has been sent to NIST.

BRAD VERD: If you could add to that, it'd be nice to have the document number [inaudible].

RUSS MUNDY: Right.

ANDREW MCCOANCHIE: Yes. When I inform the RSSAC Co-Chairs, I will inform them of the SSAC document number.

BRAD VERD: Then I'll send the e-mail to them.

---

FRED BAKER: That works.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Brad.

FRED BAKER: Now I'm thinking back. Are we on 8G or 8H?

RUSS MUNDY: We were actually on E. Thank you, everybody. This was an extremely helpful discussion. Hopefully we can figure out how to do more of these and make them less stressful and learn how to say things together in a more effective way. Thanks, everybody. End of report.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. Thank you very much. Daniel, do you have any comments from then IAB?

I don't hear Daniel, so maybe he's missing. Naela, do you have comments from IANA?

NAELA SARRAS: Hi. Yes. Thank you. Very quickly, last week, for the IANA budget for FY21, public comment closed. I believe there were zero comments received on that one. The staff will now move to preparing a public comment report that it will put out, and then it will move on to the PTI Board approval. Then it will join the ICANN budget for the formal Board

---

approval from the ICANN Board. So that's happening in January and beyond.

The second item we'll be working on in December is the implementation of the LGR metrics (the Label Generation Rules metrics) that Liman spoke to.

Then a major thing we're preparing for the rest of the month is how to handle the holidays. As you know, the ICANN office is closed during the holiday period from Christmas to New Years, but IANA stays operational. So we usually have staff on hand to process requests coming through during that period, and we adjust our schedule accordingly. We'll be sending out notifications to say what the hours are and how to contact us in case of emergency, which I'll make sure the RSSAC receives as well. So that's something we're preparing for as well for the rest of the month.

That's it from me.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you.

NAELA SARRAS: Thank you.

[DANIEL MIGAULT]: Fred, from the IAB, we have started to call for two representatives for the GWG. So that's in process.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I'm glad that's happening. Thank you for that. Duane, do you want to comment?

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Fred. I don't really have anything to report in terms of root zone maintainer activities, but I would like to update people a little bit on something I think we've talked about before, which is that there's been progress made in having the root server operators share contact information with IANA. I'll work with Naela to finalize that, but we expect to turn that on this month and have a monthly update of the contacts from the root ops to IANA.

FRED BAKER: Okay, great. Thank you. Before I move on to AOB, do we have anything that people want to add to AOB?

Failing that, Steve, you wanted to talk about staffing?

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. Just a quick announcement. As I mentioned, in February this chair, with the anticipation of starting the Governance Working Group, my colleague, Carlos, will be the primary staff support for that. So we began a transition process where Carlos will step away from a day-to-day operation of RSSAC. Then Ozan has been brought in to do that role. We had a bit of a ten-month or eleven-month transition, and Carlos has been helping Ozan fulfill that role. I think the time is ready where Ozan

---

is ready to leave RSSAC support. So I just want to announce that the transition will happen in January in next year and that Carlos has one more activity to finish. That is the organizational review [inaudible] report due to the OEC.

So I just want to take the opportunity to thank Carlos for his service to the RSSAC. It's been six years. Carlos and then Matt at IETF 86 in Orlando where Carlos's [inaudible] supporting the RSSAC and [us] ... He has made significant contributions. He will not be far. I think he's supporting the GWG. He's available to advise the support team on RSSAC matters. Let's give thanks to Carlos for his term and welcome Ozan to step up. My colleague, Danielle, will also step up a little bit of her time supporting the RSSAC as well.

So the RSSAC will not see any change in terms of the support staff we have. So just a quick announcement on that. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. I haven't polled the group, but I think I speak for the group in saying that we thank Carlos. Carlos has done some very good work for us and we appreciate that. Welcome aboard, Ozan and Danielle.

With that, we're done with the agenda. I think the time has come to adjourn. Do I hear a motion to that effect?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

So moved.

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here, seconding with, I guess, a wish for a Merry Christmas and other holidays and a Happy New Year because we probably won't speak until next year.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Our next meeting will be on the 7<sup>th</sup> of January. We'll see you here then. We're adjourned. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**