

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. Good morning, good evening, whatever it is in your part of the world. In my part of the world, it's very definitely morning and I've got the sun streaming in a window here, so I've got my hand up to make sure that I can see. But we should come to order.

Roll call. Great, thank you. Okay, so Cogent, who's here from Cogent? DISA?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yeah, this is Ryan Stephenson.

KEVIN WRIGHT: This is Kevin Wright.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. ISC, I am here. Jeff is here.

JEFF OSBORN: I'm here.

FRED BAKER: NASA?

TOM MIGLIN: Yep, Tom Miglin's 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: Okay. Netnod? I hope Liman will show up a little later. RIPE? Kaveh, you're here.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I am here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. UMD? USC ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here. [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard is here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

---

FRED BAKER: WIDE? Hiro, are you here?

Okay, various liaisons. Kaveh, you're here, liaison to the Board. Liman is not here, liaison to CSC. Brad's here, liaison to RZERC. Russ, are you here?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, Russ is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. IAB, is Daniel Migault online?

[UNIDENTIFIED MALE]: He's not here, he sends his regrets, but he said I could proxy for him if anything is needed.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Switching to your IAB hat?

[UNIDENTIFIED MALE]: That's correct.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, okay. So, IANA Functions Operator. Naela, are you here?

NAELA SARRAS: Yep, Naela is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, RZM. Duane, are you here?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane is here. Good morning.

FRED BAKER: Okay, good. And we have several staff listed. So, okay. Can we have the agenda back?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'm sorry, I think we skipped ICANN as an RSO? Did we ... ?

FRED BAKER: Did we skip ICANN? I'm sorry, well, ICANN, who's here from ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt's here.

TERRY MANDERSON: Terry Manderson is here as well.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Okay, thanks for pointing that out. So, yeah, most of us are here.

---

---

The agenda you've got sitting in front of you on the screen, and it was emailed earlier. Any questions or concerns about the agenda? Things people want to add as AOB? Okay, and with that, can you go back to the top please?

Here we go. Okay. Administrivia. Ozan, you want to talk about the minutes?

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Fred. Hi everyone. I circulated the RSSAC meeting minutes from the 2<sup>nd</sup> of June meeting slightly more than two weeks ago. We haven't received any feedback or questions on the draft minutes yet.

The action items from the meeting have been completed. So, if you do have any comments or questions on the draft minutes, please share them with the staff now. And I just want to note, there's a vote item during this meeting. Thank you, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

We usually do take a quick vote to accept the minutes. Does anyone have comments on the minutes from last month? Okay, voting to accept the minutes, does anybody have an issue they want to raise? Is anybody abstaining? Failing that, I presume that the minutes are accepted. And, Jeff, do you want to talk about the caucus membership committee?

JEFF OSBORN:

Sure. Thanks, Fred. My apologies, I'm still settling into the role and I'm not sure exactly what we're supposed to bring up but we had the two

---

normal things which are we had sent out a letter to the people who seem to be relatively inactive over the prior year, and we got some responses and didn't from others.

We have a new application from Tim April at Akamai to join the group. He's a principal architect of IS and sounded qualified.

So, again, I'm not sure exactly how we're supposed to do this in terms of like whether we need input or if it's just a status update. But what's basically going on is we have been pinging the people who have not showed up and about half have responded that they're still interested in attending and about half have sort of disappeared. We have a shared spreadsheet where we can go to a lot of detail about the size of the caucus, who's been active and who hasn't, and I can either make that available to the group—Ozan's got that—or we can just state that the status is that we're continuing to contact people who are not active, and we're continuing to [get interest and] new members.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, yeah, we usually circulate statements of interest for this call so that we can accept them.

JEFF OSBORN:

Like I said, that's my bad was that I haven't fallen into the "Oh yeah, here's the meeting and this is what I need to do before that." So, my apologies. I don't think there's anything that's an emergency, but I can certainly have something better for the next round.

---

FRED BAKER:                                Sounds good. If you can forward that SOI so that Ozan can include it in the agenda, we can discuss it next month.

JEFF OSBORN:                                That'd be great. I'll do that, Fred. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:                                Okay, cool. And now then the next thing, we have three outgoing liaisons that are changing and we have the option of replacing them. We have asked for volunteers. And what we have is that the liaison to the ICANN nominating committee, the only person who has expressed interest is the current liaison, who is Amir Qayyum.

The liaison to the CSC is ... we're supposed to replace that and Liman is actually not only our liaison to it, but the chair of the committee. He has volunteered to stay in place, but according to our procedures, he's term limited, which creates an issue. That's why his name isn't here. However, I'll note that that he did volunteer to continue.

And then liaison to the RZERC, we have had two people offer to do that. The outgoing is Brad Verd and the options to continue include Brad, who is representative of an operator, and Daniel Migault, who is the liaison from the IAB.

So, having said that, I will accept a motion to accept Amir as the liaison to the nominating committee.

---

BRAD VERD: Hey Fred, I'll motion to accept Amir.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Do I have a second?

WES HARDAKER: I'll second.

FRED BAKER: Okay. In that case, what do people think about that? Is there a problem? Does anybody have an issue with accepting Amir as the liaison to the NomCom? Failing that, is anyone abstaining? Failing that, I gather that we have agreed to accept Amir as the liaison to the NomCom.

Second one being now liaison to the CSC and I mentioned that Liman has said that he's willing to do it, but he's technically term limited. We'll get to term limits later, but I'd like to first have ... Is there any discussion on that? What do people think about the possibility of accepting Liman to go a third term?

WES HARDAKER: Well, we can't do that without a bylaw change, right? A bylaw change has to be approved through the Board. I don't really see that as [available short-term].

[BRAD VERD]: It's just a procedures change, that's all.



WES HARDAKER: Oh.

FRED BAKER: And you'll notice on the agenda, 7D, the first one, we do have some proposed updates to the term limits.

[BRAD VERD]: Fred, if I may?

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

[BRAD VERD]: So—I'm trying to think of how to word this—I feel like there are three outgoing liaisons that are rather important to RSSAC. And what I'm sharing here is based upon my experience here in RSSAC, and conversations with everybody here in the group. So, if I get this wrong, please just say so.

Liaison to the Board, I think that's pretty important to us, direct impact to us. It's our channel to the ICANN Board. I think that one's pretty obvious. I think the other two that are important, and what I mean important is directly impacting—all of them are important—but directly impacting us is the CSC because that is the committee that kind of oversees—I wish Liman was here—but that is the committee that

---

oversees the IANA function and everything that goes into the root zone. So, I think that's pretty important to the RSOs, and therefore RSSAC.

And the second one being the RZERC, which was created as part of the transition. Again, directly impacting contents of the root, this would be the group that would approve new record types or some dramatic changes or something which all in all would directly impact the RSOs, and therefore RSSAC.

So, I feel like those two are pretty important. And when I say that, what I'm really trying to say is I think somebody from RSSAC should be on there rather than caucus members. And that's my personal opinion. I know there are different thoughts on that. And again, I'm happy to go in whatever direction the group wants.

But specifically, with the with the CSC and the situation we're in right now—again, I wish Liman was here—but Liman took on this role and was elected as the chair of the CSC at the AGM last year. So, that shows that he'd be very effective and his peers respect him. And I feel like it would be a good thing for us to keep him there somehow. And if that means changing the procedures so that the term limit doesn't get him out of that role, I think that would be worthwhile. Specifically, since he has only been in that role as Chair for less than a year now. It'd be a shame to see that come to an abrupt end.

So, those are my thoughts on the topic.

---

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you. So, let me observe—I said a few minutes ago that update to the procedure and specifically on term limits is something that we're going to be discussing later in the meeting. And if you would permit to presume that we're going to agree to change the term limits and move ahead then with Liman in the Customer Standing Committee. And I'm sure [Robert and his rules] would have a problem with that, but I'm basically trying to figure out how to deal with the linear agenda.

So, is there any other discussion on these three people in positions? With that, let me move ahead to voting. With the ICANN Nominating Committee, we only have one nominee and so we're in a position to accept him by acclamation according to our procedures, and so I suggest that we do so. Those that have a problem with doing that, those that would vote no, say so please. Those that would abstain, say so please. Then I take it that we have accepted Amir Qayyum as the ICANN Nominating Committee liaison.

Oh, hello, Hiro. Ozan, Hiro is here.

Item two under that heading is the Customer Standing Committee and, once again, does anybody have an issue with accepting Liman as our representative to the Customer Standing Committee, recognizing the term limit issue? Hearing none ...

BRAD VERD:

[Fred, this is Brad.]

FRED BAKER:

Go ahead.

BRAD VERD: I have no objection to Liman continuing, but is it possible to change the agenda and have the term limit discussion now or the voting later? So that we can ... I don't know.

FRED BAKER: Well ...

BRAD VERD: It feels weird accepting or voting on Liman when we have this outstanding issue, I guess.

FRED BAKER: Well, okay, so I agree that any way you look at it, it's weird. Let me do this. I'll talk about that agenda item after we've dealt with the term limits.

BRAD VERD: So, just for my clarity, I think what you're asking is if there were no term limits, are we okay with Liman? Is that what you're saying?

FRED BAKER: Yeah, if there were no term limits, are we okay with Liman?

BRAD VERD: Got it, okay.

---

FRED BAKER:

But as you suggest, let's continue that discussion after we've talked about term limits. And we should do the same with the RZM since you have volunteered, we do have another applicant and we have your comments of a moment ago. So, let's simply move both of those to after we've discussed our procedures.

Now, the next thing on our agenda is the CCWG report, which I don't know, I was up for the 5:00 AM meeting on the CCWG this morning. Ozan, do you want to talk about that?

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Fred. Hi everyone. So, the Cross Community Working Group on the new gTLD auction proceeds was set up roughly three and a half years ago. And all of the supporting organizations and advisory committees were chartering organizations in this Cross Committee Working Group and they had a few public comment proceedings back in [the year], and then through the end of May this year, 2020, they published the final report.

And the RSSAC, as a chartering organization, needs to indicate its support to this final report if it has no issues with it. And I shared the background notes in early June on that and also later in June, I also shared another note flagging the webinar that happened a few hours ago today that Fred had just mentioned.

And basically, on this Cross Community Working Group, on the final report, the Cross Community Working Group suggested three

---

mechanisms on how to deal with the auction proceeds and how to allocate them. So, if the Cross Community Working Group receives support from all of the chartering SOs and ACs, then the leadership will submit the final report to the ICANN Board, and the ICANN Board will look at the mechanisms being offered and make a decision on that.

Also, in my notes that I shared with you, I had pointed out a portion of the report, which is the Annex D, on pages 50 and 51. There are a few example projects that were placed by the members of the RSSAC through this group, who is, I believe, Brad at that time, also Tripti.

So, when we look at the final report, we see that all the example projects that were offered relating to the DNS root service were on the report and the Cross Community Working Group considered these projects to be consistent with ICANN's mission.

So, basically, if there are no comments or issues with the final report, then the RSSAC will go ahead and indicate its support to this report. The deadline is by the end of this month. So, I think if you have any comments or issues, this meeting is a good moment to share them with the rest of the RSSAC. And also, if as the member to this group, if Brad would like to share more, please feel free to chime for it, Brad.

BRAD VERD:

Thank you. Yeah. So, Tripti and I took on that that role after talking to RSSAC, all of you, this was three, four years ago now. And the main reason that, besides being a sponsoring organization and engaging with them, was that we wanted to make sure that those four scenarios that you see on the screen in front of you were included.

---

After some debate and much discussion, they were added to the original list. And I'm pleased to report that they have stayed in there.

So, I think of the 11 recommendations, they're pretty straightforward. And I think what's most important to RSSAC is that the funds can go forward with these four scenarios which follow what we had put into 37.

But I would recommend everybody read the document, go through it, watch the seminar, if it's available on video, and give us feedback. I think, Ozan, we have until the end of this month or later this month to provide our approval or disapproval?

OZAN SAHIN:

That is correct. The 31st of July is the suggested deadline. And if RSSAC needs more time, then we need to communicate this to the leadership of the CCWG.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, so I think the RSSAC Admin Team, Fred and others, we've talked about this and we don't see any objection, but, obviously, we're here to channel what you guys want in here. So, if there's feedback or concerns with what's in there, then we should share that. But in the end, since we are a sponsoring or organization, we have to give our approval or disapproval. And right now, the Admin Team is saying that we're fine with it. Any questions?

---

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

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I just wanted to recognize what Brad and Tripti did there because I was in the [committee a year] prior to this one, which has resulted in chartering this one. And I know that there has been a lot of energy that went into this to make sure that what we are going to do, what we're looking for is included or is possible within this framework. So, yeah, I just wanted to recognize that. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Thanks, [Kaveh.] Thank you and thank you, Brad. And I suppose thanks to Tripti, except she's not here.

BRAD VERD: The person who we should really thank who isn't here is Carlos. Carlos was the one who did a lot of the leg work. But thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, so be it. Could you go back to the agenda, please? So, okay, I'm looking for people to raise concerns on this. Let me ask, is it reasonable to ask people to send an email to the list with any such concerns over the coming week? Don't all shout at once.

BRAD VERD: Fred, I think putting a timeline on this would be helpful. I think giving everybody a week, and then if there are no responses, then we'll draft



---

up a response in support of it. We'll share it with the group here. People can wordsmith or add comments there, and then before the end of the month, we could send it, if that sounds like a reasonable plan.

FRED BAKER: That sounds rational to me. So, please read the thing—you've got it in your email—and comment during this coming week and we can proceed as Brad just described. Okay, so, Ozan, is that the end of that report, or that topic?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Fred, and staff will work with the RSSAC Admin Team to draft this report as outlined by Brad and circulate the note.

FRED BAKER: Okay, great. Now, let's move on to the independent review process. That's got your name beside it, you want to talk about that?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, thank you, Fred. So, this is another area where, at this time, ICANN Org is actually looking for feedback from, again, supporting organizations and advisory committees. Independent review process is one of the accountability mechanisms available at ICANN. It's in the ICANN bylaws and it's also one of the powers available to empowered community, which RSSAC [thought] it would be part of in the future, with its new form.

---

So, what the ICANN Org is looking here is actually guidance from the SOs and ACs on the establishment of the standing panel for the independent review process. And there has been some work in this establishment process.

And so, interested parties to be part of this standing panel are already applying for it and the deadline for applications is end of July. And also, there have been some earlier rounds of feedback from the SOs and ACs on how best to implement this.

So, there has been an implementation oversight team that has worked on it. And in order to evaluate the applications and form the standing panel, ICANN Org wants to know whether the SOs and ACs would like to leverage the expertise of this implementation oversight team, have them look at the applications for the standing panel, or form a separate group that is completely new who can handle those applications in the establishment of the standing panel.

This may not be fully relevant to the RSSAC, but we just placed it on the agenda today, so that if RSSAC had anything to say in this regard, we just don't miss it before communicating the feedback from the RSSAC to the ICANN Org.

And I had sent a note again towards the end of June on that. So, if you have any questions or preference, again, whether to use the already existing implementation oversight team to select the standing panel or form a new, separate representative group to evaluate these applications. If you have any preference on the two paths that were

---

outlined by ICANN Org, then please let us know. And then RSSAC will then communicate its preference, if any, to the ICANN Org. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Moving on, we have several work items. Ken, would you like to talk about the local perspective work?

KEN RENARD:

Sure, good morning. Thanks, Fred.

So, the Local Perspective Work Party had their third meeting on the 29th of June. Abdulkarim Oloyede took over as the work party leader.

In the last meeting, Wes presented the work he had done with others on Verfploeter, as well as Andrew presenting some of his code, which is really geared towards this exact type of thing, getting a local perspective. So, we had some good discussion there.

A document has been started and I posted that link in the chat for the Zoom session here. It's a pretty rudimentary document at this point, but it's a starting point for discussion and I invite everyone to go take a look at that document and comment on it, throw any ideas in there, whatever you see fit. And if you'd like to join us on our next meeting, which will be on the 20th of July, I believe it's 15:00 UTC.

While I'm at it, I'll talk about the Rogue Operator Work Party. We had our third meeting on the 30th of June. And the group is going into a little bit of an existential crisis about whether we're talking about rogue operators versus rogue responses. The original intent was the rogue

---

operator, one of the 12 organizations doing something bad, but along the way, we've kind of gone towards this rogue responses, which is a pretty good thing here to really qualify what the rogue operator means so that a bad response from maybe a local root or an on-path attacker or something that's not a legitimate operator would not fall into the rogue operator definition.

I'm going to post the link again. We have a working document that I just posted into the chat. Again, please, invite everyone to take a look at the document, provide comments to the document, throw something out onto the caucus mail list.

Our next meeting for that group will be on the 21st of July, at I believe 13:00 UTC. And that should be it, with respect to those two work parties and work items. And if anybody has any comments, please, welcome to speak now or contact myself for Abdulkarim as work party leaders. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you, Ken. We also have, not a formal work party, but we have some ongoing work about RSO financials and discussion of an SLA and an SLE. And that's being done basically because I think it's important. The GWG is going to write some kind of a document that describes what those arrangements are. And if we have expressed no opinion, we might not be happy with it. So, I think it's in our court to express an opinion as to what kinds of contracts we might be willing to entertain, and then hand that off to the GWG as input to their process.

---

So, Ozan, could you put the link to the current financial document into the chat, please?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. A moment, please.

FRED BAKER: So, that started with a drafting team. We had—what?—four or five volunteers. And the guys came up with what I thought was a pretty good document. And what I've done now is, rather than have it be a team that ... Wes commented in an email that it appeared to be meeting in secret, [or at least] there was that rumor going around and it needs to be us. It needs to be the RSSAC, the various operators.

So, what I've done is closed the drafting team. And what we now have is, instead, a discussion among the RSSAC [on that].

So, the next meeting of that will be a week from today, and it's at 7:00 Pacific, I don't know what that works out to UTC. Oh, it's 2:00 PM universal time looking at the invite. So, I'd encourage people to read and comment on the document and attend that meeting to make sure that the document winds up where it needs to be.

And I'll note two people that are on the invitation. Ryan asked me if he could invite two people from his management chain. And well, of course, fine. If people from management chains of any of the RSOs want to look at this, I think they need to be able to do so and to get their comments in. So, I have invited people from management chains of any

---

of the RSOs to be at the meeting, and specifically we have [Jill Place] and [Aaron Welling] listed on the invitation to them.

So, now I'm looking at the provisional document. Okay, we can continue that discussion next week. It looks like, just running through the comments on the thing, looks like we're pretty close to that. There we go.

And then the remaining work item is RSSAC [0], version five. And you've got a link there in the agenda. And, Ozan, could you put that link in the chat room?

OZAN SAHIN: I just pasted it in, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Thank you.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So yeah, I'll take this.

FRED BAKER: Go for it.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Every year, the RSSAC updates its operational procedures. Staff kind of bundles up edits that are outstanding things that come up during the year and we do updates in one kind of bunch.

---

This year, we've got three things that have come up. One, as we've already heard, is the question of liaisons and term limits and whether or not those outgoing liaisons should be coming from the RSSAC or the RSSAC caucus.

The second thing is translations of RSSAC documents. And so, I've drafted some text in here on how the RSSAC's working language should be English, or is English.

And then the third item this year is how to kind of conceive of RSSAC meetings, how to define RSSAC meetings. Previously, the text we have in RSSAC 000 before dates from a time when most RSSAC meetings were closed, they were private. And since then, we've gone to default open. So, there's some discussion in this document about how to categorize RSSAC meetings now that they're default open.

Kind of in the interest of time, it sounds like we really need to have the liaison discussion today. Probably the other two discussions about meetings and working language can be tabled at least until the end of this meeting, but there's other things that are depending upon the liaison discussion. So, is that okay if we just do that one now? Because that could actually take a little bit of time. Is that okay, Fred?

FRED BAKER:

It works for me. Does anybody object? Okay, go ahead Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Okay, thanks. So, previously ... Sure, so we'll start with the NomCom here. The text you're seeing on this on this screen, which is extracted

---

from RSSAC 000 v4 and then edited. RSSAC 000 v4 said a person may only serve for three consecutive terms. I went through all the liaisons, the admin committee asked me to come up with some language to kind of make that a little bit more maneuverable, I guess. So, I said, a person should ideally only serve for three consecutive terms.

And then you'll see at the end of that paragraph, instead of saying that the liaison to the ICANN Nominating Committee needs to come from the RSSAC caucus, it's been changed to just say it needs to come from the RSSAC.

So, those two things are what we're discussing here now. I think turning it over to the floor now is the thing to do. I'll note that I'm glad Hiro joined because, Hiro, you had some comments on what exactly ideally means and how it's not really defined.

So, does anyone have any comments on this? Wes, go ahead.

WES HARDAKER:

So, I guess two random things. So, one, I'm not sure. So, each of these liaisons has very different roles. And I listened carefully to Brad's opinions earlier on what should be RSSAC members versus the RSSAC caucus.

Personally, the NomCom one, I don't think we ought to restrict to just members of the RSSAC. I think that is a broader panel that actually works well with diversity.

In terms of timing, I actually think term limits are a really good thing. I think two years is the right thing to do most of the time, except that



---

RSSAC is weird, no offense to RSSAC, myself included. We have very long-standing people, and we have a very small body of people to draw from. And I think we probably have to allow for longer terms just in the way that this group works because I don't see us fixing this group anytime, at least in the next couple of years until ... and fixing isn't the right word, because we actually work very well and have been highly productive.

But the other option ... So, I agree with Hiro's point that the word "ideally" is kind of odd there. If we want to say that there's no term limits, then that's what we ought to say and not try and be [probably] fuzzy around it. I think that's it.

FRED BAKER:

Brad, I see you've got your hand up.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. Just to echo kind of what Wes was saying, well, first, I agree. I don't think the NomCom should be ... I think it's perfectly reasonable to have the caucus involved, and we have. The person that is in there now and has been in there is from the caucus, so I think that's great.

Regarding the term limits, I think if we just go back in history, we didn't have any until kind of the reboot of RSSAC. And we put in term limits on the liaison to the Board, and then as we created our procedures document—and I'm going off a memory here and hopefully people can correct me—I think we just picked like two terms seems reasonable.

---

And then obviously, we put down in our action items that we should revise, or update, or review 000 every year and add updates.

So, we've been at this now for five years. No, six. Anyways, long time. I think that much of what Wes said is true. We have a small pool to pull from and I think certain roles are more important or have direct impact on us. So, we might want to have somebody with a voice there, like I said earlier. So, I think looking at this as perfectly reasonable, looking at getting rid of term limits or changing them.

Regarding changing them, I like Hiro's suggestion of trying to clarify that "should ideally" matter. And maybe you can add some clarification to that, Hiro, because one and two kind of look the same to me, options. But I'm trying to understand the nuance of it. But either way, I'm in full support of doing something like that. That's all I got.

FRED BAKER:

So, Russ, I'll come to you in a minute. Hiro, do you have any comments you want to add at this point?

HIRO HOTTA:

No thanks. For me, I support the extension of term limit, why it's good for the previous liaison to continue.

And as to the caucus one, if the RSSAC believes a person from RSSAC caucus can work for RSSAC, I think we can accommodate as a caucus member to be a liaison. And us to ideally implementation, I put some options on the comment, but I'm not sure which of the options is good, so it's up to the discussion among us. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you for that. I think the words “should ideally” actually came from me. My initial thought when we ran across the term limit problem was that the term limits were being more trouble than they're worth, and I suggested that we simply remove them.

But having term limits is a good thing. The issue there is that having term limits isn't a number. It isn't one, it isn't two, it isn't 20. And I didn't know what to do about ... Okay, if two's the wrong number, what makes three a better number, or five, or any other particular number? And so, I suggested the more weasel worded “should ideally” as a way of saying, “Let's not let it get out of hand.” That's what I was thinking about.

Now, Russ, you've had your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Fred. Yeah, I'd like to say a little bit about this as a person who has served on the NomCom from other organizations besides RSSAC or RSSAC caucus. And that is, I think it was Brad that said earlier that diversity of input and opinion—maybe it was Wes, I'm not sure—is a very valuable thing in the NomCom environment.

I do personally like the, what I'll call, soft wording that is in there because I think it does express the desire to not have a person that's forever on the NomCom. And years ago, there was just one person from the RSSAC that served on the NomCom for many years and the rest of RSSAC was really happy because nobody else wanted to do it.

---

But the issue of not staying too long I think is important. But there are situations where it only makes sense for a person to have an additional term. Do I think it should be available for caucus people or should it be just RSSAC core people, or should it be also open for caucus people? I think it would be good to keep it open for caucus people, rather than [pull] the NomCom back to just being RSSAC core. That's it. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, so now if I understood Brad's comments and other comments that have been made, people generally agree that having caucus participation in the NomCom makes sense. Did I get that wrong? Somebody want to tell me I've got that wrong?

BRAD VERD:

That's what I heard also.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. On the other hand, and Brad, this was your comment, the CSC and the RZERC, you would really like to see somebody representing an RSO in those positions because the issues relate specifically to the businesses of the RSOs. Did I summarize your comment correctly?

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, that and we've all worked with a lot of people. Really, the question you got to ask yourself is would you be okay with caucus members representing the RSOs or kind of the content of the stuff that would directly impact you as an RSO? And that's where I get a little kind

---

of like—nervous isn't the right word. I'm just more comfortable if somebody from RSSAC is in those roles.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. And now, as it relates to these two positions, the CSC and the RZERC position, we have two different sets of considerations. In Liman's case, Liman represents Netnod and has been around kind of forever. And so, the argument is that having an RSO person there is important because the IANA is important to the root zone. Did I miss anything in that summary?

BRAD VERD:

No, I don't think so.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. And now, with the RZERC, we actually have two candidates. One of them is Daniel, who is a caucus member. He's a liaison from the IAB to the RSSAC, but he doesn't represent an RSO. And the other one is yourself, who has been doing that job for a while. And you have volunteered, you put your name in, but you're not listed in the agenda because you have been term limited.

And so, my understanding is you're saying that the RZERC specifically relates to the businesses of the RSOs. You would be more comfortable with having an RSO person in there.

---

BRAD VERD:

Well, and what I said, yes, if you did the literal interpretation, but if you take the interpretation of what I said earlier, which was somebody from RSSAC, I feel that Daniel is in the conversations with RSSAC, he understands, and by being there, even if it's in a liaison role, he understands the concerns and what's going on. So, my focus would be RSSAC versus necessarily having an RSO, if that makes sense.

But, as I read Hiro's options for trying to define or put a box around "should ideally," I like option two, which would be if there's a volunteer, then the existing one would step down, so that my name would not be listed if everybody was okay with the idea that it's somebody from RSSAC, and that includes the liaisons. I don't know, that's up to the group.

I haven't heard anybody else say anything. So, I am certainly not trying to push for an RZERC job. I am happy to give up that to Daniel. As I stated earlier, I am advocating for Liman to stay on the CSC since he's chair and clearly that reflects well upon us and Liman.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Well, as you pointed out, this hasn't been a noisy conversation today. Are there any other opinions on the table?

WES HARDAKER:

So, the one thing about Daniel is, and I actually think he'd do a good job, he's actually fairly well versed within RSSAC in general and has been around for a long time. I actually don't remember the IAB liaisonship term limits. So, recognizing that his term limit since he's been a liaison

---

from the IAB to RSSAC for a long time, I actually wonder if he's coming up on a term limit on the IAB side of things. I need to go look that up. Unfortunately, I didn't do it fast enough in Google.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and I have no idea.

WES HARDAKER: So, I mean, he will certainly be a caucus member, but we may be in the case where IAB actually has to term limit him out and then we're stuck. Right?

FRED BAKER: Right.

BRAD VERD: Then the IAB's in the same position we're in now, right?

WES HARDAKER: Well, except that the IAB tends to get a lot more nominations than we do in RSSAC liaisonship roles, so I don't think the IAB will be in trouble.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Russ, your hand is still up. Is that an old hand or a new hand?

---

RUSS MUNDY:

Oh, it's actually a new hand, Fred. I was going to make a suggestion, if this would align with what Brad was maybe thinking because I do believe it's very wise for some of the outbound liaison positions to be filled by people that are part of the ongoing RSSAC internal meetings. If it would be reasonable or appropriate to say something in the procedures that RSSAC members, including incoming liaisons, would be eligible to fill ... I don't know if it is or not, but that's possibly a way to get it in words in our procedures.

The other thing I wanted to just mention, and this has come up from the time that I was on the RZERC as the SSAC rep, and that is that the new committees that were a result of the transition of IANA stewardship, for the most part, made up of people from other committees. So, you have this whole cascading set of requirements that the sending organizations have as well as the receiving organizations have. And one that comes to my mind, anyway, is the NomCom—I'm not sure if it's in effect yet—but the NomCom itself has term limits on the membership. So, even if RSSAC says it's okay to send person X, the NomCom might say, person X has been there too long.

So, it's kind of a new world. We have to figure out how to roll in, so to speak, and accommodate these different requirements that various organizations have. They aren't going to ever be consistent. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you. Duane?



---

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, thanks Fred. Sorry if this is obvious, but I don't think it makes sense for a liaison to RSSAC to be a liaison to another group. I think if Daniel wants the role, he should have the role as a caucus member, not as a liaison. Does that make sense?

FRED BAKER: Okay. Yeah, it does make sense. And does anybody else have a comment on that topic?

[UNIDENTIFIED MALE]: I think that's really a clever point. Something was bothering me and I couldn't figure out the fix. I think that's a great idea.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Suzanne, you had your hand up very briefly.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yes, and then I took it down because somebody else commented to the effect of what I was going to say anyway.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, where do we stand in this conversation? The concern really is this term "should ideally."

BRAD VERD: Fred, if I may.

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

BRAD VERD: I feel like maybe I've created some of this and I apologize. If people are comfortable with caucus members, any caucus member, in those roles, then there's no changes needed. But yet, we then need to tap on somebody for the role where nobody volunteered.

So, I think there's kind of a series of questions here. Are people comfortable with anybody in the caucus being these liaisons? Yes or no. Which I'm fine with, if that's what the group wants. And then if so, then we've got to find somebody for the ...

And then becomes, I guess the second question would be, are the term limits too short? Should we change those? And maybe we shouldn't. Maybe we should leave it as they are. And if we leave it as they are, then we need to tap somebody for the CSC role. And Liman would step down.

Because I hear conversation, but I don't necessarily hear ... I guess it would be nice to hear consensus around those questions, if that makes sense.

FRED BAKER: It does make sense. And I guess right now I'm hearing two different opinions. Suzanne, you got your hand up.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Yeah, for real this time. I'm really uncomfortable with the question of caucus members generally for liaison roles, for the reasons that others have had reservations about that. But I think it actually depends on the role, which I know makes things more complicated, not less.

In general, though, this problem is why I am uncomfortable with term limits. Because putting a term limit as a hard requirement means that in a situation like the present one, which we knew was going to happen sooner or later, we end up in a position where we might not be able to appoint the best possible candidate because of this constraint that we can't weigh against the other factors.

In this particular case, I'm actually uncomfortable taking a sitting chair away from the CSC and I think that the CSC should be someone who is associated with one of the root server operators, at least, as I think Brad said, until we broaden the future RSSAC.

So, I think in this particular case, I would be comfortable reappointing Liman.

BRAD VERD:

Can I? And I don't know—sorry to interrupt, I don't see any hands up—but is there a way, Fred as the chair, that we could make an exception, like a one-time exception right now? Because I think we did this for NomCom in the past. I don't remember. But is there a way to make an exception to not force Liman out since there is nobody else that has volunteered and Liman, I believe, he stated that he's happy to continue.

---

And then we can leave this bigger discussion around term limits and language for more time.

Like, can you as the chair like make an exception? I don't know. I don't remember.

FRED BAKER: Well ...

BRAD VERD: I feel like we did this ... Andrew, you were here I know. Ozan, I don't think you were here. I thought we made an exception for NomCom for one year because we didn't have a volunteer.

OZAN SAHIN: Hi Brad. That is correct. A one-year exception was made for Alejandro.

BRAD VERD: That's right. Yeah, that's exactly it.

FRED BAKER: And can I do that as chair? I imagine as chair, I can do anything that nobody's bothered by.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah.

FRED BAKER: That said, I personally would be more comfortable if there was a sentence or two sentences in the procedures document that says, "The chair may at his or her discretion set aside the term limit in the case that it becomes needed by the committee."

And there's probably a better way to word that, but a statement like that would make the question much clearer.

BRAD VERD: I think that's a good way forward. I don't know, I feel like there's still discussion. I think people want certain things but trying to figure out all the cases becomes a challenge in the procedures document.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yep.

FRED BAKER: Well, it does. And like I said earlier, I think term limits are actually important because it guarantees that we change things from time to time. But then if two's the wrong number, why do I believe three's a better number? Or why do I believe five or one or any particular number?

So, it seems like it might be better to have a statement in there like the one that I just threw out to give us a way to work around details.

---

So, let me ask for a general opinion. Andrew, you just heard my proposed statement. I'm sure you've got a better way to word it, but should we ... ?

BRAD VERD: Kaveh has got his hand up.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. Kaveh, go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Hi, I just wanted to add that if you're going that path, to basically vote for Liman—which I fully support—I think for good governance, since it's not in procedures, it's good to make sure, first of all, ask first a separate question, which is if everyone is okay with doing so. That that will be separate vote. And I think for that, it's good to make sure that everybody is included.

So, if people are not present, a voting member from one of the letters is not present, my suggestion is to do that via email or some other model. Not that it's important now, but later on that these things might be disputed, hopefully never, but no one knows.

And I think it's good to show that this decision, even though against our procedures, but maybe with full consensus and everybody was [aware of making this decision]. Just my two cents.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay, Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. So, I have a question about timing because I'm not aware as to when precisely Liman needs to be appointed for his next term on the CSC. Because the RSSAC 000 updates of course, we roll all these in one big update. And so, if we're going to make any changes to the document and produce a new version of RSSAC 000 with some new text in it, it's going to take a while.

So, my suggestion would be to handle the special case of Liman continuing in his liaison role to the CSC, as a special case without any new text added to RSSAC 000 because it's probably not going to get done in time.

FRED BAKER: Well, and I don't disagree with that. So, when would the new RSSAC 000 take effect? Does that just simply take effect when we vote for it to [do so]?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It does, but we still have the other two issues, which we haven't even really discussed, which we're probably going to need to have another call on. And then, the document needs to be stable for two weeks, and then the RSSAC needs to vote on it. And then, at that point, after the RSSAC votes on it, then it would take effect.

---

So, I think at a minimum, we're probably looking at like three weeks, four weeks.

FRED BAKER:

Well, yeah, and so I'm thinking I would entertain comments in email. We'll probably wind up taking it up in the August meeting.

Naela, you have a comment.

NAELA SARRAS:

Good morning. I wanted to just respond to Andrew's question. I believe Liman's term on the CSC doesn't end until October. So, you have a few months left. But, please, my colleagues and I can check with the policy team. I'm not quite sure, but it's not in the next few weeks. I think he has until October.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you. Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Yeah, pending verifying that because that gives us a fair amount of time. The short-term alternative is to leave the additional updates to the operating procedures or the normal process.

And I do think that if we're changing our actual operating procedures, we should update the document. And a simple change to just say we're moving term limits, from the liaisons particularly, that should be easy to write, and it sounds like people would be okay with that.



---

So, we could align the operating procedures document with what we're actually doing and reappoint Liman and get past this and consider the additional issues on a longer timeline.

FRED BAKER:

So, I'm trying to figure out what you just suggested. Are you suggesting that RSSAC 000 V.5 have only the term limit change, and the other changes go into a V. 6? Or?

SUZANNE WOOLF:

I haven't thought about the version numbering, but the idea is to say— because functionally the procedures document is about keeping us honest, but it's much more important that the procedures document reflect what we actually do, then that we have a procedures document we're not following.

The numbering you suggest does make sense. I don't mind revising it twice in six months, but I realized not everybody's comfortable with that.

And in any case, we should verify the timeline. And I see that in the chat, Ken has suggested language: "RSSAC chair may authorize an exception in terms of the selection of liaisons in extraordinary cases."

If we could make that change and be comfortable with it, that keeps our actual procedures aligned with our documentation and gives us the flexibility we need to do what seems like the right thing.

---

FRED BAKER: Yeah, and that wouldn't make sense.

What I have been thinking, and I might be wrong here, is to essentially put that statement or a statement like it in our minutes so that we can refer to it. And not actually go with a different version number document, but say this is kind of a work in progress this year. We have the statement, which we've actually acted on in the past. And we'll have the thing tidy by the end of the year.

OZAN SAHIN: Fred, I'm sorry, as a host I cannot raise my hand, but I just want to get myself in the queue.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, sure. Go ahead.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you. With respect to the question from Andrew and Naela's clarification on Liman's end of term as the CSC liaison, it is true that his term will last until the end of September, so until October. But for the operational procedure of CSC, the RSSAC needs to notify the CSC of its appointment actually [nowadays].

So, initially we had asked them to give us time until today, the 7th of July, to give them the result of the appointment so that we could run the one-month nomination period. And the intention was that RSSAC could come up with a decision today so that the CSC support

---

staff could be notified so that they could organize themselves accordingly.

So yes, the term limit is the end of September, but I don't think RSSAC has time until then to notify the CSC. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And so now I'm looking at comments in the chat room from Andrew and Kevin and Suzanne basically saying ...

SUZANNE WOOLF: Fred, if I may?

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

SUZANNE WOOLF: I think what's important when there are contradictory procedures or we're trying to navigate through different constraints like this, we just be transparent and explain what we're doing and why.

So actually, I like your suggestion of documenting even in the minutes that we do not do this lightly, but we decided to waive this specific requirement in our operating procedures for this specific reason. And we'll be updating our operating procedures to reflect this additional wisdom we've gained.

---

It's a little awkward to have to make a decision today. But the other thing is that if we're not comfortable making a decision today, we can inform the CSC with apologies that we're going to need a little more time. That happens in ICANN land all the time.

So, there's nothing insurmountable there. But it would be nice to be able to say we're doing something unusual, we know it's unusual, here's why.

FRED BAKER: So, Ozan, if I ask you to give that kind of a statement to the CSC, do you think you've got the words together to do that?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. I'm happy to draft a language for your review.

FRED BAKER: Okay. What I think I'd like to do is finish the conversation concerning the CSC and the RZERC—and by the way we have 11 more minutes for the allotted time for this meeting—and we have several things on the agenda.

So, let's plan to actually vote on CSC and the RZERC liaisons at the next monthly meeting, which would be the August meeting, and address the changes in RSSAC 000 during that time. So, at the point that we do that, we have a firm basis for saying what we're up to, as Suzanne said much better than I'm saying it.

---

Am I leaving anything out? Okay, so we're not going to vote on CSC or RZERC right now. We're not going to vote on the term limits per se, but we have this proposal of giving the chair explicit permission to deal with extraordinary events. I think that's actually useful.

Does anybody have an objection to that statement? Okay, so Andrew, could you—I think Kevin suggested some wording for it—incorporate that in the RSSAC 000 V. 5 for discussion as we go with that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I will do so, Fred, and send to the list.

FRED BAKER: Great, thank you. And now there's two other things: Your translations of RSSAC publications and other updates. Is that a long topic? Or can you simply summarize that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: There's been some discussion in the document, so we're probably better off just having a separate call for that. We certainly can't cover it in 10 minutes.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. Okay, so I'm just going to set this aside for the moment.

Moving on to reports. And so, this question of translations of RSSAC publications actually is important to something going on right now. That is that the ICANN—what do they call themselves, the Asia team? Is

---

talking with China and trying to respond to some questions that have come from China. There is a Chinese [policy meeting] that I have been asked to address and kind of to give an overview of the evolution work that we have going on, and to respond to some specific questions that they have.

What the Admin Team has come up with, is that we can use a modified version of the report that we did, that Brad and I did to the GAC a year ago. Modifications are basically because we've changed this entire concept of BPQ and there are some other things in there that probably are really kind of extraneous.

So, Andrew is doing a hacked up version of that report. The idea then is that I would record a delivery of that PDF, which would allow the Chinese then to add subtitles to insert, make sure that people that don't speak English or don't speak English well can understand what's being said and then play the recording during their meeting.

And now, Brad, have I adequately summarized that?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, you got it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, that's going on. And let me ask right now, does anybody have some heartburn with that? Hearing none.

Brad, were there any other things that we were going to bring up in this report? I think that was the big one.

BRAD VERD: No, that was the big one. I think the only other thing is that 37 has been translated now to multiple languages and is available on the webpage. That was a request that came from the Asia team also. And I think the only thing that we've talked about here is that we've, on the webpage, stated that the English version is the version of record. So, if there's any debate over something, the English version is the one that needs to be debated.

FRED BAKER: Yep. Okay, so that ends my report. Kaveh, do you have any comments from the Board? Kaveh? Well, I'm going to take that as he probably doesn't have any and Liman certainly doesn't have any because he ...

KAVEH RANJBAR: Can you hear me?

FRED BAKER: There you are. Okay.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Hi. No, there's no updates. The Board didn't have any session related to RSSAC work and also on the Board meeting agenda, RSSAC was not on the agenda. So, there's nothing to add here.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Liman isn't here. Brad, news from the RZERC?

BRAD VERD: Nothing new. As I stated last time, two documents that the RZERC was looking at. One is the new [ZONEMD digest record type thing] in the root. RZERC is going forward with that and I believe RZERC is going to be reaching out probably to RSSAC to validate that the RSOs will support the new record type. Just some word of "yes." But other than that, it's all in development right now.

The second one is signing of root-servers.net, which I think RZERC agreed that this should be sent back to maybe RSSAC and SSAC to look at. So, that's all I got.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Russ? Comments from the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you very much, Fred. First of all, thanks to all the participants in our joint meeting that we got 29 June. I hope everyone found it useful. It seemed to be good and engaging.

Beyond that, I don't have anything particular or new to report from the SSAC. Unless anyone has any questions, that's the end of my report.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And Daniel isn't here, so I guess we don't have a comment from the IAB. Naela?



NAELA SARRAS: Thanks, Fred. I don't have any updates to share from the IANA today.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, Fred, nothing to report for me either. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad and Hiro? I'd say Liman, but he's not here. Do we have anything from the GWG?

HIRO HOTTA: Briefly, two meetings in June. And the model of our new body to implement RSSAC 037 was discussed and GWG chose a PTI-like single member LLC, rather than ICANN supporting organization.

And three GWG members—Liman, Luis Diego Espinoza from ccTLD, and Geoff Huston from IAB—volunteered to revise the draft of key characteristics of PRS, the new body, and put the draft on the table in the last meeting. And further discussion on the draft is ongoing and will be discussed on Thursday this week. Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I wouldn't go so far to say that the supporting organization is out yet, but it certainly is not what people are talking about. Everybody is

---

---

focusing on this PTI-like model which has still got a lot of questions. I mean, it's so premature, it's hard to kind of give any details around it.

We do have a few people who feel some pressure from somewhere, I don't know where, to give something to the community. And at the end of the last call, myself and a couple Board members agreed, kind of echoed, saying that we should make sure that what we get out is the right thing and not trying to meet some arbitrary deadline.

So, I think we've got a long ways to go before we're in a state of consensus on where this ends up right now.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. So, moving on down the agenda, the only thing that we have is the announcement of the next meeting, which would be on the 4th of August. Let me just throw out the question. Does anybody want to do a dive and catch and bring something up at this point?

Failing that, we'll have a call like this on the fourth of August. You'll get that email from Ozan soon.

And with that, I think we're adjourned. So, thank you very much.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**