
FRED BAKER: So, calling the meeting to order. Ozan, would you put up the list of who should be here? Thank you. Okay. So, Cogent, are you guys here? Okay. I don't hear Paul or Brad. DISA? Kevin, Ryan? Well, I imagine they'll join us. ICANN? Matt or Terri, are you here? Well, three for three. Okay. ISC, I'm here. Jeff, are you here? Okay. I heard Jeff. NASA?

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I see Barbara.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Can you hear me?

FRED BAKER: I hear you.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: All right. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, NASA has a new primary representative. So, Barbara, do you want to take a bow?

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.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Sure. Imagine me bowing right now.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Netnod. Liman, Patrick, are you here?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, here. I don't know about Patrick.

FRED BAKER: Okay. RIPE NCC? University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. USC?

WES HARDAKER: I'm here.

SUZANNE WOOLF: And Suzanne.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ARL?

KEN RENARD: Here.

HOWARD KASH: Here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign. Brad, are you here?

BRAD VERD: Yes, I'm here. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: And WIDE. I saw Hiro's note.

HIRO HOTTA: Yes.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, I imagine Paul and so on will let us know when they're here.
Okay. So, Kaveh is not here. Liman, you are the liaison to the CSC. Brad,
you are the liaison to RZERC. SSAC. Russ Mundy, are you here?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. IAB, Daniel Migault?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: IANA functions operator. Naela, are you here?

NAELA SARRAS: Yes, here.

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

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And for staff, who do we have, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: I believe from staff we have Andrew, Steve Sheng, and Andrew McConachie. So, we're missing Danielle. Danielle is also on the call. Excuse me. We are all here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Good deal. That being the case, you're looking at the agenda. Did anybody have some adjustments to make to the agenda? Okay. Moving onto administrivia. Ozan, do you want to talk about the draft amendments?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Hi, everyone. I sorted draft minutes from the last call, the August call, about two weeks ago. We haven't received any comments on the draft minutes. The action items from these minutes have all been completed. If you have any questions/output here, please let me know. Fred, minutes will be a vote item for today, one of the three vote items on the agenda.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay. So, having discussed, and I presume everybody saw the minutes, do people have any comments on them? Failing that, let's vote to accept the minutes. Is anybody going to be voting "no"? Is anyone going to be abstaining? If not, I'd think we can conclude that we have accepted the minutes. And then, Jeff, you have a candidate for the RSSAC Caucus?

JEFF OSBORN: I do. We have an applicant, Nicolas Antonello, who is currently technical engagement manager with ICANN. The SOI here is listed. His relevant experience is pretty extensive. Of us on the Membership Committee, only Alejandro had extensive experience with him. But I'm assuming, as an ICANN employee, he is well-enough qualified.

So, I'll put this out there, if anybody has any input. If nobody has anything negative, the Membership Committee has unanimously confirmed that we'd like to take him on. And again, I can't remember—does this go to a vote, Fred?

FRED BAKER: I believe it goes to a vote.

JEFF OSBORN: All right.

FRED BAKER: Which is fairly pro forma.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. Before you do that, just briefly, we had a process where we were culling the herd in the caucus. This morning, a series of very polite e-mails went out to the people who had been non-responsive for going on two years. Ozan is such a diplomat. A series of incredibly polite notes informing people that if they don't respond, they're going to be disconnected.

This morning's note said, "You're off the list." The Membership Committee intends to do that with another seven people who, in spite of saying a year ago they wanted to try something, have done nothing since. So, if I don't hear anything else from anybody in the RSSAC call, a series

of incredibly polite notices will let those people also know they're off the mailing list and out of the caucus.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And just for completeness, could you give me a list of those seven people?

JEFF OSBORN: I can, but not under the pressure of being in a live meeting.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Please share that with the entire committee.

JEFF OSBORN: Sure. Give me a minute, I'll throw it on the chat.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's not pressing. In your own good time. But it's good to know who is on the committee and who is not.

JEFF OSBORN: Even better. Thank you very much. I will get that out today.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. So, what is the size of the caucus, now? How many people do we have after the event, today?

JEFF OSBORN: I believe it's 80-something. Ozan, do you have a more accurate number?

OZAN SAHIN: We have one or two, the RSSAC members included. I think your number excludes the RSSAC members.

JEFF OSBORN: It does. It does. So, with the RSSAC numbers, it's just over 100. Well, it's around 80 within the caucus, and not within the RSSAC.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Ozan, could you go back to the agenda, please?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure, Fred. We still have a pending vote item on Nicolas Antonello's application.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, I didn't hear any complaints about him a minute ago. Is anybody going to be voting "no"? Is anybody going to be abstaining? Failing that, I believe that we have accepted him. Work items. We need to talk about RSSAC zero, version five. So, we have a new copy of that. Andrew, are you on the call?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I am, Fred, yes.

FRED BAKER: Could you walk through the changes from RSSAC zero, version four?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. I wasn't prepared to do that. Sorry. But I can quickly dig that up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Fred, I suggest we move through the other work items and give Andrew a few minutes to pick up on that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: A fair amount of—

FRED BAKER: Yeah, that sounds good.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thank you. I'll raise my hand when I'm ready.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, Ken, you have two work parties to comment on.

KEN RENARD: Okay. Good morning. The work party on a tool to get a local perspective met last on the 24th of August. We discussed some user narratives that Andrew had contributed. Specifically, they are: justifying the location for new instances, identifying underserved areas, recursive operators trying to understand the RSS, research on the RSS, end-user experiments, transparency advocates, and a government wanting to be able to improve connectivity and access.

So, we left the meeting with some basic writing assignments for some folks to talk about the specific metrics that were necessary for those particular use cases. Out of seven, I believe, use cases, I think we had four volunteers. In just a little bit, I'll post the link to the user narratives document and invite anyone else to sign up for a ... To write a few things about metrics that are not already assigned. You'll see that in the document. The next meeting for that group will be the 21st of September at 15:00 UTC.

The other work party, the Rogue Operator Work Party, last met on the 25th of August. The discussion started off with the idea of rogue responses, and that kind of took us off into the weeds. We hashed out a few things.

What came out of it was the real need ... The main focus of this document and work party is to focus on a real, legitimate RSO doing something bad, with the side note that it's important to remember that there are unofficial responders that could mimic the behavior of an official RSO and make them look rogue. So, it's kind of framing the discussion of we're focusing on the real operators going bad.

The next meeting is on the 22nd of September, 13:00 UTC. I'll post some links here in the chat for the documents. Please feel free to join in, make comments on the document, or discuss things on the document, or on the general RSSAC Caucus mail list. I hope to see everyone at the next calls. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Thank you. So, the discussion of a possible SLA. We had a call this last Thursday, and I believe we're coming up to a stable version, and we'll be voting that on the first week of October. Remind me, Ozan; what is the voting process for that?

OZAN SAHIN:

The RSSAC000 version five, or ...?

FRED BAKER:

Yes. Well ... Okay. Show me the agenda again.

OZAN SAHIN: I'm sorry, I didn't know you were not able to see it. Let me stop, share, and share my screen again. Are you able to see the agenda now, Fred?

FRED BAKER: Okay. I've got windows moving around, doing strange things. Here we go. Okay. Yeah. Thank you. So, the SLE drafting update, Ken has talked about his things. We met last Thursday. Remind me, what is the process that we'll be going through with the drafting update?

[OZAN SAHIN:] So, the group agreed to have a next call two weeks from the last call. I will send out the calendar invitations for this call tomorrow. I think that's next.

FRED BAKER: That explains why I can't find it on my calendar. Okay. So, that's what's happening with work items. Ozan, do you want to walk through the ICANN69 draft schedule?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. Hi, again. ICANN69 will take place in October. Due to the virtual format, this time the committee leaders and the ICANN Org organizers agreed on a two-week schedule. I think this is, basically, to mitigate with the negative effects of the time zone issue.

So, the first week, the week of October 12th, will be devoted to internal SO/AC work. The following week, the week of 19th of October, is for

plenary sessions, such as the welcome ceremony, three plenary topics, the public forum, the meeting of the board, and so on.

Working with the RSSAC Admin Team, we came up with a draft agenda. It includes, of course, the RSSAC Caucus Meeting, which is happening around ICANN Annual General Meetings. We have two work parties meeting in the SO/AC internal work week.

Also, we requested a session with the ICANN Board, and there are now thoughts whether to have the session as a joint session with the GWG, but hopefully we'll have more information on that.

And then, while creating the agenda, basically, the admin team wanted to take advantage of block four and five, which the team thought would work for most of the RSSAC members and the RSSAC Caucus members. If you have any comments on the meetings, on their slots, on their sequence, I think this is a good moment to share.

The session request submissions will continue, I think, one more day, and I'll be submitting those sessions on the internal platform. So, I'll pause here to see if there are any comments. I circulated a note for the meeting with the board to see if RSSAC members have any suggested topics.

So, if you have one, please make sure to share that with the group, so that we can share it with the board ahead of time. The board has just submitted a topic, which is the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model, to discuss with all [according] organizations and Advisory Committees. So, I'll be sharing this note on the RSSAC list, too. So, I'll stop here to see if there are any comments on this draft schedule.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does anybody have any comments on that? One question, there. The Admin Committee, Brad, and myself, and staff, hadn't come up with anything in particular that we wanted to talk with the Board Technical Committee about.

Brad and I had a one-on-one call—one-on-two?—with Göran, the CEO, talking about that, and asked him what he had in mind. He would like to see a joint meeting between the RSSAC, and the GWG, and the board, basically informing the board of how things are going, and so on.

So, we expect to have such a call, or expect to have such a meeting. And the big question there, in my mind, is what is going on with the GWG? So, that's the thing that Ozan just noted in the schedule, the RSSAC and board joint meeting.

OZAN SAHIN: Fred, I guess we have a couple of hands in the Zoom room. So, we have—

FRED BAKER: Okay. I'm looking at the wrong screen, then. Yes, we have three hands. Liman, you want to get in?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry, that's probably an old hand.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. I'm ready to talk about RSSAC000 v5 whenever you are, but let's go to Russ first.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Fred. I was going to bring this up in my liaison report, but this seems like, perhaps, a more appropriate time. I believe that the general sentiment from SSAC is to have an update meeting between SSAC and RSSAC in our normal closed format/approach.

At this point, it looks like the things, at least the interest from the SSAC perspective, are to give RSSAC some insight into some of the new work parties, as well as a couple of the ongoing work parties. No significant external activities like we had last time, with the KSK rollover plans and problems that occurred. So, it's primarily an update.

And so, this seemed like a good time to get the sense of the RSSAC, if such a meeting is viewed as appropriate from the RSSAC's perspective, and it would be, if so, 60 minutes or 90 minutes, if anybody has a preference—either yes/no, and length. Fred, can I just turn it back to you at this point?

FRED BAKER: Certainly. Ozan, where do we have that in the schedule? I don't see it.

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Fred. So, this will not be on the public schedule, but surely it will be on this schedule, this internal document. I'm working with the SSAC support staff, Kathy, to see what would work best for the SSAC. We are targeting, again, one of the block four or fives on the SO/AC internal work week. I'll report back on that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Andrew, let's get back to RSSAC zero, version five.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Thanks, Fred. So, the final redline, and the final clean versions of these documents, was sent to the RSSAC, I believe, a couple of weeks ago. But instead of going through those really long documents, we have these excerpts, the edits document that we have been going through.

I'm only just going to give a high-level overview of what changed. I'm not going to talk about language because we have talked enough about this language. But first of all, there were some changes made to RSSAC liaison positions.

The RSSAC liaison to the ICANN Board of Directors, that was not changed at all. The RSSAC liaison to the ICANN NomCom, the term limit was left in place, unless there are no other candidates for the position. That was the only change made to that liaison position. The outgoing RSSAC liaison to the ICANN CSC, similar to the NomCom, but it was changed to be "candidates can only be drawn from the RSSAC," as opposed to previously, when they could also be drawn from the RSSAC Caucus.

Moving onto the RSSAC liaison to the ICANN RZERC. Similarly, it is term-limited, unless there are no other candidates for the position. Candidates can only be drawn from the RSSAC, no longer the RSSAC Caucus. So, those are the changes made to the RSSAC outgoing liaison positions.

Moving onto the definition of RSSAC meetings. In v4, we had the definitions largely talking about, or relevant for, when the RSSAC was still holding closed meetings. Since the RSSAC has opened up so many of its meetings, these definitions needed to change.

So, v5 now talks about regular, emergency, and informational meetings, and many of the changes are the nitty-gritty of how those three types of meetings are defined and how quickly they can be called, or canceled, or moved. We have spent enough time talking about that without me having to really dive into it, I hope.

Moving on. So, moving past the meetings, onto the project archive. This text is not completely up to date. This text is not the same that's in the final version that was sent to the RSSAC two weeks ago. But this is text that Wes wanted added, and the RSSAC added, talking about the GitHub page for RSSAC Caucus projects.

So, in addition to adding section 2.5.2, there is going to be a note on the RSSAC Caucus web page talking about this and pointing people to the GitHub page for the project, for ... I think what we're calling the ... I forget the exact title we settled on, but it's no longer called "Project Archive." I think it's ... Well, whatever. Or maybe it's called "GitHub Archive," or something. But that's in the version that was mailed to the RSSAC list.

We also cover, or we changed, the rules around confidentiality. The old language around confidentiality mixed up RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus Work Parties. The new language around confidentiality has different rules for both kinds of work parties.

And then, finally, in section three, in the publication procedures, the RSSAC stated that its working language is English. That's it. That's an overview of all the changes between RSSAC000 v4 and RSSAC000 v5. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Now, does anybody have any discussion on those changes, before we actually take a vote? Anybody have any issues? Hearing none, Ozan, I guess we need to take a vote on this point?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, does anybody have any issues/plan to vote "no" on the new set of rules? Anybody?

OZAN SAHIN: I see Russ has his hand up, Fred.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. Okay. Russ, is that an old hand?

RUSS MUNDY: Old hand, sorry.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, okay. I didn't hear any negative votes. Is anybody abstaining? Hearing none, I guess we have approved the operational procedures. Okay. Kim Davies is on the call with us this morning. Kim, you were here to talk about .arpa. Do you want to fill us in, there?

KIM DAVIES: Certainly. Hello, everyone. Thanks, Fred. So, this is an update on an Internet draft that has been posted. We were trying to drum up some review on various mailing lists, and I know that, on the GNSO list in particular there has been a thread of communication, I think, triggered some additional interest in this document. So, thanks for the opportunity to go over briefly with RSSAC, and I'm very happy—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]. Where is it?

KIM DAVIES: I'm very happy to answer any questions or clarifications you might have. Next slide, please. So, just for some context, ICANN and IAB have joint responsibility for operating the .arpa zone. This is spelled out both in RFC 3172, and also in the MOU between the IETF and ICANN for performance of protocol-parameter-related functions.

In this context, IAB effectively acts as the manager of the domain. It's the IAB ultimately responsible for policy decisions, and what goes into the zone, and how the zone is to be appropriately used, and ICANN acts as an administrator of the zone.

In practice, ICANN subcontracts its responsibility to PTI, and it's considered part of the protocol parameter IANA functions. Essentially, we alter the zone at the behest of IAB directors. In that regard, IAB sort of has, I think, delegated some of that responsibility to the IESG and, therefore, in the process of producing RFCs, we get certain actions advised to us that we would then implement.

So, in that context, representatives of both ICANN and IAB do meet regularly. In those discussions, that I'll get to in a little more detail throughout the slide deck, we have been discussing some changes. One is immediate, and others are potential changes for the long-term that pertain to the .arpa zone. To reflect those changes, we've devised a draft that is intended to be published as an IAB track document that describes the approach. Next slide, please.

So, just some quick context on what .arpa is. I suspect this group is probably pretty familiar with this. I was part of the original taxonomy of the Domain Name System, one of the earliest TLDs. Initially, a transition mechanism from ARPANET.

But in 2001, the U.S. Government formally disassociated itself from the domain. It was then that it was relabeled as the "address routing and parameter area domain." And specifically, again in RFC 3172, it reads that

the IAB has the responsibility, in cooperation with ICANN, to manage the ARPA domain.

The zone is small. Tiny, in fact. It contains around a dozen delegations, and they're all for protocol/parameter-related purposes. You have reverse DNS mapping, E.164 telephone numbers to URIs. We have home.arpa for residential home networks, and there are a few other applications, as well.

We have an informational page on the IANA website that lists the applications. I think important to note here is that none of these applications in this list are actually in the ARPA zone itself. They're all contained in distinct sub-delegations, and those sub-delegations are all on different name servers within the different zones. And also, all of them have a different authoring process that is distinct from the .arpa zone. Next slide, please.

Just to illustrate how small it is, I stripped out the DNSSEC resource records, but this is the entirety of the .arpa zone as it stands right now. Next slide. So, the current configuration of the zone is it's served by 12 of the 13 root servers.

J-root is not an authority for .arpa, based on what I've been told. I'm sure a more definitive answer is on this call. But my understanding is the reason J-root is not an authority stems from RFC 2780, which has text in there that says that root servers should not be serving .arpa.

And most critically to the rest of this document, changes to .arpa are processed through a special workflow because the authorities for .arpa are shared with the root server authorities, which means that the A and

AAAA records in the root zone serve double-duty as glue for both the apex of the root, but also for the ARPA delegation.

And the consequence of this is that, any time we change root servers in the root zone, we also need to cross-authorize those changes with the IAB in order to be compliant with our operational procedures, by virtue of the IAB being the authorizer for changes to the .arpa zone. Next slide, please.

So, here are a couple of problem statements that emerged in our discussion that really is at the heart of what this document is trying to accomplish. The first one has a very real, tangible impact. It means that, because of the way the current configuration is maintained, both IANA and Verisign need special processing workflow when it comes to .arpa authority changes.

So, the initial triggering event for us even considering changes was that we're in the midst of developing our next generation Root Zone Management System and, in doing so, we're looking at the special, logical corner cases that exist in the software today and seeing if there is a way to simplify the way things work. This is one case where there is an explicit carve-out for .arpa where it's treated specially, and we were seeking, if that's possible, to eliminate.

This is driven by the hostnames themselves—not that .arpa is served by the root servers, but that rootservers.net specifically is used as the hostnames in the NS set. So probably, an important distinction is that the problem here can be solved just with changing the hostnames, not the architecture itself.

The second problem statement is we have noticed over time that there have been discussions around future usages of the .arpa zone, and some of the more interesting proposals that have come along—for example, using DNAME in .arpa—have really been avoided because of an assumption that the Root Server System is risk-averse/conservative in that regard, and that there is an assumption—whether it’s true or not—that Root Server Operators would be reluctant to take on novel, new uses of .arpa, given that that infrastructure is shared with serving the root zone. Next slide.

So, the Internet draft is the result of bringing these items to an IANA/IETF leadership group that meets regularly. This includes representatives of the IAB, the IASG, ICANN Board, PTI. We talked about it in this group of a dozen or so people and, starting in March 2018, in that group, there was agreement that there was no real necessity for .arpa to retain strong linkage to the root servers, and also that there was potential upside to it not being tightly linked to root server and root zone operations.

In October 2019, this has percolated for a few years. It was agreed that we should write an Internet draft and document what we thought would be the right approach. Myself and Yari Arkko volunteered to draft that and we published that in February of this year.

Essentially, the document conveys two key ideas. One is renaming the hostnames, and that should address that [immediate] operational uniqueness when it comes to .arpa and changes to the root zone. And then also, it speculates what would be necessary for a fuller separation, so that changes to the .arpa zone wouldn’t have collateral impact on root zone or root server operations. Next slide, please.

So, the host name change itself. What we're proposing is to change the NS set for .arpa from "a" through m.root-servers.net to "a" through m.ns.arpa. Ns.arpa would copy over all the IPv4 and IPv6 addresses for those hosts. There would be absolutely zero change to the IP addresses themselves. This would just be a host name change for the purposes of .arpa itself.

The expectation is we would implement this once the document is completed and published, and this would mean that there would be no logical interdependency between root zone and .arpa changes for the purposes of ... So, the root zone business workflow and .arpa business workflow.

Obviously, if a Root Server Operator is changing their infrastructure and renumbering their server, edits need to be made to both zones, but they no longer need to be done ... Sort of a tightly integrated approach. They could be done as two separate, parallel activities.

Importantly, this step does not change that the 12 root servers will continue to serve .arpa, and our expectation is there will be no real, practical impact on operations or availability of .arpa as a consequence of this change. Next slide, please.

So, I noted that the document also talks about what fuller separation would look like. So, it does go into some detail about what would be necessary to separate so that impacts to .arpa wouldn't impact root zone/root server operations.

So, we talk in the document about the need to serve ARPA on different infrastructure to the root zone, and also that, while not necessary for this

kind of separation, there would no longer be a need for the zone publication process itself to be intertwined with the root zone publication process as it is today. Today, both are performed by the root zone maintainer, and those processes are inter-related.

And to be clear, for both, there is no requirement that the operators themselves be different as a consequence of this, just that the operators would presumably provision systems that are somewhat not the same, that they're somewhat separable, so that ARPA-serving could be provisioned in a different way to root-zone-serving.

Now, another important point is this document does not say this needs to happen. This is just spelling out, if ARPA had a different usage pattern or had different requirements, these are the things that would need to be explored to relieve that close inter-connectedness with root server operations.

Lastly, ultimately, how the root zone is provisioned and served, we believe, is a management decision between ICANN, and IAB, and the directly involved parties, just as is the case with more or less any other zone. Zone operators get to pick their NS records, identify their operators, and so forth, and they do that in accordance with what their operational requirements are.

Obviously, the current situation is working just fine for the current operational requirements but, should they evolve over time, then the expectation is IAB and ICANN will discuss their emerging requirements, identify if the current situation is fit for purpose, and, if it's not, then take steps to amend the current situation. Next slide, please.

So, how would this happen? The document itself is just high-level concepts. It's not a detailed implementation plan, just given that it's intended to be published as an RFC. So, it's not ideal to put in the ephemeral details of exactly, step-by-step, how it would happen.

It's typical for RFCs to only have statements of principle, or the essential specifics in the document. And then what happens is, once it's given to IANA for implementation, we obviously, depending on the detail required, would develop some kind of implementation plan around that, and our expectation is we would build a timeline and specifics around how to do that—involve the relevant stakeholders at that juncture.

[Plan] adoption, IANA staff, we expect that we would implement the host name requirement. We think that's largely self-contained, and we would communicate with the Root Server Operators, of course, and others that are directly involved.

And then, as I noted, present a course for future changes for how .arpa could be provisioned, but there is no timeline for future action. There is no mandate that this has to happen. It's expected that work in this area will just be driven by whatever applications seek to use .arpa, and what the desire is to isolate them from root server impacts.

So, for example, maybe there are some kind of novel RR-types that need to be implemented, maybe there is some kind of unique server-side processing, or maybe there is some kind of application for .arpa that has significantly different usage patterns that present a concern that it's comingled with root server operations. Next slide, please.

This is the last slide. So, here is what we think of the next steps. Firstly, I've been asked to present to a number of different groups, this being one of them. So, firstly, just going through those engagement opportunities, discussing with the different groups, identifying if there are any concerns or any feedback we need to integrate, then to bring that feedback back to that leadership group and update the document.

If no fundamental changes are required to the approach, the expectation then is we would hand it off to the IAB for formal consideration/adoption. If this is published as an RFC as written, then we would change the hostnames for the .arpa zone authorities.

And then, beyond that, we would just continue our regular management dialog regarding how .arpa is managed, and if something emerges that warrants the reevaluation of either how the name servers are configured or how publication of the zone happens, then it would happen in that context.

But I think, very critically, there is text in the document that basically says that anything that is done will be done with all due care and deliberation to mitigate potential impacts on critical infrastructure. So this is not lost on us, that .arpa is an important zone. We're not doing this flippantly.

And when changes are anticipated that would have a likelihood of significant impact then, of course, that will be discussed openly, and we'll seek to consult with all relevant parties to make sure it's done in a way that does not have any negative impact. So, that's the entirety of the slide deck. Very happy to answer questions or get feedback.

FRED BAKER: Liman, you have your hand up. Is that relevant to this topic?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It is indeed, yes.

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. Thank you, Kim, for a very interesting update. I must admit that this has gone under my radar entirely, and that's entirely my fault. First question: what's the timeline for this document? You mentioned on the last slide that the plan is to ask the IAB to adopt it, and so on. Do you have a feeling for when you intend to reach that point?

KIM DAVIES: My best guess right now is probably in the next month or two. I mean, I have speaking engagements on this topic for the next three weeks, so I think that that alone means that nothing is going to progress any further for the next month.

If there is no other feedback that is emerging that I'm aware of, I'll speak with Yari and we'll probably do an O2 draft, and then I'll send it back to that group and see what happens. I'm actually not familiar with the IAB's internal procedures, how long that kind of consideration takes. So, beyond that, I'm not quite sure. But from what's under my control, I would say probably a month or two.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Fair enough. Thank you. So, has there been any open discussion about this document on mailing lists or in other venues?

KIM DAVIES: I know it's being preliminarily discussed within the IAB. I think there have been a few private discussions that I have been CCed in with a few different groups of folks. But in our most recent meeting, we did note that there was a lack of broad review, which triggered the suggestion that we drum up interest on some of the operator lists.

So, I know I made a point of mailing it to a few lists, and I think the one mailing list where it caught significant interest was on the DNS-OARK operations list. There was a thread that went over a few days there and we got quite a bit of feedback from that.

So, it has been discussed on a few mailing lists. I'm not sure if it's comprehensive enough or if there are additional forums that we could apprise of it, but that's the current status.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I interject one, quick, Liman, to help answer the question? So, with my IAB-member hat on, it would take us at least a month, probably, to deliberate on it once the community had ... Or I should say Ted and Yari got to the point of wanting to bring it to us and to actually discuss. Just getting it on the agenda with timelines and stuff, it would take a bit. It has been discussed, I think, in DNS Op and a few other places, but I agree 100% with Kim that it didn't generate a whole lot of conversation.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So, I have a final question, which is to Kim again. So, where would you like to receive input on this? Because I probably have a few comments. On a positive note, I would like to read the document, and I kind of feel that I have a few comments; where would you like to receive them?

KIM DAVIES: Directly to me is fine, if you just want the authors to be apprised of it. Alternatively, if you wanted to discuss it on a mailing list with other's opinions, DNS-OARK seems to be the most active. If you discuss it in the context of RSSAC, I'm sure staff support will provide comments back from this group.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's fine. So, that means that ... I probably have a few comments that I would like to have opinions from other DNS-related people, not necessarily Root Server Operators. So it's okay to conduct such discussion on the OARK list then, is it?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. That's where the bulk of the discussion has happened to date, and I'm on it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay.

KIM DAVIES: So, I will see it if it's there.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. That works perfectly fine for me, so thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Ken, you have your hand up.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. As we're going through the governance model for root servers, I myself tend to forget about the ARPA zone. So, as policies are made to add/remove operators down the road, that will need to be considered in here, as well, as just more of a trigger point for operational pieces. So, that's something to follow along with. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I had a question, and this is probably to Wes or to Daniel. I think there is an appeal going on about the .arpa zone. Am I correct in that?

WES HARDAKER: Well, Daniel is the official representative. I'll let him answer if he wants.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. I will defer to you, Wes. Okay.

WES HARDAKER:

Yeah. We're in a strange boat where we have both a liaison and an actual [IV] member on RSSAC, so it's kind of strange. But the appeal is over. There was an appeal to get a new sub-domain added to ARPA that failed to get added based on the review by the IASG and the technical expert that the IASG appointed, for various reasons. The number of bullet points that are in the appeal was, to the IASG, quite lengthy.

The proponent did bring it to the IAB as well, trying to get the IASG's decision overturned, and we in the IAB agreed with the IASG that it should not have been done. He still wants to get that done at some point, or the original proponent is trying to get it done, but he has sort of been trying to find loopholes in RFCs to get it through, although he doesn't agree that they're "loopholes."

But functionally, those appeals are done and over with. He still hopes to get another registration done at some point, possibly through a different mechanism—hopefully, properly written specifications.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. When I saw the thing, and I think I saw it on the IETF list, my sense was that the guy had a problem that could be solved with an application of money—buy a name in ... Pick your registrant. Is that the position that the IASG and the IAB are taking?

WES HARDAKER:

Actually, no. So, actually, I apologize. He was trying to get something under uri.arpa, so it wasn't even in .arpa directly. It was in one of the

delegated sub-domains that already exists. There are two problems in that, one, there's really no content in uri.arpa.

Maybe Kim actually knows the exact content. I tried to find it but couldn't. It was a technical argument, entirely. There is not money-related. He wanted to create a new URI called "Drop." So, "Drop."

And instead of using "Drop:" like every other URI on the planet, he wanted to use "Drop£." He was trying to argue that the RFC says that you can use any of these special reserved characters when, I think, if you read the RFC, that was not the intent he's trying to find.

So, all of the arguments that he was trying to persuade were very fine detailed reading of the RFCs, and wordsmithing, and cherry-picking parts of them, and there is no money-related stuff that I know of.

He is now looking for co-authors to help fix existing RFCs to either make them how he wants them to be or, at least, write a better specification that might conform and get published so that he could get something allocated under a uri.arpa. I am not an expert on URIs, so take everything I take with a 90% accuracy or truth level.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. So, let me throw the floor open. Does anybody else have comments on .arpa and the proposed change?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Here again. I probably have comments, but I would like to read the document first.

FRED BAKER:

Oh, how prosaic. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Kim, in the chat, says that Ozan has the slides and will share them. So, that's in response to Ryan. Okay. So, I take it we have no other comments at this time? So, thank you very much, Kim, for going over that with us.

With that, now, we get into report. I mentioned a possible meeting with the GWG, and the RSSAC, and the board at ICANN. We will have a call in two hours with David Olive to go over what in the world we need to discuss. That's kind of the news of the day. Brad, do you have anything that we should discuss at this point? Well, I don't hear Brad. So, that is kind of the chair's report. We don't have a lot going on right now. Kaveh is not here. Liman, do you want to comment from the CSC's perspective?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Sure, happy to do that. But before I do that, as you spoke, it dropped on me that, in relation to this .arpa draft, do we as RSSAC want to make a statement as a statement of support or a statement of non-controversial, or anything like that? I'll put the seed in your mind so you can think about whether the RSSAC should make a statement regarding the proposal in that draft document, which I haven't read yet. So, just to keep that in your mind when you read the document.

So, going back to the CSC. That will be a very brief report. The CSC did not conduct a meeting in August because of occasions and because of virtually nothing to do on our table. So, we do have the period reports from the PTI and, again, we received 100% fulfillment of the SLAs. So, just

ticked that one off and sent out our own report that everything is working fine.

We are still going through the procedures for the appointment of the actual committee for the coming year. A problem there is that it goes through a number of approval steps in various other committees. So right now, we're waiting for the GNSO Council to approve the full slate of members of the CSC for the coming year. It's just a formality, but they haven't had a meeting yet, so we hope that will be completed before the end of October.

Apart from that, the only thing that we have on our table is an informal request for input to the IANA budget process, but we haven't really brought that up as a formal agenda point. We have received a general request from Naela, but that was more like informational. We're in our process, right now, if you want to comment. And right now, no one in the committee has found reason for the committee to make an official comment from the CSC point of view. We'll see how that evolves. That concludes my report. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you much. Hiro notes that needs to run off to another meeting. Brad, do you have any comments from the RZERC?

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. Really nothing to share that I haven't shared already. Like I said last time, they're working. RZERC is preparing a document to endorse a zone

mod, and that is moving forward. I think this will be the last time I report for RZERC. So, that's all. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Russ, news from the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: The only thing [for news], I'll get the draft agenda put together for the joint meeting fresh for ICANN69. That's it for now. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Daniel, do you have anything from the IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT: No, I don't have anything to report.

FRED BAKER: Naela?

NAELA SARRAS: Thanks, Fred. Just to emphasize what Liman already said, we are in a process where we are gathering input from the community on priorities for the PTI and IANA budgets. Last week, there was a webinar on, I believe, Thursday, two different times, that can help with the community members to talk over priorities that PTI has, and see if we're on the right track for priorities that we're focusing budget on, and then what other inputs we have.

So, we're in that process. If you think we need to focus/shift on specific things, this is the time to express that to the IANA. The budget will, of course, go through the budgetary process that you're familiar with.

It will be put out for public comment for you to submit public comments against it, and then it will join the ICANN budget process early next year. But right now, this is just gathering input on the budget itself, how we're prioritizing how we build the budget, and this is per the PTI bylaws that we're running this process. That's it. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Duane, comments from the root zone maintainer?

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Fred. Nothing to report this time.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So Brad, Liman, Hiro has just left, but do we have anything from the GWG?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Is that me? Work continues. We do run our regular meetings twice a week. Right now, the focus is on the SAPF, as we call it in RSSAC037. We're going to have a meeting on ... So what's that, you're time? It's probably Thursday afternoon/evening American time. It's in the middle of the night for me. We're going to focus on the SAPF and the

composition thereof—how the representation is going to look like in the SAPF. So, that’s where we are right now. Brad, fill me in. What else?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. No, I think we just started the focus on the SAPF last time we were here. We had shared that they believed that most of the power or responsibilities would fall within the SAPF, and that was going to be a big discussion. And so we, literally just last week, started discussions around the SAPF. It’s too soon to know where that’s headed. Yeah. So, that’s what’s going on.

FRED BAKER: Well, okay. So, yeah. And in my mind, SAPF is “RSSAC next generation.” It seems pretty appropriate. Excuse me?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It is pretty much so, yes.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay. I have come to the point where I need to adjourn the meeting. Does anybody have anything they want to get in before I do so? Tom, you have your hand up.

TOM MIGLIN: Yes, I do. Yeah. Thanks, Fred. I apologize for being late for the meeting, but I know, right at the beginning of the agenda, I wanted to make sure that I introduce ... I think most people have seen here in the last few

RSSAC meetings we've had, but Keith Bluestein, who was our primary representative from NASA to the RSSAC, has left NASA, and so I want to introduce Barbara Schleckser as the new primary representative.

That's upon confirmation with the ICANN Board, that she is our new primary representative, and I will remain as the alternate representative. But Barbara is already a member of the RSSAC Caucus. She was also, for NASA, for their [inaudible] agency, is DNS IP address management lead for the agency. So, I'd like everyone to welcome Barbara.

FRED BAKER:

Great. Thank you. Okay. So, with that, we have finished the agenda. I guess I'll close the meeting. So, we're done. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]