

---

FRED BAKER: Let's come to order. Ozan, could you show me the list of people that theoretically should be here? There we go. Thank you.

Cogent, are you here? DISA? ICANN.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yeah, this is Ryan Stephenson from DISA. Sorry, took me a while [to unmute.]

FRED BAKER: Okay. Ryan Stephenson is here. No problem. ICANN. Matt, Terry, are you here?

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So ISC, Jeff and I are here. NASA, I see Barbara's name. Tom, are you here?

TOM MIGLIN: Yeah, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Netnod. Liman, are you 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.*

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: RIPE NCC?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh's here.

FRED BAKER: UMD.

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: ISI.

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here.

FRED BAKER: Suzanne is joining later. ARL.

KENNETH RENARD: Ken is here.

---

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And Brad, you're here from Verisign. WIDE, Hiro. Yes, Hiro's here.

HIRO HOTTA: Yes, Hiro's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and Kaveh, you're the liaison to the board. Liman, you're the liaison to CSG. Daniel Migault, are you here?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Russ Mundy. And Naela, you're here for your last meeting, right?

NAELA SARRAS: Yes, I am. I am here for my last meeting, and I will be joined shortly by my colleague, James, who will start representing us going forward.

FRED BAKER: Okay, good. It'll be good to e-meet him. Root zone maintainer. Duane, are you here?

---

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

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, good deal. Going back to the agenda, what we have on the agenda is a few things that we don't usually bring in. Call to order, the roll call, things we just did. Administration, we want to look at the minutes from a month ago, get a report from the caucus membership committee, and talk a little bit about the RSSAC chair timeline. And then we'll have Ozan talk a little bit about the RSSAC ICANN 69 schedule.

We have three work items. One of them is a vote for whether we're ready to send something to the GWG. And then Ken, I'm going to turn to you for a tool and rogue RSO discussion. And then our usual list of reports, so Brad and I will talk about some issues. Kaveh will talk about the ICANN board, Liman, CSC, Daniel can talk about the RZERC which he's taking over. Russ, if he's here, can talk about the SSAC. Daniel can talk about the IAB, and Naela can introduce us to her replacement, the IANA functions operator, and RZM. Get a report from the GWG.

And then unusual folks here, Eric Osterweil who's been the liaison to the SSR2 work is here and will give us a report. Suzanne Woolf will give us a report on the ICANN naming function. Amir Qayyum will talk about actually two different things, the ICANN naming function and the fellowship committee. And then for mentoring ICANN fellows, we have Rao Naveed Bin Rais, and then go to AOB. Anybody want to change the agenda?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I have a suggestion for an AOB please.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

KAVEH RANJBAR: [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thanking Naela for serving [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: Yes. Well, many thanks to Naela, she's been a blessing to have here. Okay, and Eric says he has a hard stop in 25 minutes, so we should probably put him earlier in the game. Eric, could I get you to give your report now out of order from the agenda?

ERIC OSTERWEIL: Yeah. Sorry to cause a fuss, but my report would be actually pretty quick, I think. The SSR2 review team is on glide rails, we hope, to try and knock on wood finish by this month with our drafting and then begin the process of transmitting our final report. That'll take however long

---

---

the administrative processes are going to take to actually get where it needs to go, but our optimistic target is that by the end of the month, we'll have wrapped.

We spent a lot of time going over a lot of the detailed feedback from all the constituencies and at this point, I think there's a lot of happy consensus about a lot of the items on the team, and there's a few pieces in motion, but a lot of the substantive stuff that I would hazard is most relevant to RSSAC has remained pretty much as it was modulo the feedback we got from various groups.

Also, there's a webinar tomorrow. Sadly, I won't be able to attend that, but it's at 15:00 UTC where we're going to brief the community. So anybody with interest in where we are with more high resolution than what I just said certainly can join the webinar tomorrow at 15:00 UTC.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you much. And Ozan, could you shift the agenda so I can read the top of it? I'm really good at skipping things. I don't want to do that. Okay, so I already forgot. Somebody said they had an AOB item.

KAVEH RANJBAR: That was me, Fred.

FRED BAKER: What's your AOB item?

---

KAVEH RANJBAR: My suggestion was to add a thank you to Naela as an agenda item.

FRED BAKER: Oh, okay. Yeah. Cool. We can put that in the agenda. Been planning to do that anyway. So we've all seen the minutes from a month ago. Does anybody have a problem with them? Any changes that anybody would like to make? Is anybody voting against accepting these? Anybody abstaining? Failing that, I think we have accepted the minutes. Thank you.

Jeff, you want to talk about the caucus membership committee?

JEFF OSBORN: Yes, Fred. This should be quick, but there's a note of interest. Ozan, can you put up the set of slides? We have an annual membership survey of the caucus, and we got results back and correlated them. The good news is there's no bad news. I think the results were about what we would have hoped for.

We got about 34 responses which is roughly a third of the total, and of those people, 94% responded in a meeting and 85% in a party. Everybody who responded wants to continue, so we thought that was positive. Next slide, please.

The participation rate of the people who responded fully, about 90% had participated by discussion. About 80% had reviewed text. About 40% had written text, and fully a quarter were actual work leaders. So there's a self-selecting bias maybe that these are the most active

---

people, but this says to me that the people we're getting input from are actively involved in the caucus. Next slide, please.

As for meeting frequency and location, frequency, fully 75% said they liked it the way it is. Next slide, please. Almost 80% said they like where it is. Next slide, please. Fully half the people said it wasn't hard to contribute, and between neutral and easy or very easy, 75% of people said this was not hard to do. We had a minority 9% challenging that it was complicated. I'd like to think that's at a level where we don't need to make huge changes. This is overall, I felt, a positive response.

The last page was the reasons people didn't contribute, and no time is kind of not a shock, no interest or no technical experience were basically the reasons. But for most people, they are being involved.

We're continuing to do our work on the membership committee to bring in new people who have a level of interest that we feel is adequate to bring them in, and letting people know who haven't done anything in a year or a year and a half that they're being let go. And that continues. Any questions? All right.

FRED BAKER: Not really. Thank you, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Ozan, for putting that together. Back to you, Fred.



---

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now we want to talk about the RSSAC chair election. You guys get to replace me. Ozan, you want to talk about that?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Hi everyone. About two years ago, the RSSAC elected Fred Baker as the co-chair, and in October 2019, the bylaw changes affecting the RSSAC leadership came into effect and Fred's co-chair role became the chair role, and he completed his first year of his term in 2019, and he will be completing his second year by the end of this year.

I just wanted to give you heads up on the chair election timeline. The RSSAC will be voting on the chair on the 1st of December 2020, and with the conclusion of ICANN 69, we will be starting a 30-day nomination period for the chair position, and it will close on the 23rd of November. Fred will be eligible to run for a second term, if there's any question around that. So I just wanted to give you heads up on this timeline. I'll be circulating a note on the RSSAC list in the coming weeks. I'll stop here to see if there are any questions. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Anybody have any questions for Ozan? Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Ozan, can you remind us of what happened to the chained coupling to vice chair here?

---

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. At the same time the bylaw changes affecting the leadership came into effect in October, it was also agreed that Brad Verd's term as the co-chair would become the vice chair, but Brad was completing his second year in his second term, so we ran through a vice chair election process, but at the end, RSSAC concluded that in the absence of other candidates, the vice chair role was a new role and Brad Verd was selected as the vice chair and he's now serving his first year of his first term as the vice chair.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right. First year of the first term, which means that the term continues. All right. so the terms are staggered for chair and vice chair now, are they?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Got it.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Ozan, do you want to talk about our draft schedule?

---

OZAN SAHIN:

Thanks again, Fred. I circulated the draft schedule for ICANN 69 last week. Currently, the ICANN prep week is underway this week, but officially, ICANN 69 is starting next week on the 13th of October, on Tuesday. This time, it will be three-day community days allocated for the SOAC internal work on the week of 12th of October, and then the following week, the week of the 19th, we will have plenary sessions.

If you look at the community days, RSSAC has five sessions here, two on Tuesday, two on Wednesday, one on Thursday. Three of them are essentially related to RSSAC caucus: one RSSAC caucus meeting and then two work party meetings.

On Wednesday, there are two joint meetings, one with the ICANN board and the RSSAC with [inaudible] GWG, and then it will be followed by a joint meeting with the SSAC. You will not be able to see the session on the schedule because it's a closed session, but I circulated a calendar invitation on the RSSAC mailing list, so you should have a calendar invitation for this meeting on your calendars.

The following week, we have the plenary sessions. We will have three plenary sessions at ICANN 69. These are the domain name business, DNS abuse, and WHOIS changes under GDPR, and then this is an annual general meeting, so we'll have a welcome ceremony on Monday, and before the welcome ceremony, there'll be a community board focus on ICANN meetings.

So I noted these sessions on the RSSAC schedule. I also noted the technical sessions in purple and also these green ones are the networking social sessions. And I just wanted to note there are also

---

agendas linked to this schedule, so if you go to the agendas, you'll see the participation details and the agendas for these meetings. Please reach out to staff if you have any questions on the schedule. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Ozan, could you drop the link to that in the chat?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure, I'll do that.

FRED BAKER: Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: One reminder, could be helpful, Fred, which is the participation links will not be made available on the ICANN 69 schedule until 24 hours prior to the session start time. This is a security measure. Also, you will need to have registered for ICANN 69 in order to be able to access the ICANN 69 schedule. So if you go to the schedule in order to see all the sessions, you will first have to be registered for ICANN 69 through the link I shared, again, on the same e-mail. And I'll go ahead and share the link to this.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, I've been putting these into my calendar, and what I lack is the Google Drive links or the Zoom links for the calls. But

---

you're saying that isn't available anyway. Does anyone have any comments on the agenda?

Hearing none, that's what we'll do. So let's move back to the agenda for this meeting.

OZAN SAHIN:

Fred, I'll go back to the agenda, but I think there's a helpful reminder before leaving this schedule that I forgot. Later this week, there'll be a meeting with the GWG on Thursday at 10:00 PM UTC. I also circulated a calendar invitation for this meeting, but I didn't include it on the schedule because it's not part of ICANN 69, but just as a reminder, there's this meeting with the GWG later this week.

FRED BAKER:

Thank you for that reminder. We'll be talking about that in a minute. Moving ahead to our work items, we have a proposed MoU/LoI which we've been talking about for a couple of months now, and we have as a vote item this morning. Does anybody have any final comments on that MoU/LoI? Hearing none, and I don't see a hand.

Okay, so let's go to the vote. Does anybody want to change anything in this? Is anybody voting no? Is anybody abstaining? Failing that, I believe—

MATT LARSON:

Fred, ICANN would like to abstain.

FRED BAKER: Oh, okay. Yeah, and that's understood. But given that we accept this and we have everyone except ICANN—and ICANN for obvious reasons—is in favor of this. So what we will do now is Steve is going to print off a PDF of the thing and send it to me, and I will in turn send that to Ted as chair of the GWG for him to communicate to the GWG, prep for our meeting on Thursday. Wes, you have your hand up.

WES HARDAKER: Thanks, Fred. I will note that we have been specifically asked by the caucus members to give them a copy of it at the same time as it goes to the GWG, so we should probably consider what we want to do with that.

FRED BAKER: Well, okay. Does anybody have an objection to sending it to the caucus?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Fred, no, I don't have any objection, but just for clarity, I know that we are not planning to publish it as an RSSAC document, but will it be generally available on the website in some form, or we will just e-mail it to the caucus, let's say?

FRED BAKER: There wasn't a plan to put it on the website, the reason being it's not a numbered document, it's a submission to the GWG. GWG is within their

---

---

rights if they change it. I would be surprised if they make material changes to it, but it's our thought processes going to the GWG, and they may have a different take on things.

KAVEH RANJBAR: May I comment, Fred?

FRED BAKER: Yeah, sure, go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I agree with you, but especially since we have a clear vote with one abstention on this, I think this is our advice, so they of course might not follow, but my suggestion is to somehow make it generally available so the position of current root server operators is clearly documented, what we have clear consensus on.

I think in the future, it might help. I don't think it's essential. But A, for the sake of history, and B, who knows what would happen in a year or two. So it's good that if you have such a clear consensus, it is somehow documented. And I really have no idea how. I assume staff might have some suggestions for that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So I've got three hands up here. Liman.

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I strongly support Kaveh here. This is official communication from the RSSAC to another body. This should be publicly available somehow. Not necessarily as a numbered document. I wouldn't mind making it a numbered document, but if we don't want that, then please publish it as an official letter or communication somehow. We need to be transparent.

And again, as far as I know, it doesn't concern any secret details, security-related or anything as such which would be a hamstring. But I don't see that here. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: okay. Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I was just going to suggest that if it is sent to the caucus and the caucus is an open mailing list, it does have an archive and that archive is viewable via HTTP, so there will be a link to the e-mail message containing that file. That'll be a permanent link, it'll work forever. So there'll be some record of this, and there'll also be a record in the minutes of the meeting that this was a voted upon item. So I don't know if that suffices as having it in the permanent record, but there will be that at least.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Wes.



---

WES HARDAKER:

Thanks, Fred. I think it's fine to be on the website somehow. I was actually going to say the same thing as Andrew pretty much, which is it is in the mailing list archive, so it is technically documented in history, although finding it might be a challenge, or knowing that it's there.

It certainly shouldn't be a numbered document though. It really isn't advice in tradition. It's more of a conversation starter with the GWG. It is not an output we expect to be permanent, it is something we are offering as a starting point for the GWG to consider and is likely transitory.

I suspect that after a longer period of term, we might come up with a final version of it after negotiating with the GWG and that result could then become an RSSAC document. But at this point, it's our current take on the direction that we think is helpful for the GWG to consider. It's very different from a [numbered] RSSAC document. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. And in that context then, I would expect it to be some kind of a document from the GWG. Would you agree with that?

WES HARDAKER:

I expect that they would—it is unclear to me everything that they're going to publish, and maybe we'll hear more about that on Thursday, but their longer-term planning will include lots of stuff, including figuring out how to stand up 37 and the various infrastructure. And I would expect that that would include more SLA-like stuff, but we don't know yet.

FRED BAKER:                   Okay. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:           Yes. Wes, I'm happy to have it un-numbered, as long as it's listed somewhere on some RSSAC page that this is a thing we sent to another group, because someone will look for this in the future and they will look in the RSSAC pages. So just clearly mark exactly what it is. This is a first draft or a proposal to blah-blah. That's fine. And don't give it a number if you don't want to, but I think it should be in there somewhere. Thanks.

WES HARDAKER:                [We can put a link to it] from the minutes, Liman. Would that suffice? I'm trying to figure out a solution. I don't have one either.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:           If there's a link to a separate document stored somewhere which is not part of an e-mail message, I'm happy. I'm not quite happy with just leaving it inside an e-mail message to the RSSAC caucus. That's not quite distinct enough for me.

FRED BAKER:                   Okay. Let me follow this thread. Does anybody object to making this proposed MoU public?

---

BRAD VERD: Hey Fred?

FRED BAKER: Yes, go ahead.

BRAD VERD: I apologize, I'm on the phone so I can't raise my hand. But I have no objection to making it public, but if we do, we just need to explain kind of what Wes just described the document as when we make it public so people don't think it's an official document.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I think we've already done that. If you read the preamble of the thing, the opening sentence is this document is produced by RSSAC as a thought exercise for what an agreement might look like. Does that accomplish what you would like to accomplish there?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I'm fine with that. I'm just thinking of whatever it ends up in its final state, with a link or whatnot, it would be nice to be ... Yeah, that's fine.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Fine. So Steve, you're producing a PDF that can be put on the website, and Andrew, you actually manage the website, correct?

---

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Can you put this in some appropriate place on the website then?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I will propose an appropriate place to the admin committee and then we can—I'd like to clear it with you first once I find an appropriate place before I put it up. But we can make that the plan.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So admin committee will be talking tomorrow then.

WES HARDAKER: So Fred, if I can [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: Wes.

WES HARDAKER: I agree with Brad completely. The trick is putting the right heading on it, and I'm quite confident that Andrew will find the right heading and introductory text. And maybe we could even copy part of it out like was suggested to put on a webpage, because just having a link—you don't want to label it as something like—again, the position and how it was written is important to take away before they click on the link. But I'm

---

sure Andrew will come up with an appropriate heading. Good luck, Andrew. Let me know if you need help.

FRED BAKER: Well, would the title of the document be an appropriate heading there, proposed MoU/Lol?

WES HARDAKER: I think that's a good title. I'd be tempted to take a paragraph out of it from the introductory and put that in the ... It's almost like this is a project that we're working on, right? Though it's a decision point, it's still ongoing work to some extent. It's a starting conversation, as I said before. Maybe everybody disagrees with me there.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, so Andrew, you can look at that overnight and we'll talk about that tomorrow in the admin call.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay.

FRED BAKER: Okay, are we done with this topic? I think we are. If there's no further comments, let's go on. Ken, you have two work parties here. You want to talk about what's going on with them?

---

KENNETH RENARD:

Yeah. Thank you, Fred. So the tool on the local perspective work party met on the 21st of September and a few days later, some of the work party leaders met again. We're looking to add more detail to some of the user narratives and actually pare down the number of user narratives that have been discussed, and then take those and focus them on a document to try and steer this towards completion. Andrew has done some great work—really appreciate that—on the narratives and the document.

The next work party meeting is a little bit out of cycle. It'll be with the community days the week before the ICANN meeting, so 15 October. I believe that's at 16:00 UTC. Please join in, have some fun, and share some thoughts on the caucus mailing list as well. An agenda has been sent out already.

For the rogue operator work party, the group last met on the 22nd of September and we were really focusing on a real legitimate RSO doing something bad. Really trying to get the document in shape where unofficial responses or somebody responding on behalf of the operator is really an afterthought, which will be discussed but that's not the primary focus of the document.

We had a topic brought up about the actual source of the zone files, where you get them from directly from the RZM versus an intermediate. That was interesting to me, and I'd like to start a discussion next time on that to kind of drive that home.

Rogue work party, next meeting will be on the 13th of October. That's at 14:00 UTC. Again, part of the community days week. I invite everyone

---

to join in, take a look at the documents, comment in the document or on the mailing list, or please join in on the work party calls. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you, Ken. Does anybody have any comments for Kim on the work parties? Hearing none and seeing no hands, let's move into various and sundry reports. I don't know that I have an awful lot to report. We've had several chairs meetings, calls, and so that has been organized by ICANN and then left to the devices of the chairs.

The principal subject on recent calls has been plenary sessions at ICANN 69. And I'm involved specifically in the planning of [one called] DNS abuse. I'll tell you very frankly that I'm confused by that title. I've of course heard about it at several previous ICANN meetings. But I don't see any of the issues that are raised there as actually abusing DNS. They're abusing DNS-related processes, things like tasting names and so on and so forth, but not like somebody is doing something screwy with the protocol. So I do find myself scratching my head there.

But that has been the principal subject of work in those calls. The other topic is whether we will have a face-to-face meeting in March or not. And I don't know that we have any ... I haven't seen smoke coming out of the chimney in that regard, but I frankly don't expect to have a face-to-face meeting.

My advice to Göran in that context has been that whenever they choose to have a face-to-face meeting, they will find that a large percentage of people disagree and don't want to attend. They will have people there

---

and they will have a number of people participating via Zoom or whatever.

And I believe that to be true regardless of whether they schedule the meeting next week or two years from now, because you're dealing with the community and you have the statistical impacts there. So I think my humble opinion that we should have a face-to-face meeting in March and we should be prepared for a large number of people to not directly attend. But that's my opinion. And like I say, I haven't seen any announcement from ICANN one way or the other. Brad, do you have anything you want to talk about?

BRAD VERD:

No. the only thing I'll add to your commentary about the DNS abuse stuff is I scratched my head on that a lot too. And I think their nomenclature, you're correct, doesn't have anything to do with the protocol abuse. What it has to do is more with registry abuse. So like the operations of the registry and abusing names, purchasing abusive names, that type of stuff. But yeah, that's how I reasoned it in my head. But no, you covered everything for the group. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. We'll move on. Kaveh, do you have any comments for us from the ICANN board?

KAVEH RANJBAR:

No, no discussion of anything related to RSSAC in the board. Today, there is an update—if I'm not wrong, either today or tomorrow,



---

depending on the time zone. Anyway, end of today here. It's basically—so GWG will provide or ICANN Org will provide their perspective from GWG to the board, and of course, I will be monitoring and if there's anything related to RSSAC, I [inaudible].

Other than that, on Wednesday the 14th if I'm not mistaken, we have—and Ozan, correct me if I'm wrong with the dates—sorry, on Tuesday—Ozan, could you please correct me? When is the board, GWG and RSSAC meeting?

OZAN SAHIN:

It is on the 14th of October, Kaveh, at noon UTC.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you for the clarification. So Wednesday, 14th, we have instead of our usual ICANN board and RSSAC meeting, we have a meeting with the board and GWG. The agenda that's going to be proposed is again, as usual, first board—we talk to the board, and I think generally, as usual, it is led by the chair and vice chair, giving an update about work parties and what we have done.

Then from the board to us—which we still have to discuss within the board if they want to propose that question or not, but the general idea is that the general question of this meeting from different ACs and SOs is basically if they have any comments or additions or suggestions for the evolution of multi-stakeholder model.

As you might know, it's about two years now that ICANN has led a program for evolution of multi-stakeholder model, and of course, there

---

has been multiple input methods. RSSAC also has been called a few times. But still, the board would like to hear if there's any comment or feedback about that. That's the general question from the board which has come on to all of the constituencies.

I see Ryan—no, it is in the agenda. Because of time zone and all of that, I think it's best to check, Ryan. So, that said, as I said, GWG is also there. The suggestion is to also basically—we give a specific agenda item for GWG to report to the board, and of course, have a dialog with the board, [if] we would be present, but my thinking is I don't think we can engage in a three-way communication effectively. Of course, if it happens, we will explore that, but because of—all of you know the complexity of this governance, and generally, this is our meeting with the board. So we are giving GWG an audience and we're present. But the style of the meeting will be [lighter,] so it's basically us with the board, board with us, and GWG with the board and we are present. And of course, if you have additional comments or questions, we can add, but that's the general theme.

And yeah, I think that's it. If anything comes out of today's presentation to the board about GWG progress which is related to RSSAC, of course, I will write to the RSSAC list. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. And let me also note—if you could go back to the draft agenda, please—right after the joint meeting with the board and the GWG, we have a joint meeting with the SSAC. Russ has not yet proposed an

---

agenda for that, but that'll be forthcoming. That's our usual joint meeting with the SSAC. Okay, thank you.

Go back to the agenda of this meeting, if you would. Liman, you want to talk about the CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Sure. It will be brief as usual. So nothing new under the sun, except that, as you know, Naela is leaving us as well. I'm shedding tears every evening. And the two items are, number one is that the final slate of participants in the CSC has now been approved by all involved parties. We are officially go now. And the second one is that we received a letter from the IFRT regarding a small change that they wanted to make to the contract between the PTI and its contracted parties. It's about a minuscule little line in a dark corner which specifies instructions that the reports are supposed to contain information that is no longer relevant because it's a leftover from the old contract with the [NTI.] So it's totally noncontroversial to me.

That said, it led to a few mail messages being exchanged in the CSC, but that was because people didn't know the background for this. And once it was presented, everyone seemed happy. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Thank you. Daniel, you want to talk about the RZERC?

---

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes. We met last month. I started being the liaison a few days ago, on October 1st officially, but I attended the previous meeting. There are two documents, one which is adding zone data protection to the root zone, and a recommendation regarding signing root zone nameserver data. I have to review those documents and provide some feedback. I'm happy to have joined that work.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you much. Russ, you're with us now. Would you like to talk about the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, happy to do that, Fred. I think that hopefully, folks did see it. I did get a draft agenda sent to the RSSAC mailing list September 28th, sometime during the day. I didn't have time to pull the URL out of our mailing list archive, but if folks did not actually see it, please let me know and I'll resend it. But for the most part, it's typical discussions that RSSAC and SSAC has in terms of discussing each group's or work party work that's underway and what's planned for the next set of things that the groups are going to undertake.

And one of the additional items that we have on the agenda this time was put on there because of the SSAC leadership wanting to go forward with having the discussion, and that is an open discussion about having or developing or changing as needed processes so that SSAC and RSSAC could more effectively develop things in a joint way as opposed to going off into separate little corners. And then at the end, kind of comparing our work.

---

So if people would be thinking about that and what things would need to be done from an RSSAC perspective, whether it's changes to SSAC or RSSAC or whatever, I'd encourage folks to think about it so we can have a fruitful discussion about it. So that's what I wanted to report to folks this week. Any thoughts or comments from anyone?

WES HARDAKER:

One of the big ones would be SSAC 113. I don't know if most of the RSSAC participants have had a chance to read it. It's an excellent document that's well written in terms of adding a new private TLD or not adding a new private TLD for private namespaces to the root zone. I'm assuming you'll go over that briefly in at least number three with done work.

RUSS MUNDY:

Normally, yes, we'll review the published documents that have come out since the last time we met, and I can ask for maybe a little extra detail and attention to be focused on that. Thanks, Wes.

WES HARDAKER:

Great. Thanks.

RUSS MUNDY:

Okay. Thanks all.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. And Daniel, we come back to you for a report from the IAB.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes. I have nothing to say from the IAB.

FRED BAKER: Okay. It is kind of an amazing thing for the IAB to have nothing to say. But okay.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I'm filtering.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Right.

WES HARDAKER: Let me add one little thing. The AIB has, if you look at the last minutes, been considering the TLD kind of situation as well with regards to SSAC 113 and the DNS [op] proposal by Roy Arends has been adopted by the DNS [op] working group as a potential way to discuss the .zz proposal and other things. There's not much conclusion there, but the IAB is being asked in multiple directions to take a look at what the right thing to do there is. We don't have a conclusion or even a complete path forward.

---

But we also made a comment to the future—I don't have the full-length title. The report that just came out of the ICANN working body to talk about future TLD, the new gTLD program and things like that. So the IAB actually did make an official comment and submit it to that as well, which was closed last Friday. Public comment closed on that. Reaffirming the fact that the—a couple of things. One, that the report did talk about the RFC that relates between the IETF and ICANN with respect to special use domains as well as the ones about internationalization, and we actually did recommend that they consider referencing SSAC 113 as well because it seems important in that work.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you, Wes. Moving on to the IANA functions operator. Naela, do you have comments for us?

NAELA SARRAS:

Yes, I do. In terms of comments relating to updates from IANA, I think the only update I'll give you is that as of the end of this year, following the AGM, as you all know, the PTI has its own board that has two members selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee. the ICANN Nominating Committee published its results, I believe, last Friday, its selection last Friday, and then we now have a new board member joining the PTI board, which is James Gannon, who happens to be coming over from the CSC. That's been his most recent involvement with the PTI. So that makes up five board members, three of which are ICANN staff-appointed to the board and then two are selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee.

---

In terms of [changes here,] I will be, as you said at the beginning, Fred, I am moving to a different job in ICANN. I'm actually going to the global stakeholder engagement team focusing on North America. I'm currently in October here, this is my transition month, I'm actually putting 50% care in IANA, 50% in my next position.

As such, I'm happy to report that my colleague, James Mitchell recently joined the IANA team as the director of technical services and he will become the new IANA functions liaison to the RSSAC.

With that, I will let James introduce himself to the group.

JAMES MITCHELL:

Hi all. My name is James Mitchell. As Naela said, I've joined IANA PTI as director of technical operations. Today is actually my second day, so I'm getting up to speed with everything. I have a background going back more than ten years predominantly in the registry service provider space. One of my responsibilities as director of technical services is to oversee the cryptographic business operations, which involves IANA's involvement in the KSK management.

I guess that's it. if you have any questions for me, shoot. Thanks. Nice to meet you.

FRED BAKER:

Well, I'm not sure we have a lot of questions for you right now. We don't know you all that well. But I do have some comments for Naela, and the first one comes from the AOB item. I do want to thank you, Naela. You've been a pleasure to work with, and the IANA does a good



---

job and you do a good job with it. So I wish you well. You're going to be what, VP Global Stakeholder Engagement?

NAELA SARRAS:

Correct. Yes. So ICANN has a team that looks after engagement with different regions. I'll be focusing on the North America region. So thank you for the kind words, Fred, and I've learned and enjoyed working with this group for the last, I believe, four years, immensely.

I'm also not moving too far, and because of my role as engagement, I'm sure I'll be running into you and possibly looking for engagement and ideas and interactions with you. So I'm not going too far. Please count on seeing me and hearing from me as needed.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you much. Let's move on. Duane, do you have comments from the RZM?

DUANE WESSELS:

I do not have anything to report today, Fred. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Brad, Hiro and Liman, do you have any comments for us from the GWG?

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

We have a couple of drafting teams that have written—how to put it—very rough strawman ideas around the various functions that we are looking to establish, and more forming them into bodies that perform various functions. So we have had a team that has looked at the SAPF function and one team that's looked at the new combined function for the performance and measuring and the secretariat functions which is internally named the PRS, which is more or less intended to be a stating point, rubber stamp of the [PTI.]

so those have been reported back into the main GWG and I think the coming meeting will be the first when we start to look at this in the larger group. That is one brief report at least. I don't know if Duane or Brad wants to add anything to that, or Hiro.

BRAD VERD:

I'll add a couple things. Obviously, all the work that we've put into RSSAC 37 was put in with kind of a mindset that this would be in the structure that is ICANN and community and whatnot. And what's being proposed through the GWG is a little different. I guess I didn't see it coming, but now that I see it, I'm not sure it's a bad thing, but the way that I think about it or the way I kind of picture it in my head is it's actually creating a pseudo-RIR. It's creating a different community rather than kind of plugging into the different pieces of the community that we had worked with on 37.

So the SAPF would be essentially a community that has to be created and whatnot. Membership might come from a lot of the same players, but if you think of like a RIPE and an ARIN, how they have their own

---

communities and whatnot, that's kind of where the direction that this is moving. So I just want to make sure everybody is aware of that [inaudible]. Hopefully Hiro and Liman can add some color.

FRED BAKER: Well, Hiro, do you want to get in on this?

OZAN SAHIN: Fred, I think Hiro just left the meeting for another meeting at the top of the—

FRED BAKER: Hiro dropped off. Okay. Well, so thank you very much, guys. I'll be curious to hear about this pseudo-RIR.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Aren't we all?

BRAD VERD: Please don't coin that phrase. That was just kind of how I have thought about it. It was easy to kind of point to something and say, "Oh, you mean like the RIRs." But it's not an RIR. [inaudible] the model. There are a lot of similarities when you lay them next to each other.

---

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay. Thank you much. Now, the next on the list, J, is Eric. Eric already spoke earlier. The next place I want to turn this over to is Suzanne talking about the IANA naming review.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm not sure Suzanne is on the call.

OZAN SAHIN: Hi Fred, I don't see Suzanne in the Zoom room.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So be it. Then Amir, can I turn to you?

AMIR QAYYUM: Yes. Thank you. Ozan, can you please display the slides that I sent? Hi everyone. This is a brief overview of the NomCom selection process for this year. The NomCom recently announced the final selections, and I hope everyone is aware of the final [inaudible]. The process started last year with the initial meeting in Montréal for the NomCom 2020. But then when there was a long phase of soft dive assessment which was due in March, the Mexico meeting, but that became a virtual meeting. So we did the soft dive assessment of all the 96 candidates. Each NomCom member was assigned four to five candidates to explore and discuss about.

Then we had the online discussion and a shortlisting was done in April based on this soft dive assessment that I already talked, I believe, in one

---

of the previous RSSAC meetings. And then later on, there was the deep dive process, that a team of two to three NomCom members is assigned four to five candidates where they do the background check, the online interviews of the candidates by the deep dive team, and later on they come up with their recommendations and deep exploration of the candidate profile and expertise. And after the online discussion, further shortlisting is done for the final interviews.

So this deep dive interview phase was completed in June. It took quite a lot of time because each deep dive team has to prepare quite well for the online interviews with the candidates. So about 47 candidates were interviewed and then we reduced for the final interview in September for each category of ICANN board, PTI board and the other constituencies. Next slide, please.

The final phase has just completed. This final phase was for the interviews with the board candidates, the ICANN board and the PTI board. Because of not having the face-to-face meeting this time, the NomCom has decided not to have the final interviews with the candidates other than the ICANN board and PTI board candidates. So the selection of the GNSO council, ccNSO council and the ALAC members were done based on the discussions and the deep dive interviews. So no final interviews were done with the full NomCom.

The full NomCom had a very extensive meeting for their final phase of selection. These were six consecutive days with six plus hours every day from 25th of September to 30th of September, and then we had a day for the final selection.

---

So the NomCom interviewed seven candidates for the ICANN board and three candidates for the PTI board, so we had two interviews of one hour each for the five consecutive days. So one hour initial discussion about the candidate, then one hour of interview, and then one hour of the discussion after the interview for selection and building consensus, and then again, for the second candidate.

The final section meeting was done on the sixth day where all the selections were done through majority voting by the voting members. It is just to remind that RSSAC and SSAC liaison are the nonvoting members in the NomCom .

So the NomCom finalized two ICANN board member, one PTI board member, two ALAC member, one from Europe and one from North America, one ccNSO council member and one GNSO council member. Final slide.

You might have already seen in the announcement the NomCom appointees for the ICANN board of directors are Sarah Deutsch and Avri Doria, and for the PTI board of directors, James Gannon, for the ALAC, Europe, it is the candidate who has been selected is Pari Esfandiari, and then for the North American slot, Gregory Shatan.

Then for the ccNSO, Javier Rúa-Jovet, and the for the GNSO council, Olga Cavalli. So these were the seats available this year to be filled by the NomCom, and this has been done after quite an extensive process. And it took quite long just because everything has to be shifted to online interviews and discussions.

---

I recall, because I was in the NomCom previously also, that many of the consensus building has been done during the coffee breaks and face-to-face meetings and talking to others and explaining, but online meeting had some drawbacks also that we were not really able to talk offline other than our normal discussion, so we had to select all the candidates based on the majority voting because otherwise, many of the candidates that have been selected [inaudible] consensus, which was a little bit challenging. I will not say impossible, but challenging because of this online.

When we were having the meetings for the final selection, we were having the time zone for Pacific, California, up to India and China. So you can say one person was having an early morning meeting and the other was having an after midnight meeting. So it was quite challenging. But still, I believe they did good work and there was quite extensive work involved in this selection and reviewing of the 96 profiles that we received for this year.

Any questions? Because the NomCom process is not confidential, it's all open. Only the candidates are confidential. Any question about the process or anything? I would be happy to answer.

FRED BAKER:

Well, I don't have anything to add. Does anybody else have anything to bring up? Ozan put a link to the ICANN Org announcement in the chat room, so you can read that if you haven't seen it yet. Thank you very much, Amir.

---

AMIR QAYYUM: Thank you.

FRED BAKER: It is now 8:00 in the morning here, so it must be 8:00 in the evening for you. Thank you for being with us a little bit late. Now, you didn't talk about the fellowship selection committee. Do you have comments there?

AMIR QAYYUM: Yeah, I was thinking it is the next point so I can start [inaudible]

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Go ahead.

AMIR QAYYUM: It's very brief. In November last year, we selected the fellows for the March meeting which unfortunately became a virtual meeting because of the COVID-19 scenario. Then in February, we selected the candidates for the policy forum in June in Kuala Lumpur. That meeting also became a virtual meeting.

So the fellowship selection committee already had a selected pool of candidates for the March and June meetings, and we decided to delay their fellowship up to the next meeting which will become a face-to-face meeting. Assuming that the March meeting next year will be a face-to-face meeting, so the candidates selected for the March meeting in 2020 will be offered the fellowship for the March 2021, and those who



---

were selected for Kuala Lumpur meeting in June 2020 will be offered this fellowship for June 2021.

In fact, they have already been communicated. Only those candidates who were not really comfortable because of the timing to delay the fellowship were excluded, otherwise, the selection is already done. So not much for the fellowship selection committee, at least for timing, unless we have, again, face-to-face meetings and the new applications start coming in. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you much. Does anybody have any questions for Amir there? Failing that, fellowship mentoring committee. Rao, are you on?

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS:

Hello everyone. This is something that is related to the previous point which is about the selection. We have been working with the fellows as mentors starting from last December, and of the meeting in March, but it was delayed and everybody knows what happened.

So now, what actually ICANN did, they pooled all of them together, so the fellowship program at ICANN has pooled all these—because for a policy forum, we can only have fellowship alumni, and for these general meetings or the first meeting of the year, we have the newcomers. So now they have joined them into one pool and we have restarted their mentoring process from now on. It has already been kicked off and tomorrow, we are going to in fact have a roleplay session with the PDP with them where they'll be given a real-time PDP process topic and

---

they'll have to go through in our session about coming up with their own thoughts of what they think about the policy and they will experience the whole PDP process. It's going to be held tomorrow.

So we have already started with them. I joined late today because I had a meeting with my fellows almost at the same time. So I'm actually mentoring right now 12 fellows, which normally I have five to six, but because they have pooled them together, I have six newcomers and six alumni. And it is expected that I'm going to work with the newcomers still ICANN 70, assuming that it's going to be physical meeting. And with the alumni starting from now, I'll be working with them until ICANN 71.

So this is the [understanding] of this process. This process is going to be different this time because we'll have to work with the same bunch of fellows for an extended period of time, which provides us an opportunity to work together even on more issues and let them get settled into ICANN according to their areas of interest. But the challenging part is not being able to physically meet, and this was a fundamental part of the mentoring process.

So in terms of physical meeting, there was none, as we know, so we are just hoping that they get an opportunity next year in March and June to experience the meeting. So if any other question anybody has, I'd be happy to answer. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Anybody have any additional questions for Naveed? Failing that, I think we've come to the close of the meeting, so let me ask, does

---

anybody have anything that they would like to bring up at this point that we've managed to not include in the agenda?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well, agenda item eight, maybe.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah, it's AOB. And during Naela's report, I thanked her. So now we're at 8(b), the next meeting is in November.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Fair enough. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so apart from that, does anybody else have anything to bring up at this point? Hearing none, then I think we can call this meeting adjourned. Thank you for attending.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**