FRED BAKER:	Well, so good morning, good evening, whatever time zone you're in. This is the RSSAC meeting for February of 2021. Okay. Going first into who's here. Cogent, are you onboard? DISA?
KEVIN WRIGHT:	This is Kevin Wright.
RYAN STEPHENSON:	Yeah. This is Ryan Stephenson.
FRED BAKER:	ICANN?
MATT LARSEN:	Matt Larsen's here.
FRED BAKER:	ISC, I'm here. Is Jeff here?
JEFF OSBORN:	I'm here, Fred.
FRED BAKER:	NASA?

BARBARA SHLECKSER: Barbara's here.

FRED BAKER: Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here.

FRED BAKER: RIPE NCC?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh's here.

FRED BAKER: University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: USC ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here. Suzanne sends regrets today.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

FRED BAKER: WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Let's see here. Liaison to the board, Kaveh's here. Liman is here. RZERC, Daniel Migault are you here?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes, I am.

FRED BAKER:	Okay, and Russ Mundy?
RUSS MUNDY:	Yeah. Russ is here. Good morning.
FRED BAKER:	Good morning. IANA Functions Operator?
JAMES MITCHELL:	James is here.
FRED BAKER:	Okay, and the Root Zone Maintainer?
DUANE WESSELS:	Duane is here.
FRED BAKER:	Great. Thank you. And Ozan says in the chat that Howard Kash has entered the call. Okay. What do we do next? We're supposed to review the agenda. What we have this morning is the parts that we've just gone through. We'll have a little administrative review. We'll go briefly over the ICANN70 draft schedule. We have three work items and then some reports and AOB, closing the thing out. The one real change from normal stuff is, Ken you had a requestion regarding a possible document. So I'll ask you to talk about that in item 16. Does anybody have any adjustments they need to make to the agenda?

Failing that we'll move on to the minutes. You all received the last minutes in email. Does anybody have any objections to those stated in minutes? Is anybody abstaining from approving them? Failing that, I believe we have approved the minutes. Now we want to get an update from Jeff and Ozan regarding the Caucus Membership Committee.

JEFF OSBORN: Yes. Good early morning, Fred. Hello to everyone else. The Membership Committee is proposing two applicants. We have Afifa Abbas for the Fellowship Program Mentor replacing Naveed Bin Rais, who has served two terms, and Amir Qayyum for the Fellowship Selection Committee, which would be a second term. This is following the idea that getting two terms is a norm that we expect to follow.

Any questions? Both candidates are very well-qualified. We didn't see any issues. Their qualifications are linked to the screen shown here. Again, Fred, I never remember if we're supposed to simply say these are our recommendations or whether the RSSAC needs to vote to accept the recommendations.

FRED BAKER: Well, we do need to vote, or at least the agenda tells me that. So we'll take to ballots here and I'm going to assume that you have moved that they be accepted. Liman, did you want to talk?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry. Failing someone moving it, I would have moved so.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So Fellowship Program Mentors. Do we have a second for that motion?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Since I failed to move, I'll second it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does anybody have any concerns with the proposal? And so you're recommending …? How does he pronounce his name?

JEFF OSBORN: No. For which one? The first one in green we are recommending Afifa Abbas.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Apologies.

JEFF OSBORN: Previously, Naveed had served in that for two terms.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay, so does anybody have any comments on having Afifa in the position? Hearing none, does anyone oppose? Failing that, then I guess we've accepted Afifa for that position.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you. And then I will move that we accept Amir Qayyum for the Fellowship Selection Committee for a second term. I will make the motion.

WES HARDAKER: Seconding.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Any discussion on that? Any opposition? Is anyone abstaining? Failing that, we've accepted him as well. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Fred. If there aren't any further questions, that's it for the Membership Committee.

FRED BAKER: Cool. Ozan, you wanted to talk about the draft schedule for ICANN70.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Thank you, Fred. Hello everyone. ICANN70 will take place from Monday, March 22nd through the 25th. So, it will be a four-day meeting and the ICANN Org has been in touch with the Supporting Organization/ Advisory Committee leaders as you may know, for a while. Yesterday the internal session requests submission tool opened and it will stay open until next week, Friday the 12th of February.

And RSSAC017 have been discussing which sessions RSSAC might want to have at ICANN70 and looking at some of the meetings that RSSAC had in the past, we put together this draft schedule that you are seeing on your screen at the moment. On the schedule, looking at day one I noted the technical sessions on that day. The tech day will be block one, two, three. And by the way, the meeting time is based on, again, the origin and location of the meeting, which was supposed to happen in Cancun, Mexico—so from 9:00 AM until 5:30 PM—and there are five blocks. So on the first day, we have the technical sessions, tech day.

On the second day, Tuesday, I reached out to our party leaders and both Ken and Abdulkarim are interested in having the March work party sessions as part of ICANN70. So looking at the usual timing of the monthly meetings of the work parties, block one seems to work for the work parties on Tuesday and Thursday.

And later on Tuesday, there is one of the two plenary sessions. On block four, on Wednesday, there will be the DNSSEC Security Workshops. So this will take three blocks. And on Thursday, the other work party session, another plenary session, and close to the end of the meeting. That will be a public forum.

I think yesterday ICANN Org shared a list of the plenary session proposals with the SO/AC Planning Group. I believe this will be shared on the RSSAC list. But the four proposals that have been received so far, one came from ALAC, Registry Voluntary Commitments. The other proposal came again from ALAC about the New gTLD Applicant Support. And one came from GNSO Commercial Stakeholder Group, Governmental Regulatory Development. And one from the Non-

Commercial Stakeholder Group, Technical Internet Governance or Technical Aspects of Internet Governance.

So I believe there will be a vote in the SO/AC leaderships on these four proposed topics and then two will be picked as the two plenary sessions at ICANN70. So this agenda item is really here for our sake to discuss. If there is any other RSSAC work session that you may suggest having at ICANN70.

And speaking of other potential meetings at an ICANN public meeting, at ICANN69, RSSAC had a joint session with the board and the GWG. And we have been expecting a proposal from the GWG in March, based on the upcoming public comment proceedings information. But I believe Ted and Fred have been in touch to see if ICANN70 would be timely to discuss such a proposal with the Board. But I guess that's not the case. Fred may provide more information on that.

The other potential meeting would be a closed meeting with the SSAC as RSSAC, having with the SSAC typically. So I will be in touch with Russ and the SSAC support staff to see if there's interest to have another meeting so also your comments on that would be welcome.

I think this is it, what I wanted to discuss. But if you have any questions or suggestions before the session request submission deadline, please share them with us so we will be finalizing the draft schedule. I see some hands are raising so I'll just over back to you, Fred, for the queue.

FRED BAKER: Daniel you have your hand up. What's on your mind?

DANIEL MIGAULT: The question I would have … I'm just asking if it will be possible to have a calendar so that we can have a link to that calendar and have the sessions that are mentioned in the Excel sheet?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Sure. This is still work-in-progress, Daniel. This is the draft schedule at the moment. The public schedule will be published, I guess, by the 1st of March. So after the end of session request submission period, which will be next week Friday, I will share the final version of the RSSAC schedule with you. And regarding your request to the link to the public schedule and for calendaring purposes, I will make sure to share it with the RSSAC as soon as it's available.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. But I'm also asking if it's only me because if it's only me, I can do that myself and I can even share with the group. So it's not necessarily you. So if other people would be interested, it would be good to know. Otherwise, I'm not asking Ozan to do something only for me.

FRED BAKER: Well, I have been interested as well.

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. Ditto. I think it's a great idea.

OZAN SAHIN:	Sure, I'll definitely share the link on the RSSAC mailing list so that you can pick your preferred sessions at ICANN70.
FRED BAKER:	Now, questions from … Our usual monthly meeting is, what, a week later? It's on the 1st of June, which is a Tuesday. Would it make sense to have that meeting during the ICANN week?
LARS-JOAHN LIMAN:	Are there any direct benefits from doing that? Because we have a week full of other meetings. Why do we want to cram that meeting into this week when we're not having a physical meeting?
FRED BAKER:	I don't know if I'd use the word cram. It looks like we've got a lot of empty space. But I'm basically asking do people prefer that? It sounds like you don't.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	No. I should probably check my own calendar before I say anything stupid here. According to my notes it should be on April 6th, according to normal schedule, right? Which is two weeks later.
FRED BAKER:	I'm sorry, I'm looking at … I went and looked in May for some reason. Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So it's two weeks away, which means it's not really nearby. And I suggest that we focus on the ICANN meeting unless there is a specific benefit from having that meeting the same week. But that's just a proposal and I'm happy to be persuaded otherwise.

FRED BAKER: No. And you're correct on the date. Okay. So I'm not hearing a chorus or seeing a lot of hands.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Let me just put something on the other side of the scales, which is there could be other things discussed during the ICANN meeting that we want to address quickly. And for that purpose, having a meeting that week would make sense. So I'm not entirely black and white on one side here but I would really like to hear more voices.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. Russ has his hand up. I think that's on another topic though. Russ, are you trying to get in on this topic?

RUSS MUNDY: Well, actually, it was on another topic but I do have an input on this. And that is for those of us that have engagements in other ICANN related activities, I would prefer to not have an RSSAC meeting in that week unless there were a distinct need or advantage for doing so. Liman

mentioned if there's something we have to handle quickly. Because even though the RSSAC schedule is not especially crowded at this point, when you overlay the other schedules on the activities of the week it gets more crowded.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I can offer a compromise here which is that we make reservations in our calendar for a potential meeting. At least, in my case, it's much easier to rip out a meeting from a calendar on short notice than to put one in on short notice. So we reserve time in our calendars. We have a time slot available to us if we need it and if we don't need it we just cancel the meeting and go on. Now, that may not work well for others so I respectfully offer that as a compromise.

FRED BAKER: Well, and so that's a very reasonable approach. And just looking at this calendar I might suggest day two, block two, as a potential in case we find we need a meeting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That makes much sense to me and I support that.

JEFF OSBORN: I think that's a good idea as well, Liman.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So let's leave it at that. I don't think we need a vote here but let's leave it as he's got it on the screen right now. Russ, did you want to comment?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, on the other topic if you're ready to go there.

FRED BAKER: Yes.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. Thank you, Fred. Basically, I wanted to ask at this point if there were any particular items of interest on the part of RSSAC that they would like to hear on from SSAC. I'm going to try to discuss this with the SSAC admin committee tomorrow and it would be helpful if there were items of interest, if I could hear them today so I could bring them up tomorrow. If there aren't any, that's fine also. But I just wanted to ask folks if there were any.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Do folks have a topic they'd like to bring up? I don't see any hands. Let's leave this in email. If you think of something that you would like to discuss with the SSAC in a joint meeting, post a note today, if you would, and we can include that.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks.

FRED BAKER: So in the chat, Ken says he's interested in work party status.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. Great.

FRED BAKER: Now, Ken is that our work parties or is that SSAC work parties?

KEN RENARD: There's the mute button. Just our work party is sharing with SSAC, just the normal thing we do when we meet with them.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Now last time, since it was a closed meeting, we did not have that in the block schedule. And I would propose the same here, for a joint meeting with the SSAC, that we not have it in the block schedule. The obvious time to me is on Friday. Ozan, did you have any particular recommendations on having such a meeting?

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Fred. So since it doesn't need to be on the schedule, again, based on what works for the RSSAC and SSAC, we'll work on a time with the SSAC support staff. But a Friday meeting, if I recall correctly would mean a Saturday meeting for one of the vice-chairs of the SSAC. So I'll see what really works best for the SSAC and RSSAC and we'll schedule it.

	It doesn't have to be even on that week. We could use the following week too. So we'll see.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So the timing of the joint meeting, I'll leave to you to work out with them.

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Do we have any more discussion on the ICANN70 schedule?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If I may, Fred. I don't know if RSSAC has a preference on the proposed topics. I think right after meeting we'll be sharing those on the RSSAC mailing list. But if there's any suggestions, I think the RSSAC members can share them with you, Fred, so that if there's any input from the RSSAC that needs to go to ICANN Org on these proposed topics, we can provide that. These are the four proposed that the Org has at the moment. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: You're going to send that email?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes.

FRED BAKER:
Yeah. Okay. Does anybody have any preference on plenary topics this time around? I don't see any hands up. Okay. Let's move on to the next thing. Show me the agenda, please. Okay. So work items. Ken you've got your name beside all three of these. Do you want to talk about those?

KEN RENARD:
Sure. Thanks, Fred. Quick review of each of the work parties and then [inaudible] one of them. The Local Perspective Work Party met. Was it last week or the week before? Big things happening there, as we're trying to narrow some scope and really focus on just the data collection for such a tool versus any details of analysis that you would do with that data.

We started the work party looking at what user narratives. What users would use this tool and what do they want out of it? We paired that list down to now three. Anybody please correct me if I'm wrong there. The three user narratives are number one, evaluating the proposed location for a new instance of a root server. Two, informing a decision on an underserved area. Third one is recursive operators wanting to understand their view of the root server system.

During the last meeting, we went over the underserved area, really transforming that from, "This is what it means to be underserved," to, "We're just telling you these are metrics that might be used to inform a decision on underserved." So just looking at the metrics. Originally, I had pared down that section and the work party decided to add a few

things back in there. So that's a little bit of writing and cleanup that I need to do with that section.

There's also the idea that Atlas probes already measure a lot of the stuff that we need. We like the idea that that happens, just because we get to have instantaneous access to 10,000 measurement points with a great backend searchable database. So having parity between what this tool measures and what Atlas has is a nice thing to have—not strictly necessary, but it's nice to have.

The core writing team will meet within the next week or two and really try to advance the document some more. One of the things up for discussion in that group is the user narrative about recursive operators wanting to understand. There's some new text floating out there for discussion in the core writing group and that'll be brought to the main group.

The Rogue Operator Work Party also met last week or two. Big changes there are the introduction paragraph of the document, really setting the tone that this document is not a strict definition of what is rogue and what is not rogue. We're focusing more on informing a future governance body of what we're thinking, similar to what RSSAC047 did as, "This is what we're thinking. Take this and you decide," to that future governance body.

Unfortunately, we're removing almost everything Duane wrote and then assigned him some more stuff to do. So, Duane, I feel your pain and really appreciate your contributions there. One of the things with the Rogue Operator Work Party is that the guiding principles laid out in

RSSAC037 are somewhat foundational to this Work Party and how things are Rogue. That'll come up in the next topic here.

We're likely to remove some or all of the detection and mitigation section, which may mean that we need to retitle the work party. But that's just how we fit into this reduced scope and something that's manageable and fitting into just informing the governance body versus strictly defining it.

Another topic that came up, which was added to the document, that I felt was interesting but just mentioning this for people to think about and if you have any thoughts, share them. But somebody was interested in their region, the topological region of the internet, having the availability of multiple root server operators in case one goes rogue. Now I think, in theory, in any region you have access to all root server operators regardless of where they are. They may just not be close or as low-latency as others. If there's any thoughts on that send it out to the list or bring it up here.

That last topic here on the work items is about the guiding principles. And since the Rogue Work Party has founded its definition or its ideas around what it means to be rogue based on those guiding principles, it was brought up that maybe RSSAC would want to publish those principles from RSSAC037 as a separate document, the idea being that these are fundamental things. Having them as a separate document might bring them to the forefront. RSSAC037 is on the shelf and people have forgotten about it. So this would really bring those back to the forefront and really set them out as being, "These are our guiding principles."

That was a suggestion that came out of the work party. I'm bringing it here to this group and would like to hear thoughts from people on publishing that document or anything in the other work parties.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you, Ken. On that third point, I'd like to invite to discussion. Does anybody have a viewpoint on pulling those out and putting them up as a separate document somewhere?

I guess I'd like to make two comments. One of them is that it might be appropriate, to instead of making this literally be a numbered document, make this be essentially a blog entry somewhere. And we can discuss with staff where the blog would be.

But I'm not convinced that having another document is needed, is necessary because we have the principles in RSSAC037. And I'm concerned, frankly, trying to specify something in two places, you then always have the question of consistency. If a change is made to one then we need to make sure that a change is made to the other and that it's the same change. So in the interest of consistency, having one specification makes sense. Ken did the work party at all talk about either of those issues?

KEN RENARD: No. It was just mentioned that since the definition or the working ideas around rogue depend on them, maybe we reiterate those principles in an appendix of the Rogue Operator Work Party document. Or if there was an external reference, it seemed like there was interest in having

those pulled out or highlighted in more than just this document. But I like your idea of doing a blog entry where we can reference 37. That's the official source of these things. We're just bringing it out to highlight it here. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Russ, you have your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. Thanks, Fred. In 37, there is a long form and a short form of the principles. And I think the Work Party was wanting to have the long form of then in an explicitly available and visible location, if you will. This is one of the reasons why I think that the possibility of including the long form of them as an appendix to whatever document emerged from the Rogue Work Party, because it's … For one, the biggest thing with respect to the Rogue Work Party is it provides a more clear description or almost a counterpoint of, "Well the principles say this. And what are the examples of things that aren't in compliance with this?"

And referencing someone or pointing someone to RSSAC037, page blah-blah, is awkward and is easier to have it, either as an appendix or as a number document. I must admit, in the work party discussions, I had not thought of the idea of a blog. That certainly is a possibility. But I think the idea is to have the long form of the principles easily and visibly readable by those that would be reading the Rogue Work Party document results. Thanks, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Duane, I'll come to you in a moment. But let me ask a question of Russ and Ken. What is the intended audience of this document? If it's an appendix in the Rogue document then the audience is the same as the audience of the Rogue document. In proposing a blog, I was thinking that the audience was the general ICANN community. What is the intended audience here?

KEN RENARD: I think the reason for even suggesting the separate document or separate publication of some sort would be that this should be a wider audience than just the Rogue Work Party. Rogue Work Party's audience is generally the future governance body. But others that might be— whether they're considering Rogue or they're considering whatever about, or just trying to understand the root server system or the root server operators, these things really go a long way, I think, to explain where we're coming from and how we feel about how important this is and how important it is to get it correct. So I think it could be used outside the Rogue Operator audience.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. I think Ken described it well. And I agree, Fred. As an appendix to the Rogue Work Party document, then it really almost by definition becomes the same audience. But a separate document could well get broader use.

FRED BAKER:	Okay. I'm thinking on my feet here. Rather than stand up a work party to write that document would it make sense—this is a question—would it make sense to have the Rogue Work Party put together a proposed document?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	I have a comment.
FRED BAKER:	Yeah. I see your hand. Go ahead.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	I think we need to think about ownership of these principles, so to speak. I would like to see them come from the RSSAC formal committee. No, maybe not. Actually, I'm thinking also on my feet here. Sorry. I withdraw that. Sorry. Please carry on.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. And in any event, if a subcommittee of the RSSAC develops it and the RSSAC publishes it, it's from the RSSAC. Duane, you've been waiting. Do you have a comment on this topic or is it another topic?
DUANE WESSELS:	No. It's on this topic.
FRED BAKER:	Go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I wanted to respond to something you said. A while ago you were talking about if you create a new document, then you have this information in two places and you have to keep them in sync, which I entirely agree with.

I think one of the suggestions from the Rogue Work Party to put these into their own document is maybe to address that case where … If you wanted to update the principles in the future, would you want to go an update 037? Would you want to publish an entire new version of 037 or would you rather just update a shorter document? I think that was one of the ideas behind the reason for making this a separate document. If you do that then, of course, you've got things out of sync so you'd have to explain why that happens. But I think that was the idea.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Follow up comment to that.

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think you're on the right track there, Duane. What about this? Create a separate document, which starts with describing the history of the principles, describing that they came out of the work of RSSAC037, and have that document update RSSAC037 because that moves the single source of information out of the RSSAC037 document and into this new

one and then we can update the new one. And we can, from the work party document, then reference this new document. Because, Duane, you are right. If we want to change these in the future, we want to have a small document to update. And I think that would work in line with how I see RFCs working, which I have as a role model for me. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I agree. I think that's a reasonable approach here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. General opinions? I only see Liman's hand still up. Liman, do you have more that you want to say? Okay. He's taking his hand down. Duane, go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS: Fred, I'll jump back in. You asked a question before about would the Rogue Work Party write this document? I'm not sure you even need to be as sophisticated as that. I think you could have staff or somebody just start a document with just these principles and we could get it done pretty quickly, I would think.

KEN RENARD: I support the idea of the Rogue Operator Work Party not doing it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Would it help if I undertake to do that work?

FRED BAKER: Sure.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Then you have a stuckee. So my action item would be to create a draft document that we can discuss at the next meeting.

FRED BAKER: That sounds like a good idea.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If someone wants to chip in some keystrokes, please don't be shy.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, Liman, if you could come up with a proposed document, that would be good. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: I have not looked at the history document from this perspective but I would guess there might be some words that, introductory wise, might be useful at the front end of the intro for the principles. Just a thought.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Good idea. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So let's go ahead and do that. Liman, if you want to pull together a proposed document, we can discuss it in the March meeting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Happy to, if that was a question.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Moving on to reports. I don't know that Brad and I have a lot to report. We do have the SO/AC chairs mailing list which is happening and we've had some meetings. The discussion there has been about plenary meetings at ICANN70. And I'm drawing a blank, but the topic that was raised earlier. I'm not sure that we actually have a lot to report. Brad, did something come to mind for you?

BRAD VERD: No. I don't think there's anything that hasn't already been covered.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I have a very short report in that regard. Kaveh, do you have anything from the Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I have. So two basic were report-worthy. One, from Friday 22nd until Sunday 24th the Board had a workshop. And the workshop, the only thing which was somehow related to what we do is an update from the GWG. In the Board, we have a working group which is following that up and then reports back to BTC. And the Board has two liaisons to GWG.

It's Tripti and Lito. So they basically briefed the full Board on updates from the GWG. Nothing different from what we heard from Brad, Leo, and Lars. So, in general, the messaging, from my understanding, was aligned.

What I think might be good for this group to know is that my understanding is the Board has a good and aligned understanding of the work—why it's happening, why it is larger than just ICANN, and basically how we started and where we are going, where the work is going. So I think there is good alignment in understanding about that in the current Board and I don't see any issues or anything that I would worry about. So that's that.

Then we also had a BTC meeting recently last week, where basically the two resolutions were discussed within the BTC, which then will be passed to the Board for passing. And there were about 12 recommendations. So RSSAC028. Yes, Ozan. Thank you. If you go to recommendations ...

Basically, first of all, this goes to the recommendations tracking system with the Board, then goes within the Org. OCTO has done a lot of work and Matt is on the call. So, Matt, please correct me if I'm missing anything. I will just try to basically recap a report that Matt provided to BTC.

On RSSAC028, what the Board is going to approve and what the Org is going to implement, there are a few recommendations there. So Recommendation One is let's make no immediate change to root server names at this time. If you remember RSSAC028 and if we can have …

Yeah. It's the technical analysis of the naming scheme used for the individual RSOs. Basically, ICANN agrees with Recommendation One.

Recommendation Two is to basically do some research on four topics. I'm not going to go through that. And ICANN Org basically agrees with that. And in a resolution, the Board is going to basically ask the Org to commission that such research. Again, Recommendation [Three] goes for conducting a study on node regulation. Again, that's something that the Board is going to recommend to the Organization and OCTO to take on. Recommendations Four and Five, basically they don't need any action from ICANN Org at this point. So that's RSSAC028.

And then, RSSAC047, advisory on … Sorry. 28 has maybe something else which I guess we will hear from Daniel, basically, because this is also discussing RZERC. So possibly also doing, if he has something. But RZERC also has done some work. RZERC02 is a document which will be published soon. And Daniel, my apologies because I caused a bit of delay there. But that will be published soon. And there, it is basically telling the Board—supporting, doing the research, which is in RSSAC028. So I think this is all coming together well.

Then we have RSSAC047 which is advisory on metrics. Again, a few recommendations there. The first one is to implement the measurements and analysis. Basically, the Board is going to approve the resolution thanking OCTO for already implementing it. This is the work that Paul did and is already on GitHub. Then Recommendation Two is to basically make that more permanent. And that's something that the Board is going to recommend to the Org to implement and they will.

And Recommendation Three doesn't need any additional work or anything from ICANN org.

So yeah. You will see these two resolutions about RSSAC028 and RSSAC047. And that's all I have. If there's any questions or comments? Matt and Duane, if there's anything that I missed, please. Okay, seeing no additional hands I will give floor back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Daniel, RZERC, or the IAB do you have anything to report?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, RZERC. As mentioned, Kaveh … The recommendation on signing the roots zone name server data is about to be published, though it repeats a little bit RSSAC038. It's good that the Board is already taking action somehow.

There is another document in RZERC which is advisory on adding zone data protection in a root zone. I think, at that point, we are mostly discussing whether … The document is mostly ready. We're just waiting should we publish it before the IETF draft is being published. And they're having some work just to check where the draft is into the RFC editor queue.

A third point on RZERC would be that the current chair, which is Duane, finishes two terms so there is going to be a selection or the election of a new chair. Yeah. So it's going be on February 16th for the open call and it's going to close on March 9. And the next meeting is going to be on

March 16. I'm currently thinking of putting my name but if you have any feedback on that I would be happy. Okay. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you, Daniel. Russ, did you have anything to say for the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Nothing further that we haven't already discussed. Thanks, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. James, comments from the IANA functions operator?

JAMES MITCHELL: Just to say that the Root Zone KSK Ceremony is scheduled for the 11th of February. And again, that's a restricted ceremony with live streaming links to be posted on the IANA website just prior to the event. That's it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Duane, do you have anything to report.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Fred. Nothing new to report.

FRED BAKER: Okay. We have three people in the GWG, Brad, and Hiro, and Liman. Do you have comments from the GWG?

HIRO HOTTA: Yes. GWG had two meetings in January. The first one was dedicated to the discussion of funding again. In the meeting last week, GWG was starting discussion on the whole NewOrg document. It was initially drafted by Duane, by neatly gluing the partial documents for such as PRS and SAPF crafted so far. DRF, it's Designation and Removal Function, will be added to that document. The content of the whole document will discussed from that next meeting. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: So could you put the link to the current working version of that document into the chat? I have a feeling RSSAC members might want to read that.

BRAD VERD: I'm not sure the working document is available for public consumption yet, Fred.

FRED BAKER: It's not? Okay.

BRAD VERD: I don't know. Maybe Liman or Hiro know. I'm not sure if it's in the public workspace for consumption yet. I don't think it is, as it's in even a pre-

beta phase right now. The first time the GWG talked about it was two weeks ago. So it's super early.

As Hiro stated, it is a first attempt, essentially, at gluing together all of the different documents that the GWG has created into one document. I think some of the stuff of material I think that's interesting, that is worth sharing, is on the last discussion they were talking about the makeup of the board of PRS, with PRS being this entity just like PTI. The board makeup gave, I think it was two seats from ICANN, one being like the CEO of PRS and one being from the ICANN Board. And then I think two were from the community via NomCom, and then two were from RSOs, and then one, I think, was from the IAB. I think that's where they ended up.

But anyway, I thought the biggest takeaway for this group here is that the original makeup had, I think, one RSO seat in there. And then after the discussion, it was decided there should be two board seats that are appointed by the RSOs. I thought that was important. As Hiro said the funding discussion continues.

But I think all of this, regardless of what's in the document, has yet to go through any lawyers or legal review. And I think that will be quite extensive for what's being proposed here. So I'll just leave it at that, saying that I think we are unclear, I should say, as to if this is what the final state will look like—final state, meaning what this document says.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I will just reinforce what you said, Brad. I share your concerns about the availability of this document but I suggest that we, as liaisons, take on

us to find out whether we can share this document in this group. And if we can, we will do so on the mailing list. I'll take that as an action item and do that shortly after this meeting, if that's okay.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. I can imagine the RSOs might be very interested in that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You skipped over two reports in your list here, in the agenda.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You skipped over two reports, two agenda points, the CSC and the IAB.

FRED BAKER: Well, I'm sorry. Okay. So I actually asked Daniel for the RZERC and the IAB and he gave us that. So I skipped you. And my apologies. I really didn't intend to. Do you want to give us that report?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. A few quick things. The CSC is supporting the IANA functions review team and their report. And it also supports the proposed changes—the recommendations they put forward to the Board for changes in the

Bylaws and whatnot. We will express that when the Board turns it out for public comment in the next phase.

The last report from the PTI regarding the IANA services was, to our surprise, not 100%--didn't meet the SLAs to 100%. But that turned out to be one single request that came in just the day before Christmas and it was lodged in the system for over Christmas holidays, which meant that they missed the timing date. This didn't have any customer impact and we just forwarded that with, This is a malconstruct. This is a bad construct in the SLA, that it counts the calendar days rather than working days.

We intend to look at the DNSSEC-related performance and start looking into what various things we can assess and put under our looking glass. And we will start to deal with that in May. So we have a placeholder on the May agenda to start discussing that.

We had a report from the PTI, regarding their customer satisfaction survey. It was extensive and very informative. And I'm glad to say that in almost every case, customer satisfaction seems to be rising over time.

We're planning for a meeting with the Board Technical Committee. No firm date for that yet but we have asked the support staff to look into that.

And finally, we have a new liaison, which made me raise an eyebrow when I heard the name, which is we have Milton Mueller as liaison to the GNSO Non-Registry Stakeholder Constituency. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So with that, we finished out the agenda. Does anybody have anything else that they'd like to bring up? Hearing none and seeing none, then I think the meeting can be adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]