FRED BAKER:	Okay, good morning or evening or wherever you are. This is the RSSAC call for March of 2021 and let me do a roll call and make sure people are here. Cogent, Paul, or Brad here? DISA?
KEVIN WRIGHT:	This is Kevin Wright, and Ryan Stephenson's on his way.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. ICANN?
MATT LARSON:	Matt's here.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. ISC. I'm here.
JEFF OSBORN:	I got in late so Ozan's still going to cover me on my section, but I made it.
FRED BAKER:	Okay, cool. NASA? Barbara are you here?
TOM MIGLIN:	This is Tom, I'm on.

FRED BAKER: Tom, okay.

BARBRA SCHLECKSER: I'm on. This is Barbra.

FRED BAKER: Cool. Okay, Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here and I believe we also have Patrik this time, right?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yep, I'm here as well.

FRED BAKER: Okay. RIPE NCC?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, Kaveh's present.

FRED BAKER: UMD?

KARL REUSS: Yeah, Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: USC ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Both Wes and Suzanne are here.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yup.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

FRED BAKER: Cool.

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

FRED BAKER: WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, present.

FRED BAKER: Liman, you already said you were here so I imagine you still are. Russ Mundy?

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, Russ is here. Good morning.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: James from IANA? Duane Wessels?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay, and of course we have several from staff. Let me go over the agenda. Well, okay. Next agenda item, we have several people that are in-house counsel, were from senior staff and from several of our companies. Erum Welling has been with us for a number of calls recently. We also had Keith Drazek from Verisign and Marco from RIPE NCC, and from ISC we have a new in-house counsel, Rob…

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Carolina. Carolina.

FRED BAKER: Carolina. I'm terrible. I didn't remember his name. Do we have any other observers on the call? Okay. Question for the RSSAC, these people each represent in-house counsel. Well, represent management of their various organizations. Is there any objection to them being here? Hearing none, moving on to the administrivia. You've all seen the minutes from the last meeting, does anybody have any comments on those minutes? Okay. Vote to accept them, does anybody have any objections? Is anybody abstaining? Ryan tells us in the chat that he's arrived. Oh, and Brad tells me Keith couldn't make it. Okay. I assume we

have accepted the minutes. Ozan, I guess you're going to talk about the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, thank you, Fred, and hello everyone. Today I'm happy to cover the slides that we put together for this meeting on behalf of Jeff and the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee. As you may recall the Membership Committee periodically conducts activity reviews of the RSSAC Caucus members and I think the first one was done in September 2019 and then another one was conducted around April 2020, and recently the membership committee conducted another activity review of the RSSAC Caucus members and got some results so this is what I'm going to share in this meeting with you. As a reminder when RSSAC Membership Committee does that, they look at the RSSAC Caucus members with the exception of those who joined in the past 12 months and the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee also doesn't look at the activity of the RSSAC members in the RSSAC Caucus.

The Caucus members get credits [in these reviews] for attendance to RSSAC Caucus meetings, the RSSAC Caucus Work Party memberships, their contributions to RSSAC publications, and also any liaison or representative roles that they fulfill. The RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee defines activity with three pieces of [inaudible] of any activity that I just listed and inactivity as zero or one or two pieces of activity for these credit bullet points. So in this recent review, there were a few findings that could be interpreted as good news for activity in the RSSAC Caucus. If you look at the March 21 review, the number of inactive RSSAC Caucus members went down to 12 and the active caucus

members are here at 60. We currently have 103 RSSAC Caucus members in the caucus. Again, the differences here, the exclusion of RSSAC members here and the caucus members that joined in the past 12 months, the number is 8. The inactivity ratio is going down and also another finding for RSSAC to discuss—could be here—the number of members who joined in the past 12 months and I don't know how much of that could be attributable to the fact that the meetings went online, the removal of face-to-face meetings but of course the number of recent new RSSAC Caucus members in the past 12 months went down to eight.

So we have one more slide. The total number of inactive caucus members, 17 here. These are the changes from May 2020 review and six of them were renewed from RSSAC Caucus. The Membership Committee continues to track five of the RSSAC Caucus members since then and 6 RSSAC Caucus members out of 17 that were found inactive in May 2020 review showed activity since this time. I think Jeff will be sharing these numbers in the RSSAC Caucus meeting which will take place this coming Sunday but the membership committee wanted to share those with you in this meeting. Of course, one important note is from the Membership Committee is that the Membership Committee thinks due to the pandemic world that we have now and the challenges that the RSSAC Caucus members may be experiencing, they would like to hold off on sending any notices to RSSAC Caucus members for some time.

So taking no action at this point on these results but of course, your comments on this approach or any of the numbers here are welcome. Thank you, over back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay, let me ask a question because I'm not sure I understood what you just said. You have already removed six people but you have not sent them notes. Is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: These six RSSAC Caucus members that were removed were at the request of RSSAC. They were removed in September 2020, I guess. This is not result of this recent March 2021 review, Fred. They were removed as a result of last year's review.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

JEFF OSBORN: Fred, we're basically trying to grant a little bit of leniency given the pandemic and we decided for a six-month period to just halt the actual termination letters.

FRED BAKER: Okay. We also have some new caucus members. Am I correct in that?

JEFF OSBORN: The exempt ones represent, yeah, the ones who are joined in the last 12 months.

FRED BAKER:	Okay. Sounds good. Let's move on in the agenda.
OZAN SAHIN:	Fred, I think Kaveh has comments. I see his hand is up.
FRED BAKER:	I'm sorry. Kaveh, go ahead.
KAVEH RANJBAR:	I just wanted to say, yeah, I supported the idea of leniency. Thank you for coming up with that, and actually, I think we can maybe forego 2021's review and then next year we consider it. So instead of six months because I think that's additional work and communication where we can make it simple by saying this year we are granting that so we track it, but we're not acting on it. But next year we will act on what we have and, yeah, we'll take it from there. That's my suggestion. Also on the first slide, I have a small wording suggestion but I think if instead of credits, if you just call them activity, continuous activities, let's call them activities are counted as because credit it has some judgmental value to it or someone can perceive that so I prefer if you're really not doing something special with it, just make it as clear as it is so the activity is counted as one of these four.
FRED BAKER:	Okay, thanks for that. There any more comments on the presentation?

JEFF OSBORN:	Six months was arbitrary. Kaveh's suggestion of holding off for a year I think is a good one. If nobody else has an issue, we will change our arbitrary 6 months to 12. No contrary moves to Kaveh's suggestion. Thank you.

| FRED BAKER: | Well, I'm fine with that. Anybody else have a comment there? I don't hear any. Let's move on with the agenda. Okay. Ozan, you want to talk about the schedule for ICANN70? |

| OZAN SAHIN: | Yes, thank you, Fred. Shortly before this call started, I circulated the RSSAC ICANN70 schedule on the RSSAC Mailing list so you should have access to this spreadsheet that I'm showing at the moment. ICANN70 schedule was announced yesterday and also in my note, there's a link to the announcement. Also please note that the sessions that I listed at ICAN70 here, it doesn't include the RSSAC/SSAC joint closed meeting which will happen on Monday the 29th of March, but you should have received a calendar invitation for that so this meeting is not shown here. On this schedule, I noted the tech day that will take place on day one of the meeting. One thing as an update from our last meeting which we looked at this schedule again, is RSSAC agreed to secure a slot for an RSSAC meeting at ICANN70 that was block two on day two, on Tuesday, but I checked with the meetings team and due to lack of available Zoom rooms for this slot at ICANN70, this meeting was moved to block three.

So, that's one update that I can provide since our last meeting on the schedule. But you will see links to the RSSAC sessions or the technical |

sessions, or the plenary sessions that I listed here and there's also a link to the agendas of the RSSAC meetings and the agendas will be populated the week of 15th of March. If there are any questions, please go ahead, I'll be happy to answer, or reach out to me after the meeting. But this is my update about ICANN70 RSSAC schedule.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and question for you Ozan. On day two, block three we have an RSSAC meeting that I believe that was a placeholder if we decided to hold an RSSAC meeting it would be there. Am I correct in that?

OZAN SAHIN: That is right, that was the agreement on the RSSAC February meeting and we secured this slot. But I think if RSSAC doesn't want to hold the meeting at this time, we should reach out to the meetings team to remove this session because ICANN [community] already started signing up for sessions and the sooner we remove it the better because as we get closer to the meeting, more people will have signed up for the session.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. So we can discuss that with the admin team tomorrow. I have a feeling we might let that go. I haven't come up with a specific need for that meeting.

OZAN SAHIN: Sure.

FRED BAKER: Okay, moving on. Let's see here. Oh, yeah, the caucus meeting agenda. Do you want to talk about that?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure, let me continue with the caucus meeting agenda. The next RSSAC Caucus meeting is happening at IETF110, this coming Sunday at 15:00 UTC for 90 minutes. On the draft agenda we have Jeff Osborn for the Caucus Membership Committee to go over the slide deck that I've just presented and Fred to talk through the recent RSSAC publications, the ones that got published since the previous RSSAC Caucus meeting and under Work Parties we have the updates on the two Work Parties underway plus Andrew will be presenting on RSSAC002 data. If you have any suggestions for the draft agenda, please share it with the RSSAC or the RSSAC Caucus but this meeting is happening this coming Sunday. Again, back to you, Fred, for discussion on this topic.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and this coming Sunday… I'm not looking at my calendar at the moment. Want to remind us what time that is?

OZAN SAHIN: It is between 15:00 UTC and 16:30 UTC.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so West Coast time that's 7:00 AM. US East Coast that's 10:00 AM.

OZAN SAHIN: Right.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Okay, now [inaudible] here. Liman and Kaveh, I believe you wanted to talk about NIS2 and what's going on at Netnod and RIPE NCC.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, so if it's okay with Liman and Patrik, I will open the subject. First of all, thank you for the time. I have asked and as it was discussed, we also have Marco now in the call. I also shared his LinkedIn on chat. Marco is basically leading our public policy and Internet governance at RIPE NCC, so he's quite involved with all European engagements. The memo that we have shared, basically RIPE NCC and Netnod, is about basically a situation that we have observed legislation that is shaping now and we thought can affect root operators and also generally DNS operators so we thought it is good to bring it up into attention of RSSAC. I will do a very short intro because there are people who are much more expert than me on this, especially Marco and Patrik, that's what they do like day to day basis, so they have a lot more insight and I think that would be better use of time.

                               I will also add my personal understanding of this, but of course, then we would then rely on them to answer any questions and there's also call for action. So, in short, there is NIS2 directive being shaped now. This is

basically revision of the original NIS directive which was the European commission's basically proposal for information security and the current one is not super clear on how they call it or how they scope it, but the way we read it is it will involve route operators, and not only actually K-root and I-root, Netnod and RIPE NCC which are based in Europe, but also anyone who provides services to people in Europe. Which is basically all other operators as well. And also, it's constant as operator of essential services which basically would put some explicit requirements on them and expectations from all of us as operators. Based on that, what we suggest—and more details of course is in the paper—but our suggestion is to make it clear and then comment directly by each operator, comment directly to the public comments which is open for that and basically state their position or our position.

My personal suggestion is that we do it individually, so independently each operator and then my reasoning for that is actually we talk a lot about independence as one of our core values and we might have the same position but personally, I think there is value in sharing that independently even if it same points written in different form repeated 12 times. Personally, I think there is value in submitting that separately. Second point is what we can explore and this is, again, my suggestion. We can explore to ask ICANN board to also engage and follow this up. Either [via] the public comment which would be very short but possibly by other means. I mean, ICANN Org also has different ties either via other constituencies like GAC or with other engagements within ICANN Europe has connections and basically discusses these types of policy issues with the policymaker so we can also ask possibly ICANN board to

engage on behalf of us and make sure that the policymakers get what they're regulating clearly and then what's this space.

My final comment on this is the way I see they get it wrong, in my opinion, is of course the European regulator as a whole regulates a huge space. Even when you think only about Internet or unique identifiers, there is a huge space and then they try to find consensus within all the member states. The issue is, of course, as a regulator they look for centrality, and if you focus it on root, of course, root is centrally controlled. But that is very different and very out of scope of RSSAC and root operations. But technically separating this is hard. I mean, personally, I think of course I mean Internet is widely distributed decentralized network when you look at routing and when you look at DNS operations. But exactly DNS is the point where you also have the central element which is starting from the Root Zone and then all the zones linked from there, they come into play. For an operator to get that right that, "Hey I need to control that central thing. If I want to implement control measures I don't have to touch the distributed parts [in nature of this beast,"] and sometimes it's hard.

My thinking is we really need to make that clear and finally, I don't see an immediate issue coming from this, to be honest and my personal assessment is even if it's low it's not that it will immediately happen to all of us. But the chances and likelihood are really high and the cost of trying to fix that after it is written down and try—because I think at the end we can always bring people back to the technological reality of how this works but it will be much more costly and time-consuming and might cause [bridges] in the road. If we can act in time and we can get them to fix it before it is legislative text, I think it's the most efficient but

it is in everybody's best interest. So these are my opening comments. I don't know if other operators, especially non-European ones need more info on the memo or should we jump into questions and also additional explanations by Patrik, Marco, and Liman?

If there is need for additional intro, please raise your hand so then I know that. If not, I will give the floor to Patrik to add if he has anything or I would also like to hear his personal opinion about possible effects of this. Patrik?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much. Well, the rest of the people on the call might see two different asks. The first one which is not what we're asking for is for us and RIPE NCC under the European legislation, under the jurisdiction in Europe to convince our legislator that they are on the wrong track. That's our fight. We have to fight that just because just like every one of us have to fight whatever legislator we are in the jurisdiction within which we operate. The important part, though, which is what we really wanted to do is to have a look yourself and evaluate whether you are covered by this proposal. And if it is the case that you draw the conclusion that you are, then it might be the case that you actually should send input. It's important to separate these two different things and unfortunately one of the things which is pretty alarming for us from that Netnod/RIPE NCC is the interpretation of the proposal which actually has extraterritorial coverage.

Just like the EU is complaining on the CLOUD Act, for example, for those of you who follow that, that European entities are told to not use

US-based cloud providers or similarly that EU is complaining on the extraterritorial legislation in China. Here we have a proposal where EU is proposing something that can be interpreted—but it's something that you have to do [which are outside] of Europe, that's something that you might interpret as extraterritorial legislation. Which is a little bit weird that we in Europe, which are against extraterritoriality, proposed something that actually is that. Anyways, the important thing that we want you to do is to evaluate this proposal for your own operation. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Patrik. Yes, thank you for making it very clear and I think it is very important to distinguish between these two different actions. Of course, yes, we are committed to do what we have been dealing with our own legislators and we will do that. But I fully agree with Patrik that it is good that you have a look for yourself and take action if you see the need. Also, it may be good to share it with each other, just our interpretation if or course your organization is allowed or wants to do that. I think sharing experiences will also help if that's something we can do.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Could I trouble you to put the link to the public comment page in the chat so that people can all see it?

KAVEH RANJBAR:	Sure, I can do that. In the mean time, Marco, do you have anything to add?
MARCO [SCHMIDT]:	No, not really. I think you and Patrik capture it all. I was about to say that's really the important bit also to look into what position that brings you in even if you're not an EU operator, because as I understood it, you all have servers, at least a sever within one of the 27 member states and the way we read the proposal is that in EU's vision, that would bring you into scope of this directive even if your legal seat is somewhere else. So that's really the key point I think for everybody to evaluate and think about. Like, "What position am I in if that's their interpretation?"
KAVEH RANJBAR:	Yeah, fair enough. Thank you. Then to get the second question as well, I mean, does RSSAC find it useful that we advise ICANN board to take further action? That means if you have basically shared view and then all of us, otherwise as Patrik said, we will do what we have to do and we will see the outcome and we will find a way to continue operating, but that is also just a possibility which came to my mind so I'm asking or sharing my thought. I don't know if—I see Brad has his hand up. Brad?
BRAD VERD:	I'm curious, Patrik, Marco, and Kaveh given that you guys have spent a lot of time on this, how do you guys see compliance with the NIS2 directive affecting say Root Ops or RSSAC as we function today? And then the [leading and] harder question is looking forward in a future

governance of the root that's going on with the GWG, how do you see it affecting that? Three topics there, current world, Root Ops, RSSAC, and then the harder question like in the future.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Brad. I see Patrik hand is up already and I would like to see if he has anything related to that. Patrik?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yes. The NIS directive and also the NIS2 is a requirement to report to named authorities if it is the case that the organization covered by the directive have some kind of security or otherwise described incident. The directive has to do with reporting, registering, and that you provide the service and then if you have an incident that you report within 24 hours, and then finally after I think it is a month you need to file a complete report over what actually happened. That is in general the NIS directive and also the proposal of the NIS2. There is no change in the operation itself. The EU do discuss other things, for example, the need for something that the call DNS4EU which is a need that the politicians say for some definition of need of European competitor to the quad eight and quad nine and whatever.

That is not what we're talking about here, we just talk about the NIS2 directive and the NIS2 directive from my perspective do not change in any way, shape or form how we're operating as an organization as a root server operators. That's my evaluation, thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Patrik.

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry. If I may, just coming back to that, Patrik, the report for a security incident, for whatever those incidents might be, what action or whatnot is taken upon that? Or is it just a passive report and we're done? What is the outcome?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: The outcome is that the report can also be evaluated and also a request—ultimately there can be some penalties if it is the case that you have a security incident that the authorities believe have had some impact on the service provided. Specifically, if the incident has impact on integrity and PII information. In that case, it might result in penalties if it is the case that the evaluation of the security incident is such. Otherwise, you might get penalties if you don't file a report, interestingly enough. There's one more thing I would like to say. So the question is then how are entities outside of the EU, how are they supposed to report incidents? Well, you are supposed to appoint a legal entity within the EU that is representing you and the service that you provide. There are requirements in here but this is one of the things that you have to evaluate yourself.

My reading is that you have to appoint a legal entity within the EU which is the entity that is living up to and fulfilling whatever the requirements the NIS2 directive had.

MARCO [SCHMIDT]:	Maybe to quickly add, the way I read it is, yeah, they could also say, "Hey, this went wrong, and here are some instructions on how to correct it." In terms of immediate operational impact on the way you operate your servers. One of the things, for instance, that we're looking at this slide is because it makes reference to supply chain and it could mean that they say, "Okay, sure. But you can host root server instances but only if the data center matches this and this requirement," and that might not be very suitable for us. But, again, like Patrik said, you really have to read it all and look into how your operations are organized, and think about what could possibly go wrong.
KAVEH RANJBAR:	Thank you very much, Marco. Liman, is this related to that before going to Ken? If you're replying to that, then please go ahead. I assume not because…
LARS-JOHAN	I hate this mute button, they hide behind the other buttons. I have a comment that will extend this but I guess Ken has a comment or question regarding this too so Ken, please go [inaudible].
KAVEH RANJBAR:	Please go ahead, Ken.
KEN RENARD:	Okay. Mine's slightly separate. Just reading this from my perspective overall, yes, this seems like a good thing. They're trying to protect

people. Going to our non-EU RSOs covered by this. Yes, we provide a service within the EU but we also certainly can be considered critical infrastructure. But one could argue that the critical infrastructure being provided is really the RSS, not just a single RSO. We've stated before that one RSO can just completely disappear off the face of the earth and the RSS is fine. In that sense, the critical infrastructure being provided that the EU cares about could be the collection of us versus the individuals. The biggest impact I see it having on most of us certainly outside the EU is just the reporting on security incidents and whatever other documentation we have to provide about continuity of operations, things like that. I think that's going to be somewhat difficult, especially being in the US government and US military sharing our security incidents within 24 hours or whatever levels that that's required. I don't know how other organizations feel about sharing these things and with whatever detail. So those are my thoughts. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much for sharing those, Ken. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I will say my mind I extrapolate from this. Okay, so let's say that EU actually managed to get this settled and have that put in place. Now, how many seconds will it take before other countries and regions was like, "Oh, the EU required them to do that, then we can do that too," and suddenly we have to report to 250 odd places every time we have a security incident. That, and we have to appoint people in various regions and [we have to and we have to ...] It's not only the European

Union, we have to extrapolate and see what will happen from this in the future, and already now we should take the actions that we want to take to drive this in the right direction which I believe is not at all—make it stop. But we need to think in bigger circles than only the European Union. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. Patrik?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yes, let me continue in what Liman said and specifically emphasize what Ken said. I said that I did not think this would impact the root server operators and the way we do. Given what you said, Ken, I've been thinking a little bit and I agree with you. Yes, this might impact our ability to implement diversity by separating RSO from RSS and I think that is one of the fundamental architectural things for how we are, what we believe in the root server system from our perspective. So Ken, I agree with you there. Regarding the formal jurisdiction, all of us organizations are based in one state under one jurisdiction and I hate to say it but from Netnod perspective, we feel that if it is the case that we have a formal legal oversight or whatever, or if for example one of you guys or someone else in the world believed we at Netnod are doing something completely wacky, the formal way of addressing RSSAC Netnod is to go to the Swedish government or the Swedish regulator and the regulator will go to us and do whatever they are forced to do. To believe that we can have any kind of cross-border formal oversight is

something that we at Netnod think is the wrong path forward. Thank you.

KEVAH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Patrik. Since you're here and Russ is next before I have a question which concerns both of you, I wanted to suggest that I know you had that idea but I wanted to suggest to ask you to kindly work with Russ to also share this with SSAC. Share the memo. So first of all, I wanted to check if anyone in RSSAC has any objection to that and second, if that's okay with you and Russ to follow through. Russ, before going to your question, I wanted to clarify this. Does anyone have any objection sharing this with SSAC? I see no hands or comments, so I take that's doable. So I will leave that to you, Patrik and Russ, to do that. Is it okay with you, Patrik?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yes.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Kaveh. That was exactly the question that I was headed towards. If there was any concerns on RSSAC's part with working on this in a relatively joint manner, and certainly, at the earliest feasible time to present it to the SSAC and determine if they want to raise issues and if so, what those issues are. And so as your liaison I'm happy to participate

and do the liaison thing with that. Thanks for agreeing that it's a good thing to have SSAC work on it also. I think it is important to have both bodies involved.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Russ, question for you. You're basically organizing an agenda for a joint meeting between the RSSAC and the SSAC. Is this something that the RSSAC should bring to that meeting?

RUSS MUNDY: Well, as a matter of fact, Fred, I'm glad you asked. There will be an SSAC meeting on the 15th of March. Patrik and I will be in touch with the SSAC leadership to see if we want to discuss it at the 15th March meeting. I hope so, and I think it is a very reasonable thing to have on our joint meeting agenda and all it takes from my perspective is a request from RSSAC and it will be added to the agenda.

FRED BAKER: Well, consider it requested.

RUSS MUNDY: Will do.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. Thank you. So basically to wrap up my closing comments and then I will ask if anyone else has anything to add. Brad, you had your hand raised.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, you can answer this in your closing comments just for everybody's edification. I think there's a clock running on this so if you could share that, that would be helpful.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, thank you very much. Basically, I mean to conclude what was discussed. The memo is basically our—RIPE NCC and Netnod's—understanding of what might be possible coming. Also what might be possible consequences but, of course, this is not legal advice so the idea is please have a look yourself, look at the directive, look at the published documentation. You have to form your own opinion but that's what we believe, that's our shared belief and there is 18th of March is the deadline for that comment round. So if you have comments, please submit before 18th of March. It is a simple process and the comments can be short, but that's good to bring up. Finally, I mean, the thing is to look at this whole thing from different perspective, it is, as Patrik said, about jurisdiction, and this is a new regulator basically [showing weight] in the playfield we were playing. Generally, as long as our norms of operation is stricter than the regulation, generally, there is no problem.

                                    If our norm is to report publicly within 24 hours, this won't be a problem. But if our operational norms are different or if there are multiple regulators coming up with different things left and right, we might have a problem because it might be smaller than our norms. It might be more strict than our established norms. And that would make

it a very complex discussion because these norms have been shaped over the many years of operating RSS and there is no clear process to say, "Yeah, we should change that for all of us." For me, I'm comfortable with any regulator as long as they have wide enough regulation which our norms fit within easily. But if I see they are entering that area, then for me that's a bit concerning. So that's what I have. Patrik, Liman, Marco, any additional comments before we close? Liman, I see your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Brad asked before that the relationship with the current ongoing discussions in the GWG. And if this explodes into a plethora of requests from various sources for information, maybe the secretariat function that we are discussing in the GWG will actually have an extra role to play here to consolidate all of these requests and try to negotiate a common view angle or common set of properties to report and to actually carry out that reporting. But we'll save that as input for the discussions but I just note that that is something that we might want to take into consideration. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: That's right, thank you. Marco?

MARCO [SCHMIDT]:   Yeah. Maybe just to add if you or any one of your colleagues wants to have more information or want to brainstorm a bit more, by all means do reach out to me on a bilateral basis. I'm more than happy to mail or

have a chat further about this on a one-to-one basis with individual operators if needed.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And for whatever reason, I can't raise my hand so consider my hand raised. One thing that I found very irritating, there was a call between the European Commission and ICANN on Friday, and several presentations were made. Most of the presentations were redacted. There were parts of the slides that we could not see. And if they want to communicate with us, redacting part of the information is just irritating. Could I trouble you guys to—and by the way they said, "Fine, contact us as European [inaudible] and we'll send you the slides." Could I ask either Netnod or RIPE NCC to get the unredacted slides and share them with the RSSAC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: [inaudible].

MARCO SCHMIDT: I think that could be somewhere.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. Brad and Liman, if it's an old hand, please remove it, otherwise I will ask you. Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I just wanted to expand on what Liman said. Liman, even the idea of this coming from multiple different countries is a scary thought. I'm curious if it's better to know the devil you know than the devil you don't. Is it something that we should recommend a single regulator? Thinking of the GWG that like ICANN or somebody that defines these regulations and then, I hate to say it, but sets up the agreements between all these different countries to say, "These are the regulations, this is where you have the discussions on the regulations regarding the root type of stuff." I don't know if that's possible but that would alleviate some of this.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Brad. Yeah, and my reaction to that would be good idea but cha-ching. There is a lot of additional money for EU engagement with GWG, but that's a different discussion.

BRAD VERD: No, I'm thinking even the GWG aside, what if it was ICANN that was our [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: Fair enough. Fair enough.

BRAD VERD: That's all.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. Thank you. We will follow up on the Zoom documents, Fred. Since I didn't hear anything from the group on asking the Board, I think that's not on the table anymore which is fine, that was just what I thought. So Andrew, I see you have your hand before I give the floor back to Fred. Please, go ahead.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah, just quickly. I pasted a link to the presentations in the chat and I'm going to work on getting a recording of that session sent to the RSSAC as well. Thanks.

KEVAH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. Then as Marco mentioned, there's also an event set by RIPE NCC. I will definitely share the link as soon as I have it with RSSAC. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Kaveh. I think holding off on a request to the Board is fine but I don't want to have that be totally taken off the table. I think that might well be something that the SSAC might desire to occur and of course, if it is, we would want it to be a joint action of RSSAC and SSAC.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Of course, fair enough. No, I meant for this session and as a result of this discussion. But, of course, in our further collaborations, we might actually decide to do so. Okay, fair enough. Thank you very much. Fred,

back to you. Thanks for your time, everyone. And Marco, I think we will say goodbye to you.

MARCO [SCHMIDT]:   Yes, thank you for inviting me. I'll sign off here. [inaudible].

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Marco. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Thank you, Marco.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Andrew. You have your hand up.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sorry, old hand.

FRED BAKER: Old hand. Okay. Next item on the agenda is our work items. Ken, you've got two of those. You want to comment on those?

KEN RENARD: Sure, thanks, Fred. The two Work Parties are continuing with—we have a core writing group for each and the regular full Work Party met just last week. The local perspective, we're looking to do some more

document cleanup. We're going with three user narratives which are informing an underserved area, not actually making the exact determination. RSO evaluations of new locations and recursive operator wanting to understand the RSS. Those sections about the user narratives are filling out nicely and determining what they need out of such a tool. The next step is just to summarize that stuff and say, "Hey, this is what a tool needs to do." To kind of conclude this, we need some help with the requirements section just by name there as well as the conclusions. I will paste the document links shortly in the chat here for both these work parties.

The Rogue Operator Work Party, again, is also moving along trying to wrap up here. We've got some objective and subjective examples of what rogue behavior would be and trying to describe those things, not to completely 100% defining them. Really, this document is just giving input to a future governance body. We're also looking to clarify, I guess there were some documents that were sent out to the RSSAC Caucus I believe about some guidance for network operators in Russia. Really want to clarify that this document is talking about the IANA RSO and their rogue behavior. We are not going to be talking about anything like what Russia's doing and we're not going to be trying to judge them as rogue or not. That's just outside of our purview. I encourage you to take a look at those documents.

I see Ozan is already posting those. Thank you, Ozan. We are approaching the one-year mark on both of these Work Parties. We may want to request extensions. I don't know if it's Zoom burnout or what, but it's been difficult to get folks to contribute outside of the core few.

But I don't know, is there a procedural way to go about an extension if we need such a thing?

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. I think the procedural way is probably to bring it up at an RSSAC call and suggest that maybe it needs more time. I was about to ask you what you thought your remaining schedule might be, so okay, consider that question asked. What's the game plan?

KEN RENARD: The documents are converging to something that could be a product to propose to the RSSAC. Experience thus far has been that convergence takes a lot longer than we expect so if it could be one or two more months to extend beyond the one-year guideline, is that something reasonable?

FRED BAKER: It seems reasonable to me. Does anybody have an objection to that? Hearing none, go ahead.

KEN RENARD: Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Hi, I just wanted to make sure I understand. Did you mention that you want the document to be clearly outside, I mean to have the Russian initiative outside the scope of that document?

KEN RENARD: Yes, as well as others that fall into similar types of behaviors. Like if somebody's hijacking routes, we don't judge those. I don't think it's any bit of RSSAC's business to judge those. But we do recognize that activities of actors like that could affect the judgement of IANA RSOs and we specifically call that out to say we want to separate that.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. Which means this initiative is impacting the current document. That's my guess.

KEN RENARD: Only to make it explicitly clear exactly what we're doing, yes.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Ken, I take it you're done?

KEN RENARD: Yes.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay. Liman, you want to talk about what you're working on?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Thank you. I have now taken a stab at the principles guiding the operation of the public root server system document that you see in front of you. I've written a bit of introductory text. I have commented on the actual principles and Andrew has graciously helped me to clean up the language a bit, and then there have been a few comments from Ken as well, which are good. This is not yet done but we are I would say past the halfway mark so it should be downhill from here. I would suggest that we give this document one more month and that we set the goal to vote on this document in April. And in order for that to happen, I would like to have some more eyes on it and even if you don't disagree with anything in here, leave a mark somewhere saying, "I had a look at this, this looks good," or send a mail to that effect to the mailing list because there are a few issues where I would like to hear more voices. They are not contentious per se but just to understand which way I should lean and which words I shall choose would be helpful. I suggest that we set deadline and I will now take one from thin air, looking at my own schedule, and I will say if people could… Oh, we have another week. Good.

If people could comment on this document by March 20th, I would be grateful. And I will try to take these comments into consideration and polish the text so that it's ready for voting in time for the next meeting, which I believe is on April 6th, so the document has to be ready on March the 30th.

FRED BAKER: Okay, now let me ask a question. We looked at the RSSAC schedule at ICANN 70 a few minutes ago, and there was one session that wasn't clear that we really needed. We left it there as a placeholder. Would you like to discuss this document during that slot? We could make that the agenda of that slot.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'd be happy to. Just let me see where in time that fits. That's on the 23rd, right? And the time is eastern 1:30, which means it's later here, so it's 7:30 in the evening of the 23rd. Yes, that's an excellent suggestion.

FRED BAKER: Okay, well, let's plan on that then. Ozan, I told you earlier that maybe we would want to let ICANN know that we aren't going to use that session. I guess we're going to use it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Apart from that, are there any questions or comments regarding this? If not, then I say thank you and I'm done with this item.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Ozan, I saw you pick up the link for this. Could you put that in the chat, please?

OZAN SAHIN: Fred, the link to the guiding principles document?

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay, I see it there. It is there. Cool. Okay, next thing on the agenda, the only thing we've got left is comments, reports from various and sundry, one of which is me. I think, actually, a lot of what we've discussed in the last hour is stuff that I would be reporting on, so I'm not sure that I have anything specific to add to that. Brad, do you have anything to bring up?

BRAD VERD: No, I don't. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, let's move on to the ICANN Board. Kaveh, do you have any comments for us?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No. [Briefly related to] basically RSS or RSSAC-related activity that I can report on, I wanted to ask RSSAC if it's okay to share basically the memo that Netnod and RIPE NCC Shared with the ICANN Board so they know. Because all of these four directives are being discussed at the Board, not only because of the root but mostly because of possible effects on registries and registrars and other ICANN operations under oversight of ICANN. So I thought it might be good input to that discussion. So if there is no objection, I will share that memo also with the Board. But of course, only with the Board, so it's not for public view.

Hearing none—

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's okay with me.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Liman.

FRED BAKER: Does anybody have any objections to them sharing that?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay, so I will do that. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, comments from the CSC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. We had our regular meeting on the 15th of February. Again, we [were fed] a report from the PTI which gave 100%, meeting all the SLAs that are in our watchlist.

We talked about the ICANN survey. We had asked the PTI stuff for a drilldown into the responses from specifically CSC members, and that turned out to be a red herring because when they did—and they did report it to us in a good fashion, but we realized after a while that only four of the CSC members responded. So the statistical significance of these numbers is less than fully relevant. So we kind of gave up on that after a while.

We still keep an eye on the IANA functions review team report that we intend to comment once it reaches the Board. We're going to do a thing in synchronization with that, and ICANN staff helps us with that.

We are planning to have a meeting with the Board technical committee at our April meeting, and we also have a chair election ongoing for the chair for the coming year. That's it. Thanks. Any questions? Well, then thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Daniel, you show up on the agenda twice, RZERC and IAB. Do you have any comments for us?

DANIEL MIGAULT: No for both items. Maybe for RSSAC, the only thing I can remind is that there is an election, so the chair is going to be nominated to the next meeting, and then we'll see what happens.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Moving on, Russ, do you have any words from SSAC for us?

RUSS MUNDY: Not much further. Ongoing SSAC activities, but nothing really to share there. There will be a revised agenda, and thanks to Ozan for getting the initial agenda put out earlier for our SSAC/RSSAC joint meeting. Just thinking a little further, the timing for the discussion of the EU documentation or efforts, I'm thinking it would be good to try to fit in

15 or 20 minutes. Would you agree with that, Fred? Is that about the right target to try to fit on the agenda that time?

FRED BAKER: Yeah, it makes sense to me.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. Thank you very much. That's all I had.

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

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I don't think James is with us. He wasn't at the start.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Hi Fred. Not a lot to report. I'll just say—and sort of on behalf of James also—that last month, we had the key signing ceremony which went swimmingly, and they signed keys for three more quarters and sent the first of those back to us. So we're all set in that respect. That's it.

FRED BAKER:	Okay. And we have three people on the GWG. Brad, Hiro, Liman, anything from the GWG?
HIRO HOTTA:	Yes. Just one GWG meeting in February, and not much to report at this time. Actually, a review and discussion on the GWG proposal document has been run. I think there's nothing especially new that should be shared here.
	Yes, one additional thing. As the chair position of GWG, Ted Hardy has been chair during this one year from the beginning of the GWG. Later this month, March, GWG will select chair for the second year. Thank you.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. Question. There is a document being prepared. Is it done from the GWG?
HIRO HOTTA:	Not yet.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. So, is it appropriate for us to see that document?
HIRO HOTTA:	I think it can be seen from the public in some way.

[ANDREW MCCONACHIE:]   Yeah, the document is public.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, could you put a link to it in the chat?

[ANDREW MCCONACHIE:]   I can find it, yeah.

FRED BAKER: Thank you.

[ANDREW MCCONACHIE:]   Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Before you go on, the only thing I'll add—and just to make sure everybody is aware. In the GWG, there's a slight deviation—I don't know if it's a deviation or interpretation or however you want to say it, but the funding is an augment funding. It's basically to—it's not a replacement funding that will be provided to the RSOs. It is more of how to rightsize the ship or what you need to rightsize things versus just a blank check for funding. I just want to make sure people understand that. Maybe Liman or Hiro could expand on that. I see Duane's hand up.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, I was just going to—I pasted the link to the document, and I just wanted to note that as you look through the document, there's still a lot of stuff that's under discussion, a lot of comments that are unresolved. The reason that I feel comfortable making this public is because the GWG's mailing list archive is public and this document link has been mentioned there. So it's still very much a draft and subject to change, but you have the link there now.

FRED BAKER: Okay, great. Thank you. Yeah, I can imagine several of the RSOs being interested in feeding comments back to you guys. Okay, is there anybody else that would like to comment at this point? I don't see any hands. So we'll move on to AOB.

Okay, move on to AOB. Ozan, did you want to talk about that?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Thank you, Fred. This is Ozan with an update on the strategic outlook trend identification sessions that the ICANN Organization has been organizing for a while.

These sessions have been in place even when we had the face-to-face meeting. I remember a collective session for all supporting organizations and advisory committees at ICANN 64 in Kobe. Now that meetings moved to a virtual nature, ICANN Org suggests organizing dedicated session with each supporting organization and advisory committee. During these sessions, the idea is to collect feedback from the ICANN

community on various areas that will help the ICANN community, ICANN Board and ICANN Org update its strategic plan, and these sessions are not recorded. It's really a brainstorming session where participants will be put on the breakout rooms and talk about some of the areas, including security, ICANN's governance, unique identifier system, geopolitics, financials and ICANN Org's operational excellence.

Of course, not all of these areas need to be addressed during the sessions, but the RSSAC admin committee thought RSSAC members could provide valuable input to the process, and the organizing ICANN faction will be sharing this briefing paper with the RSSAC, but I've been in touch with the organizing function to find a good time slot for the session, and I just wanted to provide this brief introduction to this session. So the calendar invitations to you do not come as a surprise.

If you have any questions at this point, I'm happy to answer, but please expect some calendar invitations from me. And the suggested time that I found was 14:00 UTC on 16th of March, Tuesday, 14:00 UTC is what we use for the RSSAC meetings. So I will hand it back over to you, Fred, for any discussions on that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does anybody have any comments? Okay, yeah, I will be very interested to know the timing of that session.

OZAN SAHIN: So Fred, if there are no objections, we will proceed with Tuesday 16th of March 14:00 UTC, and the session will be for 90 minutes.

FRED BAKER: That sounds good to me. Okay, going back to the agenda, I think we're actually done. Am I correct in that?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Fred. So maybe you see the next meeting timing here, which is not the first Tuesday of April. This is because, again, what we secured for ICANN 70 for the RSSAC meeting. But again, the RSSAC admin team will discuss, and it looks like this slot will be a good time to discuss the guiding principles document. So we can still put it in an RSSAC meeting format or make a dedicated [inaudible] session.

FRED BAKER: Well, no, let's make that a work session. I think as far as having this meeting in April, I think we should go with our usual time, which would be in April, I believe. Okay, if nobody else has anything to bring up, we're at the adjournment point, so anybody have anything that they would like to discuss? I don't see any hands, I don't hear anything, so we'll consider this meeting adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]