

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you, Ozan. Hello, good morning, good evening, wherever you are. I guess this is the agenda this morning. Does anybody have any adjustments they want to make to that? Failing that, let's go into the roll call.

Cogent, Paul or Brad, are you here? DISA?

KEVIN WRIGHT: This is Kevin Wright.

FRED BAKER: Hi, Kevin. Okay, ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ISC, I'm here, Jeff is here. NASA, Barbara and Tom, are you here?

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Barbara is here.

TOM MIGLIN: Tom is here.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. Netnod? RIPE NCC?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh is here.

FRED BAKER: UMD?

KARL REUSS: Karl is here.

FRED BAKER: USC ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

---

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here as well.

WES HARDAKER: I see Suzanne on the list too. Sorry, I didn't mention her. I hadn't looked at the participant list.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yes. I'm here.

FRED BAKER: WIDE? Hiro, are you here?

HIRO HOTTA: Yeah. Hiro is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liaison to the Board, Kaveh, are you here? I thought I saw your name on the list.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. CSC, Liman, are you here? RZERC, Daniel Migault?

---

DANIEL MIGAULT:                    Yeah, I'm here.

FRED BAKER:                        And you're also RZERC as well. I'm sorry, IAB as well. And SSAC? Russ, are you here?

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

FRED BAKER:                        Okay. IANA Functions Operator?

OZAN SAHIN:                         Hi, Fred. This is Ozan. We received regrets from James Mitchell for this meeting.

FRED BAKER:                        Okay. Root Zone Maintainer?

DUANE WESSELS:                    Yes. Duane is here.

FRED BAKER:                        Okay. And we have with us Paul Hoffman is going to talk about some of the work he's been doing. And as an observer, we have Andy Kimble here.

---

Okay. Next on the agenda—we have the usual agenda and you can read it. I asked if there were any comments on it. Are there any comments on it? If not, let's move on.

The draft minutes were sent out. You should have received them. Does anybody have any adjustments they need to make to the minutes? Okay. Does anybody oppose to the minutes? Is anybody abstaining? If there's no dissention and no abstention, then we've accepted the minutes. Jeff, do you want to talk about the caucus membership?

JEFF OSBORN:

Sure. We're continuing in the hiatus from asking caucus members to either show up and perform additional duties or leave for a year. But we thought under the conditions of the pandemic, that made sense.

We had one member, though, Casey Deccio, who's a professor in computer science at Brigham Young, who volunteered to leave because he didn't expect he was going to have the time to do things. So that's about it. One person out and not a whole lot of movement. Ozan, I believe, is speaking on the Caucus Member Recognition Proposal.

FRED BAKER:

Ozan, do you want to talk about that?

OZAN SAHIN:

Sure. Thank you, Fred. Thank you, Jeff. Hi, everyone. I'd like to introduce a proposal today that has been developed for RSSAC's review and feedback by staff, working with the RSSAC Admin Committee and the

---

RSSAC Membership Committee. So let me make this proposal bigger for you.

It is called the RSSAC Caucus Member Recognition Proposal. I circulated the link to this proposal a week ago when I circulated the agenda for this meeting. There are some reasons that had made us work on this proposal. One, there are substantial contributors in the RSSAC Caucus who go above and beyond and devote significant amount of volunteer time to the RSSAC Caucus work.

Secondly, there are three ICANN Committee recognition programs available to ICANN Committee at the moment and these programs are provided in this proposal in the last appendix section. The scope of this programs often fail to recognize the internal hard work of the committee members, and this is why the Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees have their internal additional recognition elements to recognize their own members.

So just as an example, the ICANN Community Excellence Award is focused on the multistakeholder model and working with other committees and other community groups. There's another program, Tarek Kamel Award for Capacity Building. This one is focused on regional or global capacity building efforts. There's also a Committee Leader Recognition Program in which all committee leaders who have completed a term of service are recognized in the Annual General Meeting of ICANN.

But there have been a few cases where RSSAC members or RSSAC Caucus members were recognized through these programs. For

---

instance, Hiro Hotta was recognized in 2017 in the ICANN Community Excellence Award. The award was renamed in 2020. It used to be called ICANN Multistakeholder Ethos Award in the past, when Hiro was recognized. And then last year, Ramanou Biaou, an RSSAC Caucus member, was recognized in the Tarek Kamel Award for Capacity Building. Again, the reason these programs, their scope often fail to recognize the hard work of RSSAC Caucus members.

Lastly, the RSSAC Admin Committee had committed to recognize the contributions of the RSSAC Caucus members last year when it addressed the proposal from an RSSAC Caucus member in July 2020 and shared it on the RSSAC mailing list. Also, this commitment contributed to the development of this proposal.

Let me actually go ahead and share the link so that if you'd like to go through the document and review it yourself, you can do that. So I just pasted the link in the chat.

On this proposal, we suggested that one RSSAC Caucus member would be selected by the RSSAC annually for this recognition. There's some considerations that have been suggested for RSSAC when selecting the RSSAC Caucus members for this recognition such as the material contributions to RSSAC Caucus publications, leadership roles in the RSSAC Caucus work parties, attendance at RSSAC Caucus work party meetings, and also RSSAC Caucus meetings, any outgoing representative or liaison roles served, and additional contributions to RSSAC Caucus work.

---

Also, some recognition elements were suggested in this proposal such as the formal acknowledgment in the relevant RSSAC meeting's minutes. For instance, if RSSAC wants to recognize an RSSAC Caucus member towards the end of the year in that meeting's minutes when this caucus member is selected, there can be a formal acknowledgment in the minutes, and then present additional physical award like a glass award to the recipient or shipment of an award in current conditions. And acknowledgment in a dedicated webpage of the past recipients in the RSSAC Caucus workspace. If we take the example of ICANN Committee Excellence Award, it would look like photos with the award in the dedicated webpage.

So this is the proposal. We appreciate your review and feedback either on this call or after the call when you review this document. There are a few questions still we particularly seek your feedback on. For instance, one question could be should the RSSAC Caucus members be evaluated based on their lifetime contributions to RSSAC Caucus work or will they be evaluated based on just the past year. This proposal was written with the assumption that they would be recognized based on the contributions within just the past year but your feedback may be valuable on that. Also, with respect to the eligibility of an RSSAC Caucus member after receiving this award, should they be disqualified from receiving it a second time or disqualified from receiving it a second time for a certain period of time? These are the points that have been discussed so far. Any other feedback that you may provide will be helpful. I'll stop here to see if you have any questions or comments on that. Thank you.



---

FRED BAKER: Ozan, I have a question for you. Are you asking us to have a vote on this this morning? Or would you like to have e-mail discussion?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. I don't think RSSAC will need to ever have a formal vote on this. I think a general consensus to accept this proposal would be enough to implement it, such as what we did with the RSSAC Caucus travel support guidelines. When RSSAC put it to implementation phase, we didn't include it in the RSSAC Operations document but we just started implementing it. So if there's a general agreement in the RSSAC that this proposal should be followed, then we can start implementing it without requiring a formal vote.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Then I'll ask for that feedback when it comes time for me to make some comments. Liman, you have your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I do. Sorry to be late to the meeting. I have two more questions that I would like to add to the ones that Ozan mentioned here. One is, are ICANN staff members eligible for this? Because we have a couple of staff members who are also a member of the caucus. And also, are RSSAC Committee members eligible for this? Just so we all understand that and don't run into conundrums later on.

As to voting, I think we should have a formal vote on this, not because it's formally needed or something like that, but it sends a signal to the rest of the community that this is something that we want to do, it's

---

something that we undertake and we had made the formal decision to start doing this. I agree that it doesn't need to go into process document, at least not at once. We can do that at the next round of updates to that document. But I think a vote would send the right signal. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Well, as I said, we'll discuss that later on in the meeting when I have an opportunity to make some comments. Having put this forward and I put the link out, we'll move ahead with the agenda. Ozan? Okay.

Ozan, do you want to talk about the NomCom election package?

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Fred. Sure. Recently, the RSSAC Admin Committee heard from NomCom support staff that Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees who appoint members to NomCom would be asked to provide their names for the 2022 NomCom composition by mid-June. That's why we started the nomination process on the RSSAC Caucus mailing list last week. It's going to be a one-month nomination period, and then the RSSAC will be able to vote on the nominees in its June meeting. So we will be able to submit the names to NomCom for the next year's NomCom. So that's just the informal explanation on this process, if you have missed the communication on the RSSAC Caucus mailing list. That's the end of my update.

---

FRED BAKER: I said okay and my computer said, “You’re muted.” Let’s look at the proposed draft schedule, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. ICANN71 will be taking place from June 14 through June 17 and will be conducted virtually again. It’s a four-day meeting. The time zone for this meeting will be—actually, the schedule will be developed based on the original location of the meeting which is The Hague in the Netherlands. So the business hours for The Hague will be at the core of the schedule, from 9:00 AM until 5:30 PM.

After discussing this in the RSSAC Admin team and reaching out to various RSSAC Caucus work party leaders, the RSSAC Admin team identified one session which RSSAC could have as work session in this meeting for the Local Perspective Tool Work Party meeting. We picked block 5, which we thought could work for most of the RSSAC in the schedule. Since Day 1 would conflict with the Tech Day, we reserved Day 2 block 5.

There are two additional meetings around ICANN71 that RSSAC Admin team thought we would organize for the RSSAC but off the schedule. So these are the RSSAC Joint Meeting with the RSS GWG and working with the RSS GWG support staff. This meeting can be conducted in the regular time slot of the RSS GWG in conjunction with the ICANN71 week which is Thursday, 17 June at 22:00 UTC.

Also, again working with the SSAC support staff and the SSAC liaison to the RSSAC, Russ, we identified again a time on Monday, 21 June at 19:00 UTC for a Closed Joint Meeting with the SSAC.

---

So, if you have any comments on these, I'll be glad to hear. Otherwise, I will start circulating calendar invitations for these sessions. I have one more topic to discuss regarding ICANN71 but I'll pause here to see if there are any comments. I see Liman's hand is up but I don't know if this is a new one.

FRED BAKER: I don't see any hands up so go ahead.

OZAN SAHIN: If there are no comments, then the other thing that I wanted to flag for ICANN71 is the plenary session topics. As you see on the block schedule, there are three plenary session slots. The Planning Team, the relevant ICANN Org team working with SO and AC leaderships are currently planning for three plenary sessions. Fred circulated the topics for these sessions on Friday.

There are currently four categories for the proposed topics and so far I've seen only one comment from Paul Vixie on these topics. I think he thought the first topic, which is the Governmental Regulatory Developments, would be picked and I think he supported that. This topic is actually a carryover from ICANN70. It was planned to be conducted at ICANN70 but it has been deferred.

Some of the topics have been consolidated because their coverage were similar—ICANN's multistakeholder model. Also breaking logjams meeting, functional and productive ICANN, and the role of ICANN in the wider Internet governance arena, and then how the DNS can evolve to

---

meet the needs and aspirations of the global community of 2025. These topics came from different community groups, for instance, ALAC, GNSO Registrar Stakeholder Group, the GAC. They were consolidated in this category. Then the third category is WHOIS registrant experiences consolidated with the understanding the reputation block list providers. And the last one is the future of ICANN meetings after COVID-19 pandemic.

I'll drop the link to this list in the chat, if you'd like to review it. I will again stop if you have any comments on whether or not to support any of the topics. If you do, please share it during this call or on the mailing list today because the leadership has been asked to provide feedback, if any, by tomorrow. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER:

Thanks, Ozan. This is Wes. Can I get, I guess, a statement of purpose to some extent of the goal of these plenary sessions to educate the broader ICANN community toward particular topics that we think are less understood. I mean, the target audience is what I'm looking for. I recognize these all of ICANN but is there a fundamental goal that these plenary sessions are trying to get at?

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Wes. I think what ICANN is trying to do here is to create unconflicted sessions on the schedule, as broad participation as possible to allow discussion between different committees, between different perspectives on the topic. In most of the plenary topics, you would have

---

panelists from different groups providing different perspectives. That's my understanding.

WES HARDAKER: That makes sense. So then it's actually almost best to pick topics that need a broader sense of engagement between multiple organizations with a better understanding across all of the communities. Sounds reasonable. Thank you, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: Sure.

FRED BAKER: I shared this list the other day one Sunday afternoon. I got two replies, one of which was Paul Vixie's in which he said he didn't really expect to influence things because he was kind of talking on different topics. I got privately a note from Jeff Osborn. Any additional comments would be of interest.

Ozan, did you say that this was going to be discussed in a meeting on Wednesday?

OZAN SAHIN: ICANN is currently collecting feedback from SO/AC leaderships on any preferred topics. They have provided a link to provide that feedback to the Planning Committee, and the deadline to provide this feedback from the SO/ACs to the Planning Committee is tomorrow.

FRED BAKER: It's tomorrow? Okay.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. So if there's any opinions, we'll summarize this back to the Planning Committee tomorrow. I actually forwarded Jeff's comment to Tanzania yesterday because I had the idea that the meeting was yesterday.

Okay. So where do we stand? Okay. That's the draft schedule. Does anybody have comments on that schedule?

Now, I had mentioned this to Ken and to Liman that we could schedule times for their work sessions during the meeting. Liman replied that he didn't really need the time or he didn't expect to be able to use the time so we got a slot for Ken's two work parties. That's what he asked for. He wasn't sure which work party would use it but there's a slot there. I have a sense that we're actually going to finish that work and take a vote during the June meeting. So that may be OBE. But if there's other things that we need to discuss, I'm open to that and people can comment on that.

Let's move ahead. It's here. Work items. Ken, do you want to talk about your two work parties?

KEN RENARD: Sure. Thanks, Fred. The two work parties—the Rouge Operator Work Party has kind of gone through round one of RSSAC Caucus review. There’s a little bit of work for the writing team to do which meets next week. I expect that the next full work party meeting will just be a formality and then finish up that review.

The Local Perspective Tool is coming up on its first RSSAC Caucus review. So again the co-writing team will be next week and implement the edits that we talked about in the last meeting, then sort of sent out that document out to the caucus for review. And then hopefully the following month, that could be at the ICANN meeting or even before it could be ready to pass on to the RSSAC for voting. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Thank you, Ken. Liman, do you want to get in here?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sure. Regarding the Principles document, we’ve had a couple of editing sessions which have been very successful, I’d say, mostly because we’ve been able to cut out a certain amount of text, which is always good. Less is more. And we are now, if I remember correctly, at a position where there are a few editing passes that need to happen and they are sitting in my lap. I think we’ve agreed on the content and the plan going forward is that I fix it up so that it’s presentable, and then we do a last round of the e-mail list for the caucus, and after that we send it to this



---

group for approval or not, as thick it may be. So that's the way forward. I hope to be able to have this done in time for the June meeting. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. We have with us Paul Hoffman, who's been doing a prototype of the RSSAC047 metric measurements. Paul, would you like to talk about your prototype?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

Sure. Hi, this is Paul Hoffman. In the spirit of it being an informal prototype so we could figure out what are problems and such like that, I've been working on it a bit in the background. The current status is I think that it is reasonably code complete but I am not sure because we're getting a bunch of errors.

So one of the things that has come up in this—and as a reminder, we use 20 vantage points to collect data from all 13 of the root server identifiers—we're getting excessive timeouts on v6, mostly on UDP but not exclusively on UDP, to the point where with some of the measurements that we're doing with the numbers we're getting, if this were in today—remember we went with a pass/fail. Some folks would be failing and it's very clearly failing due to the measurement platform, not due to them having v6 on some of their instances turned off and such like that. So this may be due to the fact that we're using dig. Dig may be doing its own route checking internally before sending out queries or something weird like that. It's very hard to tell looking in the dig source code. And moving forward, there might be a decision to say,

---

“Well, let’s try a different way of sending the queries from the vantage points.”

But where we are now is that it’s pretty clear looking at the actual results that the failures are likely not due to actual failures on the part of the root server operators. It’s possible that some of all are turning off v6 part of the time but that seems extremely unlikely. Also, just to be clear, this is not happening just on a couple of root server operators, it’s happening across them. And it’s not happening on just one or two of the vantage points, it is happening sporadically across them. Again, this may be a problem with dig being a little bit funny or it may be a problem with v6.

Second part of what’s happened—and Duane is familiar with this because I keep bugging him when I find things—is in developing the toolkit, I found some issues with RSSAC047 itself like, “What did we mean here?” or “Wow, this part of the measurements is either underspecified or overspecified.” What I have done so far is I made a markdown equivalent of RSSAC047, which in that document, which you can look at in, anything that displays markdown or I could print a PDF, it actually has little markers that indicate everything that RSSAC047 is doing that somebody would want to see in an implementation. And I put the same marker in my implementations. So if you get an error, you can see where in RSSAC047 that error came from. But I’ve also now been keeping comments there about, “Hmm, maybe we want to fix this.” So that’s ongoing. I think that that’s pretty much almost the top of stack now. That’s ongoing.

---

The next major task is to be adding, monitoring, and alerting. So right now if one of my vantage points fell over, I wouldn't know other than like later when I looked and the data was all wrong. I'm not really excited to do that because whoever is going to be implementing this for real for the things that will come out of the GWG are going to have their own favorite monitoring and alerting systems, and so spending a bunch of time doing that now isn't that interesting to me. But, again, it's an open-source project so if there are people who have a favorite one who want to throw that in, I'd be happy to pick any of them. In specific, ICANN on its internal uses Zabbix, which I hate. And so if someone has one they're like, "Yeah, I love monitoring and alerting. I love Prometheus," whatever, and wants to spend 5 or 10 hours working on that, I'd be happy to roll it in. I'm not against it. I just haven't wanted to spend 48 hours learning something that will probably get thrown away later by whoever's favorite.

Going forwards, at least from what I've discovered now, we might want to either investigate other things to use for the probes instead of dig or just leave it alone and say, "Yeah, we're going to get a bunch of timeouts, who knows." We might do a minor update on RSSAC047 with some of the things that I found. I don't think we want to do the major update where it says, "Do these numbers." As we've been looking through RSSAC047 both here and, you know, people started looking in the GWG a bit but do these thresholds make any sense especially thresholds for the RSS? Those were big things that we totally got bogged down on in that last workshop that created 047.

I haven't seen people interested in doing again, although we still have these funny numbers. But we could at least do maybe a minor update

---

on 047 for some of the things I've found and maybe other people have new ideas, I don't know. I'm not spending a whole lot of time on this right now just because I'm shifting my focus. As you all know, RZERC pretty much said, "Hey, please do RSSAC028 again but do it for real," which is the naming of the root zone identifiers. So that's going to take a lot of wind up and such. So I haven't been focusing a lot on 047. It didn't seem like there's a lot of interest from RSSAC either other than to know that it was happening. So I'm open. If RSSAC makes a specific request on something, I can certainly try to get it back into my schedule and such. But that's where I'm at. I'm totally open to questions.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. There's a question in the chat. Daniel would like to know where you might look for the code.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

Sure. I'll paste that. That's been open all the time. When I first finished the implementation, I sent a couple of messages to the caucus mailing list. It's in a big GitHub repo. By the way, that GitHub repo also includes the sort of the running commentary that I've been doing in 047 in the markdown. So I'll try to pay attention to questions here. So, Daniel, I'll send that to the caucus mailing list again later.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Does anybody else have comments?

---

PAUL HOFFMAN: I see a bunch of hands. I don't know. Am I supposed to do hands or do you do hands?

FRED BAKER: Well, I'll do the hands. Karl?

KARL REUSS: Thanks. I was wondering what you're using for vantage points, in particular the network providers.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Good question. I'm using a bunch of different ones. 047 said that we had to be across the five regions and such. I will totally admit that I have vastly undershot on both Africa and South America because it's virtually impossible to find reliable virtual machine folks in either continent. I think I ended up falling back to just using Amazon in both of those. We had a couple of vantage points in some small ISPs in Africa and it turned out that they were totally flaky. We had one or two in Latin America, same problem. One of them I couldn't get an operating system that was less than four years old, things like that. So right now we still have the 20 vantage points but they are, of course, splayed across the north.

I'm pretty much using any commercial operator that I can so that we do have as many different networks as possible. So, for example, I'm using OVH. It turned out I wasn't using the OVH that burnt down, but they also have vantage points somewhere else in Europe so I'm using them for that. And I'd be happy if I discovered new ones who seem independent. It turns out that many VM providers who look

---

independent in fact are just remarketing things from Google Cloud or whatever. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm also not using Microsoft for Azure because their prices were astronomical and their service wasn't any good.

But I've got seven or eight. I don't have that documented yet in the repo. I'm going to leave myself a note, not to say exactly which ones but I will list them all and I'd be happy to add more if people say, "You didn't think of this." But I've got—I'm thinking just off the top of my head—Hetzner, OVH, like I said, Google, Amazon. Certainly, Linode and DigitalOcean. There's probably one or two other small ones who are reliable enough.

KARL REUSS: All right. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: A question for you: are you planning to discuss this on the caucus list? We might have a number of people from Africa that could help you or could chime in.

PAUL HOFFMAN: I would be happy to. I probably don't want to speak about it because a lot of times—I mean, I certainly did plenty of research. In our group at OCTO, we actually have two people from technical engagement in Africa, one on the east side and one on the west. We scoured and the one or two organizations that were there doing VMs, not reliable. VM would disappear, billing would disappear, and things like that.

---

It turns out in Africa particularly, you've got everything in South Africa, you've got one or two in Nairobi, and that's about all. It's sort of surprising. Unfortunately, that's true for the big providers like Google and Amazon as well is that they focus just on that.

Basically, for Latin America, if it's not São Paulo, it's not there. I'm sorry, if it's not São Paulo or Mexico City. It turns out Mexico City—I suspect with more work, I can find a VM provider there but I was told that all of them, everyone in Mexico City basically doesn't interconnect with each other. They all interconnect with Texas. So it wouldn't be much of an advantage over the fact that we also have a vantage point in Texas, that whatever we got in Latin America would actually look like that it was in Texas.

FRED BAKER:

That's lovely.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

Yeah. I was surprised about that. So, Fred, going back to your question, do I want to bring this up in the caucus? I can. I don't really want to point this out because I think it's a sad thing for the entire southern continents minus Australia, where we do have one in Australia. But yeah, if any of you, since you are operators, have looked into this for your own reasons, I would love to hear what you have found out about this. Because even a moderately stable ISP who will rent VMs, I'd be totally happy to try and support them. Again, some of the European ones are quite small. Hetzner only has two or three data centers and we're using the ones outside of the normal places.

KARL REUSS: I think VMs may not be the best approach everywhere. Some places may just work better with boxes in data centers.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Karl, I think you're right. The problem in Africa with that is that they won't let you rent boxes if you are not a local company, whereas they will rent you a VM. One of the ISPs, who I also thought was a little bit flaky about their VMs, I they are probably more stable on the other one on actually getting a box. Like there's no way that they were allowed to do this legally. And you'd be surprised, even for some of these normal VMs, I had to send a copy of my passport to prove that I was real and such like that before they would set up a VM. It's sort of an interesting challenge, but if it's a challenge that some of you have already overcome and I can talk to your folks, I'd be interested.

Again, Fred, going back to your question, I don't think this is a great topic for the caucus but it might be for some of you root ops-y folks.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. I brought up the caucus basically because we have a number of African participants there.

PAUL HOFFMAN: I think that even in just in OCTO staff, we're fairly well covered on that. And the same is true for South America, quite frankly. They all just laughed and said, "No, don't bother."



FRED BAKER: Okay. You might want to talk with LACNIC and see if they have any viewpoints.

PAUL HOFFMAN: I already did that.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

PAUL HOFFMAN: And what they said was, São Paulo. Basically, that was it. There was a chance that there was one getting set up in Chile and it never happened.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, Duane, you wanted to get a word in.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Thanks. One question, one comment for you, Paul. As you said, you and I have talked on and off about this a little bit. I believe you told me at one point that you were not able to do the DNSSEC validation part. So if you could say more about that.

PAUL HOFFMAN: I'm sorry, we forgot about that. Thank you, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS:                   What about access to the data?

PAUL HOFFMAN:                   Two good questions. Currently, I am not doing DNSSEC validation because I've only come across one sort of stand-alone tool that would do it and it doesn't do it reliably. On the other hand, since we're not getting reliable v6, maybe I should turn it on anyways. Right now, as you can see, if you look in the code, there is DNSSEC validation fully coded out in the main analyzed the correctness parts but it stubbed out. So it was there, I was using the get DNS validate command to do it but it gets spurious errors that I can't figure out and that's not like a supported tool from NLnet Labs. I'm happy to look at if people have DNSSEC validation tools. Again, the situation we're in is I want to validate this set of RRsets and here is the root zone that I am validating against. So we know the keys, we follow them day by day. If those appear, that would be great. I can wind them in. That would be actually very easy to wind in. I've got the code. But right now, it's just stubbed out. And because I'm talking this way, I'm totally spaced. Duane, what was your second question?

DUANE WESSELS:                   The access to the data.

PAUL HOFFMAN:                   Oh yeah. ICANN make that available. It's all in Postgres databases now. I'm sort of keeping them up to date by hand. I am pulling automatically from all the vantage points but I'm not getting them all the way to the

---

---

box. But I'm up through at least the end of April at this point. But I can do a Postgres dump of the data for people to look at. I'm using very simple schemas and such. If anyone is interested in that, let me know. Duane, I assume you're interested. So I can do that. In the database there's basically derived data for each query plus the AMO that came out of bind itself with the full answer. And that's still for every record. So it gets a bit big but it's easy to move those around.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you very much.

PAUL HOFFMAN: If people want this put regularly in a specific place, we could do that. But I remember during the workshop people were like, "No, we should not have that generally, publicly available. It could be embarrassing to us." But it had to be available so I can easily make it available to anybody. If you want me to post process it from Postgres into something else, I'm sure I can dump it into tab-delimited. But given that one of the fields—and probably the field that people are most interested in—is a hairy bunch of text with carriage returns and tabs in it, it might be better just to leave it as a Postgres database.

FRED BAKER: Liman, did you want to say something?

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Yes. First, a comment on the African, South American problem. Yes, that matches our Netnod experience as well. It seems to me that they haven't really gone through the metamorphosis of going from regulator-based things to market-based things. So the regulators are still very much on top of everything in many African countries. On top of that, they have lacking international connectivity between the various nations. So there is very little bandwidth going between the various nations, which makes it even more complicated or be useful to do measurements there. Still we want to do it, I suppose. So it's just that we have to live with the facts. By the way, thank you, Paul, for doing all this work.

My second comment is that regarding the document itself, you said you had ran to sudden odd corners that needed fixing and some of them were slightly bigger issues. I suggest that since we now know about some things that need to be fixed that we do what Paul suggested, a small overhaul of the document and fix the small issues that we can't fix easily and the remaining ones be put in a chapter at the end saying, "These are known deficiencies with this document but they are too big to tackle at this point in time." So that people who read the document at least know that we are aware of these problems. Thanks.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

That sounds fine with me. I don't know how you all in RSSAC want to do that but I think that doing an appendix of now that we've thought about this—and really the bigger issues are all with the thresholds. Like we sort of picked a bunch of them out of thin air and such like that, and we can say that. I think that that's an okay thing to say so that whoever

---

becomes the delegation removal function knows that they've got even harder work to do.

One thing I just noticed as you were speaking, Liman, about Africa—and again, thanks—one possible issue but I don't think it's big is that, like I said, basically for Africa we've only got Cape Town and for South America, we only have São Paulo. I have both of those on Amazon web services. I could change one of them to Google. But I think once you're a thousand miles away that any network efficiency sort of fall off completely.

Just as a note on outside of Africa—and I'll try to write this up and put this in the repo just as an informal note that could change over time—but I made an effort, like when picking once in the United States and in Europe, trying to pick ones in locations that weren't where everyone was. So, for example, I picked one in Ohio for the United States. Like we had to be in the Amsterdam because some of them were only in the Amsterdam but we also have one in, for example, Helsinki. So that gives a little bit of the further away. The OVH one we have is in Warsaw. In fact, there's another OVH one in Montreal. So we at least have some variety among what turns out to be for VMs a rampant lack of variety if you want to go past like four places. That's it for me.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you very much.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

Liman, do you still have your hand up?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No. Sorry, old hand.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Okay. Great.

FRED BAKER: So for United States, places I find myself wondering about territories—Puerto Rico, Guam, that kind of thing.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Nope. None, unfortunately. I certainly was hoping for that, especially because some of those I could even smudge into other regions because it's by regions, not at all. Not at all. The lack of variety was very disappointing in this. Having said that, like I found one South Carolina, great.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. South Carolina probably has reasonably good connectivity. Okay. Do you have any more that you wanted to talk about?

PAUL HOFFMAN: No. Let me know if you all take Liman up on doing the 47bis because I certainly can be helping with leading that or whatever. Once I post the link again to the GitHub repo, the document is right there so you can see immediately what the small ones that we're talking about are.

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, so going back to the draft schedule for ICANN71, I can imagine scheduling as such and to talk about that work if people are interested in that. We would probably do that on the third day, Wednesday. Yeah, probably block 5 on Wednesday. Okay. Thank you, Paul. Thank you very much.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Sure.

FRED BAKER: What we have left is one list of reports. Frankly, from the chair's perspective, I don't have a whole lot to report. I said that we would talk about the Member Recognition Proposal at this point. Has anybody taken the time, while we were talking, to glance through that proposal? So I'm guessing not really very many people. That seems like something that people would like the RSSAC to do to recognize caucus participation. Ken?

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Fred. I just put a comment in the document. The caucus and work parties seem to be the same usual suspects. I was trying to think of what could we do to get those quiet folks that are contributing a little bit get them recognized and encouraged. So I said in the document what about an honorable mention type thing? It doesn't have to be the formal everything that the other piece already is but just something to get a broader audience engaged. Thanks.

---

FRED BAKER: That sounds interesting. One thing that I would like to not happen would be, "Okay, you've got an honorable mention. Therefore, we'll ignore you for the next three years."

KEN RENARD: True.

FRED BAKER: Liman, did you have a comment?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I would just like add my support for doing this. Whatever we can do to spark a bit of participation from the RSSAC Caucus is worth doing. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. It was suggested earlier that we really should have a formal vote because it becomes a visible way to say that we're thinking about this. What I'm going to do, I think it's not fair to have a vote today because, frankly, I don't think many of us have read through the proposal or have much of a comment. But Ozan, you would describe this as a stable draft at this point, correct?



---

OZAN SAHIN: No, I wouldn't Fred. I think this is the first time we introduced this proposal to RSSAC. I think RSSAC members can provide their comments, feedback, and then we'll see if it would be ready for a vote in the next RSSAC meeting or not.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Let me ask people to read this and comment to the list on it as they see fit. Steve?

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Fred. I think Liman raised that good question earlier on whether this would exclude current RSSAC members or ICANN staff members who are part of the caucus. The proposal as it's currently written does not exclude either at the ICANN staff or current RSSAC members. I think it will be useful to get some input from the RSSAC specifically on those questions. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I'll just leave those open questions for the thread, whatever it is. With that then I'll set this aside. Who do we have next for report? Kaveh, do you do have a comment from the ICANN Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No discussion related to RSS. Just maybe noteworthy that we had the Board workshop in the weekend for three days. But items and agenda were mostly basically going through what the Board is dealing with the

---

different reviews and also different constituencies, including GAC. But there was no RSS or RSSAC stuff on the agenda.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Brad, I neglected to ask you if you had comments. Do you want to say anything?

BRAD VERD: No. I think you've covered everything. So I'm good. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just briefly from the Customer Standing Committee, we had our normal monthly meeting in the middle of the month, as we usually do, but this time we had invited the Board Technical Committee. We usually have a meeting with them once a year, just to touch base and exchange information.

It wasn't spectacular. I did the recount of what's been going on in the CSC and we exchanged pleasantries. We had on our plate to look through the SLAs with the PTI and we've come across a situation where the allowed delays are sometimes measured in just days. And if you read the document surrounding that, it's supposed to be interpreted as calendar days in every case. And it turns out, when you have a timeout

---

of three days and it happens in conjunction with a major holiday, it can run into problems.

But after going over that back and forth, and also talking with the people who created the SLA back in the day and with the PTI at length, we realized that nowadays it's actually not a problem, we can drop this off our plate. So we did. We will not be making any changes there. This is always good. You can say that at least. Things are good as they are.

There's the final thing, we will be sending in support for the IANA Functions Review Team Report, which is now published and has been submitted to the ICANN Board. End of report.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you. Daniel, do you have comments?

DANIEL MIGAULT:

I have no brief feedbacks from IAB except that I'm going to report ... Since Paul is here, I'm going to report the update of the platform. Because monitoring connectivity and the state of the network is some things that the IAB is considering for future workshop.

Regarding RZERC, what happened during the last meeting, we basically addressed the comments we've received from the Board on the recommendation regarding signing the root zone name servers. I mean, the clarification were very technical, which was a little bit surprising, given the intent of the document. So that's something we're working on with the Board.

---

Another question was raised, whether someone from OCTO should be more permanent represented in RZERC. I'm happy to take any feedbacks regarding that aspect. I think that's all for RZERC. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Did the IAB have any comments? I'm sorry, go ahead.

BRAD VERD: I was going to say I have a question. The OCTO represented RZERC, is that a liaison position? A voting position? What is that?

DANIEL MIGAULT: It has been just raised on the table. It has not been discussed yet. Everything is open; it could be a voting member or just a liaison. That's a sort of—

BRAD VERD: Can you let us know how the discussion goes before it comes to a vote?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. Sure.

FRED BAKER: Liman?

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would also like to know what caused this discussion? What's the seed that prompted this? You don't have to respond here and now but that's something I would like to know.

DANIEL MIGAULT: It has just been brought during the last RZERC meeting. So I haven't seen any seeds since I am attending the RZERC.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Duane, you have your hand up?

DUANE WESSELS: Daniel, can I provide a little bit of background on this as well? Is that all right?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Sure.

DUANE WESSELS: In case anyone doesn't know, I'm the former chair of RZERC. I'm no longer the chair. But the discussion that Daniel is talking about is—so when RZERC was initially formed four plus years ago, there was a suggestion that ICANN OCTO have folks—not voting members, not liaisons, but just sort of participating and observing the RZERC meetings. That suggestion was not accepted, and so there has not been persons from OCTO participating in the RZERC meetings since that time.

---

The discussion recently was that there have been some items that came to RZERC where some people felt that may have been beneficial to have OCTO staff present during the meetings for their input. And as Daniel mentioned, one of the things that we're working on now is the document RZERC002, which relates to RSSAC028. Paul mentioned also the work about studying the names for the root servers. This work that's probably going to fall to OCTO and we discussed that it might be helpful to have them participate in some of the meetings as observers. So that's the background on that.

DANIEL MIGAULT: With that said, nothing prevents to invite some experts or people without having any position.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, that's right. The RZERC procedures and bylaws allow the committee to invite anyone to participate at any time.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Paul, you just raised your hand.

PAUL HOFFMAN: I did. So just a slight update to what Duane just said. ICANN Organization is treating RZERC now almost as if it was an SO or AC. And I'm saying almost because I know I'm going to get flamed for not being as precise as I can be, but I can't be precise here. So with the RZERC02 and 03 documents, we are treating them as if they were an RSSAC document or

---

an SSAC document that had recommendations. We look at the recommendations, we do that dance. Fred, you're very familiar with what we call the ARR or the Advice Registry where if somebody has advised ICANN do something, we have to do it. So on RZERC02, again, which is RSSAC028, that is definitely in process and it's already hit my timeline. It hasn't been accepted by the Board but we're kind of assuming it is. I just wanted to be clear, not that there may be something that possibly will happen with RSSAC028 again. It seems really, really likely and I'm already working on it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Do we have more to discuss regarding RZERC? Failing that, Daniel, your name is also beside the IAB. Do you have anything from them?

DANIEL MIGAULT: No. I just mentioned earlier that I'm going to—I think what has been of interest for the IAB during this session is the platform set up by Paul and the work RSSAC is doing so I think it's 47. But that's all I think it's of interest for them.

FRED BAKER: Matt, you just dropped something into the chat, a couple of Board resolutions. Do you want to talk about that for a moment?

MATT LARSON: Sure. Kind of self-explanatory. That the Board as part of the ARR process, OCTO follow that for RSSAC028. And right now, we're in Phase 4 of the

---

Implementation Phase, as of the March Board meeting where the Board approved a resolution that basically says, "Go do all that stuff."

FRED BAKER: Okay, so nothing more momentous than that?

MATT LARSON: No, it's just I was just reacting to Paul. You might have interpreted what Paul said that it was maybe not yet a done deal. But from the Board's perspective, and therefore, from OCTO's perspective, the Board has spoken following our recommendation and saying, "Yep, go ahead and do that stuff in RSSAC028."

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. So let's move on to SSAC. Russ, do you have anything to say?

RUSS MUNDY: Only a little bit today, Fred. Thank you. The main thing going on with the SSAC realm related to RSSAC at this point is getting ready for ICANN71. And the big focus there from my point of view really is our joint session. I know Ozan mentioned the specifics on that earlier. But I would like to ask folks to be thinking about any topics that they would like to have included on the agenda. And either send them to the list or send it to me privately. Whichever is just perfectly fine.

The thing that I would be particularly interested in is any thoughts that people add with respect to the GWG activities in view of the reports



---

that we had last month that the RSSAC meeting. Any thoughts people have about the general topics or in particular, the GWG, how we should focus and how much time we should spend on that. Unless anybody had questions for me, that's it for today. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Anybody have any questions for Russ? Failing that, let's move on to the IANA Functions Operator. James?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. This is Ozan. James is not on the call. He sent his regrets for today.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Shows how on top of things I am. Let's move on to the RZM. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Hi, Fred. Thanks. I just wanted to give a little bit of a heads up to people regarding the message to digest for DNS zones, the ZONEMD work. We're following RZERC's recommendations and we're not planning on hopefully adding this to the root zone in the coming future. I've submitted a talk to the ICANN DNS Symposium about that. So hopefully, that gets accepted. You may see that on the agenda. Thanks,

---

FRED BAKER: Okay. GWG. Liman, I'm going to direct this to you since you've been leading the RSO discussion. Do you have anything to report from the GWG?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I knew you would. Thanks. Yes, we had a meeting with—I don't remember exactly but some of the root server operators and also the RSO representatives on the GWG, which led to the conclusion that we, as the three representatives, have been a little bit lacking in spreading information on what's going on and seeking input from the rest of the root server operators. And in an attempt to remedy that, we have started a series of meetings where we invited all the root server operators to participate. And in those meetings, we try to work through the working document that we have in the GWG and explain the various ideas, the various statements, the various things we write in that document and also receive input from the root server operators so that we can better understand which are the crucial points of where we really need to make an effort to do input to the working group, the GWG.

There are some things where there has to be a bit of give and take because we are now opening up to a wider set of community members. And we need to adapt to reality. All the functions that we had in RSSAC037 need to have a home so we need to find the right organizational home for them and we've tried to design such a system. All this leads to certain steps away from RSSAC037. And in the series of meetings with the root server operators, I would very much like to understand if there are any crucial problems that you RSOs see with this

---

document that we are writing. Are there any steps that you are unwilling to take? And if you see problems with the document, please explain that to us. Not only by saying, "No, it doesn't work." But also, please try to make us understand why this is problematic for you and your organization in your operations of a root server identifier, so that we can bring that to the table of the GWG and explain to them why something doesn't work or needs to be changed or can be done in a better way. I think I'll stop there unless Duane or Brad or Hiro wants to add to my comments.

BRAD VERD:

I'll just add that something I've been saying all along, please take the document back to your organization. Please read it. Please go through it, just like we did with 37. Go line by line. If you've got comments, if you got questions, put them in there. We really need the input. We continue to have these meetings and there's a lot of silence. It would be helpful if people would raise concern because this is happening.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I would like to add, we actually took a copy of the GWG document. We froze it at a certain point in time, split it off into a copy, and made that copy available to the root server operators. So those from your various organizations who have been participating in this new series of meetings should have a link to this copy of the document which you can edit or at least to suggest comments. And please do so because we go through the document. And when we find comments, we discuss them, we explain what's going on and so on. So that's a very good way for us to

---

understand what the problems are and for you to get some feedback on why the decisions were made to write the text that's in there. Thanks.

HIRO HOTTA:

I'd like to add one thing about the GWG itself. As to the RSS GWG itself, various parts of the draft proposal are compiled into one proposal document mainly by Duane, and [good]. GWG started to review it by one or two meetings a week to shape the draft to some extent before ICANN71 in June. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you very much all three of you. Is there anything remaining on that point? Not hearing anything. I'm about to close. Does anybody want to get a word in edgewise? Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we'll call the meeting adjourned. Our next meeting is on Tuesday, June 1<sup>st</sup>. I'll talk with you then if not before.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**