
FRED BAKER: Good morning, all. You can see the draft agenda in front of you. So we've got, what, four things that we actually need to vote on this morning. Some work items to discuss.

Ozan, could you show me the list? I'm supposed to call roll. Okay, cool. So let's do this. Cogent. Looking for Paul or Brad. DISA. Kevin or Ryan?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yep.

KEVIN WRIGHT: Kevin here.

FRED BAKER: ICANN. Matt? Terri?

MATT LARSON: Matt's here.

FRED BAKER: ISC. I'm here. I think Jeff's on the call. Jeff, are you here?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. We received apologies from Jeff for this meeting.

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: That's right. He's having a minor operation. NASA. Barbara? Tom? I guess not. Netnod. Liman? Patrik?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here. Patrik is probably not.

FRED BAKER: RIPE. Kaveh, I heard.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh is here, yes.

FRED BAKER: And [inaudible]? UMD.

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: USC.

WES HARDAKER: Both Wes and Suzanne are here.

FRED BAKER: ARL.

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign. Brad, you're here.

BRAD VERD: Yes, Brad's here.

FRED BAKER: And WIDE. I guess we're ...

HIRO HOTTA: Yes. Hiro's here.

FRED BAKER: Oh, okay. Hi, Hiro.

HIRO HOTTA: Jun's not.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And Kaveh, you're also liaison to the Board. So you're here for that. Liman, you're with the CSC. Daniel, RZERC.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: And Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: I am here. Good morning.

FRED BAKER: Good morning. And Daniel, I guess you're also IAB. IANA Functions Operator?

JAMES MITCHELL: Yeah, James is here.

FRED BAKER: And Duane, the Root Zone Maintainer.

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

FRED BAKER:

Okay, cool. So that's the roll call. I think we have a quorum.

You all received the minutes. Does anybody have any comments on the minutes from the last meeting? Okay, then we should vote to accept them. Is anybody going to vote to disapprove? Okay, is anybody abstaining? Failing that, I believe we accepted the May meeting minutes.

Ozan, do you want to talk about the Membership Committee?

OZAN SAHIN:

Yes. Thank you, Jeff. Hi, everyone. This is Ozan with an update on the Membership Committee. So as you heard, Jeff couldn't make it to this meeting. As a support staff for this committee, I'm happy to report on a few agenda items today.

One is the application from Wei Wang. He is actually an old RSSAC Caucus member who joined the Caucus in 2014. He contributed to RSSAC publications like RSSAC028, the Technical Analysis of the Naming Scheme Used For Individual Root Servers.

But then in time, Wei Wang got inactive. And therefore the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee, as a result of its activity review in 2019, tried to contact Wei Wang, first in September 2019 and then in January 2020. And failing to receive a response, and also in consultation with the RSSAC, Wei Wang was removed from the RSSAC Caucus along with other inactive Caucus members in February 2020.

But Wei Wang recently reached out to the Membership Committee a few weeks ago. He explained that he was a PTI (Public Technical

Identifiers) board member between 2017 and 2020. And he was inactive in the Caucus mailing list to avoid a potential conflict of interest between his two roles as an RSSAC Caucus member and a PTI board member, which the Caucus Membership Committee was not aware of before he was removed from RSSAC Caucus.

So he wants to rejoin and continue contributing to the work of RSSAC Caucus. And after discussing the situation, the Caucus Membership Committee agreed to recommend RSSAC to let Wei Wang rejoin the Caucus. And this is vote item today. So I'll stop here to see if there are any comments.

I see Liman raised his hand, Fred.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I just wanted to state my support for Wei Wang. I've worked with him in the past, and this is a good person to have on board. It's mentioned here. He used to work for CNNIC. I think he was even the CTO for CNNIC at some point in time. So this is a good resource. We should put him back. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: And I personally know him from when he was working at China NIC as well. Does anybody else have any comments? Does anybody wish to not approve him? Liman, your hand is still up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry.

FRED BAKER: Is anybody planning to abstain? Failing that, I believe we've accepted him.

Ozan, did you want to talk then about the RSSAC Organizational Review Implementation?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure, Fred. I can, but before going to the Organizational Review, I think there's another agenda item.

FRED BAKER: Oh, you're correct. We should talk about the Nominating Committee and the member recognition. Go ahead and talk about the membership recognition proposal.

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. I'll share a few comments on the Caucus Members Recognition Proposal from the Caucus Membership Committee too. I introduced this proposal during the RSSAC May meeting, and one takeaway from that meeting was that RSSAC wanted to actually vote on this proposal in the upcoming meetings. So then Fred invited RSSAC members to provide their input on the draft Google Doc. We then received a few comments from Ken, Hiro, and others.

And Ken's suggestion was to add an honorable mention to the proposal which would encourage newcomer participation. This was supported by Jeff on the doc, but not only by Jeff but by the rest of the Caucus Membership Committee as well.

And then with respect to Hiro's comment to not strictly limit the number of awardees to one per year and kind of have flexibility in terms of the number of awardees if needed.

So the Membership Committee is supporting both suggestions. This proposal is not a vote item for today. It's still open for input. In terms of the next steps, if there are no objections to these suggestions, staff will edit the text to reflect then and share a clean version of the proposal. And then we may plan an RSSAC vote in the July meeting if that sounds good.

And also, I'd like to flag a few open questions that were discussed in the previous meeting like whether RSSAC members should be eligible for this recognition. Or the better question, as I recall, was about the eligibility of ICANN Org members in the RSSAC Caucus for this recognition.

So I'll stop here, and I see Ken Renard has his hand up.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, Ken.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. I just wanted to clarify on the honorable mention idea. We can call it whatever we want. I wasn't thinking that this had to be something formal where we track awardees by a year and you can only win X number of times in a row and all that stuff. Just something simple that could recognize and get people participating in the work parties. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: And I personally would support that question for—I guess it's for Ozan. This isn't something that we're required to hand out per se, but that we have the option of handing out. Is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: Excuse me, Fred. I'm not sure if I understood your question correctly. Do you mind repeating it?

FRED BAKER: Sure. I have visions of the Selection Committee or the Administrative Committee kind of saying, "Oh, no. We have to award somebody this thing this year. Who should we award it to? Is there anyone that qualifies?" That seems like the wrong question to ask. It seems, rather, that we would want to say, "So-and-so has been contributing. Let's give him an 'atta boy' by mentioning him—him or her—as a contributor in the Caucus" perhaps as an honorable mention, perhaps the actual word. Am I correct in that?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, that is correct.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And these are the only comments that have been raised in the selection criteria?

OZAN SAHIN: Correct. These have been the comments that we've received so far. So if you would like to give another week or two to RSSAC members to provide comments, and then a clean version could be shared for a vote in the next meeting.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Let's see our participants. I'm looking at who's actually here. So I wouldn't want to embarrass this individual in any way, but the person that frankly comes quickly to mind for this award is Paul Hoffman who, for quite a long time, has done quite a bit of work in the Caucus. He works for ICANN Org.

And you mentioned that there was an open question of whether people in ICANN Org could get this award. What do we have as statements about ICANN membership or ICANN relevance? Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: So, currently we don't have any statements in the proposal that prohibit ICANN Org members or RSSAC members being recognized in this recognition element. But since that was raised as a question in the previous meeting, and if there are any RSSAC members who have an opinion, I just brought it up.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. And let me invite comment from the RSSAC right now. Anybody have anything to say about RSSAC members or ICANN employees? Are they a special case in some way?

OZAN SAHIN: No, we're fine.

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

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah, so personally I think being more inclusive is better. And if you really recognize someone, at least from the RSSAC perspective ... I understand why we might want to be careful about ICANN Org's staff, but to be honest, this is Caucus work. This is very visible. So my suggestion is we should be as inclusive as possible.

I would suggest that we don't add an exclusion rule like that, and decide case by case. And we really think someone deserves that, I think it's good. In general, I think encouraging the ICANN and the likes of ICANN—RIR organizations or ISOC people or similar organizations—to also participation in the process, I generally find it very actually useful. But acknowledging that I understand that's why it might sometimes look, yeah, a bit basically supporting self.

But to be honest, given the independence of RSSAC in all of that, I really see no issue there—RSSAC in this capacity, [in a work] capacity. The main relationship we have at ICANN Org is as one of root operators and they are similar to the rest of us.

So if I stand in RSSAC perspective, I think we actually A) shouldn't and, B) don't have this much ground to add such an exclusion. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I don't think we should exclude anyone. That's for sure. But I think we should be careful when we start providing those awards because if we are providing those to RSSAC members or maybe ICANN Org, people who's job it is to participate to that, I think it might be perceived as we are excluding people that are a little bit outside. So I think for the first prizes, we should give a message that we're open, that anyone can receive that prize even though you are not part of the core team.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. Thanks, Fred. This might go without saying. And maybe it's really obviously, but I'll say it anyways. ICANN Org policy support staff should be excluded from this award. So that means like me and Ozan and

Danielle and Steve. But that says nothing about someone like Paul Hoffman who doesn't actually support the RSSAC. But I just wanted to state that explicitly. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, thank you very much. Now I'm thinking, Ozan, your comment was that you have no exclusions whatsoever in the document. And I'm thinking about Andrew's comment. Should there be a bullet here saying that wouldn't apply to someone whose job it is to support the RSSAC?

OZAN SAHIN: I would not put it in these words because I would say everyone's work is to attend RSSAC somehow, so I think the boundaries are very blurred.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: If I may?

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. I started out here with not having much of an opinion, but I started to think about what is the message we want to send? Why do

we create this? And I started to think about that, I kind of fell in the opposite position of Kaveh, I must say.

I think we should exclude the RSSAC formal members and possibly those ICANN staff because I think we want to send the message that we encourage participation from people who are not the usual suspects. And we want to encourage their participation and their engagement in this.

And for that reason, excluding them from this would send that message, but I am quite willing to accept a version which is along with what Daniel said, that we are very careful with whom we select so that we send the right message. And it could be that a more flexible policy is better.

But I definitely think that we should think carefully about the message we send. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Wes, you've got your hand up.

WES HARDAKER:

Thanks. So Suzanna and I have been discussing this. She raised a couple of interesting points that she's convinced me is right. So I'm going to bring them forward for her.

Two things. One, I agree with what Liman just said. I think RSSAC proper members should be excluded. We really want to encourage participation from people that are contributing from other sources that it's sort for

not their day job. There's no way I should get this award. That would be completely wrong.

And I would argue that ICANN staff as a whole probably should not. They are paid to contribute to the ICANN environment, and we want to encourage people that are contributing outside of core ICANN staff or core RSOs and other organizations that are part of the wider ICANN community.

And the other interesting thing is that in the selection criteria, we have attendance listed. And I would argue that that's ... Or I should say Suzanne would argue that that's really not the selection criteria that we want to necessarily consider. Right? We want to really honor those who have heavy contributions, those that have really spent time doing work, not just showing up. And I think she's right there. So I think that's our point of view.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

First of all, I fully agree with [the assessment] that RSSAC members shouldn't ... We should exclude that, I think. I support that. [inaudible] to be careful who we select. Actually, I'm really against it. I think this is something that would be lost shortly in the history. If that's our intention, let's make it clear to exclude some people.

Also, I think it won't be fair because if you say, "Okay, someone really should get it," but we have this internal agreement that they shouldn't, I

don't think that's the best way of doing it. So if you really want, my suggestion is this document.

The attendance, I also fully agree with Wes. I suggest we remove them. And I should have also noticed that, but I think it just makes sense.

But on the ICANN staff because they are being paid, I understand that. On the other hand, I think we really have to clarify the scope of the organization we are talking about. Correct? So we are RSSAC and we are here as RSOs and liaisons. And then our Caucus is open to anyone.

As RSSAC, some of us are also paid to do the work that we do. And also, some of the Caucus members who are in our organization—and we encourage them to come to Caucus—they are also paid because this is their job. You really can't go to that arrangement.

And RSSAC is an organization attached to ICANN Board, not ICANN Org. And believe me, I can see all those disconnects, but I think that kind of exclusion ... I mean, we have them, so they're also not unprecedented. I can tell you that in the RIR system, there are lot of [those]. So it won't be strange if we have them, but personally I think we don't need to make that exclusion. But if we really want to be careful who select, then I actually suggest let's exclude it from now. Because if we have the consensus, let's document that.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Steve.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Fred. A third point to consider. I think, for the RSSAC Caucus, it's an open group. There's no exclusion for participation other than through the Membership Committee that selects people into the Caucus. Once they're in the Caucus, they participate on equal footing whether they work for ICANN Org or RSOs or do not work for any of the organizations.

In that regard, from a process perspective, I think I would advise RSSAC to be careful in just excluding RSSAC Caucus members based on their employment. Right? Unless there's a strong conflict of interest because that's a slipper slope to set—whether they are paid or not.

I mean, if an RSO engineer who devotes a certain amount of time on RSSAC Caucus, would that make him not eligible? I'd rather go based on membership rather than based on organization affiliations. So that would be my advice from a policy process perspective. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Suzanne.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thanks, Fred. And thanks, Wes, for the initial comments. I want to say this very carefully because I don't want to denigrate anyone's work or effort. But I'm concerned about the optics in a slightly different way, which is that ICANN Org holds a unique role with respect to the fact that it funds RSSAC. It provides staff support to RSSAC. And ICANN Org and Board both have a unique role and are pretty much the largest influence

over how the outcomes of RSSAC processes are handled and implemented.

So I think ICANN Org does hold a unique role with respect to RSSAC, and I'm concerned about the optics. As Steve says, we treat ICANN staff in the RSSAC Caucus the same as everybody else, but Org does hold a unique role. And I'm not sure I'm comfortable with not considering it a conflict of interest to incentivize ICANN staff in that way.

As for excluding people are saying that one role precludes another, I've worked for contracted party for the last two years. Before that, I didn't. I'm the same person I was and mostly have the same opinions I did, but there are roles I know cannot take within the community because I worked for a contracted party. Okay. That's not unreasonable because I do have a different role in the community and my employer does have a different role in the community than before.

So I think there is a distinction to be made there, and I'm going to respectfully disagree with Steve that there's a slippery slope or that it can't be clearly defined. I think ICANN's role means it can be quite clearly defined. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Thanks, Suzanne. Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you, Suzanne. For the first argument, I understand. But then if you really get into that argument, I think it doesn't boil down to just encourage ICANN staff or others, or incentivize them to do this work.

Then my question is, if you hold that argument, why do we allow them to participate in Caucus? Correct? Then we are actually doing something we are not supposed to do.

That's one, and I think we have to keep that in mind. If we really go that way, then let's make it also clear if you're not comfortable having ICANN Org or any other organization/people who are active in Caucus. Because I think our belief is that our governance basically protects the inclusion we have. We have enough governance around it that not one person or organization can really shape or change things except if there is agreement on that. So that's one.

And the second one, on the [inaudible], I fully agree with you and I see that and I recognize that. On the other hand, that comes from the organization. Correct? So if ICANN basically sets up an internal policy that they cannot receive any internal recognitions, I assume that would be easily dealt with here because then we would propose it, let's say, from ICANN Org and then they say, "Sorry, we cannot accept it because of internal rules."

And then we go back to the drawing board and pick the second-best option. Correct? But then it comes from the organization, not from us. My two cents.

FRED BAKER:

So I started talking and my computer told me I was muted. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Fred. This has really been a fascinating discussion, an interesting discussion. One thing, I think, that people do seem to agree on—and this is a point that I think is particularly important—is that whatever we decide for either inclusions or exclusions, that it be very, very clearly and obviously stated in the criteria.

And the question that I raise as an incoming liaison is that there seems to be agreement that RSSAC members should not be eligible for this. But I would also suggest that neither should incoming liaison individuals even though their Caucus participation is quite independent of whether or not they are a liaison. But just to help make the point that it needs to be clear, whatever gets decided. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Thanks, Russ. And I don't see any other hands raised right now. So, Ozan, you wanted to actually vote on this is the July meeting, the next meeting. Is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. It was a suggestion only if RSSAC is ready to do that. If RSSAC wants to continue discussions, we are not in a rush.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah, and what I'm thinking is that we have some editing to do, at least in terms of accepting the comments that are there. So it seems like there needs to be at least a bullet on the selection criteria in terms of exclusions. I think I heard that RSSAC members should probably be excluded, and directly supporting staff should be excluded.

Was there anybody else that people felt should be excluded? Not seeing any hands and not hearing any. I think those are two bullet points that need to be added to the selection criteria. And then we'll be in a position to discuss this in e-mail over the next month and vote on it next month, I think. Does anybody disagree with me strongly on that? Again, hearing none and seeing no hands.

Okay, let's move on to the next agenda item. We need to talk about the ICANN Nominating Committee liaison. The person how has been doing that for several years is Amir Qayyum, and he is right now the only nomination that we have for this position. So I'm going ask very, very, very directly does anybody object to having him represent us in the NomCom?

Are we supposed to take a vote on this? Remind me.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Fred.

FRED BAKER: We are taking a vote. Okay. So hearing no objections, is anybody planning to abstain on this particular item? Failing that, I think we have accepted Amir as—

MATT LARSON: Fred.

FRED BAKER: Hello? Go ahead.

MATT LARSON: Excuse me, Fred. I should abstain on behalf of ICANN Org for this one, please.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, fine. That should be noted in the minutes, but I don't hear anybody else abstaining. So failing that, I believe we have accepted Amir in this position.

What do we have next? Oh, our Organizational Review plan. Ozan, do you want to talk about that?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Fred. As a quick background, RSSAC approved the six recommendations that came out of the second Organizational Review of the RSSAC in January 2020, and they accepted the implementation plan to implement those six recommendations. And then the implementation plan was accepted by the Board later in March last year, in 2020.

Then RSSAC started to provide reports on the implementation every six months. And to remind you of the six recommendations that were accepted, two of them [found to be] have already been implemented. Implementation of the two would be ongoing, and implementation of two would be fully or partially related to the work of the Root Server System Governance Working Group.

The first implementation progress report was submitted in June 2020. Then a second one was in December 2020. Now is the time for the third implementation progress report. Staff worked with the the Organizational Review Implementation Work Party to note some progress on these recommendations. And I circulated the draft report where I highlighted the implementation progress to date sections in yellow, and we have not received any suggestions to revise the report.

And this is a vote item for RSSAC today, so if RSSAC is fine with this report, I will take a vote and then the RSSAC Admin Committee will submit this report to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board.

Thank you, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

And we've all had the opportunity to read this in e-mail, so we certainly have had the Rogue Operator Work Party going on there. Do we have anything else? Okay.

Frankly, this particular recommendation bothers me. Reading it almost word for word, it says "do more." And anybody can always so "do more" or "do something different." If they're not specific, I don't know how to implement it.

So, our recommendation—or our response on the recommendation. We have Amir working with the Nominating Committee. We have liaison review meetings which I conduct. So I think we can say that we've been doing good work. That's mentioned here. Next item.

And we've specifically looked at the Caucus membership and culled a few of those. Next item. Could we look down a little bit further.

OZAN SAHIN: This is the last one, Fred. [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: This is the last one? Okay.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes.

FRED BAKER: No, that's fine. Okay. Ozan, you have our hand up.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. I thought maybe, potentially, one thing to highlight in this particular round of reporting would be the first recommendation which is extend the RSSAC membership by invitation to any qualified person. And RSSAC's response to this recommendation, this recommendation was found to be tied to the work of the RrSG Working Group.

So one thing to highlight in this report is that in the case that the RSS GWG work does not address this recommendation, the RSSAC Implementation Work Party wouldn't take any other actions in order to

implement this recommendation. So this could be the one important implementation to highlight on this report.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And in any event, we're saying that we're kind of deferring to the GWG on this. Brad, did you have a comment?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Thanks, Fred. Going back to the one where you said "do more," I agree with you. It's a frustrating recommendation. I guess my question is, can we say we've done more and close this one? Call it done?

OZAN SAHIN: I love that.

FRED BAKER: I'd be in favor of that.

BRAD VERD: That would be my recommendation.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can we please do that and just see how that's received? I would like to see the reaction.

FRED BAKER: That works for me, and that would be as a final sentence in the paragraph that's already there. Okay, what do we need to do with this, Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Once the RSSAC vote on this report is don't, we'll go ahead and submit this report to the report Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee. It's due in June.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so we need to take a vote. Okay. Folks, you've had this presentation. You had the report to read over the last, what, week or two. Are there any further comments on it?

Brad, your hand is up.

BRAD VERD: Apologies.

FRED BAKER: Okay. If there are no further comments, then I'm going to go directly to the vote. Do people support making this report? Are there other change people would like to make? Is anyone abstaining? With no proposed changes and nobody abstaining, I guess we've accepted the report and can send it in.

So moving along. Ozan, do you want to talk about the draft schedule?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Thanks, Fred. Sorry about speaking too much in this call.

FRED BAKER: The purpose of the call is to speak, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: I thought I could bore you. Anyways, this is the last item for me, I guess. I circulated the draft ICANN71 schedule last week on the RSSAC mailing list, and you will see on this schedule the technical sessions that I highlighted, as well as the plenary sessions in, let me say the red color.

And then the only RSSAC work session which was allocated for the Local Perspective Work Party. I also highlighted the RSS GWG meeting with the ICANN Board Technical Committee which is happening on Tuesday.

And lastly, the only other meeting that RSSAC will have around ICANN71 is the closed meeting with the SSAC. And you have calendar invitations on your calendar for that.

So I think, Fred, one discussion for the schedule now could be the Impact of Regulatory Developments on ICANN Policy Topics plenary session. I noticed that you circulated a note to see if there's intention from any RSSAC member to be a panelist in this cross-committee panel to talk about it. So I'll stop here to see if you'd like to add more or if RSSAC members have any questions on the schedule.

FRED BAKER:

Well, yeah. This discussion has been going on as an invitational meeting, and the general consensus regarding the meeting is that people are speaking in favor of having it and really kind of like it. And personally, the meeting bothers me. I'm speaking partly from an ISC perspective. These are comments that have been made within ISC, but it also happens to be my personal perspective.

Now I'm concerned about ... Oh, and now I'm drawing a blank on what my comments were. It seems like extra territorial regulation is being a problem. My own government is doing it, and that bothers me. I'm concerned about Europe doing it. I'm concerned about Russia doing it. I'm concerned about China doing it.

It seems like if you want to regulate your own area, fine. Regulate your own area. But to make a rule and say, "So now this applies to the entire world," that bothers me. And here I'm looking at the provisions of NIS 2 which basically say that if somebody doesn't do the necessary work to prevent hacks, then they can be fined. And they can be fined an amount that, I don't know, is a third of my company's budget. That seems not proportional and I'm concerned about that.

Okay. So now let's imagine, just for fun, that this becomes the rule and everybody get to make a rule like this. There are close to 200 countries on the planet, and let's imagine that each of those countries any, "Well, if Europe can do it, I should be able to do that." So we now, each of us, has 200 different countries' regulations to integrate and satisfy. And to me, that's just maddening. I don't know how we do that.

I'm concerned about the specifics of the regulation that's being proposed. And I've made that comment in this little group, and they're kind of saying, "Well, everybody else likes it. What's wrong with you?"

So we've been asked if anybody would like to comment on it and be part of a panel presenting this to ICANN. So I have two questions. One of them is, did somebody besides me want to be on this panel? The other one is, am I wrong? Am I taking a perspective that is incorrect? And let me just throw the discussion open. Those are the questions I'm thinking about.

Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yes. Fred, just to quickly point to one of your questions. I don't think you're wrong. That's it. Assessment of the severity of issue. I think we have different opinions there because, I mean, that's how it works. Especially between nations, with my limited experience of being engaged from RIPE's side and also being informed from what ICANN does. The thing is that the [powers] are really different. Right?

So the argument that now it's one or two or three, and then there are 200. That's really not like that. It is very similar to any other organic large network. If you have 6 or 13 or 17 tier ones on the Internet that you have to deal with, this is exactly the same. Or if you have BIND and Knots and a few other resolvers that you have to deal with, this is the same.

It will never happen that we will have to deal with that many countries directly, but of course anybody who asserts the power and also has the power to enforce it or show some enforcement [outcome], of course they will get it. But to be honest, there are not 200. I don't think it's even 10.

But still, that doesn't make your argument invalid at all. I think it's just better to scope it right. Still, your argument is ... I fully agree with it. It is a trend that I think maybe we need to think about some messages about that or something like that because from an operational point of view ...

Of course, we know how DNS works. We know how this can be effective or not and how much enforcement they can really put there, and what will happen if some operators vacate the space and how that will make the whole system less resilient. And maybe we can actually put the message out there and say, "Hey, in your own region, do whatever you want. Beware that, yes, this might affect resiliency in your own region, but that's your choice." Yeah, then we do our job.

FRED BAKER: Russ, you've got your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY: Yes. Thank you, Fred. I certainly, I guess you could say, empathize with the argument that this could be the beginning of a cascade of regulations that would impact the operation of the Root Server System. It would be incredibly difficult to accommodate that many different regulatory activities. It's difficult enough, in things that I've been

engaged for a long time, to comply with all of the U.S. government security regulations, let alone things that would be established by other jurisdictions.

So I think it's something that is well worth pointing out to people that if end result was that they, because of regulatory things put in place, lowered their quality of service they were receiving, then that could well be the end outcome for them. And I know that's not the intended end point, but it's a difficult point to make and describe.

The other question I have for you, Fred, is have you spoken with Rod or Julie about this at all?

FRED BAKER: I have not spoken with Rod or Julie.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, thanks. I don't honestly know if they have an opinion on it. I certainly can check with them myself, but I didn't know if it had come up anywhere in the chairs meeting or not. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. What I'm drawing out of this is that if we want to talk about it, it's going to be me talking about it because it's a thing I've been bellyaching about. So, okay. Do we have any further comments on the ...? We actually started this from talking about the RSSAC schedule during the ICANN meeting. Right? Am I missing something?

KEN RENARD: Hey, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Yeah.

KEN RENARD: Real quick. On the RSSAC schedule, the time allocated for the Local Perspective Work Party. I believe we'll be using a very short amount of that time, so if we had any other topic that we wanted to discuss and meet with, there should be room in that hour-long session for at least half, I believe. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. I've got myself mentally a little bit lost. Why am I looking at the schedule and we're talking about that particular meeting?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. Yes, we started talking about the RSSAC schedule at ICANN71 and then we also talked about the plenary session too.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so we got off talking about the plenary session. Okay. I lost context. A computer scientist on the call will know what losing context means.

Daniel, you put in the chat that you need to leave the meeting in a few minutes and, specifically, we wanted to talk about your question regarding OCTO. So do you want to talk about that?

DANIEL MIGAULT:

Okay, so I sent a few e-mails to raise a question that has been raised during the past two RSSAC meetings. The question is ... That is my understanding. The context was that we have to respond to some of the questions that came from OCTO for clarifications on the document RSSAC has just published. We are missing maybe someone from OCTO within RSSAC.

So the question has not been discussed in RSSAC, but it has been two times on the agenda. We didn't address it because of a lack of time, but the question was RSSAC [membership] being extended to an additional member that represents OCTO. And that member could be voting or non-voting, etc. So I raised my personal opinion on the mailing list, but I haven't received many feedbacks.

Or maybe you've shared them with the chair directly. So this question has been discussed during the Admin Committee which I didn't take part of. The outcome from the Admin Committee was that there is no need for a specific representative from OCTO to be an RSSAC member.

So this is the position I am going to support on behalf of RSSAC, but just for clarification it doesn't mean that OCTO will not participate in any of these meetings. RSSAC still has the possibility to invite OCTO members for any sort of discussions. And actually, it's not an OCTO

member. It's any kind of expert or any people can be invited during the meetings. So it's not that we don't want to talk to OCTO.

So I'm happy to take any questions or any comment if any people have some.

FRED BAKER: Duane, you have your hand up.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Fred. I want to just clarify something I think I heard Daniel say. So this hasn't even been discussed yet in RZERC? There's no proposal from RZERC to consider. But I don't think, in RZERC, there has been a suggestion yet that there would be a voting member of OCTO on the RZERC.

But really, the point I wanted to make is that RZERC hasn't even really discussed this itself yet. We haven't had time.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. Thanks for the clarification. But the point was basically to know what to respond in case the question is being raised or discussed, if we're not running out of time.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay, so I have a quick comment and then I'm going to go to Brad. So my question, each time you've asked this question of me has been what standing RSSAC has about the membership of RZERC. I'm not sure

why we would be asked that question, other than the fact that you represent the RSSAC opinions as a liaison.

Okay. Brad, you have your hand up?

BRAD VERD:

Yeah, thank you. Hopefully you can hear me. My comment on this topic was that RZERC was originally created—I believe the groups even validated this when we went through our charter—as first created as kind of a [no-op] group, that it was not going to look for work. It was only going to respond to work that was presented to it from its member or the community.

And as Daniel said, OCTO could be invited at any time. Or anybody could be invited in at any time based upon their subject matter experts. I didn't feel that it was necessary to create a liaison role for OCTO. That was my thoughts. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Do we have any other comments on this topic? Well then, Daniel, I think you've got your marching order there.

DANIEL MIGAULT:

Okay. Thank you very much.

FRED BAKER:

Thank you.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I'm leaving. Bye-bye.

FRED BAKER: Bye-bye. And going back to the draft schedule, then I'll tell the committee putting tighter that plenary that I will represent a viewpoint, my viewpoint. If anybody has input to me, please feel free to contact me and let me know your viewpoint. And I think we're doing with this topic.

[Let's see here]. What time is it? Okay, so let's move on to the work items. Ken, you've got two tools here [or two work parties]. Yeah.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Fred. So the first work party, a tool for the Local Perspective. We met about two weeks ago and it looks like Duane did his homework. I have not done mine yet, but really putting the finishing touches on the discussion of a repository for results of the tool. I expect a small amount of discussion during the ICANN meeting in two weeks, I guess. And from there we can go into a final review and then a last call for that within the Caucus.

The other work party, the Rogue Operator, that went into a one-week review period. We got a few comments, and Steve and I incorporated those into the document. And that went out for a 48-hour last call to the Caucus I guess on Friday, so that 48-hour period is over. So my question, I guess to Steve, procedurally how do we officially present this to the Caucus for review to then be able to vote on it hopefully the next RSSAC meeting?

STEVE SHENG: Thanks, Ken. So the 48-hour last call was end of day today because Monday was a U.S. holiday, so we accommodated that. The next step for the document, if there are no last-minute proposed changes, then what we will do is do a copy editing to make sure that is suitable for publication. And then we can bring this to the RSSAC.

There's a dependency on the principal document, so this document cannot be published until the principal document publishes first. After copy editing, this will be like a holder pattern until that document publishes because there's a reference in this document. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Steve. And that's it for the updates on the two work parties. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, Liman, your work party was just mentioned. Do you have any comments for us?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I have only embarrassment to bring forward here. I must admit that I dropped this. I made kind of a promise that we would be done for this meeting, but I have failed. I'm sorry. I will have to make a new attempt for the next meeting.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Andrew, do you want to talk about RSSAC047?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE:

Yeah, sure. Thanks, Fred. So I have an action item, too, with Paul Hoffman to draft a Statement of Work for updating RSSAC047 which would eventually become RSSAC047 v.2.

I haven't started drafting the Statement of Work yet, but with the two work parties winding down in the Caucus, the idea is that we'd spin up another one. We'd spin up this RSSAC047 v.2 Work Party probably in the next, I guess, maybe couple months or so. But first I need to work on a Statement of Work. And when Paul and I are happy with it, then we'll send it back probably to the whole Caucus for review.

Also, Paul Hoffman has volunteered to lead this work party. But, of course, that'll be a decision that's made on the first meeting of this work party. But that's the update. Thank you, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. So I guess we come to reports, and the first of these is from Brad and myself. Brad, do you have any comments that you'd like to make?

Okay, he's being very quiet. And I think we actually already talked about, in the context of the plenary comments that I had to make. So, Kaveh, do you have comments about the ICANN Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: No. No news or related activity to raise to RSSAC. I think I can get the next one, the RSO consultation. I will share my view and some stuff which I think affects our work and our relationship with the WG as RSOs. But from the ICANN Board's side, there has been no activity regarding RSSAC recommendations.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. There I actually have small details to say, at least. I don't remember when that was done. That's done already. We had on our plate, we kind of discovered that the PTI ran into problems fulfilling a certain SLA, or a couple of them that were based on days where the classic interpretation of the SLA has been calendar days.

And that has led to being a bit problematic for them to fulfill that when there are big, major holidays. We thought about going to working days instead of calendar days. But to begin with, the PTI eventually said, "No, we don't need that," and we actually went one more step and asked staff to help us find out how bad this actually was by looking at historical records. And it turns out that this was not a problem, so we have actually closed that case without making any changes.

And the only other thing is that we are planning to have a joint informational meeting together with the PTI during this upcoming ICANN meeting. And we will work together to present the package, the

PTI and its services and the CSC as the [inaudible] for the PTI. That's going ahead and we have a very good plan for that.

So that's my quick report. Thank you. Happy to take questions.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. And we took Daniel out of order because he needed to leave. Russ, let me turn to you.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. Thank you, Fred. The only real item I wanted to mention today is our joint meeting. It's upcoming on the 21st of June. Ozan did send out the meeting reservation there. I forwarded a draft of the agenda to the Admin Committees of both RSSAC and SSAC to make sure I haven't missed something. [I asked] for inputs there. The committee can expect to see something from me probably Thursday or Friday this week with a draft agenda.

And if anybody thinks of anything and wants to be sure it's on the agenda, feel free to send it to me or to the list before you see the agenda. And that will be fine. We'll be sure things are covered.

Thanks, Fred. Nothing else at this point.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. IANA Functions Operator?

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi, Fred. Nothing more from me. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Root Zone Maintainer. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Hi, Fred. Nothing to report right now. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And GWG. Brad? Hiro? Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: What to say? The last scheduled meeting was cancelled because our chair was not able to attend. We've had these synchronization meetings between the Root Server Operators and the GWG representatives.

There have been very active discussions going on there, and I'm trying to [condense] these discussions into tangible items or bullets that we can bring to the GWG. A very important one seems to be that there needs to be checks and balances in place to—what's the appropriate [thing I'm trying to say]—avoid capture of the Root Server System. The voices of Root Server Operators have expressed that we kind of put the model system, the RSSAC037 model system in the ICANN community circles, and that's because we knew that there is a systemic system of checks and balances within ICANN.

Now, the GWG's heading in a slightly different direction kind of bringing it out of the immediate ICANN circles and creating its own community

around the Root Server System. And that means that we also lose the immediate contact with the checks and balances within the ICANN system. So we need to reconcile that somehow, and that's a major point that I will try to bring back to the GWG when we have our next meeting.

Brad? Hiro? Any more comments?

BRAD VERD:

I'll add a couple. Some of these smaller meetings that we've had, these drafting meetings, have had some surprising revelations in them. I feel that those discussions that were pretty heated at times happened just before this last GWG call which was cancelled. So the larger Caucus has not heard some of these discussions that lead to the fundamental principles of what was driving the GWG. So hopefully, the meeting that is scheduled for this Thursday will take place and we can have a larger discussion around some of these things that were said.

Specifically the things that was said from a key contributor to the content of the current GWG model was that if RSSAC037 was good, or as good as we say it was—or adequate—that the Board would have just accepted it. And the fact that they didn't accept it means that the Board wanted a new direction and something different.

That was corrected. History was revealed. We reread RSSAC038. We explained that we were highly involved with ICANN Org to create a concept paper around RSSAC037, and we were involved in creating the charter of the GWG with the ICANN Board and the Board Technical Committee. Basically, it was RSSAC's intention to go to the community and not as a result of the Board's seeing RSSAC037 as inadequate.

So that was a bit of a revelation that occurred on one of the calls, and we'll see what happens Thursday when we have a discussion with the larger Caucus.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Hiro, did you have anything you wanted to add to that?

HIRO HOTTA: Nothing to add. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So we're at the point in the agenda where we talk about any other business, and the only thing that we have listed there is the fact that we have another meeting coming up a month hence. So let me ask, is there anything else that anybody wants to talk about at this point? Hearing none and seeing no hands, our next meeting is going to be July 6th. Ozan will be circulating a calendar invitation for that as he usually does. And I think we're done, so we'll go ahead and adjourn.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]