FRED BAKER:	Okay. The first thing is the roll call. So, let me ask Cogent. Who's here from Cogent? DISA?
KEVIN WRIGHT:	Kevin Wright here.
RYAN STEPHENSON:	Ryan Stephenson.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. ICANN?
OZAN SAHIN:	Hi, Fred. This is Ozan. We received the apologies from Matt Larson.
FRED BAKER:	Oh, okay. And I'm here from ISC. Jeff is here. NASA? Barbara, I heard your voice a moment ago. Is Tom here? Okay. Netnod?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Yes, Liman is here. Patrik is not here.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. RIPE, RIPE NCC?

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.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, Kaveh is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Karl is here.

FRED BAKER: ISI? I thought I saw Wes's name. Okay. ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Yes. Brad is here. And I know I've seen Wes online. I don't know if he can talk yet, but he's definitely logged in. Somebody is for Wes.

FRED BAKER: Somebody with that name is logged in, yeah. Okay, WIDE? Hiro, are you here?

HIRO HOTTA: Yeah, Hiro's here. Jun is not.

FRED BAKER: Kaveh. I see Kaveh logged in. So CSC, Liman is here. RZERC, Daniel, are you here? SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Good morning, all. This is Russ. I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Hi, there. And the IANA Functions Operator, we have a text message and chat from James. He can't talk but he's here. And the Root Zone Maintainer, Duane is here.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. Okay. Going back to the agenda, please.

OZAN SAHIN: Sure, Fred. This is Ozan again. I see Tom Miglin has joined the call. Welcome, Tom.

FRED BAKER: Good. Yeah, and Wes spoke in chat that he had stepped out of the room when I called for him. Okay. Agenda review. What we've got this morning is pretty much our standard agenda. We intended to have, what, four work items up for a ballot. We're going to discuss one of them and have three for ballots. Various reports and then AOB. We don't have any AOB. So, anybody have any changes they would like to make to the agenda?

Failing that, draft minutes. Has everyone reviewed the minutes from a month ago? Is anybody opposed to these minutes? Do they have edits they would like to make? Is anyone abstaining from them? Failing those two, then I guess we've accepted the minutes.

And Jeff, you want to talk about the membership?

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. There is no membership activity other than the ICANN-related caucus member recognition proposal which is Ozan's bailiwick. So, he has offered to walk us through that.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Jeff. This is Ozan. Hi, everyone. So, RSSAC had a discussion on the caucus membership recognition proposal in its June meeting. There

were a couple of agreed upon items and staff had an action item from that meeting to update the proposal accordingly.

Therefore, I edit some eligibility requirements saying RSSAC members in the RSSAC caucus and also the ICANN org post development support team would be ineligible for this recognition. And I also removed the attendance requirements from the same section. I shared the link on the RSSAC mailing list. Failing to receive more edit requests on this document, the document went through the review period and then became stable. So, it's a vote item for today.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now where have you got that on the agenda for voting? Should we vote on it now?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Then let's do that. Have the various people on the call had a chance to review the proposal?

WES HARDAKER: I have.

FRED BAKER: Hearing nothing but assuming the answer is yes. So, let's take a vote. Is there anyone that would like to change this proposal in any way? Anyone that would be voting against it? Is there anyone that would abstain from the ballot? Failing that, I guess, we've accepted this.

WES HARDAKER: Thanks to those that put effort into this. I think this is an excellent path for RSSAC to take.

FRED BAKER: I would agree with that, Wes. Let's move on to the work items. We have some discussion of the principles of operation of the root server. Liman has been pulling those together.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Would you like me to speak to that?

FRED BAKER: Yes. Yes, please.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. So, we have this document where we pulled out the 11 principles for root server operations from the RSSAC037 document. And we have now created annotations and commentary for these principles so that we have them in one easy to access place. This has gone through a couple of editing sessions. After the last one, I and Steve Sheng from

staff, took a pass through the document to clean up any editorials remaining and we had a little help on our way there.

This has been sent to the caucus and there were no substantial comments received from the caucus. So, we have decided to put this on the agenda for today for voting. So, when you have all had a chance to see the document, [inaudible] that you feel comfortable to vote. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Thank you, Liman. So, let's go ahead and vote on this. Does anybody feel that there's something left to change that they would be voting no? Failing that, is anybody abstaining? Failing that, I guess we've all voted yes.

So, moving on then, Ken, you want to talk about rogue DNS servers or root operators?

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Fred. Good morning, this is Ken. So, the rogue operator work party has its document out there. It's been stable. It's been reviewed by the RSSAC caucus. It's been stable for a little while now, a couple of weeks and was awaiting the publication of the principles document which we just voted on. Mainly because it references that.

So, in general, the rogue DNS operators are defined in this document as basically in reference to the guiding principles. The technical operations giving correct answers or not doing funny stuff with responses as well as intentionally degrading services to anyone based on identity or IP

address or ASN, something like that. So, this document again has been stable in the RSSAC caucus for a while and hope you've had a chance to look it over. And I think we are ready to vote on this. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Thanks, Ken. And once again, does anybody have any negative remarks about it. Does anybody plan to vote no? Failing that, is anybody abstaining? And if nobody's voting no and nobody's abstaining, I guess we all said yes.

So, what's next? We have a statement of work for RSSAC047 version 2 which came into discussion last week. And Duane identified some things that were wrong with it or needed to be updated and made some proposed changes. So Duane, could I get you to talk through those?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Sure thing, Fred. So, I apologize for the last-minute changes. These came about when I had a telephone discussion with Paul Hoffmann who I'm sure everyone knows was involved in the original RSSAC047 document as well as tasked with implementing the initial—making the initial implementation.

So, the first version of the scope of work that a lot of people saw was very broad. But at least by my read of it, it said that nearly everything that was in 047 was sort of up for reconsideration in 047 v2. Essentially, it referred to the—as you see on the screen, in the background section, there's these two bullets. It says RSSAC047 defines bullet one and bullet

two and below the scope originally said that the work parties should not exceed the two bullets in the background section which was everything.

So, I had some concerns about that thinking that it was really very broad and could lead to a very long work party. When in my mind at least, the important work was to identify the difficulties and the problems that Paul had found in his initial implementation. I think that the—[inaudible] even says that, that there should be the initial implementation and then it should be revised based on that.

So, the changes that you see in front of you really narrow the scope of the v2 work party to correcting technical errors in the definitions of the metrics that Paul discovered by doing his work. And also, something that we talked about was that we should probably want to add a mandatory review period for the documents. Very similar to what we have for RSSAC002 metrics which are reviewed I think every three years in that case.

So, that's basically it. I'm proposing that the scope be a lot narrower. This should be a much shorter work party I think than originally envisioned. Not up for consideration and this work party is—we don't want to redefine the metrics. At least I don't want to redefine the metrics. I want to fix the metrics that had been defined rather than open up the whole thing for review.

That's my perspective at least as potential work party leader and happy to hear what other people think.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Do we have any discussion on that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here with a hand up.

FRED BAKER: Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This all sounds perfectly good to me. I'm just curious, who wrote the original text and would that person be willing to speak to why it was more open in the beginning?

DUANE WESSELS: I believe it was—I started with work between Paul Hoffman and ICANN staff. And I made some comments, some suggestions. I sort of tried to narrow the scope but I didn't really push back hard enough, I guess before the deadline until Paul and I had a chance to talk in person.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, fair enough. Just so that we don't tread on anyone's toes and they don't get a chance to fight back so to speak.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, yeah.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm quite happy with the changes, so I'm not imposing anything. I was just widening the floor a bit.

DUANE WESSELS: Sure. And when Paul and I talked on the phone last week, I said, it feels to me like maybe it would be a good thing to have a short, wider caucus meeting with everyone because I didn't want people to feel like I was ramming these changes through without his permission. He didn't feel that was necessary but if the group feels that it's necessary then I would certainly support that.

But I guess, as Fred alluded to, we can't vote on this today. That really leaves this statement of work open for the discussion by the caucus until—I guess at least until our next RSSAC meeting.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Fair enough. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Ozan, remind me, when is the next caucus meeting?

OZAN SAHIN: The next caucus meeting will take place at ICANN72 in October.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

RUSS MUNDY: Fred.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, Russ. You have your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, thanks. I'd like to speak strongly in support of this scoping down as one of the co-chairs of the original RSSAC047 work party. It ended up being very much longer and more arduous I think than anyone expected. And it seems to me that we would be much better off by trying to do small incremental improvements in 047 over time. Very similar to what 002 has been. So, I think this is a really wise set of changes to the charter. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Well, and as it's been told to me, Paul started his prototype implementation and then wound up with a number of questions. So, this responds really to Paul's questions. It seems like there are important things to consider. Okay. Is there any further discussion of the SOW? Okay. So, I'm watching the chat. Andrew, Daniel speaking in the chat and saying narrowing the scope sounds like a good idea to them.

We'll put the vote off and—now we could have an email vote or we could do this in the next meeting which will be the July meeting. Is there a strong opinion either way?

DUANE WESSELS:	I'll just say, Fred, that I don't think the work is urgent. I don't think there's a need for an email vote. I think we can wait a month for the next meeting.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Liman here. Do we actually have a meeting in—I think you're referring to the August meeting. Do we have a meeting in August?
FRED BAKER:	Yes. As far as I know, we have a meeting in August.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	All right, fine. I just know that some committees cancelled their August meeting or do an online meeting because of northern hemisphere of vacation times. But I'm perfectly happy to, I was just looking for data. Thank you.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. So yeah, we'll leave this for the next meeting whenever that occurs. Okay, back to the agenda. Thank you. And Ken Renard, do you want to talk about the local perspective tool?
KEN RENARD:	Sure. Thanks, Fred. There hasn't been too much activity on the local perspective work party the past couple of weeks. There's really just one outstanding issue in the work party and that is with respect to publishing the data. So, if a user is going to run the tool, they will have

the option of publishing data to a central repository where it can be reviewed by researchers and compared to other results. It's really just the, does the user opt-in or opt-out. They will have a choice.

So, I'm hoping to get something out to the caucus just to spark the discussions the next day to try and bring that issue to conclusion and from there, we should hopefully go to caucus review and then on to RSSAC vote. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you much. Yeah, looking forward to doing that. So, now we move on to reports and I personally don't have a whole lot to report. But Brad, you sent an email to the RSO consultation list. Would you like to talk about that?

BRAD VERD: Not really. I don't think that's an RSSAC topic. I think it's an RSO topic and I'd like to talk about it on the RSO list.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

BRAD VERD: I don't want to conflate the two topics. That's all.

FRED BAKER: So be it. So, Kaveh, you want to talk about the ICANN Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. So, nothing to report. We didn't have anything in discussion related to the RSSAC.

FRED BAKER: Liman, do you have any comments?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Not really. Not much here either. We had an almost clean report from the PDI regarding the last period. The only thing that are happening is that our—one of the representatives from the ccNSO has stepped down. This is Alejandra Reynoso because she has been elected as chair of the ccNSO Council and that conflicts a bit with her time commitments if nothing else.

And the replacement is now finally public and that will be Frederico Neves from Registro.br in Brazil whom I guess a lot of you already know. So, that's a very good replacement and I'm happy about that. Apart from that, nothing special. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Daniel, do you have anything from RZERC?

DANIEL MIGAULT: So, no. I don't have anything from RZERC. But from the IAB, the two things I might say is that we had, a few weeks ago, a very good

presentation from Wes explaining a little bit what RSSAC is doing and how RSSAC is evolving. Explaining the GWG work.

And on the IAB side, we also had a meeting with how to handle the liaisons from the IAB to the other groups. I insisted that we should try to build that dialogue a little bit more. So, this is all I have to say.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you much. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Fred. Nothing really to report. Just one more time, my apologies for missing our joint RSSAC-SSAC meeting and thanks to those carrying on and to Ozan for getting the recordings and such distributed well. That's it for today. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. James, do you have anything from IANA?

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi, all. Nothing from IANA today.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Duane, any comment from the RZM?

DUANE WESSELS: Nothing to report, Fred. Thanks.

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

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well, Liman here. What should we report, Brad? We've had a couple of meetings with the root server operators who are now building a document for success criteria for whatever proposal comes out of the GWG. I think that's a very good effort. It's well underway but not near to be finished and the work is ongoing. And there is also discussion about various way to approach this problem from other directions than the GWG one.

These are all ongoing discussions and we are probably not going to see a lot of results from that for the next several weeks. So the GWG is stepping down a bit and not working at full speed because the GWG is expecting input from the root server operators. Is that a decent report, Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Yeah, it is. I mean, I think there is a valid question I guess that—since we talked about the RSSO model here, I think it's reasonable to say that I guess RSSAC members can go back and talk to their RSOs about representation and how that would or could work.

In the RSSO model, I believe—I don't have Carlos or—maybe Ozan or Steve, you can help me. I think there's still a layer of representation there where in the root server stakeholder group—I don't have the picture in front of me. All the RSOs are represented and obviously that

would carry whatever the message is up to the RSSO Council, which does have other members, so that would be a representative model.

If that doesn't work or if that doesn't—if the checks and balances can't be put in place then we need to say something. So, please look at the question. Talk to your RSSOs about the question that was shared this morning and think about representation.

FRED BAKER: That cover it, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, thank you. Hiro, any additions?

HIRO HOTTA: No, nothing to add. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think that concludes our report. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, thank you much. And in the agenda, we have reached the point of AOB. Does anybody have anything that they would like to bring up at this point?

Failing that, I guess it's time to adjourn the meeting. This is probably the fastest meeting on record. But thank you very much for your participation and we'll call it a wrap.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Fred?

FRED BAKER: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: If I may, I'm happy if we want to adjourn the meeting, stop the recording and then discuss the email I sent out this morning but it's up to the group. It's an opportunity.

FRED BAKER: Well, in any event, we're closing this meeting. So, I think we can turn the recording off.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]