
FRED BAKER: Good morning, or afternoon, or evening, or whatever. Welcome to the RSSAC meeting for August 3rd, 2021. Let's call the roll. Cogent, are you here? DISA.

KEVIN WRIGHT: Kevin Wright.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson.

FRED BAKER: ICANN.

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ISC. Jeff, are you here?

JEFF OSBORN: I'm here, Fred.

FRED BAKER: I am, too. NASA, Barbara and Tom?

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.

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. I believe Barbara has just joined the call so if you'd like to come back to her.

FRED BAKER: I'll come back to her. Okay. Netnod, Liman, Patrik. RIPE NCC. Kaveh, are you here?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. Kaveh is here.

FRED BAKER: And Anand? UMD, Karl.

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: And Gerry?

KARL REUSS: No Gerry.

FRED BAKER: No Gerry. Okay. USC. ARL.

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Verisign. WIDE. I think I just saw—

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Okay. Hi, Hiro. So NASA, Barbara Schleckser.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Yeah. I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Cool. Liaison to the Board. Kaveh, you're here. CSC, Liman. SSAC, Russ—Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ is here. Good morning.

FRED BAKER: Good morning. Okay. RZERC, Dan Migault. IAB, same name. IANA Functions Operator, James Mitchell. And Root Zone Maintainer. Duane, are you here?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: And observers. Do we have any this morning? I guess not. Well, okay. And we've got staff—Andrew, and Danielle, Ozan, and Steve. Okay.

BRAD VERD: Apologies. Brad's here. I'm late. Sorry. Previous call.

FRED BAKER: I'll forgive you this time, thank goodness.

BRAD VERD: Appreciate it.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Daniel is here. I just had my sound off.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. I had that problem the other day on Meetecho. I pressed so that people wouldn't hear me and I couldn't hear them. There are two different buttons to do it. Both had the same effect. It was terrible. Okay. Minutes. Everybody saw the minutes? Does anybody have any objections to them? Failing that, are people abstaining from the vote? Failing that, I guess we've accepted the minutes. And Jeff, do you have comments from the caucus membership people?

JEFF OSBORN:

I actually do. Normally, it's pretty boring. But if you'll bear with me, I've got a two-minute update and an actual interesting twist. We had a candidate. I'm going to attempt his name. I believe it's Dieudonné [Azomapu] who applied. His information is listed there. We've generally been very liberal with admitting people into the caucus. In this case, I think we delved further into, "What are the requirements for somebody joining?" And this gentleman's experience was a little thin.

So we looked and found that there's actually a section in the application document that says, and I quote, "operational experience running DNS infrastructure or helping with a DNS-related Internet draft, or participating in the development of DNS server software or hardware," which is a higher bar than I think we'd considered.

So the membership committee drafted a letter back and said, "Based on the requirements that you were aware of and read, we think your meaningful experience is a little limited at this point." And then, we recommended going back and looking at the further ... Do you have

letter there? There it is. Reading up on the website, and observing the mailing list, and being an observer in meetings, going forward.

So this was interesting, where I don't think we've rejected an applicant before. And when we read the requirements, I was surprised at how high that bar is. So I would take any comments, if there were any. But we, the membership committee, already determined this was worthwhile and sent the message here on the behalf of the committee.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. So do people have any comments on that—any discussion? So for the first time, we've actually not accepted somebody that applied. Russ, you have your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Fred. Yeah. And thanks, Jeff, for this report. I think this was a very wise position that the membership committee took because, as you well point out, it's been accepting of anyone who applied. So looking at and thinking about the criteria for membership, I think, is a very good thing, especially with the quantity of people we have in the caucus and also the quantity of them at don't do a great deal. So thank you. I'm in agreement with what I'm seeing here. It think this is a good move.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thanks, Russ. I'll remind you that we're running on a mercy platform for a couple of more months, where we said, "Let's not throw anybody out because pandemic is hard." But I wondered whether back-testing the existing membership with the requirements that we just noted would be

an interesting exercise. I don't propose to do it but I think on a going-forward basis, that bar is ... Like I said, that's a high one.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Matt, you've got a comment.

MATT LARSON: Yeah. Thanks, Fred. I just wondered if you'd heard anything back from this guy and what his response was, if any.

JEFF OSBORN: Ozan, I didn't hear anything. Did you?

OZAN SAHIN: In fact, we drafted this note. I think we have held up from sending it to the applicant. I believe you wanted to take this note to the RSSAC meeting today. And if there are no concerns, then we'll go ahead and share the note with the applicant.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. I was fooled by our drafting where, in the first line, we said we said it. So that's my bad. I did want to bring this up. If anybody has a problem, it is not yet sent. My apologies for that. Ozan's more efficient than I ever remember.

FRED BAKER: Ozan does pretty well.

JEFF OSBORN: No kidding.

FRED BAKER: So question for the group. Does anybody have any concerns in this case? Hearing none, I think the RSSAC supports your decision.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent. Thanks very much, Fred. And thank you, Ozan. Let's just send it out.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Cool. So work items. We actually do have a couple of votes this morning. You've seen the statement of work and scope for the RSSAC047v2 effort, Duane and I leading that. Duane, do you want to talk about that?

DUANE WESSELS: Sure, Fred. I'm not sure there's a whole lot to say. We talked about this at our last meeting. We talked about revising the statement of work and the scope from its original version, and that has been done, and the caucus has had time to see that. The scope is now much narrower, really just focusing on implementation problems that have been found and, of course, adding a view period. So it's pretty straightforward.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does anybody have any discussion there? Failing that, let's take it to a vote. Is anybody opposed to this? Does anybody plan to abstain from the vote? Failing that, I think we've accepted it. Okay. Ken, do you want to talk about the local perspective tool?

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Fred. So the Local Perspective Work Party met yesterday, finalizing the document with respect to publishing the results of the tool into a repository. A few decisions that were made on the mail list got formalized. So anybody who's interested, take a look at section five of that document. What's left to do is some document cleanup, editorial things. I want to follow up with Wes on one thing. And at that point, I'll be ready for RSSAC caucus review. And we expect a September RSSAC vote on this document. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. RSSAC000. This is something that Andrew keeps a list of things that didn't quite work and potential changes to them. Andrew, you want to talk about RSSAC000?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. Thanks, Fred. Can you put that up, Ozan? Yeah. Exactly. So this is a list of things that staff keeps, whenever the RSSAC is forced to do something which isn't quite documented, in an RSSAC000. And then, according to the RSSAC work plan, every July we prepare this in preparation for updating RSSAC000. Since the last one we did was RSSAC000v5, the next one will be RSSAC000v6. So I'll quickly run down

these items and then if anyone has any questions about them or wants to propose a different item, or whatnot, they can certainly do so.

The first one is the letter that the RSSAC wrote. And instead of it being an RSSAC document, it was just published along with the minutes for the meeting. The second one just revolves around there not being any guidance on how long preview period should be for electronic voting procedures, while we have that guidance for regular meetings. So that's a pretty small one. The last two, I forget precisely who brought them up. But v5 says nothing about the onboarding for outgoing liaisons from the RSSAC. So any kind of training or onboarding sessions that those liaisons might need.

And then, the final one here, number four, is that new liaison roles have very limited guidance on how they should be chosen from the RSSAC caucus. There's some kind of general guidance in RSSAC000v5, covering liaison roles in general. So there's this general language that says that liaisons that aren't specifically mentioned here, we've got some very basic guidance on that. But we have numerous guidance on some liaisons and then we have all these other ones down here at the bottom, which are covered by this more general text.

So those are the four things. This is probably the first time people are seeing these so I'd be surprised if people have any detailed comments on them. But if you have any questions, now would be a great time to ask them. And certainly, I think the next plan would be for staff to start preparing some text to add these to 000v6 if the RSSAC agrees with that. So those would be my proposed next steps. Any comments or questions? Sorry, Fred.

FRED BAKER: I was about to say the same thing. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Hello. Yes. I'm finding the buttons here. This all looks good to me. I want to caution for number four, though, because I see there are lots of good stuff in there but I would propose that we write them in the new document as recommendations and things to consider, rather than strict rules for how and what because I believe we want to give ourselves some flexibility when we create these new liaison roles that may appear in the future.

So it should contain at least, "Think of this. Think of that," and so on, and recommendations for blah and blah. But I really would like to avoid a very rigid framework for saying, "A liaison must not have a term limit longer than two years, and must do this, and must report every three weeks, and things like that. So just a thought. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Gee. I thought three weeks was a reasonable time. Okay. Does anybody have any comment on these potential work items? Things to add? Things to change?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'll just say thanks for that feedback, Liman. I'll take that into account when I think about how to draft some of the new language.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, you want to take your hand down? Okay. Moving ahead in the agenda. Show me the agenda, please. Here we go. So there's no vote on that. And we move, at this point, directly into reports. I'm not sure that I have a whole lot to report to the committee. I'm sorry.

DUANE WESSELS: Sorry to interrupt. I thought we were going to update RSSAC002. I thought we talked about that previously. Is there work or a work party scheduled for that. Maybe Steve knows.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I don't think there's a formal work party. Andrew, do we have anything?

BRAD VERD: I don't think there was a work party created. I think there might have been an e-mail sent out, looking for ideas. That's all so far.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: That's basically right, Brad. I sent a mail out to the caucus, asking if people had any updates for RSSAC002. There was one response from Paul Hoffman. I also sent a couple mails to people who had wanted to get stuff into the last version of RSSAC002 but we didn't have time. We postponed that stuff. And I didn't get any responses on those. So in general, there wasn't much. With the exception of the single mail from Paul, there was no response on that—on updating RSSAC002.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And remind me what Paul had to say.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I will paste it into chat.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: That's Paul's comment.

FRED BAKER: Oh. So remove mention of the early warning system. Okay.

DUANE WESSELS: 002 has a requirement to be reviewed every three years. So do we consider that requirement now satisfied? Is that what the caucus e-mail

was for or does the review mean something more rigorous, like a work party?

FRED BAKER: Well, what's your opinion?

DUANE WESSELS: I don't know.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Duane, there's nothing defined there. So a review could be just an e-mail to the caucus, "Is there anything we should do?" or something else. But there is nothing defined, nothing in 000 about it. We put these reminders in these documents so that we do come back every so often and make that they're just not out of date. So this was the effort. Or this was the beginning of the effort. This was certainly not the end, I guess. I don't remember what the timeline was. But we said, "Yes. Let's move forward with seeing if there changes that people wanted to do to 002," but we wanted to be careful as not to open it up to all the research requests that we got last time we did this. Hope that helps.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

BRAD VERD: Did you have a goal with 002?

DUANE WESSELS: No. I didn't have a goal. It's just that I think that, in the past, whenever the review period has come up, it had ended up in a work party. So I expected that again, I guess. But I'm fine with not needing a work party. If there's no need for one, then we don't have to do. My expectation was a little bit different, I guess.

BRAD VERD: I think the difference is that 002 was not mature through both of those times. Now it's like, "Okay. Are there more changes? Is there something new that we should be doing?" And so far, the answer has been just Paul's answer.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Okay.

BRAD VERD: So maybe there's not a need for a work party. But that's where we are.

DUANE WESSELS: Yep. Okay.

FRED BAKER: And Ken notes that the review period is actually two years. So we're jumping the gun on the 2022 update or something like that.

BRAD VERD: We're not jumping the gun. We're trying to stay ahead of it since we tend to work efficiently and diligently, which can take a little bit of time.

FRED BAKER: Or something like that. Yeah. Okay. So in any event, Ken's comment, he says that was an update last year, in 2020. And two years from then would be 2022. Okay. So I think we're pretty well done with that. Let's move ahead in the agenda. Comments from the chair and vice-chair. I'm not sure I have anything to report that everybody hasn't already seen, primarily on the RSO coordination list—the Monday meetings. Brad, do you have anything to bring up?

BRAD VERD: No. The only discussion ... I shouldn't say the only but the majority of the discussions with the other SO/AC chairs are around the next face-to-face meeting or how that's going to go. That's all still just a huge question mark right now for everybody. So I don't think there's anything material to share. Just know that the discussions are underway. People want to get back to face-to-face but it's just unclear when.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. So the Board made a resolution, or had a discussion, about face-to-face meetings. They decided that the meeting that just happened would be remote but the next meeting would be in Puerto Rico and would be hybrid, which is to say that people would have the opportunity to go face-to-face. We would also, almost by definition, have some remote attendees. And we'll see where that goes but that is

apparently the current thinking of the Board. Kaveh just dropped that into the chat. Does anybody have any comments on that while we're on the topic?

BRAD VERD: I believe the one we just had was going to be virtual. What they just announced was the one in the fall is virtual and the one in the spring would be the hybrid. I believe that was my interpretation.

FRED BAKER: Okay. 73 is going to be hybrid. Yeah. I think you're right. Okay. So, Kaveh, do you have anything from the ICANN Board, seeing as we're more or less on that topic?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. Thank you. No. Nothing other than what you and Brad just mentioned. Basically, that was the only thing, that on the 15th, there was a meeting about ICANN 73. The upcoming one, that will be, basically, a virtual meeting. I also sent the rationale for the last one, which is similar to this one. So yep. That's it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, anything from the CSC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Not much this time. The PTI is doing a great job, as usual. We had some discussing—debriefing is a good word—from the joint session

we had with the PTI, with the informational webinar, which went quite well. We were entering into our yearly cycle of appointments and reappointments of the members of the committee and we are also starting to rev up our how to meet and approach the upcoming effectiveness review process that we were going to undergo, which is also a periodic event. There's nothing special that has triggered that.

We've also decided to cancel our regular meeting in August for vacation reasons and we will only have an online approval of the PTI report—the monthly report. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT:

Yeah. Actually, a few comments to say, mostly regarding the RZERC liaison. So I sent everything on the mailing list and I do have a few questions to RSSAC. RZERC published a document, which is adding some data protection to the root zone, which is basically ZONEMD. That document provides four recommendations. During the discussion during the last meeting of RZERC, some were somehow questioning me in informal ways of whether RSOs have considered ZONEMD. That means have they already tested, it does not cause harm, for example, and if, eventually, they would like to implement this ZONEMD.

I guess the question is not to have a clear and official survey. It's just to have a sense of how SSAC is doing around that. So if I can gather any

feedback, that would be appreciated. Again, it's more for the discussions that are happening at RZERC.

The other thing RZERC is doing is doing a scoping exercise proposal. So the idea is to list a number of items and to discuss whether they are in scope of RZERC or not. The way I see that is it could be a working group party. But the topic is not to address that party but to see if it's in scope to RZERC or not.

The first question regarding that I have to RSSAC is to understand if ... Until now, all those topics were confidential. And I am wondering if RSSAC has any position to have those discussions public on the mailing list. Currently, my position is that I don't see the need to get private discussions and to hide those topics. But I'm happy to hear otherwise from RSSAC.

The other aspect is does RSSAC have any proposals for RZERC? Think of it as a working group party that you would like RZERC to address. Or if you have some questions—whether you think that is in scope of RZERC or not. So if you have any proposals, I would be happy to mention those.

Currently, the topic I would like to mention is related to unsecured delegation and non-DNS usage that are related to the root zone. So that's all. I'm happy to hear any feedback--on the mailing list or right now, as you wish.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Now, this is relating to the Zone Digest Internet draft, which is pretty public. Duane, do you want to talk about that draft at all?

DUANE WESSELS: Sure. I can talk a little bit about it. It's an RFC, actually—RFC 8976. The RFC covers, of course, ways that you can add a digest to any DNS zone. But we are, of course, interested in doing it for the root zone. There's a number of things that need to fall in place before this can all happen. One of those, as Daniel mentioned, is that that root server operators should verify that their systems can accept the new record. This is something that we talked about at the root server operator meeting that took place last week or so.

I'd like to make one slight correction to what Daniel said. In terms of ZONEMD, what we need from the root server operators and from root zone maintainer is a guarantee that adding the record doesn't break anything, which is different that implementing the full protocol. We're not asking any root server operators, at this time, to implement the verification part of the protocol. They're certainly welcome to, and that may happen naturally as software gets updated and so on, but that's not a request made to the root server operators at this time.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So in reporting back, should the various operators report to the RSSAC list? Who do they report to? Do you know?

DUANE WESSELS: I think there's a couple ways it could go. We could work this within the context of RSSAC, I guess, if you think that's appropriate. We could also—

FRED BAKER: It seems to me like the obvious place to do it is in the IETF, since it's been discussed there and posted as an RFC.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. But the issue that Daniel raised—or not issue but he's raising it because RZERC has published a set of recommendations. And one of RZERC's recommendations is that the root server operators and the root zone maintainer verify that nothing will break. So that probably needs to either be, I think, in RSSAC or it could be a statement, just published by the root server operators themselves.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. Just to complement what Duane just mentioned, there are two things. One is that RSSAC provide a public statement and the other one is that—which is much less official—that I have some position to carry, to have a dialog with RZERC from RSSAC. So, for example, if I can say to RZERC, "Some RSOs have started looking at that and I have noticed it doesn't cause harm. Some are doing that. Some are planning to do that." That's what I would call a soft statement. Of course, we can also work on a public statement within RZERC, in parallel.

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

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. Thank you. If this is or becomes an official request to the root server operators, I definitely think that RSSAC is the right way to go. That's one of the purposes that we have for RSSAC and that we have carefully undertaken, to be a conduit to root server operators.

How this is further treated depends on what the expected outcome is. If this is something that needs a statement from the root server operators, it can be handed back via RSSAC or it can be dealt with, was someone proposed, as an official statement from the root server operators directly. But that the input comes from RZERC through RSSAC to the root server operators seems to be quite the right way in my opinion. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And not sure I disagree with that. Seems like this would be worthwhile sending as a question from RSSAC to the root server operators and basically get the root server operators to respond to it. Daniel, would you be willing to formulate that question?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. Sure. I can also wordsmith with Duane. But I think RZERC provided a document and we can start from that.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Providing some questions. Yeah.

FRED BAKER: Right. The document is there. I'm just thinking that it would be very easy for the RSOs to answer the wrong question. So if you could formulate the question for them, that would help.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. I can do that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So we'll look from an e-mail from you to the RSSAC list. And then let me simply suggest that each RSSAC primary forward it to his or her favorite company. Then we can collect comments. And we should collect those back to the list.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Sure. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Yeah. Thank you. Okay. And let's see here. Who do we have next?
Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Good morning. This is easy today. No report from the SSAC today.
Thanks.

FRED BAKER: My goodness. Okay. James, IANA function operator.

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. James is not on the call today.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So we have no comment from IANA. Duane, do you want to comment from the root zone maintainer's perspective.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks but nothing else to report this meeting.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad, Hiro, Liman, anything from the GWG or the RSO coordination people?

BRAD VERD: I think Hiro signed off. Liman, I think you've been on vacation. There's really been no update. There's nothing going on with the GWG. The meeting that scheduled last week, I think was cancelled due to the IETF. And we have one this week scheduled. But there's been no activity, as the GWG is waiting for the document from the root server operators on the governance success criteria.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And the plan on that is to continue the Monday discussions and come up with a document. Brad, you had suggested a possible

telephone—well, Zoom—workshop in September or in October—well no, in September, either one or two days. How is that shaping up?

BRAD VERD:

I don't think we've really talked about it as a group with the RSOs. I think it's ... How do I say this? I've said it before. I think this group works really well when we're locked in a room together. Creating this document that we're creating, given the magnitude of it and how important I think it will be, I think, at the end, before we turn it over to the GWG, we need to go through it line-by-line, and talk through it, and make sure everybody's on board.

My thought process was applying the workshop mentality that we used to get through 37 to a document like this in September. But nothing's been scheduled yet. I haven't gotten any feedback from people if they want that or feel the same way.

FRED BAKER:

Well, okay. I don't think it's actually been mentioned in the RSO coordination meetings. I expected it to come up last Monday and it didn't. So it seems like we should discuss that Monday coming.

BRAD VERD:

Okay.

FRED BAKER: Well, and the point being to decide whether it's a one-day thing or two-day thing. Is it 24-hour telephone call or what is it? So let's make sure that happens. Do we have anything else? I guess we really don't, from the GWG.

BRAD VERD: No.

FRED BAKER: Failing that, I think we've reached the end of the agenda. So AOB. Anybody else have anything to bring up at this point? Failing that, I guess we're adjourned.

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]