
FRED BAKER: Okay, could you show me the list of names, please? There we go. Okay, so tell me who's here. Cogent, Paul or Brad? DISA? I heard Ryan.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yeah, this is Ryan Stephenson.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ISC, Jeff and I are both here.

JEFF OSBORN: I'm here.

FRED BAKER: NASA? I saw Barbara's name.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Yes, I'm here.

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

FRED BAKER: Okay. Netnod? RIPE NCC? University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: USC ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here.

FRED BAKER: ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken is here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

FRED BAKER: WIDE? Okay, liaison to the Board, Kaveh, are you here? CSC, Liman probably isn't here yet. RZERC and IAB, Daniel Migault, are you here? SSAC, Russ, I thought I saw your name.

RUSS MUNDY: Good morning. Yes, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: IANA Functions Operator, James?

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Root Zone Maintainer, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here, thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And Hiro told us he wouldn't be here, so okay. So, okay, I think we have a quorum.

ANDY KIMBLE: Fred, this is Andy Kimble here as an observer. Thank you, sir.

FRED BAKER: Oh, you're quite welcome.

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. Yes, we do have a quorum.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Could you go back to the agenda, please? Okay, well, what we have to go through this morning—well, morning here—we have a discussion of the caucus membership survey, what we're going to do for ICANN72. We have a couple of work items, one of which calls for a vote, and then some random reports.

Anybody want to change the agenda in any way? Failing that, let's move into the minutes. They've been circulated. Does anybody have any objection to the minutes? If there are no objections, is anyone abstaining on the minutes? Failing that, I think we've accepted them.

Jeff, can I ask you about the caucus membership committee?

JEFF OSBORN: Sure. It has come around time for the RSSAC Caucus annual membership survey. And we had some discussion about given that there was a global pandemic—if you weren't aware of it over the last 18 months—that changed a few things, we were tempted to ask a bunch of questions that related to how we could better do things in a pandemic world.

But I think we stopped and are instead proposing that we do the same membership survey we've done before because the longitudinal value is better if you keep it the same. So I kind of want to put that out there. We felt like we could add an addendum of pandemic-specific issues like, "Do feel like you have lost the ability to provide much by it not being in-person?" You've all gotten the questions about how we're going to do things, the IETF and every other organization.

So this as proposed—you can click through on the agenda—is the existing membership survey that we would probably send out, and I guess I'm looking for input. We sort of decided we were just going to do the same survey unless somebody had strong feelings and if they did, we'd do it as an addendum rather than changing it.

Brad says keep it the same. That's where we came to. I'm going to take silence for consent, but first I'm going to leave 10 seconds of silence to see if anybody else has an issue and thinks we should ask more. Okay, fair enough. That's a living example of COVID weariness.

The other issue was the appointment for the NextGen group. Ozan, you're so much more on top of this than I am. Do you want to speak to that? Do you mind?

OZAN SAHIN:

Sure. Thank you, Jeff. Hello, everyone. We had a call for volunteers for the NextGen at ICANN mentorship role. Our current representative to this committee who is Dessalegn Yehuala has been the only volunteer who is willing to serve in the calendar year 2022. He is eligible to go for another term, and the RSSAC Caucus membership committee supported

his candidacy. So this [inaudible] item today for RSSAC to decide whether to reappoint Dessalegn Yehuala in this NextGen ICANN mentorship committee. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Ozan. That's all we've got, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. And we're taking a vote on Dessalegn. Okay, does anybody have an issue with him? Is anyone opposed? Is anyone abstaining? Failing that, I think we've accepted Dessalegn. Ozan, do you want to go over the ICANN72 schedule?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, thank you, Fred. So ICANN recently published an announcement with the revised dates of its annual general meeting ICANN72. If you haven't heard, it's going to be an online meeting. It will run between 25 October through 28 October. So it's a four-day meeting from Monday to Thursday.

I have created a draft schedule for RSSAC. I'm going to share it on the RSSAC schedule. But this is up for discussion for RSSAC today. The RSSAC admin committee drafted the schedule, identified some potential sessions for RSSAC. You can see on this table here that three of them, the RSSAC meeting, this is actually replacing the RSSAC November meeting. So it's pulling this meeting back to October 25 since RSSAC

hadn't had an RSSAC public meeting in conjunction with an ICANN meeting for a while.

And then the meeting with the ICANN Board and RSSAC Caucus meets at ICANN annual general meeting, so an ICANN Caucus meeting on Tuesday. You will also be able to see some unconflicted sessions, high-interest sessions, two plenaries on the schedule, and ICANN executive Q&A. And then at the end of the meeting, there will be an ICANN public forum followed by the ICANN Board meeting. And also technical sessions like DNSSEC workshop have been added to the schedule. And I'll continue adding any other technical sessions to the schedule.

What you don't see is the usual RSSAC/SSAC joint meeting. I didn't put it on the schedule because it's usually a cross-session. So I think the intention is to continue having this meeting with the SSAC. If this is the case, I'll reach out to SSAC support staff and Russ to identify a good time for this meeting.

So it's now for RSSAC to discuss whether they'd like to see any additional meetings and any other comments that you have on ICANN72 schedule or any questions you may have. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

And Liman is joining us. Could you go back to the agenda then, Ozan, please? If anybody has any suggestions on the agenda, of course, we're interested. Moving on to work items, Ken, do you want to talk about the requirements for measurements?

KEN RENARD:

Sure. Thanks. Hello, everyone. The local perspective work party, the document went out for final call within the caucus. And there was a last-minute remark made specifically about interpreting some of the results of the tool. One of the things we did call out early on in the document was the analysis of the data is open-ended and would not be actually described in the tool. The discussion happened on the mail list. The majority of the responses were that we don't need to address this further in the document. So that document did come out of the caucus as stable as of last week, and it was sent to the RSSAC as its final seven-day stable period thanks to Andrew. And I believe that is now ready for vote. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you much. Has everybody had a chance to read this? I should ask, who has not had a chance to read it? Hearing none, okay, so does anybody have any changes that they want to make to the document? Hearing none, is anybody abstaining from the document? Failing that, then I guess we have accepted this document. And thank you very much to Ken and the people that worked on it. RSSAC047v2, Duane, do you want to talk about that?

DUANE WESSELS:

Sure. I'm not sure what there is to say other than that everyone agreed on the statement of work. And the next step, I think, is just to formally create the work party and get underway.

FRED BAKER: Well, okay, what do we need to do to do that? Do we need some comment here? So I think the thing to do, Duane, you are going to be the RSSAC sponsor for that, right?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, I'm willing to be involved in whatever capacity, whether it's sponsor or work party leader. I think generally the work party selects its leader at its first meeting.

FRED BAKER: Right.

DUANE WESSELS: Ozan has his hand up, so he can maybe tell us what the next steps should be.

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

OZAN SAHIN: Yeah, thanks, Duane and Fred. Duane is correct. We have scheduled the introductory first meeting of the work party, and it will be held next week on 14 September. I circulated a calendar invitation for that. And as Duane said, the work party will choose its leader during this meeting. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and Duane will be convening the work party, correct?

DUANE WESSELS: I will certainly be there.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, okay. So thank you for that.

DUANE WESSELS: Mm-hmm.

FRED BAKER: Moving on to RSSAC000, Andrew, do you want to comment on that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. Ozan, can you share? Yeah, you're already on it. A few weeks ago staff had...so throughout the year as we discover things in RSSAC000 that people want changing in the RSSAC, staff collects them. And then according to the RSSAC work plan we go through around this time of the year. And we made a document of all those things. And then what Ozan is sharing now is my implementation of those things in RSSAC000v6. So I think this document itself that Ozan is sharing right now was shared with the RSSAC one or two weeks ago to get some feedback on it. I didn't see any feedback on the list, so what I'll do is I'll just go through all of the proposed changes I've made to RSSAC000.

What you see here is you see the black text is straight out of RSSAC000v5, and then the suggestions are my edits resolving the items that staff collected throughout the year. So I will just walk down these items.

Starting at the top in Section 1.2.8, this says all liaison roles and their current appointees are listed on the RSSAC website. This is in response to Item 4 which has to do with there was very limited guidance on how outgoing representatives are chosen from the RSSAC Caucus. And when I presented this list of things in the last RSSAC meeting in the last month, Liman had made a comment that he really didn't want too much of a prescriptive solution here. So I tried to keep this not necessarily vague, but I added something that RSSAC liaison roles are listed on the RSSAC website but I didn't go into too much detail there.

So moving on to 1.2.8.1 on participation, I added a sentence on orientation and onboarding for incoming liaisons. So you'll see in the first paragraph of that section I specified incoming because that wasn't specified there and this is really meant to be about incoming. And please, I'll try to keep an eye on the hands. If anyone has any questions, please raise your hand and comment. Otherwise, I'm just going to keep walking through.

Going on to Section 1.2.8.11, and this is about outgoing liaison review process. I think the only change there is that I changed it to say outgoing just to specify that that was about outgoing liaisons.

Moving down again to 1.2.8.12—thank you, Ozan—this is a continuation in response to Item 4. We didn't have enough guidance on outgoing

representatives. So there are specific representatives mentioned in RSSAC000 and then there are others which have kind of, I guess you'd say, accumulated over the years. These are not specifically called out in the operational procedures.

So the point with this edit is to say, well, there are going to be other outgoing liaisons like the ones that are listed there and to specify that a person may only serve for two consecutive terms unless there are no other candidates for an outgoing liaison position. And that language was taken from, I think, edits that we made to RSSAC000v5 where we had a bunch of discussion around term limitations unless there are no other candidates. So I borrowed that language there and put it in place here. So this doesn't affect any of the other liaison positions that are called out in RSSAC000 like the liaison to the Board or to RZERC or anything like that. It's just about liaison roles that aren't specified in the section.

Moving down on to the next one please, Ozan. Right. This final edit, we didn't have any language in RSSAC000 about like for a monthly meeting we have to send materials at least a week in advance. We didn't have anything specifically saying that for electronic votes, so online votes. So this is just adding a sentence saying we have to do the same thing for online votes.

I think maybe the best thing to do here is to let people review this and then maybe hold an online vote or something. I guess I'll leave that up to you, Fred. But we might get some comments right now, but it doesn't look like maybe people are all that prepared to comment or maybe people just don't have any comments. So maybe give people a chance to review it on the list before we take any action now.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah, I would suggest that we go ahead and review it on the list. And Ozan has just dropped a link to the document into the chat. So question: should we send this to the caucus? Wes says, "Thank you for your work, Andrew." And I appreciate your work.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thank you.

STEVE SHENG: Fred, on your question of sending it to the caucus, I think probably sending it to the caucus for a review is not needed. Once these changes are made, perhaps as an FYI to the caucus. [So this is something you put there.] Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, that seems reasonable. So folks now have the link, and we can run an online vote, what? Next week or the week after. Well, meaning we can accept comments that people have first as well. So moving along, okay, reports. There has been, I'm sure most of you are aware, a consultation with members of the RSO representatives of various root server organizations for the last, what? Month or two. And they intend to take a document that they have written and send it to us basically to be reviewed and then published with a number so that we can give it to the GWG and they have a numbered document to go after. Brad, do you want to add to that?

BRAD VERD: No, I think you've got it.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so expect an email about that document coming reasonably soon. Kaveh, do you have any comments from the Board?

BRAD VERD: I see Russ' hand up.

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

RUSS MUNDY: Silly mute button. Sorry. Question about that document. Ordinarily, this is not something that would be sent to the SSAC prior to the RSSAC publication. But due to the nature of the ongoing work [of] the GWG, I wanted to ask if there was any guidance [for me] one way or the other about a desire for the SSAC to see this prior to publication as a formal SSAC document.

FRED BAKER: Well.

BRAD VERD: It's not even a formal document yet. It's not even anything yet.

RUSS MUNDY: Right, but what I'm asking about is whenever....

BRAD VERD: It's premature to even have any of that discussion right now.

RUSS MUNDY: Oh, that's fine. I misunderstood. I thought that it was about ready to come from the RSO group to RSSAC for forwarding to the Board, and....

BRAD VERD: Russ, so it would come to RSSAC for review, modification, to go through our normal document process and then be published as a numbered document. So we would follow our normal process.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, that's fine. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, moving ahead, Liman, do you have a comment?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No, I don't think so. I think you got it right. It's a document that has grown a bit over time from what it started as. And I think now the appropriate way is to take it through RSSAC as proposed. So what you said and what Brad said. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Daniel, RZERC and IAB, do you have anything to comment on?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Hi.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry, Liman here. I thought you wanted my comment regarding the document. Were you referring to my role as the liaison to the CSC?

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah, I was referring to that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Ah, sorry. Then I can be very quick. The CSC didn't have a meeting in August because we planned it that way so that in the middle of vacation season we would have only an online vote for the monthly report from the PTI. And that report from the PTI for July signaled that they met the expectations to 100%, so there were no questions going anywhere. Business as usual. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you much. Daniel, did you have a comment from the RZERC or the IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Hi. From the IAB, I don't have anything to report. From the RZERC, we had a discussion at our last meeting. I've been asked to prepare some questions that might be relevant for the RSOs regarding RZERC003 which is adding zone data protections to the root zone. So that's basically ZONEMD. So I sent those questions, and I would be interested to know how we can proceed further. So is RSSAC willing to manage those questions and collect the responses from the RSOs, or is that something that's going to be handled elsewhere? So like the root ops? So that's basically my questions for now.

FRED BAKER: Well, I'm looking for that email that you sent.

DANIEL MIGAULT: It's on August 18.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and what did you ask to have happen with that? As I recall, you simply stated the questions.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, so the document is providing a few recommendations, and from those recommendations I extracted some questions that we thought might be interesting to respond and to make sure they will...I mean, if we have the response for those questions, we will be able to provide a statement or at least have a good understanding on how

recommendations can be followed. So now basically the question is should it be done within RSSAC or somewhere else?

FRED BAKER:

Okay, so I'm looking at your Google doc that you sent a link to. Is there anything that prevents your organization from deploying ZONEMD? Has your organization planned to test the impact of the introduction of ZONEMD? And how will the introduction of the new ZONEMD RRset impact the processing of the root zone, and has your organization identified anything negative?

Does anybody have any guidance for us? How would you guys like to handle this?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I think Russ' hand is up, but that might be old. Duane has his hand up, and my hand is going up.

FRED BAKER:

Well, okay, so....

DUANE WESSELS:

Fred, can I go ahead?

FRED BAKER:

Go ahead.

DUANE WESSELS: I just wanted to provide maybe a little bit more context to Daniel's question. So we had an RZERC meeting last month where we talked about this quite extensively. And RZERC had some concerns about these questions. And the way we left it was that the questions that Daniel is posing are not from RZERC. RZERC's statement in the RZERC003 document stands on its own. But these questions are from Daniel in his role as the liaison. These are his questions that he wanted to bring to RSSAC to see if they would be helpful. Is that accurate, Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, yeah, yeah. So basically, the confusion which we would like to avoid is that those questions are not...I mean, RSSAC is not being asked to respond to those questions for RZERC. It's not RZERC asking RSSAC to respond to that. It's basically and RSSAC work or an RSO work, whatever work it is, but it's not requested by RZERC.

FRED BAKER: Okay, Brad?

DANIEL MIGAULT: And this is why....

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

DANIEL MIGAULT: This is why I'm saying it doesn't need to be done in RSSAC. I mean it's just how we want that to happen, and it's going to happen the way we want it to happen. There is no...we're not doing it for anyone else than us.

BRAD VERD: All right, so, Daniel, I have a bunch of questions here. You keep saying we, and I'm confused because you're wearing a bunch of hats there. So can you be more specific when you say "we" by saying RSSAC, RZERC, yourself, or another hat that you might be wearing?

DANIEL MIGAULT: So the question...so RZERC has published a document which is RZERC003 in which they provided some recommendations regarding the ZONEMD. And so as an RSSAC member and a liaison to RZERC, I pointed that document, took that document, and [saw] how relevant it could be for RSSAC or RSOs. And so I came as a liaison with a few questions that might need to be clarified so we can actually understand how we [are positioned] regarding the recommendations and how we plan to position...sorry, how RSSAC or each RSO is positioning regarding those recommendations. So this is where I came with those questions. So what I checked with RZERC is if we had those kinds of questions being asked and responded, are they sufficient or would they enable to understand how the people responding to those questions [are positioned] regarding the recommendations for [RZERC]. So the way I could envision the work moving on, so it might be my work, it might be RSSAC work. But I think at some point RSSAC will be asked to maybe

make a statement regarding the RZERC document. I don't know by whom, but maybe by the Board or something. So it might be seen as either we're anticipating something or we're trying to establish a dialogue with RZERC publications. So this is where we are.

BRAD VERD: Well, I'm sorry. I'm just having a hard time following, and I apologize if it's just me. So let me just try to rephrase your question. I feel like—and this is my interpretation. It could be entirely wrong. The recommendations in RZERC003, Recommendation 1, the root zone maintainer and root operator should verify and confirm that the addition of the ZONEMD resource record will in no way negatively impact the distribution of the root zone within the RSS. Are you trying to address this recommendation by these three questions?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, to understand where we are.

BRAD VERD: So you're asking if RSSAC will get the RSOs to answer these three questions that you've written here to address the RZERC Recommendation 1?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: Okay. I hope that cleared things up for people. It cleared it up for me.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Daniel, did these three questions that you have written, did they come from RZERC or do they come from you? Now you've...I thought previously they were RZERC.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Me.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I think one possible way to see that is if I were to write a document on how RSSAC [is positioned] regarding the recommendation of RZERC, given that I can be anyone else than me.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, Liman, do you have a comment?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I kind of traced this backwards from a process standpoint, it seems to me that it's somewhat unclear how changes to the root zone suggested by RZERC are supposed to be processed within ICANN and the root server system. I think we've stumbled on that we need...RZERC proposes something. We need approval from the root server operators

for that to actually be valid, and we don't have a clear process for that. And Daniel has just stepped into that trap here that we really don't have a clear path for this.

That said, I think it's reasonable to ask these questions and it's reasonable for RSSAC to fan out these questions to the root server operators and compile a response back. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Well, okay. And I would agree that they're reasonable questions. It's just that I had the idea that they came from RZERC, but they apparently don't. So let me propose this solution, and you guys can tell me if you disagree. Let's have each of the RSSAC membership go back to their various organizations, ask the questions, pull together the results, and email them to staff. Which, Steve, who should they send them to?

STEVE SHENG: These responses, they can be sent back to, I think in this case, Ozan.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so Ozan will compile a report, and then we can discuss that online.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sounds good to me.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Okay, so let's do that. Send your responses to Ozan. Ozan will compile them. And with that, continuing down the agenda, Russ, do you have anything to report from the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: There we go. Nothing to report from the SSAC, but I did want to mention that the DNSSEC and security workshop for the upcoming ICANN meeting still has some slots available for presentations. So if folks have ideas of things they'd like to present at that workshop, the program committee is happy to take additional input. Thanks. That's it for today.

FRED BAKER: Okay. IANA Functions Operator?

JAMES MITCHELL: Yeah, hi. Well, I'll update, for those of you who don't know, IANA is scheduling or planning the next key ceremony at this time scheduled to happen [inaudible] east coast tentatively for October 14. That's how that's going to look [inaudible] normal pre-COVID situation as that allows. But obviously there are travel restrictions and all that. There's going to be somewhat reduced participation and the exact scope and makeup of that is with ICANN management and security to advise. So we are expecting some TCR presence. No external participation or nobody from outside the required roles. And looking to sign another quarter to bring us back to [inaudible]. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you much. Duane, do you have anything from the Root Zone Maintainer?

DUANE WESSELS: No, nothing new to report. Although, I will say since Russ mentioned the DNSSEC workshop, I do have a presentation scheduled on that workshop about ZONEMD. So if anybody hasn't heard about it yet, feel free to attend that session.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad, Hiro, Liman, do you want to tell us what's going on with the GWG?

BRAD VERD: GWG is on pause, waiting for the success criteria document from the RSOs.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And at this point, we've reached the end of the agenda. Is there anything else that folks would like to bring up?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry for missing the last call. I just had to leave for a minute. I sent a new update to the chat. There is a workshop upcoming from Friday until Monday. If there is anything, please let me know. At the moment, there is no RSSAC relevant stuff on the agenda. But, of course, if during discussions or Q&A something comes up, I will relate back to RSSAC.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, great. Thank you. And hearing no other people chiming in, our next meeting will be 5 October, and we'll go from there. So with that, I think we're done for today. I'll give you an hour back of your busy schedule. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]