
FRED BAKER: I'm supposed to call the roll. Would you show me the list of names, please?

Okay. Cogent, who's here?

PAUL VIXIE: Vixie is here.

FRED BAKER: DISA.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Ryan Stephenson's here.

FRED BAKER: ICANN.

Matt LARSON: Matt Larson's here.

FRED BAKER: ISC, I'm here. Jeff, are you here?

JEFF OSBORN: I'm here, but a little out of it.

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. NASA.

TOM MIGLIN: This is Tom. I'm here. Barbara will join later.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Netnod. RIPE NCC.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh is here.

FRED BAKER: University of Maryland. USC ISI.

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here.

FRED BAKER: ARL.

KEN RENARD: Ken is here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign.

BRAD VERD: Brad is here.

FRED BAKER: WIDE.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And Kaveh, you are the liaison to the Board. Liman is not here.
Russ.

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

FRED BAKER: Okay. And I saw Daniel's face a moment ago. That's RZERC and IAB. And IANA functions operator, James, are you here?

JAMES MITCHELL: I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. RZM, Duane, are you here?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes.

FRED BAKER: Okay. We have two guests from the RSOs, Robert Carolina and Sam Eisner. I saw both of their names a moment ago.

ROBERT CAROLINA: Here.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. And staff, we have a number of staff here.

ANDY KIMBLE: Good morning. This is Andy Kimble. I'm also participating as a guest to DISA and ARL. Thank you, sir.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So we've run the roll. May I see the agenda again? So we have something similar to our usual agenda with one exception, and that is that we've added an AOB item from the RSO consultation, that that's been happening on Mondays. Does anybody else have any agenda bashing to do?

Failing that, let's move on to the administrivia. Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Hello everyone. I circulated draft minutes from 7th of September RSSAC meeting a couple of weeks ago. We haven't seen any comments or questions related to the draft minutes. With regards to the action items from this meeting, these have been completed with the exception of my action item to compile responses from RSOs to the questions Daniel Migault had drafted with respect to Recommendations 1 and 3 from RZERC 3. We've heard from all of the RSOs but NASA. So once I get the response from NASA, we'll go ahead and circulate the Google sheet where I compiled all the responses and share it with the RSSAC.

Other than that, the action items have been completed. If you have any questions, comments, I'll be happy to answer. Otherwise, this is a vote item on today's agenda. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, let's take a vote on this. Does anybody have any adjustments they would like to have to the minutes of the last meeting? Is anybody abstaining from the ballot? Failing that—

PAUL VIXIE: Vixie was absent, so I must abstain.

FRED BAKER: Okay. You're abstaining. Failing that, the rest of us are in favor, I would take it, not abstaining and not dissenting. So they pass. Now, Ozan, do you want to talk about the RSSAC caucus?

OZAN SAHIN:

Yes. Thank you, Fred. Hello again, everyone. Today I'm going to cover the RSSAC caucus membership committee update as the support staff for this committee. We have a sub-agenda item here to talk about the recent caucus membership survey results. So the RSSAC caucus membership committee conducted an annual caucus membership survey back in September and the survey closed last week on Monday. I prepared a few slides to talk about the findings of this survey.

We received 26 responses from RSSAC caucus. We had 34 last year in 2020. All of the respondents participated in an RSSAC caucus meeting before, and 85% of the respondents participated in an RSSAC caucus work party.

The other finding is that all of the respondents would like to continue as a member of the RSSAC caucus, whereas I think we had respondent last year who indicated that he wanted to be removed, and that's what we did.

With respect to the contribution categories, the results of the respondents in this slide is parallel to what we saw last year. I think last year, we had seven work party leaders who participated in the survey. This year, we had three, but other than that, the responses are similar to what we had last year.

Going to the next slide, the meeting frequency, this is also a similar result that we are seeing this year. Most of the respondents wanted to keep the current sequence for RSSAC caucus to meet every ICANN annual general meeting and every other IETF meeting. So that was also

the most popular response last year. And also, this is true for the meeting venues. 25 respondents—actually, I shouldn't say 25 respondents because it was possible to choose more than one response for this question, so we saw the most popular option here to keep the current venues which is a mix of ICANN and IETF meetings.

Going to the next slide, how difficult it is to contribute to the RSSAC caucus, last year there was one response which said it's very easy. This year, none of the respondents thought it was very easy to contribute to the RSSAC caucus, but again, similar to last year's responses, a mix of responses between easy, neutral and complicated. Half of the respondents think it's easy to contribute whereas the other half are either neutral or they think it's complicated to contribute.

This is the last slide that I have today. The reason for nonparticipation to RSSAC caucus work party. Again, the time issue, time to contribute seems to be the most popular response here, and it's followed by no interest in topic and no technical experience and knowledge in topic. Last year, first response, time challenge was still the most challenging issue followed by no technical experience.

The caucus membership committee will discuss the results, and we have some open-ended results from the survey. So the committee will discuss those in its next meeting and then the results and findings will also be presented to RSSAC caucus during the next RSSAC caucus meeting at ICANN 72 on the 26th of October.

If you have any questions, comments, this is the right time to share with the RSSAC. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I do have a couple of questions. The person or persons who said it was complicated to participate in the caucus, did they say what they found difficult?

OZAN SAHIN: I should go and check if he had an open ended response to that question, Fred, but I have to do this quick research and get back to you and RSSAC on that.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. Okay, so let's move ahead. Now, I believe you have the next section, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Fred, let me jump to RSSAC ICANN 72 schedule agenda item. ICANN announced the schedule yesterday for ICANN 72, and I compiled a schedule for RSSAC as I usually do, so the meeting will run virtually from 25th of October through 28th of October, it's a four-day meeting.

On the first day, we have a few technical sessions, three sessions for Tech Day which is organized by ccNSO, and then followed by the are SSAC meeting and the RSSAC and ICANN Board joint meeting. This is the first day of the meeting, and let me remind you that the meeting blocks that you see here are during the business hours for Pacific time, Seattle, the original location for this meeting.

On the second day, as I just said, RSSAC caucus will meet, and then there'll be an ICANN executive Q&A session later that day. We will have only one plenary at ICANN 72. And I know, Fred, you're in the team planning for this plenary, and later this day, there'll be DNSSEC workshop sessions that I noted on the schedule.

On day four, there'll be one session for RSSAC, the RSSAC work session will probably allocated to the RSSAC 47 v2 work party work, and then I noted an RSSAC RZERC public meeting and then the last sessions of the ICANN 72 will be ICANN public forum and the annual general meeting of the ICANN Board.

So a couple of notes here. I'm going to drop the link to the announcement that went out yesterday after I complete my update here, but going back to the agenda, there are a few items I think RSSAC needs to discuss. First of all, working with the SSAC support team, I think we have been able to identify a time for the RSSAC-SSAC joint meeting, so over the past couple of meetings, we picked the Monday that followed the ICANN public meeting week and following the same approach, we are suggesting Monday 1st of November, 18:00 to 19:30 UTC for this meeting, and I will be circulating a calendar invitation for this private meeting with the SSAC.

Then the other point of discussion is topic questions for the meeting with the ICANN Board. You may recall that when ICANN Board meets with SOs and ACs, ICANN structures, in order to determine the agenda for this meeting, the Board comes up with its own topic which will be discussed during half of the meeting time and then the Board also asks

SOs and ACs what their topic for the other portion of the meeting would be or their questions.

So ICANN Board reached out to SO/AC chairs on that and the Board indicated its proposed work topics that you can see here on this Google document. Then the RSSAC needs to decide whether it'll submit a topic or some questions to be discussed in the remaining 30 minutes, and the due date for the submission is Friday the 15th of October. I will hand it back to Fred for any comments, questions about the RSSAC schedule or any comments about the RSSAC topic or questions for the joint meeting with the ICANN Board.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. And I will of course entertain any topics or questions that the RSSAC would like to bring up, so raise your hand if you'd like to speak. Failing that, the topic that seems most topical to me would be the document that was recently put together by the RSOs and which we'll be talking about later in the meeting, which is how to tell whether a proposal is appropriate and the [inaudible] document. That's my suggestion. Do we have other suggestions? I don't see any hands up, so I would guess that's the topic that we're going to raise.

Okay, with that, let's move ahead. So we've come to the work parties. Duane, do you want to talk about RSSAC 47 v2?

DUANE WESSELS:

Sure. We had some initial meetings to [inaudible] work party. We've talked a little bit about the scope and so far, things are still on track, I

would say. Everyone's agreed that the scope is as defined in our statement of work, and we selected a work party leader which is Anupam, and Paul is going to support, and I'll of course be the shepherd.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. And is there any discussion of that? Do people have comments they want to make? Failing that, Andrew, you want to talk about the updates to RSSAC 000 v6?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. Thanks, Fred. So this is the annual updating of RSSAC 000 and right now, we're at v6. I sent the redline out a couple weeks ago as well as the final clean version, talked about it at the last monthly meeting, the edits I was going to make, and then I went ahead and made those edits and that's what Ozan is showing now. Would you like me to walk through all the edits, or do people have any questions about specific edits?

FRED BAKER: Could you walk through the edits, please?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. At the top in 1.2.8, this is just to clarify that liaison roles are listed on the RSSAC website because liaison roles do come and go—I guess mostly come, not so much go. And then on to the participation section, clarifying that this is about incoming liaisons and that there'll be some

onboarding and orientation to help liaisons prepare and be more effective in the RSSAC.

Moving on to the next section, clarifying here that we're talking about outgoing liaison review process, these are liaisons coming from the RSSAC, and then moving down, new liaison roles, clarifying here that—so there's a bunch of liaison roles that are listed in the operating procedures, they're specific like the liaison to the Board, and those are listed in the sections 1.2.8.5 through 1.2.8.8.

So notwithstanding all that specific text there, any other liaisons which may not be listed in this document can only serve for two consecutive terms unless there's no other candidates. And this is for outgoing liaisons. And then here, beneath that, we list the kind of current external liaisons.

Moving on to 1.4.1, with in-person meetings and the regular monthly meetings, we say that for anything that's going to be voted upon, the voting material has to be distributed at least one week prior to the vote. We didn't say anything about that for electronic votes, so this sentence just says that, the same thing for electronic votes.

Moving on to Section 3.5, this came about originally because the RSSAC needed to write a response, I believe, to the GWG a while back and it was not going to be an RSSAC document but we wanted it to be somewhere on the RSSAC website.

So came up with this concept, RSSAC documentation, and just says it'll be hosted on the RSSAC website. It just kind of says that documentation has no formal status within the RSSAC. And it doesn't explicitly say

where to store it on the website. It gives a certain amount of latitude. It's just going to be stored on the website. That's it. Back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so what is it that we need to do with this document at this point? Is it open for review and edits?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: This is a vote item.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Great. Let me ask, does anybody have any comments on this document, on the proposed changes?

DUANE WESSELS: I think Andrew did a good job and I would move to approve it. Thank you, Andrew.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Do I hear a second?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Seconding.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And let's go directly into the vote then. Is anybody dissenting, does anybody disagree? Is anybody abstaining? Failing that, the rest of us are in support and so this vote passes. Okay, so we're at the reports. Brad, I'll call on you in a minute. The big item that the committee has been working on or participating in is the RSO document on how to tell whether we have an appropriate way forward, the success criteria document. And I'm not sure I have a lot more to talk about, other than that Brad and I have spoken with Göran in the last week and I spoke with Maarten yesterday, chairman of the Board, and they're both very interested in this and are in support of the RSSAC proposing success criteria. Brad, did you have anything you wanted to add there?

BRAD VERD: No, I think you got it all, you touched on all the pieces.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. Kaveh, do you have comments here?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah. Thank you very much. No news or anything directly related to RSSAC from the Board side. The only thing is we had a meeting yesterday with the Board liaisons to the GWG, which are Tripti and Lito, just to get a status update. Carlos updated us about basically the success criteria document, the work that was done. I also provided input on what we have done. And basically, now they're waiting to see what we decide, which is I guess our AOB item, how RSSAC wants to move further.

The message from the Board liaisons—and of course, that I can say would be the Board as well, I don't see any issue there—basically, the message from the Board is if RSSAC wants some support from the Board after submitting this advice, which I think would be the AOB item, the Board is ready to make a statement on top of our criteria statement if we think we find that useful. So that's a resource we can use if we want. That's all I have to add. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, so let me ask the question: if you feel that having a Board statement in addition to this success criteria document which we haven't discussed but we will in a moment, if you feel that a Board statement or resolution would be appropriate, beneficial, please raise your hand.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

And if I can provide my two cents, Fred, again, I think it goes to the discussion exactly how we want to frame our advice to the Board, the success criteria as the RSSAC document, how we want to frame it, and what would be the basically cover letter, what would it say. But my personal opinion, suggestion, is at this point in time, I think it's good if we only inform the Board but of course, keep the option. So my suggestion is language that doesn't require or ask the Board to endorse what we're saying but basically keep that option, because I think that's more friendly towards GWG, let's say, and then based on the reception and the further actions, if we really think we need more power behind it, we want someone else—the Board for example as the group which

chartered GWG, then we can ask the Board to make that statement. That's my two cents.

FRED BAKER: Well, and I would agree with that and I'll note that nobody has raised their hands. So people aren't looking for a statement or a resolution or whatever from the Board. Thank you very much. Liman, it's your turn.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I don't have much to report this time. The CSC has nothing in particular on its slate. We had a meeting, but we had a clean report from the PTI. The only thing that's upcoming is that we are just entering into a new periodic review which is a recurring thing, so it's nothing strange, and I don't see any major problems with that. so it's business as usual and regular things happening. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Daniel, comments from the RZERC?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Not so much. We had a meeting, we were supposed to do a scoping exercise but that's going to be postponed to the next meeting. So I don't have much to report, and as well for the IAB. The only thing I might mention is that I am meeting Fred at the end of this week to have a conversation regarding the liaison, so if you have any feedback, anything that needs to be improved and so on, feel free to contact me or Fred.

DUANE WESSELS: This is not IAB-related, but I saw it because of it. ISOC actually sent a letter to various governments asking .arpa to be excluded from the NIS2 requirement, just like the root is. I think we may have mentioned that in our outgoing message too, but right now the current NIS2 document only exempts the root and it should really do .arpa as well.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. SSAC, Rus?

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Fred. The main thing I wanted to mention today has already been brought up earlier in Ozan's ICANN 72 meeting schedule, and that is our joint SSAC-RSSAC meeting in conjunction with ICANN 72. We've developed, I think, over time a relatively agreeable agenda that we've used for the last several meetings, which is reviewing the status of current work parties and then discussing joint items of interest.

I expect the inclusion of this success criteria document as one of the things that we'll want to be discussing, but I'm looking forward to any other suggestions folks may have as far as things they want to hear more about either from SSAC or interact with SSAC on. So please, either send e-mail directly to the RSSAC list and we'll be sure to fit it into the agenda if we possibly can. So that's it. Thank you very much.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you, Russ, and I'm looking forward to a proposed agenda from you.

RUSS MUNDY: Yes. Will be out this week.

FRED BAKER: Okay. IANA functions operator. James, you have any report?

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. Just the KSK ceremonies scheduled for 14th of October. We'll be signing one quarter of signatures, and for the first time since the start of the pandemic, we'll be opening up to in person attendance from our TCRs. We have three TCRs that are currently US-based that'll be attending. That's all.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: That's a big milestone. Congratulations.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, it is a big milestone. So root zone maintainer, Duane, do you have any report?

DUANE WESSELS: One thing regarding the ZONEMD work, I provided some testing zones and whatnot to the root server operators that they can use to test their implementations for ZONEMD.

FRED BAKER: And what's the progress on that? Has anyone reported into you?

DUANE WESSELS: Not to me. I only sort of announced this sometime last week, so I haven't heard any direct feedback yet.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Brad, Hiro and Liman, do you have any comments from the GWG?

BRAD VERD: I don't have anything to report. They're still on hold.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. Which brings us to AOB. Let me remind us that we have two people from the RSO consultation discussion that are here.

BRAD VERD: Three. Don't forget Andy.

FRED BAKER: Okay, three. What we want to discuss here is the success criteria document. Robert, you've been managing this discussion among the RSOs. Would you like to talk about this?

ROBERT CAROLINA: Yes, I'd be happy to, Fred. Can you give me guidance on how long an introduction you'd like in just a number of minutes?

FRED BAKER: Well, I think most of us have actually been involved, so probably five minutes would be enough.

ROBERT CAROLINA: Okay. By legal standards, that's pretty short. I can do that. Right, thank you very much. The document that you see in front of you is an effort to define how to measure whether or not a proposed governance structure actually does what it needs to do. So RSSAC of course has made a number of statements about governance over the past few years, including RSSAC 037, 042 and 049, and has made other statements over the years that have an influence on governance.

There's a process that's already in progress to try to work out what should a governance model look like, and in the process of reviewing an early draft of one model, the question naturally came up, well, how do we tell a good one from a bad one, how do we measure?

So one way to look at the success criteria is that they are a measuring tool. They're a series of principles, statements that the RSOs are hoping will be incorporated within the RSS governance structure.

So within the document itself, there are a number of defined terms, but a couple of key ones. RSS GS functional description is essentially a functional high-level description of what the governance model should do whereas RSS GS constitutional documents are the actual meat and potatoes of the rules as they're implemented at some level of enforceability.

So if you think of the functional description as let's say the simplified version of how the governance structure works, the constitutional documents are where the actual power gets implemented and rights are transferred and obtained and given up and all that sort of good stuff.

The document begins in Section 1 with a series of historical statements that state both the history and present operations and the role of RSOs in root service governance and operation. So there's a reference to a couple of the historical statements that I mentioned earlier, 37, 42 and 49, and then there's a framing statement that explains why the RSOs have been an influential factor in governance of the RSS and why they should continue to have that kind of governance-related role.

The Section 2 might be a little unusual for a number of people. It is effectively a section on how to interpret the success criteria. And it restates a couple of points that I've made already. It's a measuring tool, a way of assessing degrees of success.

But it also goes a step further. It calls out specifically in that last paragraph that the various success criteria described can create tensions with each other. And they acknowledge that no governance system is going to have the highest possible score on every single criteria. There's a series of interests that need to be balanced, there are checks and balances that need to be negotiated and agreed and discussed, and one of the things that hopefully the success criteria will do will be to provide a framework for that discussion.

So then of course, there's a large glossary with many defined terms. I've only touched on a couple of them. I'll mention two in particular just in passing: RSO organizational diversity and RSO technical diversity. This was an effort to get a much more clear understanding of what is meant when the RSO community uses the term "diversity," and we teased it out into these two different types of diversity that are critical to support and defend. And in each case, you'll see that organizational diversity and technical diversity exist for the purpose of increasing RSS security, stability and resiliency.

When we get into the success criteria themselves in Section 4, they're presented in three major parts. Part A, the substantive criteria which I'll start with, but then in a moment, I'll talk briefly about Part B which has to do with the transitioning from one governance structure to another, and Part C which talks about a series of clear statements that need to be made in a functional description.

When you look at Part A, substantive criteria, these are criteria that seem to grow out of or are otherwise related to either past statements by RSSAC about RSS governance or alternatively, they seem to grow

naturally out of the principles that RSOs and RSSAC have discussed about the RSS over the years.

They're divided into hopefully a series of—there's hopefully a consistent taxonomy here. It's a little fuzzy around the edges like everything is in governance. But even so, you'll see that A1 deals with accountability, A2 criteria deals with autonomy and independence, A3 with finances, etc.

To the extent possible, there are references to existing RSSAC statements that help to interpret or define why some of these success criteria have broken out.

At the same time, note that the sub-criteria are meant to be sort of a deeper dive into the subject matter. So if we look, for example, at criteria A.3, the financial function, takes sort of a pretty general statement from RSSAC 037 Section 5.5 and then drills down into a series of related financial concerns that are influenced not just by the short description of the financial function in RSSAC 037 but also grow and extend and seem to be related to other principles that we see dotted around RSSAC 037 and reflected elsewhere in the criteria, including fundraising and the nature of fundraising and sustainability alignment, all those subpoints.

So I'm going to just skip down now to the Part B criteria and just mentioned that these are sort of a series of short statements that are meant to assure that the transition process to a new governance structure goes smoothly, and then finally, in Part C, these are really a series of criteria that say nothing more than if you're going to write an RSS GS functional description, if you're going to try to describe what a

governance structure looks like, then you need to be pretty clear about a number of things, about how we think representation will work, how voting will work, etc. So they are in effect a plea for detail.

And I think that's more than enough introduction and I think I've even gone over time a little bit. Thank you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. Sam, do you have anything you want to add to that?

SAM EISNER: No, I think Robert did a very comprehensive job in introducing the document [that he really helped drive there.] But I'm here for any other questions.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. And Andy, do you have anything you'd like to add to this conversation?

ANDY KIMBLE: No. Thank you for offering that.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so let me open the floor. Does anybody have any discussion on this document? So I think most of us have been involved. Russ, you have your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Fred. I may be one of the few people that hasn't been involved in this as an incoming liaison. I haven't actually studied the document, but it appears to be very well put together and lays out a good approach to this. So thanks to all of the folks that did do work on it. And for Robert's explanation of the structure, I am most appreciative. I don't know if we'll be able to get into this kind of detail for the RSSAC-SSAC joint meeting, but I would hope that it would be possible, because I'm sure there are other SSAC members that would very much appreciate getting this type of detail even if the document isn't finished. I think that would be a big benefit to the SSAC. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Anybody else have comments they want to make? So let me talk about the path that this document is likely to take. What I'd like to propose is that we all read it, comment on it, make changes if that's appropriate and necessary. Brad.

BRAD VERD: Please finish, but I have some comments on path forward. I've been thinking about this a lot and I have some thoughts that I wanted to share.

FRED BAKER: Sure. So according to our governance procedures in RSSAC 000, we don't vote on anything until we've had a week to review it. I would suggest that we take that week. And what we're looking for, ultimately,

is a stable document. So if people make changes, that restarts that clock.

When we do have a stable document, then I would suggest we go to an electronic ballot on it. Brad, over to you.

BRAD VERD:

I know there was some discussion when this was in the RSO theater, let's say, or realm, that, does this go to the caucus, does this not go to the caucus? Back and forth. And I've been trying to think on how to move this forward while making sure we get everybody's views and opinions without losing the integrity of what you have in front of you, which is a unanimous consensus document from the RSOs.

So what I was thinking was—and again, this is up for discussion, I was just trying to figure out how to move the ball forward. I think I've said it here a number of times, I've said it to the GWG, I've said it in discussion with Göran, that I feel pretty passionately that this to me is the next step in the evolution of 37, this was what 37 was missing, and this was either what should have been in 37 or should have been the beginning of the GWG.

So with that in mind, I feel like I guess my idea is that RSSAC should look at this as a unanimous document from the RSOs and memorialize that, basically put it through, publish it as a numbered document and then do a follow-up with the caucus. And if there are changes or difference in opinions or whatever that come out of the discussion with the caucus, I think we document that in a separate publication, therefore not losing or changing what was a unanimous document from the RSOs. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. And Wes raised the question during the RSO discussion whether we should involve the caucus—

BRAD VERD: I'm sorry, can I add one other thing?

FRED BAKER: Go for it.

BRAD VERD: A second thought there. And I don't need to jump in front of you, Lars, but this might help. The other thing that I thought of while going—if we were to follow through with that process, what that enables is that the GWG could get back to work sooner, because they would get a document quicker, and both the Board and the GWG could continue their work which has been on hold waiting for this document. Again, we memorialize what the RSOs have stated, and we can begin the process with the caucus and a larger discussion and publish something out of that. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. So yeah, I started to overlook, to forget Wes's desire for the caucus to see it. I really don't want to do that.

DUANE WESSELS: A point of clarification there, Fred. I said we should discuss it. I actually didn't specify an opinion. The caucus has indicated many times that they want a voice in situations like this even though it's more governance-related, and they want a voice in it as much as possible. So I wanted to make sure explicitly that we did consider it.

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

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I have two comments. The first is that I support Brad's approach. I think that's a brilliant way of doing it because of all the benefits that Brad listed. The second one is that I do see and understand and respect the one week we need for a stable document, but I do suggest that you set a final date for comments so that we know we have a finite time for when the document becomes stable. So give people a week to make comments and then say no comments beyond this date, and then have a stable document and we can vote. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad.

BRAD VERD: I would argue that it is a stable document if we want to enshrine and respect the integrity of the RSO view. Thanks. Short of just typos.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I understand, but we must make the distinction of whether this is a root ops document or an RSSAC document. And if we're publishing it as an RSSAC document, the RSSAC should have a chance to contribute to it, I think. We can't have the root server operators push a document through the RSSAC and demand that it not be touched. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Russ, your hand is up.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks. This does raise what I consider a somewhat difficult question that I'd really like to have a clarification on, and that is, if we as participants in RSSAC should indeed look at this as an RSO document that RSSAC is basically endorsing or putting a concurrence on, or if the document as a whole, a complete thing, is an RSSAC document. If it's the first case, then I would maybe suggest either a short intro or a cover letter or something that was where any RSSAC-specific inputs were placed and leave the document as a whole as it sits. Or if it's the second, then in accordance with our normal procedures, that the RSSAC can comment on things throughout the document. So I think it's quite important today if we can decide which path that we want to take with this document. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Wes, your hand is up.

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah, though I think Russ stole my thunder. I was going to say most everything that he just said. To put it a little more bluntly and specifically, if RSSAC members are not allowed to comment on a document that they are supposed to publish, then why is RSSAC publishing it? The RSOs have a capability of publishing something. We have done that many times as RSOs by publishing something on rootservers.org for example. There's many mechanisms to doing that.

So if you want to publish it as an RSSAC document, I think that we need to allow for the larger body of RSSAC members to make comments on it. Now, that does not mean we have to take the changes or do anything, but at least they should be allowed to raise discussion points about whether they find other holes that we're completely missing or something like that.

So in my opinion, I think publishing it as an RSSAC document is the right way to go. I expect that we won't find significant additional comments that are going to require major changes. But I do think that we have to give at least a week or two's comment period where we accept comments from people that weren't in the other discussions. With that, I have to leave in three minutes. I apologize for that.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Liman, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. The very least thing we must do is to at least allow a section for dissent for members who are not happy with the document, because that's in our procedures.

FRED BAKER: Right. Okay, so does anybody else have any comments they want to raise at this point? What I was going to propose was, again, following our own procedures, that we allow a week for people to read and comment on the document. I don't expect changes or at least significant changes, but if changes are needed, then I don't want to preclude that. And I think that it's going to be worthwhile to have a call to discuss any proposed changes to the document. And that, I would suggest, is a week from now, the 12th of October. Matt.

MATT LARSON: Thanks, Fred. I just wanted to speak in support of what Liman and Wes said, but I just think we ought to be really clear—and I want to make sure that I understand. So this is turning into an RSSAC document; is that correct? So the bulk of it was written by the RSOs but now we're opening it up for review and comment and possible changes from the larger RSSAC and therefore, that would make it more like 037 and 038 which are RSSAC documents that represent the consensus of all of RSSAC?

The document could have an intro section that explains its origin, but I think if it's going to be an RSSAC document, it should have review and participation and comments from the full RSSAC, and I think we should have enough time for it. I don't want to drag this out, but a week seems

maybe too little. Am I articulating what we think the consensus is? Because I want to have everybody leave the call with an understanding of the future of the document.

FRED BAKER:

Well, and I would agree that we need to understand the future of the document. Let me let Robert talk and then we can go on.

ROBERT CAROLINA:

Yes, thank you very much. I appreciate that I'm not a member of RSSAC so I'm in a bit of an unusual situation. Having said that, given the comments that are made and the procedures that apply to RSSAC, my advice—if anybody wants it—is that just let the comments flow. If somebody wants to comment, then we embrace that and we deal with it as it comes. This is clearly moving into a posture where it's becoming an RSSAC document, and I think it's important to follow the procedures that RSSAC follows.

Now, on a very selfish note about tempo, I'll just state in passing that I'm on a plane to Greece tomorrow morning for my first vacation in two years, given the pandemic lockdown, and I won't be back for about a week and a day. So I would just point out that if anybody wants to ask questions or have discussions, if I can add any value to those discussions, it's going to be difficult for me to do so much before October the 14th. So those are my thoughts.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So Matt was just asking whether a week was an appropriate period. Let me throw the question to the group. Sounds like maybe we should allow two weeks for review and commentary in the document. Does anybody have any opinions? So Brad.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I am okay with two weeks.

BRAD VERD: I'm in full support of comments and whatnot. I guess I'm looking for Matt for some feedback, is two weeks going to change—a week and if we have lots of comments, we just extend it like we normally do, or is two weeks meaning that the document will sit idle for nine or ten days and then people will come in on day 13? I'm just trying to be efficient.

[MATT LARSON:] I think we need a double trigger on this because it's already in the long tail, so I think we have to call a moratorium on comments perhaps at the one-week point and then in the second week of this, we should say here's the edit we made in response to these comments. If we got it wrong, please follow up but no new topics after the moratorium. Because you're right, otherwise we will all wait until the day before it's due and say, "Oh my god, you've got to change this, that and the other."

FRED BAKER: Well, and in any event, I'm suggesting that we have a call to discuss any comments and decide what we want to do with them.

[MATT LARSON:] That could be the moratorium moment. Or 24 hours before that call could be the moratorium moment.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And I want to respect Robert's vacation.

[BRAD VERD:] Yeah, I think that's important.

MATT LARSON: In all seriousness, I think Robert's vacation is sufficient reason to have two weeks so that he has time to participate and address any questions that might have come up. Really, two weeks versus one week, is it that much?

FRED BAKER: Well, it's not that much. I do find myself wondering—what I was about to suggest was that we follow the electronic voting procedure, but we will have an RSSAC meeting at ICANN 72 and we could actually do a straight up ballot at that point during that meeting if we've discussed and resolved any issues. Steve.

STEVE SHENG: Thanks. Listening to the conversation, perhaps starting from today, review till the 15th, so no new comments in the document by next Friday, and then an RSSAC meeting the following week. And Ozan will send out a Doodle poll preferably early during the week so that we give time—hopefully Robert will be back then and give time to Robert to think through these comments a little bit. So that's a suggestion from staff. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So now this RSSAC meeting is actually on the 25th of October, right? Yes. And two weeks from now is the 19th of October.

STEVE SHENG: Yes, so that works too. I was thinking scheduling extraordinary meeting, but if you want to meet at the regular scheduled time, that's fine too.

FRED BAKER: Yeah, so this meeting coming up is nominally the November meeting. We're moving it a week forward because ICANN is there. Seems to me, first off, we should have an opportunity to review and comment on the document. Then at that RSSAC meeting, follow our normal procedure to vote in favor or otherwise. So, do folks want to have a meeting to discuss changes in the document? If so, I would suggest we do it on the 19th. Liman, you have your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I would like to propose that we schedule a meeting and see if we have any comments to discuss as we get near to that meeting. If we don't have any, we can cancel the meeting because it's always easier to cancel a meeting than to put in one with short notice. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Well, funny thing that, I expected to do that. Okay, does anybody else have any comments on this? Okay, then Steve, Ozan, let's schedule a meeting on the 19th and we'll do it at the same time as this meeting. 7:00 Pacific, I don't know what that is UTC. We can discuss any comments that have come in. If nobody has commented on it, then we have a stable document and we can cancel the meeting and we'll take the formal vote during the RSSAC meeting on the 25th of October.

STEVE SHENG: Thanks, Fred. Would it be possible for RSSAC members to register your comments a day before the actual meeting? This will allow time for Robert and others to study the comments, because it'll be difficult if we have comments registered just prior to the call, and it may be difficult to address it on the call. So if possible, would like to invite RSSAC members to submit your comments a day before the meeting. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So by register, I think you're reflecting the moratorium comment that Paul was making.

STEVE SHENG: That's right.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I just wanted to say that all of this is good, and can you please, when you have settled the dates and made the meetings, give us a short time schedule in an e-mail message so we can see that these are the time limits that we have? Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Certainly. So if we have a call at 15:00 UTC on the 19th, is everybody able to make that time?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

FRED BAKER: Okay, then Ozan, Steve, we can announce that time and let's schedule the moratorium to register your comments by and let's say that's on the 15th of October. Please make your comments by the 15th giving Robert and so on an opportunity to review them and comment.

STEVE SHENG: Thanks, Fred. Will do.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. Ozan, you have your hand up.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Just to clarify, do you want this call on the 19th to start at 15:00 UTC? I'm asking because you wanted to take the usual RSSAC meeting slot which is 14:00 UTC. So just wanted to clarify that.

FRED BAKER: Okay, well, and what you just identified is that I don't operate on UTC time. So that's not a clock that I'm around. If it's 14:00 UTC, then let's do that.

OZAN SAHIN: Got it. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, so I'll let people then review the document and comment on it. Please feel free to comment not only in the document but on the list. And we'll have that call and then formalize the conversation during the meeting on the 25th of October. Does anybody have further comments for today on this topic? Failing that, let's move to the next topic, which I believe is an announcement of the next meeting. So we'll schedule a meeting during ICANN as we discussed at the beginning when Ozan went over the schedule for ICANN, and which he found there in the agenda [before him.]

I'm about to adjourn. Does anybody have any additional comments they want to make at this time? Not hearing any, seeing no hands, let's go ahead and adjourn.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]