
FRED BAKER: Okay. Cogent, I see Paul here.

PAUL VIXIE: I am here.

FRED BAKER: DISA?

KEVIN WRIGHT: Kevin Wright here.

FRED BAKER: ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson's here.

FRED BAKER: ISC, I see Fred and Jeff online. NASA? Okay. Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here.

FRED BAKER: RIPE NCC? University of Maryland?

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.

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: USC ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Good morning, everybody. Wes is here.

FRED BAKER: ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign? Now, Brad sent a note saying that they've had a bit of a storm his way. He might not be here so he might be online. WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Kaveh didn't answer a moment ago. CSC? Liman is here. RZERC, Daniel Migault? And I imagine he's not here from the IAB either. Russ Mundy?

RUSS MUNDY: Good morning. Russ is here.

FRED BAKER: James Mitchell?

JAMES MITCHELL: Good morning. James is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Duane Wessels?

DUANE WESSELS: He's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Andrew and Robert are here as observers. And we have staff, Andrew, Danielle. Ozan is playing with his mic. I thought I saw Steve Sheng online. Ozan, of course, is here. Okay.

So agenda review, you're looking at the agenda. Do you see anything that concerns you or surprises you? Do you want to change it in any way? Failing that, we'll continue with the agenda as stated.

Administrivia. First thing we saw minutes about a month ago. Anybody have any comments on the minutes? Okay. Does anybody plan to vote against the minutes as stated? Any abstentions? Failing that, I presume we're all voting in favor and we accept the minutes. Let's go on to the membership update, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thanks, Fred. Ozan is actually on top of the three items we've got here. They're a little complicated. So he has volunteered to represent the Membership Committee for this meeting. Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Jeff. Hello, everyone. Happy new year. So the first item on the Caucus Membership Committee update is the appointment of Work Stream 2 Community Coordination Group members. We have two volunteers, Anupam Agrawal and Robert Carolina. Let me provide you with a brief refresher on Work Stream 2 of the Cross-Community Working Group on enhancing ICANN accountability. This represents over a hundred transparency and accountability-related recommendations. Some of them are directed at ICANN Organization. Some are directed at ICANN Board, whereas some of them are directed at ICANN community. So, SO/AC leaders agreed on the formation of a Community Coordination Group which will function as a forum for utilizing best practices and leveraging lessons learned as each group progresses through the Work Stream 2 implementation. The group is also intended to be the mechanism for identifying and addressing specific Work Stream 2 recommendations for which implementation

may require or benefit from a uniform community-wide approach. And eventually, ICANN communities now in the phase of identifying Community Coordination Group members, each group will identify a member and an alternate, and we run a call for volunteers on the RSSAC mailing list and then on the RSSAC caucus mailing list. And now we have two volunteers. So, one is Anupam Agrawal and the other volunteer is Robert Carolina. Are there any questions or comments about the process or any discussions on the two RSSAC caucus volunteers that we have?

FRED BAKER: So now Robert is asking in chat, whether he needs to step aside for this discussion. I think we can have this discussion with him present. So anybody object to that?

WES HARDAKER: No, it's fine.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Ozan, in an e-mail to me, you suggested that they were asking for two people and we had two volunteers. So we should simply accept the two volunteers.

OZAN SAHIN: That's right, Fred. But the difference is one volunteer should be identified as the group member, the other one should be identified as the alternate. So if the group wants to have a poll on this and select the

main representative and the alternate, I have a poll set up for the selection.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Why don't we go ahead and run that poll?

OZAN SAHIN: All right, then let me launch the poll. Whoever gets most votes will be picked as the main representative and the other volunteer will automatically then become the alternate. So let me launch it.

WES HARDAKER: This should be the only, the voting representative or the secondary is present, right? So this should be the 12 votes.

OZAN SAHIN: Wes, I believe this is the intent. The group has not met yet. It is expected that the group will have their first meeting before or around ICANN73. They will then decide their working procedures, but I think this is the idea, yeah.

WES HARDAKER: For the sake of the vote for today for doing this vote. I'm trying to clarify the fact that because we're in Zoom, it's a little strange. And as you launch a poll, it'll appear to everybody, right? But only one representative from each of the RSOs should be actually voting.

OZAN SAHIN: Oh, yes. Thanks for clarification. Sorry for my misunderstanding. That is correct. If you can receive only one vote per RSO, that's appreciated. So I think I launched the poll. Hopefully, you can see it and I'll give you some time to vote.

PAUL VIXIE: I do not see a poll.

OZAN SAHIN: That's probably because you need the latest version of Zoom to participate in the poll, I guess. So, Paul, if you would like to send your vote via private chat, I can include it.

PAUL VIXIE: Okay. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you. So let's give another 10 seconds. I see Daniel's note in the chat. That's correct, Daniel. Thank you. So I will end the poll here, and I'll go ahead share the results. So hopefully you can see the results now. If that is the case, I will stop sharing the poll. Could everyone see the results? If you aren't able to see it, we received nine votes for Robert Carolina and none for Anupam.

WES HARDAKER: And thank you to both members for being willing to serve.

FRED BAKER: Indeed.

OZAN SAHIN: Over to you, Fred. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Well, I think we actually have a second and a third vote. So representative to the 2022 ICANN Community Excellence Award Selection Panel.

OZAN SAHIN: We don't have a vote for this one. Let me briefly speak to it, Fred, but we do have a poll for the third Caucus Membership Committee update item. The ICANN Community Excellence Award is an annual award given to ICANN community members for their outstanding contributions to the multistakeholder model and also as substantial contributions to the policymaking within ICANN community. It's the ICANN community that forms a cross-community selection panel to evaluate the nominations. Each SO/AC can appoint up to two members to the selection panel. We have two volunteers, Abdulkarim Oloyede and Amir Qayyum. Both Abdulkarim and Amir served on this panel last year in 2021. And since we have two volunteers and two slots for this panel, I didn't set up a vote for this. So I think both caucus members can be appointed to the panel unless there's an objection from RSSAC. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Well, I don't object. Does anybody else object? Okay. So let's accept those two. And now the third thing we need to select somebody for the Community Excellence Award. We have three suggestions, Kazunori, Paul, and Abdulkarim.

OZAN SAHIN: Excuse me, Fred. That's the 2021 RSSAC Caucus Member Recognition piece.

FRED BAKER: Right.

OZAN SAHIN: No worries. You may recall in June 2021, RSSAC approved the RSSAC Caucus Member Recognition proposal and agreed to start recognizing the contributions of RSSAC caucus members on an annual basis. So towards the end of the year, RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee reviewed RSSAC caucus members' engagement and contributions in 2021. And working with the caucus work party leaders and RSSAC Admin Committee, the Membership Committee specifically reviewed the caucus members' contributions to the caucus work parties and their output documents, members' attendance to work party meetings and any representative or liaison roles caucus members fulfilled.

The Membership Committee came up with a short list of caucus members and shared this list with RSSAC for its consideration. And the

shortlist was accompanied by a brief text to explain why these caucus members were shortlisted. So the three members are Kazunori Fujiwara, Paul Hoffman, and Abdulkarim Oloyede. Especially Kazunori Fujiwara's high attendance rate, joining all the meetings of the work parties that closed in 2021 attract the attention of the committee, Paul Hoffman's substantial contributions to the work party documents, and the fact that Abdulkarim Oloyede was a co-chair of one of the work parties and then he also fulfilled some liaison and representative roles also to the Membership Committee's attention. So that was shared with RSSAC and it's up for vote today. I don't know, Jeff, if you have anything else to add on that front but this is another vote item for today.

JEFF OSBORN:

No, I think you've covered it pretty well. That addressed the issue.

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you. So if there are any discussions on any of the candidates here, I think this is the right time before proceeding to vote and take an action on this.

WES HARDAKER:

I apologize. For procedure, are we picking one person? What's the count?

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Wes. This is what the proposal said. But I think it's not a hard requirement if RSSAC wants to honor more than one RSSAC caucus members. But yes, that's what the proposal says at the moment.

WES HARDAKER: So I have a proposal then that we honor all three of them. All three of those people have uniquely different qualifications that I'm incredibly pleased at what they all three have done in the past year. It was a hard year. Abdul did a great job running work parties. Paul has contributed endlessly, and anybody that attends all the meetings is impressive because I haven't succeeded in doing that. Anybody else have—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I second it.

FRED BAKER: Do we want to take a vote on that? We have a motion. We have a second. Any discussion? Is anybody opposed to that? Does anybody plan to vote no? Anybody abstaining? Failing that, I think we've agreed to honor all three in this.

MATT LARSON: Fred, this is Matt Larson. May I say something?

FRED BAKER: Certainly.

MATT LARSON: You should please change my vote to an abstain, considering Paul Hoffman works for me at ICANN Org. As much as I would like to see Paul get the award and as much as I'm thrilled that he will based on the vote, I really should abstain.

FRED BAKER: Okay, understood. Okay. That's where it stands then. We have one abstention and very understandable. And we have chosen to honor all three in this award. So, Ozan, is there anything further with that?

OZAN SAHIN: The only thing is that I see Ken has his hand up.

KEN RENARD: Hi. So we're creating a precedent here with the member recognition, it's not a bad precedent at all. But just thinking, should we update the proposal for down the road with guidelines or at least just recognizing that it can be more than one person for a backburner type thing? Thanks.

FRED BAKER: That makes sense to me. Ozan, you actually filed the original proposal. Are you opposed to that?

OZAN SAHIN: Not at all. If RSSAC decides to do that, I'm happy to update the proposal, for sure.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, certainly using words, something like "these members went above and beyond the call of duty" would be a wonderful thing to put in.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Then I think we've accomplished this thing. Ozan, let's go ahead and update the proposal as we suggested. Will you write the result of this?

OZAN SAHIN: Certainly. I'm on it, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So moving on down the agenda, Ozan, you're on the hook to talk about Additional Budget Request.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Thanks, Fred. So Additional Budget Requests—the requests that are outside of the core ICANN budget and the request for FY23 is up for SO/ACs. So we are now in the request period and it will end on the 24th of January. The RSSAC Admin team worked on this. You may recall that RSSAC had an Additional Budget Request last year, which was accepted by the ICANN Board for FY22, and the implementation is in progress

now. So the RSSAC Admin team didn't really find an Additional Budget Request item for FY23. But nevertheless, we wanted to share that the request can be submitted until 24th of January. So if any RSSAC member can think of any Additional Budget Request item, please let RSSAC Admin team know. Otherwise, it looks like RSSAC will not be submitting any request for FY23. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Moving ahead, Ozan, you want to talk about ICANN73?

OZAN SAHIN:

Right. ICANN73 will be an online meeting. Originally, it was planned to take place in San Juan, Puerto Rico. But the ICANN Board decided that it would be an online meeting and a four-day meeting from March the 7th through March the 10th. As usual, the meeting sessions will run from 9 AM until 5:30 PM San Juan time, and this is the Atlantic Standard Time, UTC-4.

The session request period will open very soon. That's why the RSSAC Admin team worked on a draft schedule and put it as an agenda item for discussion in this meeting. In this meeting, let's review day one first. It will also be the Tech Day. So on Monday, there will be a Q&A session with ICANN Org Executive Team. This is block two. And later in the day, there will be, first off, the two plenary sessions. The Meeting Planning Team, which is composed of the SO/AC leaders, wanted to have the two plenaries. First one, the moving forward with the global public interest framework. The second plenary session will take place on Wednesday. That's going to be evolving to DNS abuse conversation and maliciously

registered versus compromised domain names. So the last thing on Monday is the ICANN Board and RSSAC meeting on the draft block schedule. The Planning Team is looking to SO/AC groups to confirm their time with the ICANN Board. So, if block five on Monday works well for RSSAC, we will go ahead and confirm this time.

Moving to Tuesday, RSSAC Admin team thought it would make sense to have the RSSAC meeting in conjunction with ICANN73 by delaying the original length of meeting by a week. Originally it would be held on the 1st of March, but instead, this meeting can be moved to ICANN73 week, and block two could be a good time to ensure a large participation from RSSAC. As I said, the second plenary session is planned on Wednesday.

On Thursday, there is a high interest session on—it's a discussion forum on geopolitical legislative regulatory developments, and followed by an ICANN public forum. So if you can think of any topics to have with the ICANN Board, we would appreciate if you can share those.

Fred got in touch with the GWG leadership to see if it makes sense to have a joint meeting with the RrSG WG and the RSSAC. So if you have any comments on that, we would appreciate if you can share. The regular closed joint meeting with the SSAC, if there are no objections, we will be working with support staff and Russ to plan for that as well. But since this is a closed meeting, it doesn't need to be on the schedule. Whatever works for both groups, we can go for that slot. So if you have any questions or any comments to share, please go ahead. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: I had an e-mail yesterday from Ted. He said that the GWG has suggested to the ICANN Board that they add some membership to the GWG so that all of the RSOs would be represented. I suggested to him that we have a joint meeting with the GWG. He has not replied to me yet, really, so I haven't received the reply.

WES HARDAKER: Well, if the Board approves that request, then we don't need a joint meeting because the RSOs will be a part of that group. So in some ways, making the decision today as to whether we should meet in March is probably too early, because it may be that the Board will approve the request, at which point, we'll all have representatives on the GWG, and a joint meeting doesn't make a whole lot of sense anymore even officially.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. In that case, then I would cancel that joint meeting. But yeah, if they don't accept it, then I think we probably wouldn't do well to have a joint meeting. In any event, I have invited Ted to address the RSSAC during the GWG slot on our agenda for that meeting, for the RSSAC meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Would the GWG normally meet during an ICANN scheduled time?

FRED BAKER: I would expect that they would.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So that might actually be one and the same.

FRED BAKER: That might, that might. Steve, you have your hand up.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Fred. One thing I'll suggest for the sessions is kind of a RSSAC public session. It's different from the RSSAC regular meeting. But in this public session, the RSSAC provides an opportunity to brief the community of the various publications it has published in this last year. In particular, the success criteria and the company advice, we have the Rogue Operator and we also have the Local Perspective. So there's quite a few publications to showcase. This is more of a kind of letting the community know. I know the RSSAC publish something and move on. But I think at these ICANN meetings, it's an opportunity to raise awareness of RSSAC's work. So that's a suggestion. Thanks.

WES HARDAKER: Steve, you're 200% right. We haven't done one of those in a while. And the virtual meetings have kind of made us do those less and we should definitely do one, considering all the work that we've published. You're very right.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is there anyone opposed to that? I don't know how much you can hear in my background, but if you hear a small voice that's the boy that is sitting on my lap in my picture. But yeah, that sounds like a good idea, Steve. Let's plan for a discussion meeting. Ozan, can you fill that in?

OZAN SAHIN: Definitely, I will do so.

FRED BAKER: What we'll need then is people from each of the work parties or whatever to comment on the documents that were developed. Now, Steve, who would you see speaking in that meeting? Would that be the chairs of the work parties or authors? Who would you see working there?

OZAN SAHIN: I will say the lead authors of each of the advisory because they're the ones that are most familiar with the subject matter at hand. And then I think probably you or Ken will chair the meeting and just kind of pass the mic as you go through each of the publications, and then at the end or maybe after each presentation like a Q&A session, where you or Ken will moderate and take the questions from the community.

FRED BAKER: Okay, that sounds good. So, Ozan, I'll leave organization of an agenda to you.

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. I'll work with the Admin committee to find the best slot for the RSSAC public meeting.

FRED BAKER: Sounds good. Okay. Do we have further discussion about ICANN73? Failing that, let's move ahead in the agenda. I believe the next thing is to talk about RSSAC047. Duane, do you have any comments on that?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Thanks, Fred. The RSSAC047 v2 Work Party had a meeting in mid December. We finalized all the sort of outstanding changes and edits to the document and sent it to the caucus list for review. There weren't really very many changes. So I'll just briefly describe the substantial changes to the document. This was not really substantial, but there was a note that latency should be reported in milliseconds and the precision should be noted when possible. In the correctness checking section, we improve the language for proving nonexistence with NSEC resource records. One of the important things that Paul Hoffman found during his initial implementation was something we'd missed relating to the fact that certain name servers can do what's called minimal responses. And so now that is accounted for also in the correctness section.

We clarified the root server identity publication latency aggregation algorithm, which really just involves sort of rearranging the text that was already there. And then there was a recommendation added to

review the document every two to three years, and then just a couple of minor wording edits.

That's really it. Like I said, the document was provided to the caucus list for their review, which is supposed to be completed by January 15. I haven't seen any discussion or comments yet. And assuming that there's nothing substantial then I imagine we could have a vote on this at the next RSSAC meeting.

FRED BAKER: That sounds good. Thank you, Duane. Moving on ahead, we have several reports. May I start out by welcoming Ken as our new vice chair?

KEN RENARD: Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Ken will have a call on Monday, correct? Fill him in on what all is going on. I think Brad would normally be here to make a report here or to comment. Brad has had quite a bad storm overnight. He had most on the phone, probably in chat. I want to thank Brad for his assistance and mileage contributions during the last six years too as vice chair. I'm not sure I have anything further to report at this point. Ken, do you have anything you'd like to comment on?

KEN RENARD: Sure, real quick. Thanks for the vote of confidence. I look forward to working with everyone more closely. There's certainly a lot of great leadership role models in this group, so I hope to live up to that. I'm sure I'll gain a full appreciation of Brad's role and what you do, Fred. So thank you to Brad as the outgoing vice chair. I look forward to a good two years. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And Kaveh, have you joined us?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. I was in the call, Fred. Hello, everyone. For the ICANN Board, there was no RSSAC-related stuff discussed or RSSAC at this time, but of course, I will get back to you on discussing the proposal from GWG and the results of that from both point of views. I will check the RSSAC, inform them that. So that has not yet been discussed. So as soon as that happens, I will keep the RSSAC informed. Other than that, nothing else.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just a brief report from the CSC. We had, I have to say, our usual 100% service from the PTI, so nothing to complain about there. We had a periodic meeting with the PTI Board. We do that once a year. We discussed the ongoing effectiveness review that we have, which is also periodic thing of the CSC and whether the PTI Board had any comments

or requests regarding that. But that wasn't much talked about. We also looked together with the PTI Board doing overhaul over the entire SLA system just to verify that we're still on track and using the good numbers for the SLAs for IANA service. Also, we had a brief [inaudible] about escalation that's ongoing in the IANA where there is a decision, who's trying to obtain an int domain but doesn't really fulfill any of the requirements for int domains. So we really don't know why they keep trying. But that's about it. Nothing strange, work as usual. Thank you. Any questions or comments? Okay. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Yeah. Thank you Liman. Daniel, do you have anything from the RZERC?

DANIEL MIGAULT:

Hi. Not really from the RZERC meeting since I was not able to attend that meeting. No from the IAB. As far as I recall, there is nothing that was pretty much related to SSAC. One question I would have is that this week, I would like to send a note about the RSO responses related to RZERC003 recommendations. I would like to make sure the action is for me to send a summary on that and I would like to clarify what's going to be the next step then. Should I work with Ozan to have an RSSAC statement or something like that?

FRED BAKER:

Well, before I go further, Duane, you have your hand up.

DUANE WESSELS: Let's finish Daniel's question, and then I'll go after that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I guess my perception is that, yes, summarizing the responses would probably be in order. I think the RSSAC would want one to review the outcome before ... So if you could work with Ozan on that, and then e-mail that to the RSSAC, people can comment on it.

OZAN SAHIN: Okay. I see the path. It's very clear. Thanks, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Steve, you had your hand up and you took it down.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. Thanks, Fred. I was going to suggest the same approach. And based on the progression of the document, the RSSAC may even want to make this a numbered document. But we have to see the text and the response together first, and then I'll suggest the Admin Committee make a determination. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: That seems appropriate. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Fred. Like Daniel said, since he wasn't able to be at the last RZERC meeting, I would just like to draw everyone's attention that

RZERC is going to begin its charter review process. I think this is something that RSSAC should definitely be paying attention to. It's not we're not quite ready to start, but I'm sure there'll be more to talk about at the next meeting as well.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Do we have further comments on the RZERC or the IAB? Failing that, let's move to the SSAC report. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Fred. The only thing I have to mention today is the ICANN73 workshop. DNSSEC and Security workshop is putting a program together for that meeting. So if any, there'll be a call for papers or call for participation soon. But if anybody has any ideas, please respond to the call or let me know. But that's all I wanted to mention today. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. James, have you got anything from the IANA functions operator?

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. The next [inaudible] meeting is scheduled for February. With Omicron working out, what that format will look like, that will be posted on the main list once we know more. There's nothing else. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you much. Duane, back to you. Anything from the RZM?

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Fred. No, nothing to report at this time.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad, Hiro, Liman, do you have anything from the GWG?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Not much really that you don't really know. About the success criteria, the turnings taken through the Board, and the Board has sent the document further onto the GWG. It's taking into account that we spent—we have restarted the series of meetings with the GWG. But the last meeting in December was wholly spent discussing the best approach to take this paper into account for the work going forward. As you already know, the path chosen was to try to accomplish that goal that root zone operators are represented in the GWG. We haven't done much else since then because now, again, we're kind of stalled because we now need to rearrange and open up for all the root zone operators before we continue with the work. So we're again at the resting point. We're waiting for the Board to process this information. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. We've reached the point in the agenda labeled Any Other Business. So let me ask, does anybody have anything they would like to bring up at this point? Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. I have one quick update or reminder to RSSAC members. Moving forward, RSSAC meeting invitations will not come from me but from ICANN policy calendar, so please don't be surprised. I will be sending the calendar invitation for the February meeting shortly. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. That next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 1. Okay. With that, I don't think we have anything further open to discussion. So we'll adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much for joining.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Fred.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you all. Cheers.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]