
FRED BAKER: Hello all. Welcome to the RSSAC Monthly Meeting. I'm supposed to start out with a roll call so let me run through that. Who's here from Cogent?

PAUL VIXIE: Vixie.

FRED BAKER: Okay. DISA?

KEVIN WRIGHT: This is Kevin Wright.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson is here.

FRED BAKER: ISC? I'm here. Jeff, are you here? NASA? I saw Barbara sign in. I don't see Tom.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Yeah, 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?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, Liman is here. Patrik is not.

FRED BAKER: Okay. RIPE NCC?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh is here.

FRED BAKER: UMD?

KARL REUSS: Karl is here.

FRED BAKER: USC ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here. It looks like Suzanne is not today.

FRED BAKER: ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken is here.

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

FRED BAKER: WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro's here. Jason not.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Kaveh, you're the liaison to the Board. Liman, you're the liaison to RZERC. Daniel, are you here? Russ, liaison from the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Good morning. I'm here.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yes, I'm here, Daniel.

FRED BAKER: Okay. James Mitchell, IANA Functions Operator? Duane, I saw you join.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. We have a couple of observers, John and Erum, and several staff.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Fred, this is Paul Hoffman. Just as a note, I'm an observer as well.

FRED BAKER: Oh, okay. Cool. Okay. Jeff, do you want to talk about the caucus? I'm sorry. You're supposed to talk about the minutes. Ozan distributed minutes a few days ago. Were there any objections to them? Anyone abstaining from that? Vixie abstained. Okay. So failing that, I believe we've accepted the minutes. So going on to the Caucus Membership Committee, who will be speaking for that?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. Jeff said he could miss the beginning of the meeting and asked me to provide a report on the Caucus Membership Committee update. So if Ken, who is also on the Caucus Membership Committee, allows me to do so, I'm happy to do it.

KEN RENARD: Please. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Ken. The Caucus Membership Committee received two applications for RSSAC Caucus Membership since the March meeting. First application came from Hugo Salgado, who is a research and development engineer at NIC Chile. The second application came from Erum Welling, who is on the call with us today and who is the Internet governance lead at DISA. Both candidates have an extensive knowledge of the DNS. SOI of both candidates were shared on the RSSAC mailing list last week. And the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee recommended RSSAC to accept both candidates as RSSAC Caucus members. So I will now turn it over to you, Fred, and the entire RSSAC for any discussion on any of the two candidates before we go to vote.

FRED BAKER: Do we have any discussion? Liman, you've got your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I just like to state my support for both candidates. I've interacted with them both and I think they would be good additions to the caucus. So I am all in favor. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Any other comments? Should we go to a vote then? Does anybody oppose to either of these candidates? Is anyone abstaining? Failing that, I believe we've accepted them, and I'll welcome them to the caucus.

Ozan, do you want to talk about the liaison to the ICANN Board?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. Thank you, Fred. Towards the end of April, we will be starting the process to select the RSSAC liaison to the ICANN Board. The current liaison, Kaveh, will be completing his second three-year term by the end of ICANN75 in September 2022. He will be turned out for RSSAC operational procedures. So this is a non-voting position in the ICANN board of directors for a three-year term. The liaison will be elected from the primary and alternate representatives of the RSSAC for the RSSAC operational procedures. So yes, it's here.

We're planning our starting the one-month nomination period on 25th of April and it will close on the 26th of May, and it will be a vote item during RSSAC June meeting. Just a note that I skipped on the operational procedures specifying this role. The representatives from ICANN organization are not eligible to be elected. So this is the proposed timeline. And it will start towards the end of April on the 25th of April with the opening of one-month nomination period. I see Kaveh's hand is up. So, Kaveh, please go ahead.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Ozan, for introduction. I just wanted to add this to anyone who is putting their name up and if they have questions about what the job entails or how much time it takes. I can of course share my own experience. Please feel free to contact me and I will be more than happy to provide my view on what it takes and what's expected.

OZAN SAHIN: So if there are no other comments or questions on that topic, I will turn it back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: I believe you're supposed to go on and talk about the NomCom.

OZAN SAHIN: That is right. Let me then continue with the liaison to the ICANN NomCom election process. This process is actually underway on the RSSAC Caucus mailing list. The current liaison to the NomCom, Amir Qayyum, who is also with us today on the call, will be completing his third one-year term by ICANN75. We started the one-month nomination period on the 24th of March and it will be open until 25th of April. Then slate of candidates will be ready for RSSAC's consideration at the May meeting. Currently, we have already two nominees, Hiro Hotta and Abdulkarim Oloyede. But the nomination period is still open.

Are there any questions or comments on this? So, Fred, would you like me to continue with ICANN74 planning or would you like me to turn it over to you before I continue?

FRED BAKER: Yeah, go ahead.

OZAN SAHIN: Okay. Hearing no questions or comments, I will go to agenda item five, ICANN74 planning. I shared an announcement last week on the RSSAC Caucus mailing list that the registration is now open for ICANN74. So let me drop the link to the announcement from ICANN, if you'd like to review it yourself.

This is being planned as a hybrid meeting and there will be a face-to-face component. So if you're planning on attending in person, please make sure you read this announcement because there are some changes and heightened health and safety requirements for this meeting. There's a link on this announcement to all the frequently asked questions about the health and safety measures. So, it will provide answers on questions like whether you need a vaccine against COVID-19 to attend ICANN74, which vaccines are accepted, and how to verify the vaccination status, and answers to many other questions. So please make sure you read through those and make sure you register for the event if you're planning on attending in person. Because for this meeting, pre-registration will be a requirement to attend in person. So you will also need to register, I think, sometime at the beginning of June, but pre-registration will be required to attend sessions because there will be restrictions on the capacity and the maximum participants allowed in the physical meeting rooms.

If you still have questions, please let me know after going through the FAQ. I will make sure to pass them to the Meetings team and try to get answers to your questions. We will make an announcement on the supported travelers soon. So RSSAC typically has six travel slots for the supported travelers to travel to ICANN public meetings, so the due dates and deadlines about supported travelers will be shared with you soon.

I wanted to cover two topics under ICANN74 planning. This is the first one. Due to pressing a timeline of the schedule, we drafted, as the RSSAC Admin Team, a draft schedule for RSSAC. All the sessions that you see on the schedule are tentative. So this is not the final list. This has been created for discussion purposes. The bottom line is that since we understand the Root Server System GWG group could also want to meet at ICANN74. Given there's a number of RSSAC members who are on this group, so we wanted to avoid any conflicts and basically focus any potential RSSAC sessions to the first two days of the meeting and allow RSS GWG to have meetings on the following days.

What else I wanted to highlight here is, again, please don't be surprised, Russ, because of the timing of the RSSAC-SSAC meeting. It's not final. We are still working with the support teams of both groups. So we thought RSSAC work sessions may be needed. So we will cover the work items later on the agenda today but RSSAC may be taken on [inaudible] so tentatively two work sessions, plus a closed session with SSAC and RSSAC meeting are currently being planned. I'll make sure to share the final schedule with you on the RSSAC mailing list.

So I'll stop here to see if you have any questions or any comments regarding any additional meetings that you think RSSAC should have at ICANN74. So I'll stop here to hear comments from RSSAC members. I see hands from Jeff and Ken. Please go ahead, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: Hi, Ozan. Just to be clear, does that mean that if somebody is not a member of the GWG that you could get away with just making the first two days of this meeting? I have a conflict I've been torturing myself over. Is that the case then?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. This is our approach at the moment. The schedule is, again, not final. But yes, we are planning on having all RSSAC meetings on the first two days at the moment. I believe the schedule will be final two weeks from now. So you will see the final list in two, three weeks from now.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks for clearing that up. Thanks, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: You're welcome. Ken and then Russ.

KEN RENARD: Hi. Just to make it really clear that, at least from what I've heard, you will have to register for ICANN itself like we normally do. And then eventually we'll have to register for individual sessions because they're

planning on the capacity of each room and social distancing within that room. So if you do not register for a specific session, there might be space available to walk in. But be on the lookout for the individual session registrations as well.

The other thing is that the registration is open for ICANN and the hotels have their rates and links for the most part up on that ICANN website. So it's all set for you. Thanks.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Ken, for the clarification. So I believe the hand from Jeff is an old one. So I'll go to Russ now.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Ozan. Although I could be incorrect in the schedule issue, but I think the DNSSEC Workshop is Monday afternoon. I believe the day is split between Tech Day and the DNSSEC Workshop. But Kathy can certainly say with clarity if that's the case, but that might also produce some conflict. So just to note that and I'm sure you'll get it worked out with staff. Thanks.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you for this note, Russ. I'll definitely make sure to check with Kathy and to clarify this. I'll note this down. I see some comments in the chat regarding this topic. One question is the link to the agenda.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I found it.

OZAN SAHIN: Okay. All right. Thank you. Then there was a question from Daniel Migault on whether everyone needed to pre-register or just those attending in person. Thank you, Paul, for clarifying that. Are there any other questions or comments on this topic? Again, the link to the announcement is in the chat and you can read through all the information via this link. So I will turn it back to Fred for the work items. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Russ, you had your hand up. Did you want to say something?

RUSS MUNDY: Well, just a real quick question that there may or may not be an answer to. Is there a total limit on how many in-person people can attend this meeting? In other words, if there is in one comes too late to register, could you maybe not attend in person?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Russ, for the question. I don't have an answer to that question. I will take it to the Meetings team to learn. My initial understanding was based on the registration numbers, they will organize the rooms. But if you end up in a situation where there's high number of attendees interested in a session and there are no rooms to

accommodate that, I'll check with the Meetings team to get back to you with an answer.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Ken, you had your hand up and took it back down. Did you have something you wanted to say?

KEN RENARD: Yeah. Ozan pretty much addressed it. I think the reason for the pre-registration is so that they can choose the appropriate sized room for the sessions. So it's more that direction versus they're hoping that they don't have to limit the number of people who can attend. So that's why they want you to pre-register so they can right size the meeting space. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay, moving along to work items. Paul, would you like to talk about the intended users of the RSS?

PAUL HOFFMAN: Sure. Very good. Thank you, Ozan. We talked about—I'm sorry—you talked about this at the last meeting, asked me to do an SOW. Ozan reminded me yesterday that I had not so I did. But basically, for those of you who weren't there, the idea is that a possible work item for the

caucus, or maybe just for the RSSAC, if you want to keep it within RSSAC, is to write a document that simply states who is the intended users of the RSS, since we know there are a lot of unintended users of the RSS and we listed the unintended ones in RSSAC047. The idea was just sort of in the same way that we extracted the goals and operating principles out of RSSAC037 into its own documents. So someone can say, "What is it that we do?" It might be nice to have a separate sort stand-alone document that says, "Who are the intended users of the root server system?" And here I give two sort of use cases for this, one, which is not as likely but at least one RSO has told me that they are interested, is that when an RSO was under attack, if they can start picking and choosing who they want to give full answers to and such, they would like to give it to people who are the intended users.

Then the second use case, which I think is not immediate but will certainly become major later, is that once we have the new governance system, in that governance system, we're going to be doing measurements to, for example, say how well is the root server system working? And that would really be how well is it working for the people who we care about, not for the random people sending us a bunch of garbage traffic. So it would be nice to have a statement of who that would be. So basically, that's the background. The intention is to write a short document. If it's in the caucus doing the caucus, and then pass it to RSSAC, or if it's just being done in RSSAC, you can follow your own normal ways of doing things, and then have it published.

That's really all I had to say. Open to questions and comments. Kaveh, you've got your hand up, and then Karl.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. Thank you, Paul. So I think it's a correct gap that we have identified, and I think it's good to write something and fill that gap, basically. But to be honest, I don't know if it would be within the scope of RSSAC, because the way I see RSSAC or RSO saying, in that sense, actually, is we are providing public infrastructure. And as operators of that, of course, we have different venues to make sure that the policies are observed and the needs of users are represented. But I don't see it is the place for the operators of the public infrastructure to say who are the intended users because we are basically commissioned in one way or another. You understand complexity to operate a service. So I think such a document should come from IETF, at least in my opinion, because we are basically operators of what we are asked to do. And in that sense, I don't think it's best if it comes from us who we think are the intended users of the service, if you are commissioned. My two cents.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you. Karl?

KARL REUSS: Just a follow up, I guess, on what Kaveh started with. The word intended sort of jumps out at me as being problematic. I think a document that talks about who uses the RSS or who uses the root servers and who doesn't, and the fact that most queries don't go through it could be beneficial, but I don't think it's up to us to say who we intend to use our service and who doesn't.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Okay. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Paul. I think I agree with what Kaveh said. I like that. I'm a little bit on the fence about this in general, but I do feel like if it were to move forward, it would be better to talk about what are the uses rather than who are the users? Thanks.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Duane, before you go away on that, I think that the "what are the uses" is already well described in IETF documents. What we put in RSSAC047 when we wrote it initially was that list of unintended users so that we weren't measuring for them.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, one of the reasons I struggle with that is because, like you mentioned or your text mentioned, potential queries for names that don't exist to do measurements or test connectivity or something like that, right? That's not something that a person who does, that's an action of software, millions or whatever, some collection of software does that. So to me, it doesn't feel like that's a user action, for example.

PAUL HOFFMAN: I think with the wording that we started with, by user I didn't mean intended users as people, it would be intended systems.

DUANE WESSELS: We keep saying who. Who are the users?

PAUL HOFFMAN: Right. Which I guess would devolve to the operators of those systems as a possibility. But I hear what you're saying that that may be in fact just what is it used for or what can it be used for. But then that would be a list of almost anything, including connectivity tests and such like that.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I guess that's the direction I see this going.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Thanks, Paul. Interesting idea to publish something like this. The TLDR is I'm not sure that this is the right place to do it, and for a few reasons. One, we've long held that the root server operators don't filter and serve everyone and all packets that arrive to us without regard for where it's coming from, recent geopolitical events included. This is for a few reasons. One, we don't prioritize. It allows flexibility for future uses that we're not yet aware of today, and we actually have some interesting research where we have identified clients that are new versus old and have been around for a long time as well as those that

are ramping up significant rates above their normal profiling so that we could look at using that in a security kind of concept if we had to.

But it's really not in our scope to define what an acceptable user is and what is not. The biggest concern is that it can really be perceived as that we are wanting to prioritize some groups of users over others because we deem them acceptable or not. I think that that's a dangerous thing for RSSAC to try and publish. As others have said, maybe another body is sort of the right way to approach this, that it shouldn't be the operators that actually do the publication of such. So I'm leaning toward, again, starting what I said at the top, I think it's actually a good thing to do. I'm just sort of against the fact that RSSAC is the right place to bring this forward. Thanks.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

Okay. Brad?

BRAD VERD:

Sorry, trying to find the mute button. I might suggest maybe flipping this a bit. What I mean by that is I feel this discussion came from in writing the monitors, or in writing the metrics for 047, you looked at it from a certain perspective on like, how do we measure this? Well, this measures that for resolvers and this measures it for direct connect and whatnot. So rather than maybe defining who the users are, maybe we just need to find the perspective of each of the metrics to say that this metric is intended to be from a resolver point of view or from a individual user that direct connects for whatever reason. And maybe that's the way to approach it. Thanks.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Sure. That is definitely we can flip it around and see if somebody else does it or some of us can do in the IETF. But then for another revision of 047, drill down on the individual metrics as well as—remember, 047 also has us measuring the entire RSS. That might be a way to deal with some of those concerns. Paul Vixie?

PAUL VIXIE: With regard to SS formulation, there is a way to deliberately with automation not answer every question which comes to authoritative name server. It's called DNS RRL for response rate limiting. I urge that the document explicitly permit this type of deliberate non-answer, as long as it is not targeted against, let's say, some aggressor nation that has pursued a war of choice or anything else. Because sometimes, for DDoS purposes or other automated reasons, it becomes necessary and vital in fact to not answer every query that you receive. Thank you.

PAUL HOFFMAN: So thank you, Paul. Because that is when we were writing 047 originally, that's exactly the example that came up during the workshop, which was that some people said, "Well, we have the capability of doing RRL. And we would use it when we were under attack." So that's where we came up with some of those negatives. Then there was really the question of flipping around to the positive. Duane, you still have your hand up?

DUANE WESSELS: Sorry. That's a mistake.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Okay. So given that, I'm not hearing a lot of people saying, "Yes, let's do this in RSSAC/RSSAC Caucus." Is there a desire to have this done in the IETF, or maybe just leave it as specified as it is in 047? If there's a desire that "it should be done in the IETF," I can start something there. Again, I'm not part of IMRS so I don't represent a root server operator. I don't know if it will be weird to start this in the IETF with no root server operators as co-authors. I don't know if it would be weird to start it without all of the root servers being operators. I have no idea. So I think I will kick that back to RSSAC to discuss. Wes, you've got your hand up.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. To a large extent, I agree with whoever said it first a bit ago that probably the IETF is the right place. They're the ones that define how the DNS works, what it's used for, what the records go into it, and the purpose and the architecture of the whole system. So that's the one that would talk about usage versus users and things like that. They're the ones that would know, "Oh look, there's new potential uses coming up, or new record types, or new class of applications beyond resolvers." I don't know what would that be, but they seem to be the ones that it's in their ballpark to do something like that. I suspect you and I probably agree on the difficulty of getting such a document published in the IETF because there'll be a lot of discussion around it. But that doesn't mean it can't be done. It just means that it'll be an interesting story to go forward with.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Well, I agree, Wes. But what I was asking is should we even start the discussion? We are only 30 years into having a root server system, and this hasn't been defined yet. Maybe it doesn't need to be defined. Or is there interest from folks that yes, now that we see this in 047, it would be useful to have the IETF do it, then somebody's got to do it, and I'm willing to do it. But I don't want to do it if in fact the root server operators would say, "No, let's not have that."

WES HARDAKER: I think it's independent, the root server operators entering. The root server operators have always been beholden to do whatever the IETF says. We say that in 047, for example, as well. I don't think that the root server operators need to even author the document within the IETF. In fact, to some extent, I think it would almost be better if they didn't. I'm much more lenient on that particular idea, but I consider it an entirely within the bailiwick of the IETF. I don't see why we need to consider it otherwise.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Okay, great. Thanks. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Paul. I agree with everything that was said, echoing that and on top of that, as a root server operator, I personally do not see the need to clarify it further. So I think the status quo has some merit in it. And my personal view is it is actually encoded from a different

dimension when we talk about things like [inaudible] in RSSAC037. When we say we are independent, we make decisions and define the limits of power of whichever is greater and also limited. I think it is covered from a different dimension. So to me, as an operator, it is not an active and open issue. But of course, again, IETF is its own word, and it really doesn't need to be a root server operator initiating that. If there is a need, of course, it will have traction in IETF.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

That sounds fine. Given that the only two use cases that I listed here were from the root server operators themselves, if they don't feel that it's needed, then I would say the topic could certainly be dropped if people change their mind, especially as we start looking at 047 v3 or whatever, it can be brought up again or decided how to deal with it. Like Brad said, maybe we just deal with it with better wording in 047 v3. I'm not seeing any more hands. I would say I'm done.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. Ken, you wanted to talk about statement about the evolution?

KEN RENARD:

Thanks. This is a statement that we've looked at a couple times before. There's been discussion on the mailing list as well as in the document. Thank you for that, those that have contributed. The discussion was mainly around, why are we saying this? Who are we saying it to? Why are we saying this now? Not that we're questioning whether we need to

do this document but more these questions should be answered in the document itself.

The interest in this document seems to be waning. But I'm happy to kind of work on it with somebody else, others that are still interested in pursuing this. So if you are interested in pursuing this document, please e-mail me or even on the list. We can set up a short, small call and pursue this, and try and go through some of the comments, and bring this document forward. That's it for the doc. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Ozan, I believe you wanted to talk about the public comment?

OZAN SAHIN:

Yes. Thank you, Fred. So this public comment is the Root Zone Update Process Study. I think in a previous RSSAC meeting, Matt Larson highlighted the opening of this public comment. The study was published for public comment on the 14th of March. Then I shared it on the RSSAC mailing list to let the RSSAC members know that the public comment proceeding period is open and it will be closing on the 25th of April, so about three weeks from now. Matt had provided a preview of the study. This study is conducted by ICJ. The study came out, if you look at the background—excuse me. I just lost control of the—

This came out as an outcome of the proposal during the transition of the stewardship of the IANA from the U.S. Department of Commerce, NTIA, to the global multistakeholder community. The document was proposed as a plan to implement the transition and included additional

recommendations, including this formal study. That's why the study was conducted. At the end, you can find some recommendations from the study. The recommendations are all on page 58 and 9, I guess, page 52 and 53.

My question is whether RSSAC would like to submit a public comment to this proceeding or not. Because given that we have just three weeks to the close, did you have any chance to review the report or the recommendations? Is there any support to some other comments? We haven't heard anything on the mailing list yet. So I just wanted to highlight. There are three weeks to go to the close. So, hearing the silence here and on the mailing list, I believe we can interpret that there's no interest to submit a comment. And if this is the case, I will turn it back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. You want to show me the agenda again? I believe we've come to report. My activities the last few weeks have primarily been in spending a few minutes with each of the liaisons and catching up with what's happening with them and asking them whether there's anything that they would like to see the RSSAC do. I don't have a lot to report. I want to let you know that I've been doing that. Ken, do you have any comments?

KEN RENARD:

Yeah. ICANN has a Planning Prioritization Pilot Program, which I volunteered for RSSAC person that'll start up this afternoon or this evening, and I guess it's just to organize and prioritize projects within

ICANN. I'll see what it's about and I'll report back probably next meeting what's going on. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Kaveh, liaison to the ICANN Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry. Finding the mute button. Nothing relevant to RSSAC to update.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here from the CSC. IANA is doing its usual good job. We don't have anything to complain about. They're told they fulfill all their SLAs. We are interacting with an Effectiveness Review Committee. The CSC is undergoing an effectiveness review. This is a periodic thing that happens to all ICANN Committees and you probably recognize it quite well. That's undergoing right now. And the upcoming meeting here in April, we're going to have an interaction session with them. I don't really know any details. They will start off from the previous review a couple of years ago, and I haven't heard any infectious comments going any direction here. So I'm not really worried about that.

We are going to hear from the PTI. They do a survey every year when they ask the customers of the IANA functions to report back how they interact with the IANA and how they feel about that. We usually get a

presentation regarding that at around this time every year, and that we take that as one of the sources of input when we assess the job of the PTI. Usually those are very positive as well so I'm not really worried there either.

The thing that actually does pertain to the RSSAC here is myself because I am the current liaison to the CSC, but like Kaveh, I will time out during RSSAC's own procedures. I've been there now for the time I am allowed to be in consecutive terms. So I believe it's from October or possibly the turn of the year. I need to check that. I will no longer be the liaison to the CSC. So RSSAC will have to start the process of appointing a new CSC liaison. Remind me, Ozan, I think you said you will start that in June with the nominations and when we will make the actual election in early August, at our regular monthly meeting in August, the person we should expect to step into office in October, again, if I remember correctly. So that's something that we need to do. I know that Fred and Ozan are quite aware of this. And it's not pressing yet, but it's something that's starting to come up on the radar. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Liaison to the RZERC. Daniel, do you want to comment?

DANIEL MIGAULT:

Not about RZERC. We still have to go through the review of the charter review. It hasn't started yet. That's good to go. On the IAB side, I can this time say that this week the IAB is meeting all the liaisons. If there's anything you would like me to bring to that meeting, feel free to contact me. I would say, so far, what I heard is that more dialogue is expected to

be carried from RSSAC to the IAB. That's something I will try to report but if you have any other things, feel free to let me know. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: So the IAB would like more dialogue from the RSSAC?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I think that's more. That's the RSSAC willing more dialogue with the IAB.

WES HARDAKER: So IAB member here, the IAB liaison coordinator stepping down from that role in the IAB. I mean, Daniel, I think the inverse is actually the problem, right, that the IAB feels like we have not communicated enough with our tangential organizations, and we are trying to make sure that information is flowing when it should. So we are reaching out to the liaison managers on a regular basis is just to make sure that things are still going well and we're not losing track of things. So it's not necessarily that we need more communication in particular, we just want to make sure that communication is able and facilitated as needed.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you, Wes and Daniel. Are you done with your thoughts? Shall I go on?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, sure.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Russ, do you want to talk about the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes. We have actually something that was mentioned at our last joint RSSAC-SSAC meeting in ICANN73. It was just one line on a slide at that point, but there is work underway in SSAC to put together. We do have a charter to find now put together an evolution of DNS work party in SSAC that's trying to look at the impacts of the various technology changes that are going on. From the SSAC perspective, it's intended to be global in nature, if you will. All parts of the DNS are involved. But it is possible, though it's certainly not yet decided, that SSAC may ask for involvement by knowledgeable individuals that have particular expertise in various parts of the DNS operation. And clearly, the first group that would come to mind there, if such an invite was put out, would be operators of root servers.

If, in fact, that does come together—and I'm hoping that we'll have a decision by ICANN74 In June as to whether or not we will be seeking outside membership and participation in the work party—I'd like folks that are associated with this group to think about whether or not they would be interested in participating in such a thing. This really is just a heads up to think about it. I'm happy to answer questions and interact with folks that might be of interest now or later on individually is just fine. Otherwise, nothing particular is going on in SSAC with respect to the RSS and RSSAC. So I'll say thank you. And if there's any questions, I'll try to answer now. Okay. Thanks. Back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. IANA Functions Operator. James, do you have anything for us?

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. To update I think the root zone KSK ceremony is scheduled for mid May. ICANN's Travel Safety Committee in line with the opening of the ICANN meeting and [inaudible] as well through normal participants [inaudible]. Public participants are still excluded at this point in time. That's a good move there. We'll go into a few tasks that have been withheld due to the restrictions. Hopefully after we get through that, we'll be looking to start the next KSK roll.

The other one is that IANA is working with Verisign to begin the separation of the .app name service, RFC 9120. We'll be looking to make some movement near towards the end of the month. That will be sent out on relevant mailing lists shortly. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Root Zone Maintainer, Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Hi, Fred. Thanks. So I wanted to bring up a topic that's come up in RZERC, where I also serve as the Root Zone Maintainer liaison. We've been talking about adding ZONEMD to the root zone for a while, and RZERC has been reviewing the draft deployment plan for that. One of the items that came up in those discussions was relating to how the root server operators would behave in the event of a ZONEMD

verification failure. So some of the committee members were looking to see some, I guess, statements or assurances in the deployment plan regarding that sort of behavior. As one of the authors of the deployment plan, I felt like that was problematic or I felt like it didn't belong in the deployment plan. Also it would be prescribing or making statements on behalf of operators who are independent entities. But we can't just dismiss the concerns of the RZERC Committee members. So I wanted to bring it up here and sort of find a way to address this, I guess, this concern of the RZERC.

Previously, Daniel Migault had posed some questions to RSSAC along these lines. I know some of you may have answered those and some maybe not, I don't remember the exact status, but those sorts of questions may serve to address the concern from the RZERC. We talked about this also at the last Root Ops meeting, and sort of the consensus there was to bring it to the RSSAC because of the relationships between RZERC and RSSAC. But I wanted to sort of get input on how people think we can address that concern from RZERC. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Well, speaking entirely for myself, this is an RZERC document. This is not an RSSAC document. I'm not sure how this would be an assurance from the RSOs.

DUANE WESSELS:

Right. To be clear, it's not an RZERC document. It's a document written by Verisign Root Zone Maintainer and ICANN IANA Functions Operator that RZERC is reviewing. But the concern is that RZERC Committee

members are looking for some, I guess, assurances from root server operators that things aren't going to go terribly when ZONEMD is added to the root zone. Ken?

KEN RENARD: Yeah. Just kind of operationally I feel like we could—we're talking about turning this on or the validation.

DUANE WESSELS: Right. I think one way that this could be addressed is if the root server operators or RSSAC would, choose whichever one you like, if either individually or collectively, statements were made that the verification part of ZONEMD would not be enabled for some amount of time. Maybe it can be somewhat vague like that or maybe it can be more specific for a year or whatever. But I think that would satisfy the concerns of the RZERC Committee members. Does that make sense?

KEN RENARD: Yeah. I feel like gaining some operational experience. If we can go X number of days, months, without any validation failures, then maybe we will feel good about this. I feel like there should be some collective "Yay, we're in it." We obviously did this with TSIG at some point. After gaining some operational experience, then we can probably turn on the flag that says, "Don't load if it doesn't validate." Is there a meeting or a process that we could propose where collectively would say, "Yes, we're ready to do this at point X and time or based on conditions X, Y, and Z"?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I can imagine, again, one way to do this would be a sort of a collective RSSAC statement. That would be, I think, one approach or more individual statements would also work as long as—well, in theory, they would work if everyone says the same thing, right? Liman, your hand's up?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think it actually connects in a triangle here. We have RZERC, who is, so to speak, the initiating point. And of course, that has happened beyond RZERC in the way of the cooperation between the PTI and Verisign. But the injection point into the system is through RZERC. I believe that the appropriate way here is actually that the root server operators discussed this and, so to speak, received a request from RZERC, and that has already happened. I think that someone will have to initiate this by proposing something, for instance, that RZERC proposes in a written document that this be turned on at a specific date. We can haggle about the date and it's a good idea to involve multiple parties in that. So that a specific date appears in the document published by RZERC, because that document can then be handed over to RSSAC, and RSSAC can then eventually support that document and recommend that this be done. Then we have the buy-in from RSSAC, which is the Advisory Committee regarding the root server system. We have RZERC who wants to do this. And RSSAC is not going to give its blessing unless the root server operators voting in RSSAC are in on it. The actual development of things would though happen in Root Ops. We don't have to have all the technical discussions here in RSSAC. But we need to have proposed dates, I think, because RSSAC will have to have some basis for its discussion and for making the recommendations,

and preferably even a time plan so that RSSAC understands when the recommendation has to be finished so that PTI and Verisign can after that make the cog wheels rotate, and so that things happen in good order and the timeline can be followed. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks for the suggestion, Liman. I think that, to me, that sounds really good. The one thing I'm a little bit hesitant about is putting a specific date into such a document that gets exchanged because I feel like it's a bit of a chicken and egg problem. We need to sort of get these things figured out before we can start doing scheduling. But I take your point. I think it's a good idea.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Let me rephrase that. I understand what you're saying and I agree. So let's rephrase that and say could either RZERC or individually, the PTI and Verisign, suggest to the root server operators that we would like to have a clear go or no go from you at date X. And then from that, when you have that, you can then put the date in the document because then you know that the process is already cleared by the root server operators. And then we have the time it will take is the processing time of the committees, and that may be easier to predict than the work of the RSOs.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I'm sure we can find some way to figure that out. Yeah. Fred?

FRED BAKER: Well, two thoughts, one on the entire concept of having a date. The date would correspond to some event. It seems like what might be easier to describe would be the event that six months after the publication of the document or whatever that might be. So you don't really need a date, you need something that would trigger it.

Then my other question was—this seems backwards—do you really want an assurance from the root server operators, or do you want to specify to the root server operators what the result should be?

DUANE WESSELS: Can you say more about what the result should be? You mean, RZERC would write something to RSSAC RSOs saying—

FRED BAKER: Well, I would expect to find something in the ZONEMD document to the effect that RSOs are expected to verify the ZONEMD checksum. And if it doesn't verify, they should do something. I think your proposal has been to not load the zone. Why not say that in the document?

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So my proposal has been—well, I guess I don't have a specific proposal at this time. But can you clarify which document you're referring to? Are you referring to a to-be-written document or to the deployment plan which RZERC has reviewed?

FRED BAKER: What's the subject of this conversation? To the deployment plan, I guess.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. All right. So you would have the deployment plan which is authored by Verisign and IANA, dictate behavior of an RSO. "Dictate" may be a strong word, but specify how an RSO should behave.

FRED BAKER: Well, you're specifying everything else. Why not say what you expect?

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. Fred has a point there, I think. I would rather use the word "expectation" here. I think, again, that this is something that should be proposed by RZERC and maybe endorsed by RSSAC before it's deployed so that it's written on paper that the root server operators through the committee of RSSAC actually recommend that this change be deployed. So again, the seed is from RZERC but I think that our RSSAC should endorse this before it's fully deployed.

To Fred, I think a date is actually a good idea, because otherwise, this can be forever in a holding pattern because someone is dragging his or her feet too much. So to have a threshold somewhere is probably a

good idea. But it's the threshold that we should all agree on so that no one can claim that it came as a surprise to them. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Just for me to understand, do we agree that the current document from the RZM will define whether RSOs are expected to check the signature and to reject the zone? Is that something we expect to have in that document? Or is RSSAC willing to have its own statement? Because the seed I think is RSSAC003. So now we need to decide whether RSSAC is willing to have a statement or if those recommendations are going to be moved into Duane's document.

DUANE WESSELS: Daniel, what I've heard from the people that have spoken so far is that the sort of the preference or the plan is for the deployment plan document, which again is authored by Verisign and IANA, will include some expectations of RSOs regarding verification of the ZONEMD record. So specifically, what I would put into that document is that RSO should not enable ZONEMD verification for some amount of time and should not fail to load the zone if the verification fails.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay, right.

DUANE WESSELS: And if everyone's okay with that, then that's the approach that we will take.

FRED BAKER: So what you said was should not fail to load the zone.

DUANE WESSELS: Right.

FRED BAKER: I thought the thing that we were discussing was that they should fail to load the zone.

DUANE WESSELS: No, the concern from the RZERC Committee was that Verisign publishes a root zone with a bad ZONEMD record, for example, and then it causes RSOs to not load the zone and experience some kind of service disruption. What the RZERC is looking for is an assurance that since this is new, RSOs will continue to serve the zone even if verification fails.

PAUL VIXIE: I think that's a reasonable proposal for rollout. But if we adopt it, we should explicitly state that this is essentially a soft launch. And that once we get some confidence and wisdom, we're going to revisit the question of what to do when the ZONEMD fails. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: I agree. Thank you. Daniel, I don't know if your hand is old or new. If it's new, go ahead.

DANIEL MIGAULT: No, that was an old hand.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks. Fred, is that okay with you still?

FRED BAKER: Sure. It just seems very weird.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, to be clear, the part that seems weird to me is that I guess I expected root server operators to assert their independence here and say, "You can't tell me how to behave." But as Paul just said, this is a soft launch, we're gaining operational experience. We can write down our expectations of the RSOs and their behavior in this situation.

PAUL VIXIE: Let me speak a second time. Sorry, I didn't use the hand protocol. But when DNSSEC first came into the root, there's deliberately under a viable root zone. That kind of made a lot of testing possible to give us some idea about how the production software was going to behave in the presence of DNSSEC. And I think we would not have DNSSEC today if

we couldn't have taken that half step first. This reminds me of that, where at the moment, we have no reason to think that alerts on the MD won't be false positives. I'd like to understand that before we move to the next step. So speaking for C Root, we don't need independence on this topic. We ideally would like to see the system function as a whole with a coherent policy. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS:

Okay. Thanks, Paul. Lars?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

With regards to independence, I cannot tell you what to do. If I as a root server operator don't do what's the general Internet users of my root service expect from me, then I'm clearly irrelevant. So there must be this give and take between what's expected from me and what I'm willing to provide. I see here that an expectation is rising that I, to begin with, don't fall over if the MD record hits me. And further down the line, start to validate the zone and verify the checksum before I load. We're not there yet, but that's what I see further down the line.

As root server operators, we must listen to what's expected from us. In some cases, as Paul said, this means that we have to have a coherent policy and that we need to roll out new functions, and we must have a process for doing that. I thought that what we had done was to create such a process with RZERC and RSSAC. We are now actually seeing a first case of real things that need to change. So we will have to figure out the process. We don't already have it. We need to figure out the

process how to make these changes happen. I've stated my proposal for how to do so. I think we should just move along. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Well, I thank everyone for the discussion. I have all the information I need to proceed with the next step. So I appreciate it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Moving on down the agenda. I think the next thing is the GWG report. Brad, Hiro, Liman?

BRAD VERD: I don't think there's much to report other than all the RSOs have been added. We had our first meeting and we are going through a chair election process and figuring out a work plan forward. Liman, Hiro, anything else?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: No, that's about it. Nominations for new chair are due at the end of this week, and we expect to hold the election for the new chair at our meeting, not this Thursday but Thursday, in 10 days' time, if I remember correctly. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Amir, would you like to talk about the Nominating Committee?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: If I may add quickly to the previous item, if I can add something?

FRED BAKER: Go for it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Since we are all not directly members of RSS GWG, maybe from next meeting, we need to rethink this agenda item. Of course, I would love to hear from Brad, Hiro, and Lars, but we are also directly present in GWG. So we might want to keep it or I think it's a good discussion to have. Just pointing that out.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Amir?

AMIR QAYYUM: Hi, everyone. Right now in the ICANN Nominating Committee Intersessional Meeting at Washington, D.C., as you know, the Nominating Committee launched a call for application for different positions: three ICANN Board positions, one PTI Board position, one GNSO, one ccNSO, and two ALAC positions. So the Nominating Committee received a good number of applications. But the number was still lower than the previous years. So the date was extended for one week, and we got a couple of more applications. So the total applications which were considered eligible and valid were 85 for all the positions, although it is a low number as compared to previous years, which was more than 100 applications in total. But anyway, with the 85

applications, there are approximately 64 applications for the ICANN Board for the three positions, 12 applications for the PTI Board for the single available position, 12 applications for GNSO for one single position, 10 applications for ccNSO for one position, and 7 applications for two ALAC positions. Obviously, the candidates are allowed to apply for multiple positions.

Right after the closure of application, we were given the phase of about two weeks for the soft dive. Soft dive means that each NomCom member is assigned six candidates, and we have to explore in much more detail the CV, the application, go to the LinkedIn profile, the Facebook and Twitter pages, search on the Internet if we can find something relevant for the experience and expertise of the candidate, good or bad. So this phase was completed just before the start of this intersessional meeting in Washington, D.C. right now. And in this week, from 3rd of April to 8th of April, we are discussing each and every candidate, and all the NomCom members who were assigned these candidates are giving their recommendations and telling us what they have found during the soft dive phase. At the end of this week, we hope to shortlist the candidates for the deep dive.

The total candidates that will be shortlisted for the ICANN Board, three positions will be about 15 or 16, for the PTI Board, three, GNSO, three, ccNSO, three, and for ALAC, four to six candidates for the two available positions. In the deep dive phase, which will be right after this meeting, I think after 10th of April, and then it will be a one month duration because we have to do the interviews of all the candidates who have been shortlisted, we have to check the references, and then a little bit more discussion in a group of three NomCom members.

Then eventually, when we conclude the deep dive, there will be an online meeting for the final shortlisting for the face-to-face interviews at The Hague meeting for final selection of ICANN Board candidates. We do not have the face-to-face meetings for the GNSO, ccNSO, and ALAC candidates. These will be finalized in the meeting but they will not be called for the final interview. Only the ICANN Board final candidates, which will be six for the ICANN Board and three for the PTI Board, will be called for the interview at The Hague ICANN meeting.

This is it. ICANN Intersessional in Washington, D.C., we have 14 members participating in the room. And the four members are online because they have some visa or other issues so they were not able to participate face to face. Apart from these, the ICANN staff was also not allowed or they are not participating here, they are online also. Any question already, anything? Should I explain more?

FRED BAKER:

Well, I think we can move on to the Fellowship Selection Committee.

AMIR QAYYUM:

Okay. For the Fellowship Selection Committee for The Hague meeting, we already selected the ICANN Fellows. These were finalized and announced in January. And the new call for Fellowship applications for the Kuala Lumpur meeting is already out. Hopefully, it will be closed in about two to three weeks' time, I think. Then this selection will be done.

Previously, there were very, very few applicants, I will say, the good applicants. Because most of the people were saving these Fellowship

selections for the meeting once they will be resumed in a face-to-face manner. People were less interested to participate in the Fellowship selection for the virtual meetings because obviously their slot is counted and you can only have maximum of three Fellowships selections in total. That is going fine, I think. Soon, the Selection Committee will sit and discuss the applications for the Kuala Lumpur meeting.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Does anybody have anything further for, Amir? Failing that, Afifa, you want to talk about the Fellowship Mentoring Committee?

AFIFA ABBAS:

Yes. Hello, everyone. I'm Afifa Abbas from Dhaka, Bangladesh. I would like to update on the Fellowship Mentoring Committee. There is nothing much to share. But first of all, I'd like to thank the RSSAC Membership Committee for giving me the opportunity to mentor the caucus starting from ICANN72. I have been selected also for the second round starting from ICANN75.

The Fellows are basically from having the diverse background. But since I have this technical background and the experience in cybersecurity, I get mentees usually from the people who are having the interest in DNS cybersecurity and the technical stuff. Until ICANN72, we had this modality of the Fellowship that we used to enlighten the Fellows regarding RSSAC in our informal sessions. But from ICANN73, we decided that we would do this in a more formalized manner. And from then, we actually started the mentoring call from all constituencies. And last time, Fred and Ken, both of them were there introducing RSSAC's

work to them. Overall, I figured out that they have this deep interest in the RSSAC work. I also keep on telling them how they can contribute and how they can join the caucus if they are willing to. Being the representative of RSSAC for the Fellows, it's a huge responsibility and obligation, and I'm trying to serve the job with sincerity, and I hope I will be able to continue with the same dedication. Thank you, everyone.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you. Abdulkarim, you want to talk about the ICANN selection NextGen?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE:

Yes. Thank you very much. There is not a lot to share. In the last selection process, we've had very little applications I think because of there was no face-to-face meeting. And for ICANN74, we're just about to begin the process of selecting candidates. We still have very few candidates. I think I was just assigned four candidates to evaluate. And the deadline to evaluate is going to be next week, Wednesday. So we're just evaluating the candidates. Generally, the quality of the candidates has been probably reducing because a lot of people are not applying because there was no face-to-face meeting. So that's just my update. Not a lot. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. [Inaudible], do you want to talk about NextGen mentoring?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Yes. Thank you, Fred. I would like to share my take on the NextGen mentoring process. There's a template of activities that we have been using to provide the necessary guidance to the mentees. I will try to only highlight the major ones. We first have some meet-and-greet sessions. Individual groups are sent to every mentor and then we also hold some collective sessions, second meeting in the group collectively. Primarily in the mentoring process, we provide guidance, particularly by devising some scenarios in the decision-making process in the ICANN community. Most of the scenarios being taught for mentees are mostly representative of other ICANN committees, particularly non-technical communities. So I try to also tell to the mentees that decision-making process and technical environments requires a different approach. Particularly the reasoning has to be based on scientific evidences. We produce some prototyping systems. If some sticky issues arise during the discussion, we try to resolve that way. So that way, I tried to make the presence of RSSAC being felt.

Beyond that, normally, mentees are required to make a presentation. They, I think, choose their topic of presentation during setup in the application process. So my role during their presentation preparation is guiding them, shaping some topics, and providing the necessary assistance. That was in a very high level way the role that I have been doing so far.

There are issues. Particularly some of the issues have been already raised earlier. The virtual setting has caused some challenges. Particularly, the mentees are coming from law schools. Since they're doing their study paired with the Fellowship Program, so they struggle

to balance their study time with their NextGen commitment. Probably, if face-to-face meeting resumes, the challenge will be resolved.

Last time, during the call we had with Fred and Ozan, we talked about introducing some content in the ICANN Learning System, which provides some overview of the RSS infrastructure. Both Fred and Ozan shared me some resources. But I'm not sure whether those resources are readily usable because the learning system may have its own template to follow. So probably in collaboration with Ozan, we'll try to follow up this issue. And next time, probably if we can produce the content as soon as we can, it will be ready for this round of NextGen mentees. Otherwise, for the next, probably ICANN75, we'll have content which will be published on the ICANN Learning System, which NextGen as well as Fellows can make use of. That's my take on the NextGen. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Well, thank you very much. We are technically over time and we've arrived at the AOB part of the meeting. Does anybody have anything that they want to bring up before we adjourn?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Fred, I have a very quick one, just because it just happened about the Selection Committee. So I want to ask the RSSEC Caucus Selection committee to look into the procedures. Because, A, I fully support the two candidates. I think they're wonderful people. I know them, worked with them and I think it's really good. But because we have observers doing right deliberations between RSSAC members might not happen and it is not in favor of neither the candidates nor to RSSAC. I think I

want to ask Membership Committee to look into a solution for that. There are multiple ways to tackle that. But I think it's a nice takeaway for us to make sure that our governance gets better.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else? Failing that, our next meeting is scheduled for the 3rd of May. Same time, same station. With that, I believe we're adjourned.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Fred.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you all. Cheers.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]