
OZAN SAHIN: Welcome, everyone, to the RSSAC Monthly Meeting on the 5th of July 2022. And with that, over to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. So this is the call to order. The next step will be the roll call. Thank you.

Okay, Cogent, are you here? I know Paul Vixie is here. Okay, DISA?

PAUL VIXIE: Yes, Cogent is here. Sorry.

FRED BAKER: Cogent is here. Okay. DISA? Ryan and John? I thought I saw John's name. Okay, ISC? Jeff sent in his regrets and I'm here.

JEFF OSBORN: Oh, I'm actually here, Fred.

FRED BAKER: You're here? Okay. ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson is 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. NASA? Barbara, Tom, are you here?

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Tom's not in today. I'm here, Barbara.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Netnod? Okay. RIPE NCC?

RAZVAN OPREA: Razvan Oprea is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Karl is here.

FRED BAKER: USC ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Good day, everybody. Wes is here. It doesn't look like Suzanne's here today.

FRED BAKER: ARL?

KEN RENARD: Good morning. Ken's here and I think Howard is on vacation this week.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Verisign? I heard Brad's voice earlier.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Brad is here.

FRED BAKER: WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liaison to the Board. I haven't heard Kaveh's voice yet.

HIRO HOTTA: I believe Kaveh's on vacation this week.

FRED BAKER: Okay. CSC and RZERC? Daniel has sent in his regrets. SSAC?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here. I finally found the unmute function, it didn't work. Because there was a hidden pop-up window in front of it that blocked everything, but I'm here also as a liaison.

FRED BAKER: Okay, sounds good. SSAC? Is Russ Mundy here?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes. Good morning. Russ is here.

FRED BAKER: IANA Functions Operator. James, are you here? RZM? Duane, are you here?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Did I miss anyone?

OZAN SAHIN: I don't think so. Fred, I think Ryan Stephenson joined the call later on.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. Could we go back to the agenda? Thank you. So you've all seen the agenda. It was mailed out a few days ago. Does anybody have

anything that they'd like to see changed? Failing that, we'll consider the agenda to be accepted. Ken, do you want to talk about the election of the liaison to the ICANN Board?

KEN RENARD: Sure. Do we want to do the draft minutes first?

FRED BAKER: Oh, yeah. We probably should. Okay. So you've all seen the draft minutes. Does anybody have anything that they'd like to change? If there are no objections to it, is anyone abstaining from the vote? Failing that, I presume that we've accepted the draft minutes. Okay. Ken, do you want to talk about the Membership Committee?

KEN RENARD: Sure. So we have received at least three requests to join the Caucus. But the Membership Committee has not met yet to discuss those. So they will be reviewed. I believe we'll be meeting later this week and we'll make recommendations during the next month's RSSAC meeting for at least those three applications. I believe the Caucus Membership Committee will also look at the liaison to the NextGen Mentoring Committee. Is that correct, Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: That is correct, Ken.

KEN RENARD: So nothing to bring forward for the Caucus Membership Committee in this meeting, but a few things are coming up soon for the next meeting in August.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

KEN RENARD: I can continue for the next item, it was the results of the election to the liaison to the ICANN Board. Just to recap, the election for the liaison to the ICANN Board from the RSSAC was held after the last meeting in June. There were three candidates and we went per RSSAC00 procedures had a vote. No one achieved a majority of the votes, which would be 7 of the 12 RSOs. So we went with the two leading candidates and held a run-off election, and still no one received the majority 7 of the votes. So after that, Fred sent his notice of conceding the election. So now by acclamation, Wes Hardaker is the elected RSSAC liaison to the ICANN Board.

This is testing some of the limits of our voting procedures. So I just wanted to give this opportunity. If there's anybody that has any concerns or questions about the process of selecting Wes, please feel free to state them here now. And if not, we will give Wes the full vote of confidence that the RSSAC has to select him for the liaison to the ICANN Board.

Failing that, we've recognized some maybe shortcomings in the election procedures, that cases where this could happen, things aren't as easy

and simple. So during the next review of RSSAC000, which should actually happen pretty soon, we will look into this. We've had some suggestions on the mail list. But we're looking into this further in depth during that review. Wes?

WES HARDAKER:

Thanks, everybody, for issuing through this process. It has been an interesting one. And I know I have my own thoughts on how to fix 000. But going back to the selection of me for the Board, please, if anybody has concerns or wondering how to handle certain situations, please do reach out to me. I'd love constructive conversation over how you think the RSSAC should be representative to the Board. In the next three years, I think it'll be somewhat of a critical term. Lots of interesting that happens with the Governance Working Group going on at the same time. I've actually already had a couple of really good conversations, and I look forward to any more. So please do reach out if you want a particular conversation about how your concerns of RSSAC in the future.

KEN RENARD:

Thanks, Wes. I want to reiterate a thanks to all the candidates who are willing to serve and volunteer their pretty significant time. It is appreciated. With that, I guess we'll go back to you, Fred, for the next item.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Ozan, I think you're the next guy on the list.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. Hello, everyone.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman has a hand up on the previous subject.

OZAN SAHIN: Please go ahead, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry. I just wanted to give my thanks to Fred as well, too, for conceding in the election because that simplified things a lot. So thank you for doing that. Thanks a lot.

FRED BAKER: You're welcome. So, Ozan, let's go back to you.

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. In the June meeting, I had mentioned that the two upcoming liaison selection processes would start, and the two processes started on the 20th of June. The 30-day nomination period started for both the liaison to the CSC and the liaison to the RZERC. Both processes are underway at the moment. So far, we haven't received any interests to serve as the liaison to the CSC, Customer Standing Committee. As a reminder, current liaison is Liman, who will be turned out by October 2022. And the other one, the liaison to the RZERC, the current liaison is Daniel Migault. He will have completed his first two-year term by October. The only candidate, the only volunteer to serve as the liaison

to the RZERC is again Daniel Migault. So these are the updates on the selection processes and the Board's 30-day nomination period will close on the 20th of July. If there any questions, I'll be happy to answer. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Ken, you have your hand up?

KEN RENARD: It's just a clarification. These two liaison positions for CSC and RZERC, they are to be selected out of the RSSAC and not the RSSAC Caucus. Is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: That is correct, Ken.

KEN RENARD: Okay. Thanks. Sorry if I've asked that question before.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here with a comment. Selected out of ... Okay. So any member or liaison of the RSSAC Committee is eligible for these positions. Because Daniel is the current one and he is not a voting member of RSSAC. Just asking for clarification.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you. So for the CSC, it says the outgoing RSSAC liaison selection procedure from the members of the RSSAC here. And then for RZERC, again, the liaison is selected from the members of the RSSAC. So it doesn't specify primary representatives only on their operational procedures.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Let's interpret that as the widest possible selection of people that we can elect. But I would also like to ask to have this clarified a bit in the next review of this document unless it's very clear what a member is and specified elsewhere. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. The lack of clarity that I think you're referring to is does an RSSAC member represent an RSO by definition, or would that also include the liaisons?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And also the seconds.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Let's go back to the agenda. I don't hear a conclusion bursting forth on that. Let's have that discussion on the mailing list. Ozan, do you want to talk about the Caucus meeting?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. Thank you, Fred. So the next RSSAC Caucus meeting will be held on Sunday, 24th of July 2022 in conjunction with IETF 114. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to organize an in-person meeting or a meeting with in-person component due to the restrictions that are still underway on traveling to non-ICANN meetings or organizing events at non-ICANN meetings. I circulated a draft agenda for this meeting on the RSSAC Caucus mailing list. So if there are any comments on the draft agenda, we'll be happy to hear those. That's the update I wanted to provide with regards to the RSSAC Caucus meeting coming up. Thank you. I see two hands, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. So, Ozan, the restrictions you mentioned here, these are restrictions imposed by the ICANN Organization, right? They're not national restrictions, I suppose.

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Liman. That's correct.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Duane, you have your hand up.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Fred. I wanted to mention that the Root Ops meeting, which is also always at IETF, is most likely going to be held on Monday, whereas normally it would be held on Sunday. That's the way it was done in the past. So, I don't know if this will cause problems for people who are maybe traveling on Sunday or if it's worth considering an adjustment to the date of the Caucus meeting or not, but I just wanted to point out that the Root Ops meeting will probably be on Monday.

FRED BAKER: Okay. We're getting kind of late in the game to change it. So how does that happen?

DUANE WESSELS: You mean how does it happen to change the Caucus meeting, or how does it happen to change the Root Ops meeting?

FRED BAKER: How does it happen to change the Caucus meeting?

DUANE WESSELS: I don't know.

STEVE SHENG: This is Steve, if I may.

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

STEVE SHENG: Can I ask a show of hands? If RSSAC were to have the Caucus have a meeting on Sunday, how many of the Root Ops or the people on this call will be traveling on Sunday and cannot make it? Can I ask for a show of hands?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I already changed my flight to make it. Does that count, Steve?

STEVE SHENG: To make the Caucus meeting?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. So you will be okay. So, Duane—

DUANE WESSELS: I could change my flight as well. So if I'm the only one then there's no reason to change it.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. And Wes?

WES HARDAKER: My niece is getting married on Saturday and I can't come any earlier. So I'm planning on traveling on Sunday because it's a critical family wedding for me. So I'm not going to miss my niece's wedding. So I can't make Sunday is really what it comes down to, unfortunately.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I wouldn't be making Sunday either.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. So we have three. Ozan, did we make an announcement to this on the Caucus list already?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Steve. Yes, we announced it last week. But if RSSAC wanted to change the day to Monday, since it will be an online meeting, as long as it doesn't conflict with any other important IETF meetings on Monday, I think we could do that, too.

WES HARDAKER: I'll note that the IESG, who manages the meetings for the IETF, really does not like meetings that overlap with the IETF itself because it draws participation away from the IETF, especially public meetings. I and Lars,

the IETF chair, had a good conversation the other day about how Root Ops might be a special case but we should really never do that again. I think the RSSAC Caucus meeting would be greatly frowned upon to actually overlap directly with an IETF meeting. There's ways around that. We could try and hold it in a morning meeting. That's actually very common side meetings and things like that also exist. But we should be sensitive to their particular concerns with IETF participation and our effect on them.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, I agree. I think it's best not to schedule it, actually, during the IETF week. So I think given that, my suggestion is to keep the current slot. If we are to change it, I would probably change it to a time after IETF. But I think my suggestion is to keep the current time the way it is. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Even though there are three people that have said that they will not be able to make that time?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: But I can change my ticket. So I think it's just two.

FRED BAKER: I think for Wes, that's a personal conflict, so that will be difficult to accommodate.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. And if I may, I would even consider it more important that we really be adaptable to the rest of the RSSAC Caucus. I mean, it would be great if we had representatives from all the 12 roots there. But this is an RSSAC Caucus meeting. It should be open to any participants that can make it. Sunday is probably better for most of the people that have already made travel plans expecting to be able to be there, or simply, that it's easier to participate on Sunday than during the rest of the week. So I'd optimize for them over us.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I agree. We just make sure that we have, so to speak, sufficient representation from the RSSAC Committee there. I will be there regardless of Sunday or Monday because I will be in Philadelphia and I will arrive already on the Friday, I believe. So I'm good either way. I understand that we will have a lot of other people representing there as well. So I think that we should remain on Sunday. That also limits the number of changes we have to make to people and confuse them, because there's always confusion when you change schedules. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I personally will not be there. Those reasons are personal and medical.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Then I will ask Ken, will you have the opportunity to participate on the Sunday?

KEN RENARD: Yes, I will be in the neighborhood of Philadelphia. I'm already there. It's pretty close to home for me. But note that this is a virtual-only meeting, so there's no actual physical room in that IETF venue or in Philadelphia for this.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's true. I was referring more to be there in time rather than on site.

KEN RENARD: Yes. Assuming that my flight's back from vacation, well, given the current state of air travel these days, but I should be. I plan on.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, because then we have at least a vice chair there that's on time.

FRED BAKER: Well, I will be online but I won't be there in person.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. But online is what we need because it's only an online meeting, so that's fine. So thank you.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So is that matter closed then? We're going to leave it at the same time? I note that Steve put a thing in the chat regarding who is considered a part of the RSSAC. Steve, where did you pull that from?

STEVE SHENG: That's version 6 of the Operational Procedure Section 1.2.1 regarding the composition of the RSSAC.

FRED BAKER: Okay, good.

STEVE SHENG: Let me put the actual procedure so that people can view it. Please go ahead. Don't wait for me. I'll do it on the side.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So where do we stand? We're at Caucus engagement, is that correct?

OZAN SAHIN: I just switched the display to today's agenda, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. But where in the agenda were we talking about the Caucus meeting? Okay. Moving on then to the work items. Duane, you've got the first one. You want to talk about them?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, sure. So this is the Statement of Work for RSSAC001 version 2.0. RSSAC001 is the document that outlines expectations of root server operators. So I guess this was discussed the last monthly meeting, which I wasn't present for. So we have a draft Statement of Work in a Google Doc. There's currently sort of three little outstanding issues, I would say. It seems to be mostly myself and Paul and Steve talking about terminology around the words "recommends" and "expectations" and things like that in the Statement of Work. Also, an item about whether or not the Statement of Work should make a reference to any work that the IETF or the IAB might want to do in updating the companion RFC7720.

I think these are all pretty easily resolved. Some of these are Paul Hoffman being a little bit of a stickler on wording, which is that's par for the course and we can accommodate that, I think. So I don't expect any significant problems on this, I guess. It's probably too soon to vote on it now. Maybe have a vote at the next meeting. Does that sound right?

FRED BAKER: Well, I would think at the next meeting at the latest, we would want to have a vote. Yeah. So people can look over this. Ken, go ahead.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. To Duane, just look in your crystal ball and what do you think? Do you think this is a six-month work party or a full-year work party? Just gut feeling.

DUANE WESSELS: Usually when I make guesses like that, I always underestimate. So I'm going to say full year.

KEN RENARD: Okay. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I heard your reference to RFC7720, which I'm one of the authors of. I think it might be worthwhile to mention at least to the IAB that this effort is underway so that they have a chance to pick up the ball if they want to do something at the same time, but that's just a personal feeling. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So let's plan on a vote on this at the next meeting. Then moving on to the second work item.

WES HARDAKER: May I ask one clarifying question first, Fred?

FRED BAKER: Sure, go ahead.

WES HARDAKER: So Daniel's not here. Do you want me to take that question to the IAB and warn them about this coming up and updating the RFC as well? I'd be happy to do that on my meeting with them tomorrow.

FRED BAKER: That would be good.

WES HARDAKER: Okay. We'll do.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Andrew, are you here? Oh, Liman, you have your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Old hand, sorry.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I am here, Fred. I can talk about RSSAC002 v 5.0.

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: This was sent at the same time as the last one. This is updating RSSAC002. Last time we did it was, I believe, a little bit over two years ago. We talked about this at ICANN74. There were two things that got brought up then. One is the possibility of adding this label count as a new metric, and the other thing is clarifying some of the language around the load time metric. Then we have another one here, which is just the standard reviewing of all the RSSAC002 measurements to determine whether they require updating. I think that's Recommendation 3 from RSSAC002 v 4.0.

This was sent to the RSSAC Caucus a couple of weeks ago. It's been out there for two weeks. I resolved all the comments in it today because they were just editorial and whatnot. I think it could enter a period of stability now, unless people wanted to have some more comments on it. But yeah, it's definitely not ready for a vote yet because it hasn't been in a stable period for a week. But it should be ready to vote on in the next RSSAC meeting or for an online vote if the RSSAC wants to do that. Any questions or comments on it? I will take that as a no.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So we'll plan on a vote on this at the next instance of these meetings. So, everybody, please take a look at that. It will enter a stable period. Is it supposed to be a week or two weeks stable?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I believe it's a week.

FRED BAKER: So yeah, it will enter that stable period no later than a week before the next meeting. Ken, do you want to talk about cyber incident reporting?

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Fred. So this draft Statement of Work is not quite as ready as those other two. But in the last, I guess, work sessions at ICANN74, we talked about this idea of cyber incident reporting, basically making a recommendation to the governance structure, whatever that's going to look like, of what we think cyber security incident reporting for the root server system would look like or should look like. Again, we're not defining it, we are making a recommendation to the governance structure.

This originally came out of the success criteria, so I think that's 58, that said the governance structure should have the ability to do cyber security facilitation, some sort of oversight and security incident reporting, which in turn came out of some of the NIS2 recommendations or proposed mandates that our root server system should publicize some of the incidents. Now, one hand, we want to be transparent as the root server system and let people know what's happening if there are security incidents worthwhile for them to consider for the purpose of transparency. And this is something that we in some respects owe to the Internet community for various definitions of owe.

The Statement of Work here is talking about incidents that have a material effect on the root server system. Material effect is a very

undefined term and it's going to be very difficult to define that. Some of the comments in the document so far are about how difficult that will be. Maybe if we just define the procedures versus defining what that material effect is. My personal opinion is that we could have the work party take a crack at that definition of what is a material effect but not necessarily focusing on those procedures.

So where we go from here? I'd like to see comments, discussion, preferably on the mail list about this on the RSSAC mail is about this Statement of Work and refining it to create a good work party structure. That's probably not going to be voted on real soon as far as approval of the Statement of Work. So I think at the earliest would probably be next RSSAC meeting in a month. That depends on how much discussion goes on on the mailing list, or even here, if anybody has any comments on that so far, please. Welcome.

FRED BAKER:

Ryan, you're mentioning the CISA incident reporting. You want to talk about them?

RYAN STEPHENSON:

Yeah. Ken just mentioned NIS2 and it's like, well, there's also a CISA. But I mean, there's other nation member states with their own incident reporting. So that's where this work party can be a little bit tough. I don't think this work party is going to actually tackle each reporting criteria, but it's just some things that can be referenced.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. I think where this is coming from, where this document should go is, what is the right thing to do for root server system and the users of it? Maybe we could take input from NIS2, CISA, their stuff, but not taking into account directly what other people are requesting of us, but what is the right thing to do. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does anybody else have comments on this? I don't see any. So I guess we move on. Okay. The RSSAC0 updates, Ken, do want to talk about that?

KEN RENARD: Okay. Thanks. I mentioned this earlier in the results of the liaison voting procedure. But part of the normal review of the RSSAC00 document is to start in July of this year. Just question to the group: does this usually have a work party associated with it? Or is it a core writing group or some subset of the RSSAC that does this? Either way we could start this process and review 000 and provide any updates to it. Any thoughts? Steve or Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I think in the past, staff has taken a stab at. So we maintain a list, I maintain a list of things that have come up in different conversations with the RSSAC over the year, like updates that need to be made to RSSAC000. I think what we've done in the past is staff has kind of taken that list and made edits to the document, and then propose those edits to the RSSAC. And then when we've needed to have calls to discuss

specific language, we've done that. But I don't think we've actually formed work parties, or at least the last time, I don't think we had an official work party or Statement of Work or anything like that.

KEN RENARD:

Okay. Thanks. But I would like to encourage people to review the document and look for anything else, any other ideas that might be updated or at least discussed as far as updates to the Operational Procedures. Thank you. Steve?

STEVE SHENG:

Thanks, Ken. I think one particular section is updating the election procedure. I think we're updating it for the liaison but I think that the update will affect virtually all other RSSAC elections. You can organize a call just on that particular point so that we'll make sure that there's sufficient RSSAC input on that. So I think some calls on that will be necessary. Then I would encourage any RSSAC member who has any input on that, please send it in if you can. Thanks.

KEN RENARD:

Yeah. I think Wes said some really good ideas or some proposed ideas for the election procedures, and they probably need to be discussed and formulated into some proposed edits. Wes?

WES HARDAKER:

I'll note that I did split sort of my post into two halves. I think the first thing to do is to figure out what are the requirements? What do we

want out of a voting system to ensure that enough members actually participated in a vote and what the requirements are for declaring success to vote in some way or another? And then from that, we can derive what is the best system. I think one of the things that the current text doesn't really take into account very well is not everybody participating in a vote, which will happen from time to time or abstentions and things like that. So I think we've identified the problems. But there's some tricky things of, okay, what's the minimum number of members to participate in a vote that I don't think it's been discussed before. So I suggest we make sure we start with sort of those problem requirements, and then try and find the solution after that.

KEN RENARD:

Thanks. Yeah. I agree with you, Steve. A call on this, maybe some initial dialogue via the list, and set up a call at some point, noting that we don't have many significant votes for liaisons or anything else in a very short term, I don't think there's a critical timing piece with this. So I think having this done, I believe, hopefully, by September, we will have the chair election near the end of this year. I think that starts September or October. I think it would be nice to have it done by then, but we'll see what we can accomplish. Thanks. Wes, is that an old hand or new hand?

WES HARDAKER:

It's old.

KEN RENARD:

Thanks. Back to you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So we're done with the work items report. Ken, I'll turn it over to you in a second. But I'd like to talk a little bit about my status. I've had some medical events during the past year. I had a pacemaker installed. I was in the hospital with pneumonia just before the recent ICANN meeting. I have come to the conclusion that wherever I travel, I need to have medical support, which means that I won't be traveling outside the United States on business purposes. Now I'm coming to the end of my term as chair of this committee so I'll allow that to simply take its course. But I want to say that in order to let people know and be clear about what's happening with me. Ken, over to you.

FRED BAKER: Thanks, Fred. Well, I wish you well and I understand and appreciate everything that you've done as chair. Just some of the things that are going on, preparation for ICANN75 in September are starting I think later this week. So those are some of the things that the Admin Committee is participating in. Other than that, I think we've said most of it already. I think that's it for me.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Kaveh, do you want to talk about the liaison to the ICANN Board?

HIRO HOTTA: Kaveh is not here.

FRED BAKER: And Daniel is not here. So that brings us to Russ. Russ, do you have any comments from the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Hi. Thank you, Fred. Nothing particularly from SSAC in terms of update. But as Ken already mentioned, the next ICANN meeting is coming up much earlier in the calendar year than it normally does. So the timeframe to think about what folks want to discuss in that meeting. If anyone has suggestions for our joint SSAC-RSSAC meeting, I'm happy to take them and fit them in the agenda as we can either directly or via the list, that's great. Also the Security and Stability Workshop is organizing another one for this upcoming workshop. So if anyone has suggestions or ideas, please, same thing for that. There's a call for participation on that. So if anybody has any questions—I see Ryan's hands up. Is that a question for me, Ryan?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Sorry. Again, mute. Just kind of curious as to why ICANN75 is a little bit earlier than the previous. This is just a general question, if anyone knows the answer to that.

RUSS MUNDY: I certainly don't have the answer. Fred or Steve or anybody involved? The Admin Committee might have some input.

FRED BAKER: I think that would be a question for Tanzania or somebody in her position. I certainly don't have any information on that.

JEFF OSBORN: For what it's worth, it's convenient for anybody else to go into AP next 60 miles away the week prior.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Thank you, Jeff. It's just a general question. I was just kind of curious.

RUSS MUNDY: Well, it actually is about one to two months earlier than it has been passed. So it does make the planning window considerably smaller than it usually has before the Annual General Meeting. Thanks, Ryan. Anybody else have questions or comments? Okay. Thanks.

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

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

FRED BAKER: Okay. Duane, do you have anything from the RZM?

DUANE WESSELS: Fred, no, nothing to report right now.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Robert, welcome to the call. This is the first time that you're here as a regular member. So liaison to Work Stream 2. Do you have any comments from them?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. I don't see Robert on the call either.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Boy, I'm batting a thousand. Now, moving on to the GWG, we had three members that were on the GWG. Now, all of the RSOs are represented on the GWG. Do we have any discussion of events in that category that would be pertinent to this call? Failing that, the next item on the agenda is a mention of the next meeting. Ozan, go ahead.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. I believe we skipped the report from CSC from Liman. So you may want to go back to Liman before any reports.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman, apologies. Do you have a report for us?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I actually have a very brief thing. Instead of being boring as it usually is, we actually had commotion in the CSC. Because there was an outage at

the IANA and they had a problem with their mail server. They did a plan to upgrade but they didn't notice that the mail servers stopped working for outgoing e-mails. So they didn't send any outgoing automated e-mail for a week, which was kind of bad. But that has been reported and investigated, and we don't see it as a systemic problem. It's not a recurring problem, and they have now put monitoring in place for that. So we hope it won't happen again. But there was actually an incident this time. But that's all. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Now we're at the AOB part. Ken?

KEN RENARD:

Thanks, Fred. One thing I forgot to mention with respect to the security incident reporting Statement of Work is something for discussion. Please go to the RSSAC mail list. What, if any, involvement with SSAC would we like to have? Any thoughts on a potential joint work party or inviting some of our friends from SSAC to join in this to help out? So please feel free to send out thoughts on that. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I was just thinking. We already have a number of SSAC members in the Caucus. So what I suggest that we do is that we mention to the SSAC and have it announced in SSAC that this is going on, and that those SSAC members who wish to contribute actually do that through the Caucus. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Sounds great. I'm sure he could fast track any Caucus membership requests. Thanks. Russ, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Ken. I did want to mention that it was meant this potential work party was mentioned during the last RSSAC-SSAC meeting. So the RSSAC folks that were in that or reviewed the results should at least be aware that it's under consideration. But there's no problem with re-publicizing at what I'll call the right time. And I'll let the call for what the right time is be up to the others on RSSAC and I'll happily push it in a SSAC again. Because honestly, what I usually do when something like this occurs, I usually use it as an encouragement for more SSAC people to apply to the RSSAC Caucus. So that would be my plan again this time. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Russ. I would recommend once we finalize the Statement of Work, it would be a good time to send that off to—if the RSSAC agrees to share that Statement of Work with the SSAC and request people to join the RSSAC Caucus. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So are we now at the AOB part? I believe we are. So we're looking at Tuesday, the 2nd of August, as our next meeting. Before I close, is there anything else that anyone would like to bring up? Failing then, I believe we stand adjourned.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]