FRED BAKER:	Cogent, are you here?
	DISA?
RYAN STEPHENSON:	Yeah, Ryan Stephenson is here.
FRED BAKER:	ICANN?
MATT LARSON:	Matt Larson is here.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. I heard Jeff, so Jeff and I are here.
	NASA?
TOM MIGLIN:	Tom Miglin is here.
FRED BAKER:	Netnod?
	RIPE NCC?
	University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Karl is here.

FRED BAKER: USC ISI? I heard Wes.

WES HARDAKER: Suzanne is here, too.

FRED BAKER: ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: Okay. And WIDE?

                      Okay. Daniel Migault, are you here?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I'm here.

FRED BAKER: Russ Mundy, are you here?

                         James Mitchell?

JAMES MITCHELL: James is here.

FRED BAKER: Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Hi, Fred. Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: Cool.

BRAD VERD: Hey, Fred. Brad is here. Sorry, I couldn't find the mute button.

FRED BAKER: I know the feeling.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Hi, Fred. This is Kaveh speaking. I'm also online.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool.

So you want to show me the agenda?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure, Fred. I just wanted to note Russ Mundy has just joined the call. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool.

Hi, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Good morning. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Yeah.

What we need to go over today is in the agenda in front of you. Does anyone have any proposed changes to the agenda?

Hiro is also here.

Okay. Failing that, let's start the conversation. We've all seen the draft minutes. Does anyone have any changes that they want to make?

Is anyone abstaining from the ballot?

Failing that, I assume we've accepted the minutes.

Okay, Jeff, you want to talk about the membership committee update?

JEFF OSBORN: Sure. Thanks, Fred. We actually had these candidates the last time, but there that a disorder in the meeting of the caucus membership committee. So my apologies they're showing back up.

The three current candidates here—Brett, Guarav, and Razvan—are all eminently qualified, and we highly recommend them. And in fact, if you get a chance, you can look at their SLIs because it's impressive—the quality of the people and their backgrounds that we're getting; Brett many of you know probably from his Nominet experience; Ravzan is with the government in India and has responsibility for a huge DNS structure; and Guarav is actually at RIPE. So they're all people who are known and known off. I got Guarav and Ravzan's CV backwards, but if you read those, in all cases they're very qualified. I'm looking forward to working with all of them in the caucus.

WES HARDAKER: I read through all of them. They're all—

JEFF OSBORN: We have two more applicants to come up for the next time, but we literally got them in this week. So we'll show them in the next meeting and have a recommendation.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER: I move to approve these three.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry? Wes?

WES HARDAKER: I move to approve these three. I think they're all great.

FRED BAKER: Do we have a second on that?

KEN RENARD: Second from Ken.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does anyone oppose to any of them?

                                            Anyone abstaining from the ballot?

                                            Failing that, I think we've accepted them.

Let's move on to the liaisons.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, everybody.

FRED BAKER: Now we have four different volunteers for the liaison to the NextGen mentoring [many]. I'm not even sure how to approach this. Does anyone have anything they want to say about any of them?

KEN RENARD: Jeff, do you want to mention what we talked about in the membership committee as far as a recommendation for this?

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. I was just waiting to see if Ozan was going to step in on that. I think, if I'm remembering … Again, I apologize. I'm back from three weeks of travel, and my freaking computer wouldn't even boot. As I recall, Desalegn has been in that position and served well. And … Ken, help me if I'm right. I thought we were saying, for continuity purposes, it would be a good idea to not switch horses.

KEN RENARD: I seem to recall Desalegn was timing out.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. Then I'm really not qualified to [deal with it.]. And my apologies. I literally came off of three weeks' vacation about an hour ago.

KEN RENARD: I'm going to have to look at the e-mail traffic, but the caucus membership committee did make a recommendation as far as ranking these candidates.

JEFF OSBORN: Right. Now I've got to find that.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

                     Meanwhile, Ozan you had your hand up a minute ago, and now you've got it up again.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Fred. I just wanted to help Ken and Jeff in their search of e-mails. So Ken is right to remember that Desalegn is timing out in the sense that I think it was a decision by RSSAC and the RSSAC caucus membership committee that, in case there would be other interested members, they would allow such liaisons or representatives to go for two terms. So if that is the case, then it is correct that Desalegn is the currently representative and is timing out by the end of the year. And the caucus membership committee indeed did a voting, and it was decided to recommend to the RSSAC that Ali Hussain would take the

role for the next year for the three ICANN meeting starting with ICANN76 in March. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: And Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I was just going to say, if we couldn't figure this out here and now, that we postpone this to later in the agenda to give Jeff and Ken a bit of slack to figure things out. But Ozan put things right. So no further questions. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So …

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks again to Ozan who actually is more organized than I'll ever be. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: You're welcome, Jeff.

FRED BAKER: Well, okay. So, again, I'm not sure how to go about this.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here. May I?

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So just to get out of this conundrum, then I move that we elect Ali Hussain as the representative, just to get something on the table to get things moving. So there's a motion at least. Thanks.

WES HARDAKER: This is Wes. I'll second it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is anyone opposed?

Is anyone abstaining?

Failing that, we've accepted Ali.

So, okay. We have a liaison to the CSC. We have one volunteer. And if I remember RSSAC000 correctly, we simply accept the volunteer—there being one—by acclimation.

Am I correct on that, Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: That is correct, Fred. I mean, if there are any discussions on Ken's candidacy, of course RSSAC members are welcome to discuss this. But you're right to collect; given that we have one volunteer, RSSAC may appoint this volunteer by acclimation.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Do we have any discussion?

KEN RENARD: I can turn my volume down if you want to say anything bad about me. Go right ahead.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, let's consider Ken accepted by acclimation and move on to RZERC. And, again, we've got one candidate.

                And Daniel, you're on the call, correct?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, I'm on the call. Should I remove myself from the call?

FRED BAKER: Well, turn your volume down.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay.

FRED BAKER: Anybody have any comments on Daniel?

WES HARDAKER: I think he's doing a fine job in his liaison roles in general. He should continue.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So let's consider Daniel accepted by acclimation.

So, Ozan, you want to talk about ICANN75?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. Thank you, Fred. And hello, everyone, again. So ICANN75 is taking place from the 17th of September through the 23rd in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, as a hybrid meeting, meaning there will be both in-person and remote participants.

And the ICANN organization published an announcement to announce the opening of the registration period a few weeks ago. I may put a link to the announcement in the chat if you'd like to review that. Basically, there is some helpful information in this announcement and what will be different, especially for in-person participants in Malaysia. ICANN would like to ensure the same health and safety standards as it did in The Hague, the Netherlands, but of course, the Malaysian government in that regard will apply.

So there are a few updates in this announcement that you will be to be aware if you are planning on attending in person. One is about an application that you will need to download and register before traveling before traveling to Malaysia. I think it's called the MySejahtera app. So please note that you will need to download and register and use this app before going to Malaysia. And also, when you go to the ICANN75 meeting page, you will find all relevant health and safety information there. The schedule will be announced on the 29th of August. So at this time, you can register for the meeting, but you will not be able to add sessions to your calendar or schedule until the 29th of August when the schedule will be announced.

So I just wanted to speak briefly about supported travelers. RSSAC will have five supported travelers. I believe the ICANN travel support team has got in touch with all of the supported travelers. If you haven't been reached out to or you are experiencing any problems as a supported traveler, please let me know.

And the session submission period is open now and will be closing in about a week. So the RSSAC admin team worked on a draft schedule. Let me try to show it to you. So the RSSAC sessions would start based on this draft schedule on Sunday—

[ANDREW MCCONACHIE]:   [inaudible]

OZAN SAHIN: My apologies. I guess I had …

FRED BAKER: Okay, Ozan, we seem to have lost you.

                              Andrew, did you want to get a word in?

OZAN SAHIN: Sorry, Fred. Can you hear me now?

FRED BAKER: I can hear you, yes.

OZAN SAHIN: Sorry about the connection problem. I'll just switch to my phone. I had a problem with my computer. So the RSSAC sessions would start on Sunday based on this draft schedule. And, working with Carlos Reyes, we have some tentative Root Server System Governance Working Group sessions on the schedule as well that need to be confirmed. But there's a link on the agenda to the schedule, and that's the draft one. I'm hoping to finalize this within the next week. And we have some high-level plenary sessions. So we have a welcome ceremony on Monday, and it will be followed by Q&A [.]. Later that day on Monday, Block 5, there is a joint meeting of RSSAC with the ICANN Board. I will come to that in a minute. But the remaining RSSAC sessions are … So in addition to the three RSSAC work sessions on Sunday, Day 2, we are planning on holding an information session on Tuesday, a joint meeting with the SSAC again on Tuesday, followed by an RSSAC Caucus meeting, and then holding the monthly RSSAC meeting for the month of

September on Day 5, Wednesday. Of course, the planning team is working on the DNS Workshop sessions, the Tech Day. And the plenary session is, I believe, yet to be decided. I will add that to the schedule once it's final. But on the final day, there's a regular ICANN public forum, the Board meeting, and another geopolitical forum.

I think we need to discuss a bit more the joint meeting with the ICANN Board because you may recall that the Board requires all of the supporting organizations and advisory committees to confirm their meeting with the Board and their topic of interest for this session. So if RSSAC is fine with having a meeting with the Board and having it on Block 5 on Monday, the 19th of September, that's, I guess, my first question. Does RSSAC think it is useful to have a joint meeting with the Board at ICANN75? And would this be a good time to have it with the Board?

The other one would be the topic to be submitted to the Board. The due date is the 9th of September for all of the supporting organizations and advisory committees for this. And the admin team worked on a few potential topics that RSSAC may want to consider for this session, if RSSAC wanted to have this session with the Board. So I don't know if you can still see my screen because I just lost it. Okay, I think it's just me.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah, Ozan, we can see it.

OZAN SAHIN: Okay. Thank you for confirming, Steve. So one of the topics could be administrative updates. Or RSSAC could think of an update of current work parties in progress.

The other thing is the admin team thought how the Board thinks RSOs can collaborate with ICANN about recent legislative regulatory developments. So I think you lost the screen as well, but basically the admin team worked on some potential items, and it's up for discussion now for the RSSAC. Thank you.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: Ozan, I don't know if you can see the screen on your phone, but I started sharing the Board agenda.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, I can see it now. Thank you, Danielle.

And also you can see the Board topic for this meeting. So the Board topic is, what collaborative actions should the community, Board, and Org be undertaking to further progress achieving our strategic priorities? That's a generic question asked to each of the SOs and ACs. So half of the session, 30 minutes, is being planned for the RSSAC topic, and the other half is for the Board topic for discussion.

DANIELLE RUTHERFORD: All right. Andrew, your hand is raised, and then Jeff Osborn.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Thanks, Danielle. So I just had an update on the MySejahtera application, the mobile app that the Malaysian government was requiring travelers to install. The Malaysian government made a statement on Saturday saying that that was no longer going to be required. And I'll post a link in the chat. I know the ICANN Meeting Team is reviewing this because this just happened. The Malaysian just made this announcement on Saturday. But it's looking right now that the app will not be required.

But I guess my message here would be that you'll hear more from ICANN. You'll hear more from us on this in the future because they're still reviewing this to make sure that this is valid a statement and all and that this is really true. But I just wanted to give this announcement because it's looking like we won't have to install this app, thankfully.

JEFF OSBORN: I guess I was going second. It's really too bad, Andrew, because I got to feel virtuous by installing the app and completing most of it. So now I lose the virtue.

Hey, the thing I wanted to ask is: Ozan, there's a GWG tentative slot on Saturday, the 17th. How likely is that to happen? I actually am getting on Friday, but that was going to be variable. Should we, if we attend the GWG meetings, ensure we're there by Saturday afternoon?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you for the question, Jeff. I don't a definitive answer to that yet, but in the next couple of days—hopefully before the end of the week—

I'm hoping to finalize all these sessions and circulate the schedule on the mailing list so that you can confidently plan your trips.

JEFF OSBORN: Great. Thanks, Ozan. I appreciate it.

OZAH SAHIN: You're welcome.

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

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry. I think I wanted to speak on the item about the meeting with the Board. I think we should have it. I think the proposed agenda was a good one. But if only we have it for the first item, I think we should have it because I find it important that we basically introduce our new liaison to the Board and show the Board how much we trust our liaison and also basically have a proper introduction from the whole RSSAC to the whole Board. So I think even only for that it's good to have the meeting. And as in most cases, if it takes shorter, we can of course have a shorter meeting. So that's my two cents.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you.

Suzanne, you've had your hand up for a while.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you, Fred. I just want to support what Kaveh said for the additional reason that it's the first chance for a meeting face-to-face in the same room and so on and so forth. That's actually making a difference with people's ability to … And it's really surprising after being all virtual for a couple of years. But I was noticing last week at IETF that it seems to be helping people to have the face-to-face meetings when they have the chance. So I think that's an additional reason to go ahead and do that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, I have to say, at both the last ICANN and last IETF, it was amazingly different to be back and meet people face-to-face. So I think both Kaveh and Suzanne are spot-on.

But in addition, I think that the third bullet is probably a pretty important one with all the legislative stuff that comes up. There's a lot of people that have been talking about it. There was multiple discussions in the last week in the IETF about, how do we deal with legislation when all these governments are wanting to propose stuff? And it seems like a high-level topic that would be worth at least communicating with the Board about.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does anybody have a … Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Fred. I just wanted to add to what Wes said, especially about the government activities, legislation, and so forth. I recall there was, about a year ago or a year-and-a-half ago, a fairly major session by a part of the ICANN organization that is tracking these type of activities and how it might impact ICANN operations and so forth. So it might be good, if that part of the organization still exist, if there were a little liaison-ing that could be done between those folks and the RSSAC to get an update on what might be happening. And I know Wes just mentioned how much discussion there was at the IETF about that. So to try to merge those things together … But using our ICANN resource would be good if they still exist. I think [inaudible]. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Wes, you still have your hand up. Is that an old hand or new?

WES HARDAKER: Old. Apologies.

FRED BAKER: No problem.

So, yeah, I have been concerned about the amount of legislative activity. I wonder if there's a conversation to have with the GAC about that.

EN

Wes, go ahead.

WES HARDAKER: I think one of the messages we want to convey is that it affects more than just the root server system—so the GAC and the Board at a higher level. It's beyond just RSSAC, but we can give your perspectives from the root perspective. But we're not the only party that is impacted by this, certainly. For a country ccTLD, well, they're subject to their own country's rules. That makes a little more sense. But for any of the global TLDs, they run into the same type of issues that [inaudible].

FRED BAKER: Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thanks, Fred. And putting on my day-job hat for a moment, I want to reinforce what Wes said. It's always important to get ICANN Org's views on these things, but it might not be a bad idea to reach out to both the GAC and the GNSO for discussion of potential common interests regarding legislation and the impact of it. And I would be happy to work with the staff team or Fred and Ken to help make that happen.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you.

                        Yeah, I feel like just kind of shouting to the wind, "Would you guys back off?" And that would have the effect I described.

So, Ozan remind me. There was a gal from ICANN Legal that has been talking with various countries. Would it make sense to—

OZAN SAHIN: [inaudible]

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

OZAN SAHIN: Elena Plexida, I guess.

FRED BAKER: Yeah. Would it make sense to have her talk to the RSSAC about the conversations she's been having?

OZAN SAHIN: So do you want this briefing in conjunction with ICANN75, Fred, or at a separate time?

FRED BAKER: Well, we're all together, or most of us are together, at ICANN75, so that's kind of an obvious time.

OZAN SAHIN:	Sure. We can definitely check with Elena and see if we can arrange this meeting.
FRED BAKER:	Russ?
RUSS MUNDY:	Thank you, Fred. I'd like to ask, since we've had a good discussion about this here and a good deal of interest, is this something that folks believe would be useful to have on our joint RSSAC/SSAC meeting agenda to see if there is any shared concerns in this space? I don't have any at this moment, but I just wanted to ask in case folks thought it was a good idea. Thank you.
FRED BAKER:	Liman, let me let you talk.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Thanks. So, Russ, I think that could be a good idea. So I support that idea.
	But what I wanted to say was about Elena Plexida, which is that, Ozan, I don't know if Elena is going to Kuala Lumpur. If she is going to Kuala Lumpur, it makes sense to have the meeting there. If she's not going, I suggest we have it as a separate time before the meetings because that will give us a chance to digest what she has to tell us before we get to

the physical meeting at Kuala Lumpur and get into this meeting with the Board. But it depends on her travel plans. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah, I wouldn't want to force her to fly across the Pacific unnecessarily.

Okay. Does anyone have any additional comments on the joint meeting?

Failing that, let's go back to the agenda. Okay, so we're talking about work items.

Duane, did you want to talk about RSSAC001?

DUANE WESSELS: Sure. I think that the state of this is that it's now stable and ready for a vote.

Do people need a reminder of what this work party is about? Basically, it's updating 001, which has been the … V1 was published, I don't know, six or seven years ago, so it's time for an update. You can read the scope items there.

I think this is ready for a vote, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

Does anyone feel like they need more time on this?

WES HARDAKER: This is Wes. I think it's good. I'll make a motion to approve it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is Liman seconding.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

                        Ozan, how would you like to go about voting?

OZAN SAHIN: So since this is a document, Fred, we can take a vote during the meeting. We can proceed with calling a vote, and if there are any abstentions or opposing ideas, this will be recorded. Otherwise, RSSAC may vote to accept this document, and we will start a work party.

FRED BAKER: So Ken asks a question in the chat: "If we have to approve RSSAC000 updates before voting on this."

KEN RENARD: It was just a point of humor. That's all.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here. I suggest we don't make this more complicated than it is. Do your normal voting procedure, and if anyone objects, that will be noted. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

Well, is anyone opposed to this?

Is anyone abstaining?

Failing that, I think we've accepted it.

Let's move on to the next item, RSSAC002.

Andrew, do you want to talk about that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Sure. So this is basically like the last one. This statement of work was in the RSSAC Caucus for about a month. It was reviewed. There were a few edits made. And it's been stable for, I believe, two weeks now. So the question is, does the RSSAC want to kick off this RSSAC Caucus work party? If anyone has any questions about this statement of work, I guess now would be the time to ask them as well. But I think everyone is pretty familiar with it at this point.

FRED BAKER: Liman?

LARS-JOHN LIMAN: It was raised on the mailing list, I believe—no, sorry, at the meeting in, [I think] … Well, Philadelphia last week. But do we really want to have QName… The label count in there? The comment that was made was that this document and the RSSAC002 measurements should pertain to operational stuff only, where the QName minimization thing is a matter of research. It doesn't really pertain to direct operation. So this is a question to the group: whether we want to keep that in there. It's still just something for the group to look at in the scope. It doesn't say that it has to be included. But it's something that I would like to mention before we actually accept this document. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: So, Ken, would you like to talk?

KEN RENARD: Thanks. To your point, Liman, yes, it's the statement of work doesn't decide whether that label count is in there or not. And we could potentially have a discussion or argue over whether this is operational or health of the root server system or research.

The other thing—and I do believe this is within the scope of Bullet 1 of the scope—is—and I think this may be what Wes is going to point out— the possible of metrics or placeholders for queries over different transports like DoT, DoH and [duck]. Thanks.

EN

FRED BAKER: Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, that was indeed going to be my point, Ken. So thank you.

But more generically, I do think that we ought to make the scope flexible enough that, for things like QName minimization, that should be up to the caucus to determine whether it's a good idea or not. And we shouldn't necessarily rule it out of the scope, as we're predetermining that the caucus should really consider it, and then have it be flexible enough that we can bring up other things like the issues that I brought up regarding TLS in the last week as well. We could add that one probably within scope.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. So you've seen and heard. I'd even want to create a large discussion around this because it has been on the table for some time, but that question was brought up last week. So I just wanted to put it out there. I'm happy with what Wes said—that we should make this flexible enough—and I will support this document as it sits. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Do we have any further discussion of this document?

Failing that …

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I move that we accept this document and start the working group.

[OZAN SAHIN]: I second.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So those opposed?

Is anyone abstaining?

So then I can conclude that we have accepted this document and want to start a work party.

Ken, did you want to talk about cyber incident reporting?

KEN RENARD: Sure. So this is the cyber incident oversight. There is a draft statement of work. This is still a proposed work party. It's up to this body whether we pursue this at all as a work party. There is no near-term due date. There's no pressure on time. And a reminder that RSSAC does have final approval authority over this publication, so even if this work party did convene and developed something that RSSAC didn't like, again, RSSAC has that approval authority.

So just a few things about the statement of work and some of the comments that have been made in it. We're talking about incidents that have a "material effect" on the root server system. So material effect is

going to be hard to define, but should we attempt a broad definition—
for example, a significant privacy leak or attack leading into incorrectly-
answered queries or availability issues … So I agree that we're not going
to define this down to the ones-and-zeroes level, but is it worth the
attempt? So there's—let's see—observational effects on the root server
system, such as an insignificant denial-of-service attack. That could be
considered as something: "Hey, we saw this blip on the radar, but
maybe it's not worth reporting." So those are the types of things that
this work party could dive into.

Another comment is to focus on how incident reporting is initiated. And
I believe there are two scenarios here. So let me look at my notes here.
What comes from the root server system governance structure versus a
statement from an individual RSO? That could be discussed. And the
question in the document about "Should the incident reporting start
with the request from someone?" … My thinking is that NIS2 made a
request and, we think, somewhat overstepped their bounds. But what
could we define as … "This is what we think is right to disclose. This is
what we think we owe to the community. And this is what we will
offer."

And a lot of this has already been done—security incident reporting and
disclosure. It's been done since the inception of the root server system,
but as things get formalized in the root server system governance, how
would they take over or formalize? So that could be something like they
run the communication channel, whatever form that takes. And that's
it, just to facilitate the discussions. But a good point was made that we
should be "preserving the level of collaboration among RSOs," just in

effect stating that we are doing this and we are doing what we think is a good job of this.

And still an outstanding question is resolving this respect to buy-in from the RSOs. So what if the caucus comes out and says, "You will do X, Y, and Z," and some of those things are not acceptable by RSOs? Again, we have the ability as RSSAC to approve or disapprove the publication. And in the grand scope of things, this document would be a recommendation to the governance structure, not a mandate. There's still, I think, the ability to have that buy-in level from RSOs to the governance structure.

So my recommendation is ... I apologize that I haven't done all that much editing in the statement of work, but we'll continue discussions, either now on the mail list, in the document, and hopefully have something as far as a statement of work to look at more in depth at the next RSSAC meeting at ICANN75. Again there's no rush for this. We already have two work parties going.

So any questions or thoughts?

Brad?

BRAD VERD: Thanks, Ken. I think it's all really good—everything you outlined there—but I will add that I feel like maybe it's the cart before the horse. And I feel that maybe the first discussion that needs to take place is ... As I thought through this—I spent a lot of time thinking about this and how to manage this—I feel like, if RSSAC could identify what the RSOs are

willing to disclose today, then you could overlay that over a big Venn diagram and see where the commonalities are. And I think that would be a place to start, rather than jumping into, "Are we going to report on simple DDoS attacks and this and that?" I think the first thing you got to answer is, what are the RSOs willing to disclose? And then that's your jump-off point, I feel. So that was my thought for a starting point. And I think that happens long before any work party.

KEN RENARD: Okay. Thanks, Brad. And would that be something to punt to RootOps to discuss?

BRAD VERD: I don't think so, based upon conversation in RootOps. They wanted to punt it here. So this is this the … I don't have that answer. I thought I had it, but I was told I was wrong.

KEN RENARD: Okay.

Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. Yes, you have very good concerns, Ken. And I also like what Brad said.

The thing that struck me from my own side here is that, in this type of discussion, I would probably like to involve the security incident people

at Netnod. Fortunately, our head of security is my second here, Patrik Faltstrom. So for me, it's rather easy. He can easily step into the discussion if I just alert him that this is going on. So I would possibly give the rest of you the idea to involve some other people inside your organizations if we are going to have this discussion because I am probably not the best person to decide or make statements around what Netnod is or isn't willing to disclose, not without having a conference with my colleagues about that. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Thank you.

Wes?

WES HARDAKER: I have to put my mouth where my hand was. I was trying to figure out exactly what I wanted to say because it is a confusing a situation. I think one of the things that I mentioned a week ago was it's unclear to me when … There's two different aspects to this. One is, would the group of RSOs, either through RSSAC or not, publish a security incident that involved everybody, and when would that actually occur? What would the conditions be that a joint statement was necessary versus an individual statement? And if it seems like at least a common template or minimum reporting requirements should be for RSOs or in what conditions, that's certainly something that has never been done before and, some to some extent, violates the independence criteria that we've set aside where, the instant we start doing that, we're imposing stuff.

But when it comes down to where should this discussion take place, which is really I think what the brunt of this conversation has been about, I'm a little torn because I do think it's incredibly important that the twelve operators, of course, have a well-stated viewpoint in order to bring about, what are the impacts? The caucus members who are not actually running DNS infrastructure—and I'll leave that more generic than just root operators—may not understand the implications of something, whereas there certainly would be implications if reporting requirements actually got expensive, either timewise or financially or both.

The flipside of that, though, is I think that any statement that we make would be much more well-received if it came from a wider body of expertise. And that's exactly why we have the caucus: so that they can think about it. And there are certainly members of the caucus that participate in other organizations that run DNS infrastructure that have reporting requirements and things themselves. So we would actually benefit from their voice so we more mirror and match the rest of the industry.

I'm tempted to say that we shouldn't vote on this today and we should stew for another month and maybe wordsmith more. But with respect to my leaning of the two sides that I just said, I'm sort of leaning that really the caucus is the right place to do it because this is the type of thing we set the caucus up for, even though it's a little more political than technical.

So there's my ramble.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Wes. Yes. So one option is to really approach this, if the caucus is working on it[:] security incident response for the RSS—not for RSOs; things that affect the RSS. And, yeah, there's a lot of things that are in delicate balance here: security versus independence versus the right level of disclosure and to develop that trust in the root server system and community.

I'll go to Daniel first.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So the question I have regarding this work party is that I think it's based on a previous document, where we mentioned that we need to report some incident. But I think things have changed. And I was thinking of … I don't know if it's the exact term. There is a digital act from the European Union that is, I think, asking for such disclosure. So I'm wondering if we are aiming such a work party at responding or trying to address such requirements as opposed to doing something on our own. And in the latest case, I think it's not only a technical discussion but there are a lot of legal aspects because those acts have been written by legal people. So it's just a question of whether we are targeting our own incident report or if we are trying to answer to, let's say, the European Union or similar bodies.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Daniel. My approach on this was, yes … The discussion came about from NIS2, so we have differing opinions on exactly the way NIS2

and the EU were approaching that, but I personally think that there were good things, good ideas. So let's take those good ideas and try and mold them or express them in what we think is right as far as incident disclosure. What do we owe to the community to establish, maintain, and improve the trust in the root server system? So, in a way, it's a response, but we're not taking what they said and answering it. It's, "Okay, let's take the general concept and build our own. What should it look like?" Thank you.

So I agree that we should definitely stew on this, definitely not vote on it here, but potentially vote it on it next. But, again, since there's no real dedicated timeline, if we stew on this for … Let's stew on it until it's right.

Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Ken. I think folks here know that I have some apprehensions personally about how difficult it is to create something of this nature. But I wanted to just toss out an idea for folks to think about that might or might not affect the end result. And that is, in some ways, I think we could view this as an effort that had some similarities or was somewhat analogous to the work that we undertook to do RSSAC037 and 038 with the idea that it's better for RSSAC to get to the point where we at least have our RSSAC perspective on what we think is right or appropriate for this particular area, even though it's difficult, than it is to have someone else come tell us what the perspective ought to be. So just something for folks to think about. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: [inaudible]?

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Thank you. Can I speak now?

FRED BAKER: Go ahead.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Thank you. There's a discussion that I had with Liman. It's been years, when I first started down this Internet governance area. And he mentioned something to me that I actually never forgot. I know he probably doesn't believe he can say things that are that meaningful, but this one actually stuck with me because we were talking exactly about security incidents. And one of the points that he made at the time was that the reason we don't divulge where security incidents are occurring is because it gives the bad actors a sense of, "Okay, we were successful. And then we can target some more."

So I just wanted to throw that back out there because it was something that was said to me and it kind of stuck with me. And I think it's relevant here that we want to be transparent. But I think we also have to be very cautious as to how information can be used. So it's just that little tidbit I wanted to add to the discussion. Thank you very much.

KEN RENARD:	Thanks. Yeah, that's part of that balance of security: giving away too much information versus the transparency. But excellent point. Thank you.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. So do we have further discussion on this topic?
	Well, the summary I draw away from this is that we should put off actually making a decision until at least Kuala Lumpur.
	Andrew, you want to talk about RSSAC000?
ANDREW MCCONACHIE:	Sure. So this is RSSAC000v7. This is part of the yearly update to RSSAC000. So I think it was about two to three weeks ago where we had a call where we discussed three different items—two small items, and one pretty significant item. It was an hour-long call. We spent about 15 minutes talking about the two small items, which I'll briefly go over, and then we spent a long time thinking about elections.
	So the first two items that we should probably consider resolved are the fact that incoming representatives complete the terms of the previous representatives and also regular meetings are default open for observation but can be closed at the discretion of the chair. So those are the two kind of easy things that we discussed a few weeks ago and quickly worked through with some wordsmithing.
	After that, we had a long discussion on how the RSSAC should conduct its elections. I'd say there was strong support for rank choice voting.

And so I came away with an action item from that meeting to kind of foist rank choice voting on to how the RSSAC conducts elections. And so I did that and I contributed some text, and I can briefly go over that.

I do think that we're going to need at least one more call to work through all these changes. The changes are pretty significant, and my recommendation for the RSSAC is that the RSSAC moves slowly here because these are … You can just foist a whole new electoral system on a committee. The devil is really in the details. So there's a lot of small things that still need to be worked out, and there's a fair amount of wordsmithing. And there's been some good discussion in the document, and I strongly recommend that everyone take a look at the document, especially Section 1.4.1. And we don't necessarily need to go to that section right now because I don't want to take up the rest of the time here wordsmithing because we could be wordsmithing for another couple hours here. So that's my recommendation to the RSSAC: that we have a dedicated call to talk about this.

And I think, if people have any process questions or overarching questions right now, this would be a good time to ask them. But I didn't want to take up the rest of the call doing wordsmithing on this document.

Is that okay, Fred?

FRED BAKER: Yeah, that's fine.

Ozan, could you schedule a call for us to talk about this?

OZAN SAHIN:	Sure, Fred.
ANDREW MCONACHIE:	And does anyone have any … I guess there aren't any questions about what I just went over—the update or … Or people can ask me on chat or later. Thanks, Fred.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Excuse me. What time frame are you thinking of here, Fred and Ozan, for the call?
FRED BAKER:	Well, I'm thinking between now and ICANN75. Do you have a preferred timeframe?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	A little later than just next week. This is vacation time in the northern hemisphere. And this is important stuff. So can I suggest that that be put beyond August 15th or something?
FRED BAKER:	Okay.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Does that work for everybody?

FRED BAKER: Ken, you have your hand up.

KEN RENARD: Liman, that works for me as well. But one thing—I forget if this went out to the whole RSSAC—is that the recording of the first session is available, and I found that very useful for context if you're going to join the next call. Thanks.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: I'll send the recording to the RSSAC, along with a link to this document so people can review it.

FRED BAKER: Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: And I'll circulate a Doodle poll for the week of the 15th with some options. So a Doodle poll this week for a call on the week of the 15th. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So I think, at this point, we're moving on. My big report is that I will not be in Kuala Lumpur, and I'll cite health reasons. I've been in the hospital a couple of times this year, so I'm not traveling for a while.

Ken, do you have anything to bring up at this point?

KEN RENARD: No, I don't. Unfortunately, I've been out of the ICANN75 planning stuff, so nothing to report there next month. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Nothing to report since last the report. The ICANN Board is on break from the 1st of August until the 21st of August. So that's also nothing. So nothing to report.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

Liman, do you have anything to report?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: The only thing is that we are still waiting for the new names for people who are circulating out or need to be reelected for the GWG.

I do know that Brett Carr, who is one of the representatives from the ccNSO, has been reelected. And this is the same Brett Carr that we just put on the caucus.

And we have also seen a first cut of the report from the Effectiveness Review Team that is reviewing the CSC as one of these regularly recurring reviews that happen inside ICANN. There was nothing striking in there. It will be out for public comment very soon. And I don't want to forego that if they change anything in the report. So it will be open soon. But I didn't see anything in there that was alarming in any way. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you.

Daniel, do you have anything from the RZERC?

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. Just a few words. So we're going to meet—RZERC—to revise the charter later this afternoon. Some of the questions that we will be discussing are typical regarding RZERC meetings: if we want to include some attendance expectations. So I'm wondering, for example, if you have any view on that. I don't think we should change anything in that.

Another question we might have regarding the purpose is if we believe there is anything that need to be changed, especially as we've been through an exercise of what we think is in scope and what is not in scope and, given those results, is the charter is sufficient enough or if there is any need to change that text? So far, I don't see the text as preventing us from doing what we are willing to do, but I'm happy to … Brad? I see Brad. Yeah?

BRAD VERD:	You're referring to text. Have you shared that with the group? I haven't seen it. If you have, maybe it's in the e-mail list and I missed it. If not, can you share it?
	I feel pretty strongly that the RZERC charter shouldn't be changing.
DANIEL MIGAULT:	Yeah.
BRAD VERD:	So I hope that's the message we are conveying. I know we've gone back and forth a couple times in saying that, if it changes, it certainly shouldn't change just by a majority vote. There need to be some kind of supermajority going on in the RZERC to change that, and there should be a really good reason. And if RSSAC dissents, then we should document what that dissent is.
DANIEL MIGAULT:	Yeah. Okay. Yeah, sure. I mean ,that's where I'm trying to go to. But I will share with you what I have regarding the questions. And if you have anything to say, just let me know.
	I do share the same opinion as Brad for now, and I will keep you informed of the discussion, things that have been raised during this afternoon meeting.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Liman has a hand up.

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

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Yes, I share the same concern as Brad here that there is this trend inside ICANN to look for work to do. And that's not how you maintain a well-functioning committee. I've been so lucky to work for the Customer Standing Committee, which has an extremely narrow scope and it works extremely well, just because we don't step out of that scope. And people have been trying to throw things at us and say, "You must do this," and we've been very skeptical of that. So there was a design from the outset. And do remember that design before you start to look for more things to do.

                        I don't address this to you personally, Daniel, so don't feel bad about it. But it's a general caution that I would like to make. And I hope that you bring that forward to your committee. Thank you.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah. Thank you.

                        Any other comments?

                        Good.

Fred—

FRED BAKER: Okay, let's move along to the IAB.

                         Wes, you're kind of called on in this as well. So do you have any comments from the IAB?

WES HARDAKER: Daniel would be the right person to start.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

DANIEL MIGAULT: But I don't have any comment regarding the IAB.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

WES HARDAKER: I'm trying to think. I need to go back and look at notes. I don't think there's anything related, other than … So the big topic that keeps coming back is what to do with the alt-TLD-type proposals. I don't know. Some people have seen there's also [inaudible] proposal floating around. The upshot is that the GNU naming system has a draft with the IETF's independent submissions editor. And it's been sitting there for a

long time because the last ISC and the current ISC are trying to figure out what to do. And if the draft does not conflict with the DNS, then it probably could be published. But leaving this problem unsolved really amounts to, how does—well, I have my own view, and I'm trying not to put my own view into my sentences—alternate naming systems exist within our current naming application? Applications expect a name that may or may not look like a DNS name. And that is coming to a head, and it certainly affects the root servers because any system that doesn't understand a name will leak those names to the root and will get more traffic, for example. As you know, I'm sure we get dot-onion traffic and dot-tour traffic and dot- … coin? Not coin. There's another one.

Anyway, there's a bunch of stuff that leaks through the root because they're coming from systems that don't understand the alternate naming system that somebody has configured. And obviously it affects IANA and their decision of what to put into a root in ICANN and things like that, as well as the special use naming within the IETF. And it's a really complex topic and it's really coming to a head this time, quite significantly. But there's no action yet. Just be aware that there's a lot of conversation around it, which is really more broad than the IAB. But that's probably the right place for it [in the wide end].

FRED BAKER: Okay. Shall we move on to the SSAC then?

Let's do that.

Russ, do you have any comments from the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY: Hi, Fred. A couple of quick ones. First, on the discussion that Wes just brought up relative to the alternate naming approach, there is a good deal of interest in SSAC on that. We've had a lot of discussions. But, again, we've tried to say some things from time to time and had only very limited success. But anyway, yes, we are, from the SSAC side, interested in that space also.

But more to the point here, on the upcoming ICANN meeting, we have our joint meeting. We've had at least one topic added this time. If anyone has other additional topics they'd like to have on the agenda, please let me know or respond when the agenda gets sent out as a draft. And we'll try to get everything covered.

And the other thing I would like to just mention is that the DNSSEC and Security Workshop is assembling our program at this time. So if there are folks here on this call that have any topics they think the broader community would be interested in hearing about, please respond to our request for participation. Or if you haven't seen it, drop me mail directly, and we'll get the ball rolling.

So just those two things. Thank you, Fred.

FRED BAKER: Okay. IANA function operator. James?

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. I [inaudible] ceremonies on the 13th of August. And, again, it's predominantly remote participation [inaudible] interested in TCRs. This is on the west coast here.

Other than that, there's the [inaudible] to replace the root zone management system. That's that system that's used by TLD operators to submit changes to the root zone or the root zone database. We'll be doing a few sessions on that at the ICANN meeting and just general outreach to the TLD operators and their users. So [inaudible] and some comments from IANA on that. I don't think that impacts anyone here, but if you're interested, those sessions will be at ICANN.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you.

Duane, do you have anything from the RZM?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Briefly, ZONEMD is one of the things I've been working on. At our last regional operator meetings, we discussed the statement that has been approved and that is now published on the root servers' dot-org website. There's a statement from the RSOs about ZONEMD. So that's good news because now this allows us to resume progressing this within RZERC and elsewhere. So hopefully that is now unstuck. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And now we bring up the GWG.

Brad, I think you would probably lead this conversation at any rate.

BRAD VERD:	There's not much to report. The GWG finished going through RSSAC058. I think I've conveyed that here. We had our working sessions at ICANN74. We'll be meeting again in 75. We're still working out that schedule. And we have identified some topics. The group identified some topics that they wanted to explore some more and define, like defining capture, defining what the RSOs are gaining and what they're losing, and the government system and … I can't remember the third topic. But all those are happening in the next three meetings. We did not meet last week because of the IETF and schedules were just too busy. So we'll pick up in two weeks. Thanks.
FRED BAKER:	Okay. Thank you.
	Okay, we have now reached in the agenda the label Any Other Business.
	And let me just throw it open. Does anybody have anything they want to bring up at this point?
	Failing that, our next meeting will be at ICANN. We've got the time on the agenda there. And I guess we'll talk then.
	So with that, consider the meeting adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]