

---

ICANN75 | AGM – RSSAC Meeting  
Wednesday, September 21 2022 – 9:00 to 10:00 KUL

OZAN SAHIN:

Hello, and welcome to the RSSAC meeting. My name is Ozan Sahin, and I will be the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat.

I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of the session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comments verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record, and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To read the real time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation, ICANN multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and a last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not

---

***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.***

---

sign in using your full name. I don't see RSSAC chair, Fred Baker, in the Zoom room, so I will hand the floor over to RSSAC vice chair, Ken Renard.

**KEN RENARD:** Thank you, Ozan. Welcome, everyone for monthly RSSAC meeting. With that, we've got a good group here in the room as well as online. We'll call out meetings to order and start with the roll call. Thank you. Do we have Cogent in the room? How about DISA?

**RYAN STEPHENSON:** Hey. This is Ryan Stephenson. Hello all. And, John.

**KEN RENARD:** Welcome Ryan and John. ICANN?

**MATT LARSON:** Matt Larson here. And Terry Manderson is in the room.

**KEN RENARD:** All right. ISC.

---

JEFF OSBORN:                    Jeff Osborn.

KEN RENARD:                    All right. And NASA. I don't see NASA online yet. All right, Netnod.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:            Lars-Johan Liman is in the room.

KEN RENARD:                    And RIPE NCC.

KAVEH RANJBAR:                Kaveh Ranjbar is in the room.

KEN RENARD:                    University of Maryland.

KARL REUSS:                    Karl Reuss here.

KEN RENARD:                    All right. USC ISI. All right. Sounds like Wes has had at a pretty busy week. ARL, myself, was here, and Howard, I see you online.

---

HOWARD KASH: Kash online.

KEN RENARD: Verisign Brad is here. I think he just stepped out. WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro Hotta here.

KEN RENARD: There is Hiro. And we have Kaveh, Liaison to the Board. Officially still you got a few more hours left. Liaison to CSC is, Liman is here. Daniel, RZERC and IAB.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I am here.

KEN RENARD: Welcome, Daniel. And Wes, just joined us for USC. Russ, he sent his apologies. I just don't see him online. So Russ is not here. James Mitchell from IANA.

JAMES MITCHELL: I'm here.

---

KEN RENARD: Welcome. And Root Zone Maintainer, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here.

KEN RENARD: All right. And Ozan, do you want to announce the staff?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. From RSSAC support staff, Andrew McConachie and myself, Ozan Sahin are here.

KEN RENARD: Wonderful. Thank you. So you should have the agenda here. We've got few pieces of administration. We'll go through some work items, the work parties, and all the reports. A few items in any other business. Does anybody have any additions, or questions, or things to change about the agenda? All right. Hearing none, we can move on to administration. And over to Ozan for the draft minutes.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Ken. I started draft minutes a couple of weeks ago and shared it with the RSSAC members. We haven't received any

---

questions or any requests for revisions for the draft minutes. So if there are any discussions on the draft minutes from the August meeting, I think this is the right time. And then it will be a what item in this meeting. Thank you.

KEN RENARD: All right. So we should vote on that now.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes.

KEN RENARD: So does anybody have any changes or object to approving the minutes? Any abstentions? And so to look for hands in the room. All right. With that, the minutes are accepted. Thanks, Ozan. And RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee update. Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you. This is Jeff Osborn and ISC acting as the Chair of the Membership Committee for the Caucus. We had one candidate this month that we unanimously are suggesting that qualifications are amazing. I mean, the short version here is he's been working on the DNS infrastructure for the Indian NIC for 26 years. So this is an extremely qualified guy. We're really looking

---

forward to working with ICANN fellow, all kinds of fabulous things.

KEN RENARD: All right. So we'll vote on this as well. If anybody has any questions about this candidate, feel free to ask them. If not, we'll do the same thing. Does anybody have any objections to accepting this candidate to the Caucus? Any abstentions. All right. With that, we will accept Ashish, and welcome him to the Caucus.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Ken.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Jeff. Next is the RSSAC liaison to the NextGen@ICANN Selection Committee. We did get two volunteers for this. Abdulkarim Oloyede, who we know, and Malick Alassane. We'll put the statements of interest up here for people to look at. Jeff or Ozan, correct me if I'm wrong. This this position is currently filled by Abdulkarim and he is eligible for reelection.

---

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. As a general principle, we feel like people who are in a position and doing a good job should get the two terms that are sort of normal. So I think that had been our intention.

KEN RENARD: The recommendation from the Committee?

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. To be clear, the other candidates are really qualified, and we were going to go to the trouble of sending a note and saying, please, please apply again. So we have no shortage of good candidates. It's just two seems better than one in terms of working your way into job and just as a policy from the membership committee.

KEN RENARD: Ozan, how should we proceed as far as a vote on this?

OZAN SAHIN: And just like the new application for the RSSAC Caucus membership, so if there's a motion to move it, and appointing the current representative Abdulkarim Oloyede, if there is a second, we can go ahead and accept it.



---

KEN RENARD: Okay. Any motions to approve Abdulkarim for a second term?

JEFF OSBORN: This is Jeff. So moved.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is Liman, seconding.

KEN RENARD: All right. We have a motion and a second. And, again, any objections to this motion to reapprove Abdulkarim for a second term. Any abstentions? Seeing none in the room or online, we have selected Abdulkarim Oloyede for a second term as NextGen ICANN Selection Committee liaison. Yes, and good point that we'll send something out to Malick, encouraging to apply again. Both were qualifying. On the work items, Duane, do you want to give us an update on RSSAC001?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. Happy to. This is Duane Wessels. So the Work Party had a meeting yesterday, and was good. It was well attended. We tipped off or made some progress on one of the statements of work items, which was to discuss and come to some agreement on how to phrase expectations versus requirements and that sort

---

of thing. So everyone felt that stating them as expectations was the right thing to do and to avoid stronger language than that.

We also talked a little bit about whether or not to update the companion document, the RFC, and I asked everyone to think about that as homework and then come back to the next meeting to discuss that. There was one of the things I was going to mention, but it's escaping me right now. Oh, yeah. I know what it is.

So one of the statement of work items for this Work Party is to survey roots of our operators for how well they are currently meeting the expectations, and wanted to bring to the RSSAC whether or not that is something the RSSAC would like to discuss further in RSSAC meetings or some other context like maybe the roots server operator meetings.

So Steve Sheng has done some of this survey work already and sent some email messages to the RSSAC list. If people are comfortable with discussing this further, say, the next RSSAC meeting, we could we could add that to the agenda. Otherwise, we could talk about where for the discussion might be more appropriate.

KEN RENARD:

Jeff.

**JEFF OSBORN:** Just for the record, I believe Steve mentioned yesterday that he had four responses, and my guys promised me a response today. So that should be in the mail.

**KEN RENARD:** Yeah. So that's a data call out to the RSOs, and hopefully, we can get those responses back quickly and just move the Work Party forward. As I think he mentioned yesterday, Duane, the analysis of those responses is important to moving forward with the discussion.

**DUANE WESSELS:** Yeah, I think we just want to track the extent to which how well the operators are meeting those expectations. It's not blocking progress on the Work Party. But I think we just want to maybe use this as an opportunity to encourage the operators to really think about if they are meeting these expectations or not, and if not, why not? So yeah.

**KEN RENARD:** It can also help on the discussion of whether the expectations should be kept or modified. So Great. Are any further questions

---

---

or comments on RSSAC001 Work Party? All right. Seeing none, the next one is the RSSAC002 update. I'm in shepherd for that. Ray is the Work Party leader, and we did meet earlier this week.

And the topics for discussion were a new metric label count as well as some of the load time metrics and discussing the optionality, that's a word of certain metrics. How do we do this with obvious ties into the expectations of root sever RSSAC001. Are these metrics expected, required, all that now? Resolving those things.

So we discussed in the Work Party meeting the label count metric. The usefulness of it was debated and the consensus within the caucus was to not pursue that as an addition to 002. And it's pretty much it. Anybody else have any comments or thoughts and questions about 002. All right. Duane.

DUANE WESSELS:

I guess just one thing to note in case people aren't aware. In both Work Parties, we're sort of looking at the ways that they overlap and relate to each other. And there are some proposals from Caucus members to make sure that 0001 and 002 use the same language in terms of expectations and also maybe even to have the meetings joined together. So have one meeting follow another meeting. So for anyone that has filled out the doodle poll for the 002 meeting time, you might expect that whatever time is

---

chosen, there would be a RSSAC001 meeting immediately following that.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. Thanks, Duane. I'll check. Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: And just a quick reminder, the doodle poll will be closing tomorrow. So please if you haven't completed it yet, please do so. Thank you.

KEN RENARD: All right. Thanks. And anymore on 002 and 001? No. All right. So the Cyber Incident Reporting draft. So we discussed this earlier in the week. It's a complex topic. The idea is to try and discuss scope of the issue to eventually come up with a statement of work. We did that. We're kind of teetering on the fence of not enough interest now, wait, or let's go ahead and pursue this further. Given the discussion in the government engagement session this week, it seemed like there would be the usefulness of such a feature.

The cyber incident reporting could be very useful to regulators, governments, things like that might be satisfied with or at least partially satisfied with some sort of reporting, and that could

---

potentially help the Government Engagement team as well. So I think that's an important thing to pursue.

My next steps will be to take some of the notes from the meeting and draft something else to the RSSAC to get us closer towards a statement of work. There is no immediate need for this. It's not something that has to be taken care of right away. So it's in the let's get it right versus done fast been. So any questions on cyber incident reporting? All right. Seeing none, we can go over to Andrew for the 000 updates.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. Thanks, Ken. So this is Andrew McConachie for the record. The RSSAC had a meeting on 000v7. These are the RSSAC operational procedures. This is the kind of yearly update that happens every year. And it was a pretty good meeting. We had one thing that was left unsettled, and that's the section on Motions. And I think after some conversations with both Robert C and Duane, I think we're just going to delete that section on motions. Because the only place in in the entire document where the word motion appears is in that section. And it was not a word that appeared in v6.

And probably what happened is, like, through discussions, or this is maybe my fault, I just went down the rabbit hole of, like, I'm going to talk about motions and enumerate this, and I seem to

---

have just kind of opened a rabbit hole that it was a lot bigger or I guess a lot deeper than I initially thought and it didn't really resolve anything, and it just complicated a bunch of stuff.

So probably better to just leave that as it was in v6. But I guess we'll have another meeting about this, at least one, at least kind of one more dedicated meeting on 000. It doesn't need to be approved until the November meeting. So we have a bit of time. But that's the update. I don't know if people have any questions.

KEN RENARD:

Seeing no hands in the room or online. Thanks, Andrew. Yeah. Like, the goal is to get it done before the next chair election. But that's just a goal, not a requirement. All right. So next on to reports. I don't see Fred online yet.

A few things that I had actually put into AOB, so we can wait for that. I wanted to thank everyone for a productive week in the work sessions and the related GWG sessions. A lot of good work done this week. And I guess this is technically Fred's last ICANN meeting as a chair. And I wanted to thank him as well for what he's done over the past two terms as the RSSAC chair. It's been greatly appreciated. Onto Kaveh for report from liaison from the Board.

---

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much. Not much to report. We just had the session with the Board yesterday, so I think you're up to date. Maybe good to know, it was mentioned this well before. So you must know by now that the Board chair, there was election for the Board chair and vice chair.

There were two candidates and Tripti is going to be the Chairwoman of the Board. Also for the vice chair, it's going to be Danko. Again, two candidates and there were no controversy. We had time slots, they said their SOIs, 10 minutes of explaining basically what they want to do, and one round of voting. So there was no controversy or no fight, basically. And clean voting, and we would have a new chairwoman and vice chair.

KEN RENARD: And when does that?

KAVEH RANJBAR: By this AGM, so basically tomorrow, tomorrow after the AGM time. Tomorrow at 10:30.

KEN RENARD: All right. The official ceremony handing of keys. Wes?



---

WES HARDAKER: So we can never thank Kaveh enough, so I'm going to thank him again publicly. This is his last RSSAC meeting. So in his last Board report, thank you again for all of your work, Kaveh. I have a couple of other things to mention just out of discussions that I've had in the past week that came up. They weren't official documents or anything or official statements from the Board or anything.

One of the ones that there has been floating conversations about when we're going to roll the next KSK again. And one of the conversations that we had was how can we better interact, engage the readiness for that. And so Kaveh can probably speak to it better, but there is an IPC, an Internet Service Provider Consortium.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. ISPC.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, that we might want to consult and say maybe they could actually help us out this time and if we bring them online in that discussion earlier, which I thought was a good suggestion from one Board member. There's also been discussions about how liaisons can do a better job reporting to them from the Board. So

---

you'll probably hear me asking more questions about that in the future as that discussion kicks off.

The other thing just unrelated, but because it comes to RSSAC, the last KSK role, if you remember, after the KSK was removed. Before it was revoked, there was a significant increase inquiries, especially I think Verisign really identified. I don't think, Duane, did we ever figure out why that happened?

DUANE WESSELS:

Yeah. So you're referring to there was a period of time where the old key was published with its revoke bit set, but it not yet removed from the zone. That's when we saw the increase. And when it was removed from the zone, it just dropped off immediately. So I think I would say we were 90% sure it was attributed to a certain range of bind versions that didn't behave as expected. But that was the extent to what we knew. We didn't know anything other than that about why those versions were doing that.

WES HARDAKER:

In the conversations around people want to roll the next KSK, I began to think, oh, oh, okay, we solved all those problems before, so that's a good question. The only last note is that there has been a lot of discussions we've followed any of the Board

---

conversations with other groups about concern for the slowness of the next new gTLD round.

So there's a lot of interest in making that happen faster, and it's obviously taking a long time. It doesn't affect us now, but just know that there's a strong desire to get that done faster than it is being done so that more TLDs can be opened, which will of course affect us in the long run.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Can I have a clarification on your second point about liaisons? Just for clarification because that's an ongoing issue with the Board. But that's for the outgoing liaison from the Board. Let's say, Board liaison to the RSSAC. So the RSSCA liaison to the Board or SSAC liaison to the Board, that's, of course, that should be discussed, but the main issue that the Board has and the document and the effort is actually for the reporting of the Board outgoing liaison to different bodies and how they report back. There's a multiple issue. There is a clear, their role, their remits, all of this needs more clarification, and the Board wants to document that.

WES HARDAKER:

That is absolutely true. Some of the discussions that have happened this week have been, well, maybe we should

---

reconsider like, how do we improve liaison chip generally between the Board of both incoming and outgoing. So it's expanding like all things do where it feature. Scope creep is happening, so it might affect our role as well.

**KEN RENARD:** This is Ken. Question about that revocation to removal timing frame. Would there be any recommendation to change that time period to avoid that increase in traffic? Or is it just a blip?

**DUANE WESSELS:** There's have been no like formal recommendations or discussions about that. But I think it's worth considering. I think informally some of us questioned whether or not it needs to be the same as it was last time that that sort of long, it wasn't too long, but that period of time where it was published at the revoke did set. Maybe it doesn't need to be that long for the next one. Yeah. So I think it's up for discussion.

**KEN RENARD:** Well, Duane was it true that that traffic just continued to increase, like, in perpetuity, had we not removed. It could have created a real problem, had it just did.

---

DUANE WESSELS: Right. Yeah, it could have. Off the top of my head, I don't remember exactly, but I think that period of time was on the order of the whole quarter where it went up like that. And in terms of the protocols and procedures for rollovers, it doesn't really need to be quite that long. It could be, like, a month or something.

KEN RENARD: Okay. Do we have the right people connected to key rollover planning to make that statement?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I mean, it's something I can certainly bring up. Verisign and IANA have talked informally about beginning to meet and discuss some of the more specifics about the next rollover. So I'd be happy to bring it up with them at that time and then think about how it affects the way we do the KSRs and the whole scheduling thing. So that would require a little bit of thought from the teams that are responsible for writing the code that produces those key signing requests and see how that would have turned out.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So I think in RSSAC composition we have everybody we needed. We have root zone maintainer, we have IANA, and we also have, of course, the liaison to the Board and the others. So anywhere this is comes up -- and SSAC, because sometimes also [00:28:37 –

---

inaudible]. I think we have all right connections in here about it and being delivered.

KEN RENARD:

Great. Thanks. All right. Anything else for the Board in the questions? All right. Again, thank you. I'll extend my thanks to you, Kaveh, for your time on the Board. And then we'll do the same for Liman after his CSC report.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. Liman here. I actually have a few things to report this time. The CSC had a meeting earlier this week and we've had some rotation on a couple of chairs. We have a new chair for the Customer Standing Committee that is now Brett Carr, who is with the Nominate in the UK, the UK ccTLD. I have stepped down as chair and I've also done my last CSC meeting as your liaison to the CSC. But there is a bit of reports to do. So this is my last thing as that liaison.

So the CSC has undergone a periodic effectiveness review. That's something that happens to all ICANN committees everywhere on a regular basis. So this is not specific to us. That committee has now issued its initial report, which is out for public comment. And the CSC has decided to put in a public comment, but a positive one. So the report basically says that the CSC is working quite

well and doesn't see any real problems with what's going on. There are, of course, nuances and details that can be improved, but overall, it's actually doing a good job according to the report. And that's satisfying to hear that.

There were two things that were mentioned where the CSC on its own can improve things. We have a bit of a problem with attendance. The group is constructed so that there are only four voting members. And our procedures document says that all four voting members have to be present to create quorum.

Now that is tricky when the members are spread all over the globe. So it's always very inconvenient for someone time wise to have these meetings. We do rotate the meetings in order to spread the pain, but it's not a perfect solution. And we have several occasions been forced to postpone taking decisions and pushed that to mailing list, traveling and so on, and that's a bit of inconvenient.

Drawback here is that there are no alternate for these voting members. So there's no one who can step in and take the place if need be. And that's the thing that the review team now suggests that there should be alternates appointed for the voting members to alleviate this problem. And they also note that the CSC has a very routine like work.

Right now, everything is just working quite well. We see the reports from the PTI. And they do a stellar work, so we don't really have any problems with anything. So things just take a long. And that can make it difficult to attract people with the right competence profile for the CSC. So the video team also wants to encourage information flow and active work to try to attract the right type of new members as members are rotated over time.

There's also, it's not a problem, but it's something that's starting to be highlighted and that there's a number of SLAs between the PTI and the primary customers, the ccTLD and gTLD customers. And these were to begin with cost installment and contract, and extremely difficult to change. Now the CSC has created a process for changing them. So the process is fixed. Or it's not fixed yet, is a regular overhaul over the actual SLAs to see if they are still valid and relevant.

There is no provisioning for that in the procedures documents, or the bylaws or anything. So this has been pointed out and the CSC hasn't really felt that it has the tools to do anything about this. But the review top team now says that the CSC is well equipped to kick off such regular reviews and that they should be conducted in terms of cooperation with PTI. And this is good news. This is what people like to see. Now we have the tools in the CSC to actually do that work.



---

We had a joint meeting with the Board of the PTI, not the Board of ICANN, the Board of the PTI, and we have a very good relationship with them as well. Everything works well there too. But we read that we should continue to have the early meeting with the PTI Board and that we should probably from the CSC side create something like a yearly report or an overview of what's been going on over the last year and that that can be a starting point for discussions in the meeting with the PTI Board.

The PTI also conducts a yearly survey, customer survey, where it tries to reach out to its customers and you get a sense for whether they are doing a good job and they're fulfilling the expectations of the customers. That was also reported at this meeting and there was not much new. In general, people are very satisfied with the work of the PTI. And there were no big changes to previous years.

What they have done is that they, in addition to this yearly review, they also have started to have post transaction reviews, meaning when you have an interaction with the PTI to change some data for your TLD or something, you're invited to a short survey giving some input about how that interaction went. And that receives higher participation than the yearly review.

But again, this [00:35:19 –inaudible] positive feedback there and there are no alarming things. So that concludes my report. By

---

this, I step down as your liaison to the CSC. Ken Renard will take over that job and I will be happy to answer any questions.

KEN RENRD:

Thanks. Anyone has any questions about CSC? I see none. Thank you again, Liman for the six years on a CSC. Wow. And I got some big shoes to fill. Size 13. All right. Daniel, can you tell us about the RZERC and then the IAB.

DANIEL MIGAULT:

So from the IAB, we don't have much, though there will be a meeting probably between the liaisons during the breakfast in November, during the next ITF meeting. But so far, no feedback from the IAB. From RZERC, we've spent most of our time working on the charter. And we came with very, very little changes. I will double check, but I think I sent regularly after each of this charter meeting, what has been discussed.

An interesting question that came throughout the discussions was whether we think RZERC is limited to the currently designed the root server system, or if it should also include some extra mechanisms to deliver the root as the one implemented by the RSOs. And I'm thinking about the hyperlocal architecture, for example. So it has been something that has been discussed.

---

They are a different opinion. But that's one point I think I would be happy to get some feedback about what RSSAC think.

**KEN RENARD:** Okay. Thanks, Daniel. What's the time frame do you think for the charter work to be done?

**DANIEL MIGAULT:** Oh, okay. So I think we're pretty close to have-- my expectation is that the way it's going to work is we will finalize the draft and then circulate that draft through the different organizations that are represented at RSSAC. I mean, I think it's more a question that we have to keep in the head. I mean, I would be happy to bring what RSSAC think about it. But since we already could not meet a very consensus on that, I don't expect much. It's more for further discussion, I would say. I don't know if Duane wants to add something because I see a hand.

**DUANE WESSELS:** Yes, thanks. This is Duane. I wanted to just expand a little bit on what Daniel brought up. So the current charter, the section he was talking about was the purpose section, and there is the current text. This phrase it says, "and the mechanisms used for distribution of the DNS root zone."

And so during RZERC's discussions, there was a proposal to append to that the phrase, "within the roots server system." So that would be, "mechanisms used for distribution of the DNS root zone within the root server system." So currently, it doesn't say "within the root server system." It just leaves it sort of open.

So RZERC, the committee members went back and forth. There was no consensus on adding that phrase which would restrict the scope, perhaps. So at this point it's not added to the draft charter. It's as it was before. So I think that's the part that Daniel was maybe asking for feedback on. I agree. I think there's not much more work for the RZERC charter review to go through. So perhaps, in a month or two, time, we might see a sort of a final revised, proposed charter from RZERC to go out for the public comment period and so on.

KEN RENARD:

Thanks. I know some folks have had some interest or questions about the scope of the charter. I just want to make sure that they have the opportunity to see that and make comments. All right. I don't see any other hands on that. So thank you, Daniel, for RZERC and IAB. Russ still has not been able to join us yet. I don't think so. He sent his apologies. All right. James, IANA functions.

---

**JAMES MITCHELL:** Hey, guys. James Mitchell speaking. I don't have much more to add. That's been a great job coming right now. One thing to note is IANA will be holding or present at the Community Tech Day at the five years ICANN DNS symposium. That's, like, on the 17th of November. One of the topics there will be the root zone DNSSEC KSK algorithm, go over the study. Will look to engage the community there and to develop a series of recommendations to ICANN, IANA, and the community about doing a role like that. That's the algorithm. Yeah, that's it for, now back to you. Thank you.

**KEN RENARD:** Thanks, James. Any questions for IANA Functions Operator? All right. I'm back to Duane for RZM.

**DUANE WESSELS:** Thanks, Ken. I don't have anything further to the report that hasn't already been discussed.

**KEN RENARD:** All right. That's about as long as the IANA meeting here. Next is RSS GWG report. Brad, do you want to say anything?

---

**BRAD VERD:** Agenda list, everybody, for the GWG report. So I think everybody here kind of knows where we are, what's going on. We had six sessions during that ICANN, lots of engagement, substantial content collected. And we're going to start working with the members to work through it and try to tease out the governance principles.

**KEN RENARD:** All right. Thank you, Brad. Any other comments or thoughts on the GWG activities this week? Things are very productive and a lot of good ideas were exchanged. All right. Moving on to any other business. This was one of the ones that I thought about. The ICANN DNS Symposium was recently announced, and this year, ICANN will invite speakers to focusing on the centralization and diversification in the DNS. Diversification and centralization that got me thinking about DNSSEC 042, the autonomy independence of root zone.

G, would it be a good idea for us to essentially present that. Also aligning with the discussions we had with the government engagement folks about expressing this idea that we've got it. These are some of the things that the root zone or the root server system is doing with respect to diversity and our principles. This could be a chance for a good PR for the for the root server system, essentially getting more of that trust out there. So I wanted to

---

collect thoughts to see if people here think it's a good idea for a presentation to be done. Essentially on behalf of the root server system at this meeting.

I'm thinking if we do want to do something like this or if we think it's a good idea, we could start a small drafting team to put together a presentation whereby the group whoever wants to see it. And if accepted, it could be presented at that symposium. So open that up to thoughts, anybody? Anybody think it's a good idea or bad idea. Jeff, please.

JEFF OSBORN:

It's certainly an interesting idea. Still debating where I'm going, but I think you're right that there are some emerging concerns that we might want to be represented there on the basis of. So anything I can do to help the drafting group I think I'm planning to expect to be there.

KEN RENARD:

Okay. But just to be clear by making a comment now does not sign you up for drafting or giving a presentation. So please comment. Liman.

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman here. I think visibility from this group or the root servers is always a good thing to show that we participate in the various types of activities that relates to DNS service and the root service in particular is a good thing. So I would support making a presentation there and I'm willing to volunteer some efforts in that. I plan to go there myself, but I haven't really come with my calendar to see if I can make ends meet. But it's in my general plan to go there. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Terry.

TERRY MANDERSON: Terry Manderson here. I think it's also a good idea to create a presentation, but not just for this particular event, but for ongoing communication out to other locations beyond this one. I will consider volunteering. See how I did that? Consider.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Terry. Brad.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Maybe I'm going to call for a couple work items with the statement. So apologies. I think one, the obvious presentation we think about is the tutorial or the information what it was called



this week, the information. Yeah. RSSAC information. I think that needs to be updated and maybe streamlined a bit. During that we ran out of time for questions. It's something that we've continued to add to, kind of build on, if that makes sense. And I think we've reached our time constraint limit. Maybe we need to think about that.

I'll just add that there were a number of people that approached me in the hallway after the GWG meetings. They were surprised by a number of things around the root, specifically unfunded, voluntary basis supporting this massive ecosystem. Anyways, I think those are things that we should make sure we try to message in any type of platform or presentation, not platform, presentation, but that we give. So maybe two separate things.

KEN RENARD:

Okay. So yeah, I don't know how much time would be allotted to present the diversity or RSSAC042 type stuff at the DNS symposium, but, yeah, like, almost having a prepared roadshow of presentations that we can give at various, that we could can collectively put together and keep up to date and then just make sure the message is representative of all the RSOs and current representative of RSOs, and it gets that message across that this is what we do. Those surprises are interesting. People are

---

surprised that their RSS is unfunded. That's we take that for granted. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

It's Liman here. And it just struck me, maybe we should also bear in mind if we attend various conferences, which could be regional or which are not in the main streamline of conferences that we go to, that we either and give such presentations if it's suitable and if it will help informing whatever local community we're talking about. And also the other way around, if we see and hear things that are relevant for this group or for root ops that we bring that information back and try to inform the others. Thanks.

KEN RENARD:

All right. Thanks. Anybody else? Any of us having any thoughts on that? My plan would be to put together, put a Strawman slide deck and then have a call that Terry will lead since he volunteered. Okay. So to discuss and make sure we're giving the right messaging as well as content, and then we'll draw straws to see who's available to present. All right. Thank you.

Next AOB is standing briefing sessions with the ICANN Government Engagement Team. So I think the general consensus was that the session with the GE team this week was very good, very useful, and that it would be useful continue those. Now the

---

suggestion was to do it. Basically, every ICANN have a joint session with them. They did bring up the fact that governments can move slow so that maybe some ICANN meetings might be a no off, maybe canceled, but having a standing slot during the ICANN week for RSSAC to meet with those government engagement folks. Matt.

MATT LARSON: Thanks, Ken. I'm sorry I didn't get my hand up before we left the previous topic. But I guess wearing my hat as IDS organizer, could I ask that someone please submit a presentation proposal to [ids-proposals@icann.org](mailto:ids-proposals@icann.org) just to get the request in our records along with all the other ones we're receiving.

KEN RENARD: Okay. I can do that. Thanks.

MATT LARSON: Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Anybody have any support or not support for meeting with the Government Engagement folks at the ICANNs. Liman

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Support, support, support. This is a field which is becoming more and more relevant to us and necessary to engage in. I see a bit of that on the European side. I see very little on the US side with what's going on. It risks impacting the work we do and the way we do our work in a rather substantial way. So we definitely need to keep an eye on what's going on and we probably also need to engage in various areas there as well. Again, informing, as Elena concluded, this is an ongoing task.

On the political side of things, they change staff and politicians rather quickly. And the new ones don't come already educated. So we need to reeducate, and reeducate, and reeducate, and there's no end to that task. And we need to do that in order to have the new people there make decisions that are favorable for the Internet in general. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Right. Yeah, I think just building on that, Liman, I think the number I heard this week was there's 181 new GAC members in the last handful of months or maybe the last six months, something like that. It's a huge turnover since maybe COVID type of thing. It's just this is all new players. Now remember it's a small group that come here, but a lot of new members.

---

JEFF OSBORN:                   Isn't that, like, out of a 193, whole macro?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:           Liman again.   Many, many, many moons ago, we did an information session for the GAC back in Rio de Janeiro, and I don't know how we did the K to go that was. My recollection is that that was quite well received and we should probably make that a recurring task, not necessarily every ICANN meeting, but at least maybe once a year, or once every two years, or something. We haven't done one in the long time as far as I know. May maybe you have a--

BRAD VERD:                    I think Fred and I did.   Maybe Fred and I. I thought we did one somewhere after 37 came out somewhere in the middle there. But it might have been just a 37 briefing and nothing else.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:           Okay. Still good, but that again was a couple of years ago, so it's probably do again. Thank you.

KEN RENARD:                  Thanks. We can add that to our roadshow slides. And we're going to need a bigger room for that session. And I think going to the GAC and discussing specific issues, questions that they might

---

have specific to their tasks might be good. All right. Thank you. At this point, we've come to the end of the agenda and open up. Anybody else has any other business, any other topics that they wanted to bring up in the next two minutes? All right. Right on time. So the next meeting will be Tuesday, October 11th. I think that's our normal time. And I'll turn over to Ozan to see if he has anything else to say.

OZAN SAHIN:

Yes. Thank you, Ken. This is Ozan for the record. So RSSEC meetings are typically on the first Tuesday of each month. And since we are having the September meeting today, and the first Tuesday of October is in less than two weeks, RSSAC admin team is suggesting that we push this one by one week and have it on the 11th of October, if that makes sense. Thank you.

KEN RENARD:

Thanks, Ozan. And, yeah, just one thing about the GE meetings, put that RSSAC admin team agenda to follow-up with the GE folks. All right. One more check of hands in the room, and nothing. With that, we can adjourn RSSAC meeting for today. Thanks everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**