OZAN SAHIN: So welcome, everyone. Over to you, Ken.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Ozan. Good morning, good afternoon, wherever you are, and welcome to the October RSSAC meeting, and I guess, we'll call this meeting to order and go on the roll call. Thank you. Do we have cogent on the call? Okay. How about DISA?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yes, Ryan Stevenson's here.

JOHN AUGENSTEIN: And John Augenstein.

KEN RENARD: Hi guys. ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson's here.

KEN RENARD: Matt. ISC?

JEFF OSBORN: I'm trying to reach Fred. I don't see him yet. This is Jeff.

KEN RENARD: All right. NASA?

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Yes, this is Barbara.

TOM MIGLIN: Tom's here.

KEN RENARD: Welcome. Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here. Patrick is not.

KEN RENARD: All right. RIPE NCC?

RAZVAN OPREA: Razvan's here.

KAVEH RANJBAR: And Kaveh's here.

KEN RENARD: Welcome everyone. University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

KEN RENARD: Right. USC ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here. Didn't check for Suzanne. My bad.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Suzanne's here.

WES HARDAKER: Thank you.

KEN RENARD: Okay. ARL. I'm here. I don't see Howard yet. Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

KEN RENARD: All right. And WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro is here.

KEN RENARD: Welcome here, all. Okay. We did have Kaveh from the board. Actually, that should be Wes. CSC. I'm here. Is Danielle here? All right. Russ. I saw Russ already.

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, good morning.

KEN RENARD: James Mitchell from IANA Functions.

JAMES MITCHELL: James is here.

KEN RENARD: All right. Dwayne, are you here?

OZAN SAHIN: Dwayne sent his apologies.

KEN RENARD: Okay, thank you. From staff, Ozan, Andrew, and Steve are here. Wonderful.

JEFF OSBORN: Ken, this is Jeff. Just to insert this point, I've asked Rob Carolina to visit the [00:02:58 - inaudible], if that's okay.

KEN RENARD: Okay. Welcome, Robert.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you.

KEN RENARD: Okay, we have the agenda here. We got a few things in administration, work items, see there, typical reports, and is there any changes or additions to the agenda that anyone would like to propose? All right. With that, we can approve the agenda. All right. On to administration. Ozan, you want to talk about the draft minutes from the last meeting?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, thank you, Ken. Hi, everyone. I shared the draft minutes from the September meeting two weeks ago on the RSSAC mailing list. We have not received any questions or comments or requests for revisions, and if you have any comments, please share them now. Otherwise the draft minutes from September RSSAC meeting will be [00:04:03 - inaudible] item for today. Thank you.

KEN RENARD: Okay. Does anybody have any comments, questions, or changes to the minutes from the last meeting? Hearing none. Is there a motion to accept the minutes?

JEFF OSBORN: So moved.

KEN RENARD: Any second?

RAZVAN OPREA: I'll second from Razvan.

KEN RENARD: Thank you. All right. So we have accepted any abstentions for accepting the minutes? Okay. With that, I guess we've approved the draft minutes from the last time, last meeting, and we can move on to the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee update from Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Ken. It was actually a quiet month. We've had one application that was actually while we were meeting in KL. Hafiz Faruk is relatively inexperienced, but is very involved with some of the new blood coming into ICANN. So we'll be discussing him at the meeting on Thursday of the membership committee, and at this time, we've really got nothing else to say, the status is normal.

KEN RENARD: Okay, thanks, Jeff. I guess we'll vote on that candidate next meeting.

JEFF OSBORN: Yes, Thanks.

KEN RENARD: All right. Onto the chair election timeline. Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Ken. So the 30-day nomination period for the RSSAC Chair election will start in about two weeks on the 28th of October. I will be circulating an email on the mailing list to flag the start of the nomination period the provide the details of the election process. The nomination period will close on Monday, 28th of November, and then RSSAC will elect its chair during the December meeting, which will be held on Tuesday, 6th of December. So this is a heads up that you will see an email in about two weeks to kick off the process. Thank you.

KEN RENARD: All right, thanks, Ozan. I guess once that announcement goes out later this month, if anybody has any questions or comments on that, they can send it to the mail list and we can certainly discuss anything else as well at the next meeting. Okay. Onto work items. The RSSAC 001V2 work party for Steve, please.

STEVE SHENG:	Yes, thank you, Ken. The RSSAC 001V2 work party had a good meeting in KL, and so the work has begun in earnest. There are a few streams of work. So the first part is looking through the document in light of RSSAC26, which is the RSSAC lexicon, so that to bring RSSAC 001 version two inconsistent with the RSSAC lexicon. So I think Brad from Nominet has done a first pass that we'll be discussing at our next meeting. The second stream is Dwayne has done some work to tighten up the language. I think their language needs to be tightened to follow a consistent wording pattern.

So there was a discussion about expectations. So I think the current language is the root operator is expected that consistent language follow various expectations. There's a discussion on RSSAC 7720, whether there's a need to update that. I think there was no conclusion at the last work party meeting. I think was happening is in the upcoming work party meeting, that will be discussed.

So I think those are the three streams of work that's going on, and the next work party meeting is on the 20th of October. We'll be discussing these various streams, and so the work is moving along fine. Any questions on RSSAC 001 version two? Okay. So here, and now let's move on next to survey on how well RSOs are meeting the existing RSSAC 001 expectations. As one of the tasks of the work party, the work party wants to do a survey on how root servers, whether they have responded to RSSAC 001 expectations.

So Ozan, if you could share. So I started a Google doc for the root servers to fill in, these are the responses so far. We have, I think seven responses out of seven that these were not published server

expectations as expected in RSSAC 001. So that's indicated by Ryan on the mailing list. Since our last meeting, ISC has provided the link to its expectation, and I believe ARL is in the communication review process for a full formal response to RSSAC 001 that is forthcoming in fourth quarter this year.

So I think that's the responses we have so far. We'll be collecting them. I think the purpose from the work party perspective is to look at the responses and provide some guidance to see whether RSSAC 001 version one was worded correctly or worded in a way that is impossible for our root server operators to meet. Based on the analysis of the responses, parts of the RSSAC 001 will be updated.

So, for example, just looking at the responses so far, none of the root server operators are publishing their maximum capacity. I think it's quite understandable, and because of that, I think that feedback is very important to the 001 version two work party where there may be no expectation for that.

So I think this has an encouragement for operators to -- if you're planning to respond, please let us know so that we know it's coming and we can take that into consideration with analyzing it. Otherwise, I think it is a general good way for transparency and for support of the RSSAC publications. So I think I leave it there and to see if there are any questions.

KEN RENARD: Ryan has his hand up. Go ahead, Ryan.

RYAN STEPHENSON: Hey, Steve, I just want to clarify a statement that you made. We're not publishing RSSAC 001 currently, however, we will be in the future.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. That's good to know. I was just quoting from your email. Ryan, I think you have -- let me actually -- Ozan, if you could paste the link of the RSSAC 001 response to the chat, and then Ryan, if you can edit that directly, that would be good. So, I don't want to interpret the intention of you or your organization wrong. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: All right. Any more questions on these 001 updates? All right. We can go on to the next item, which is 002, and I'm the shepherd for that work party. So the 002 is the measurements that we publish. There was a work party meeting just last week, and the consensus among the group was to drop the idea of adding the label count metric. Most of the discussion was on encrypted transports specifically that we should not be counting things like DOT in, for example, TCP metrics or DOQ and UDP metrics.

So those TCP and UDP transports that we've been using for a long time now are considered native unencrypted. So where do we put those DOT, DOH, DOQ metrics as a root server operators experiment with it? So that whether they should be completely new metrics themselves or just new tags within existing metrics or identifier specific for now. So

each roots of operator can specify a metric that is specific to their root server identity and describe that.

The other thing that was discussed was that each operator should create a notes file. I think we called it a notes.txt file at the top of their tree. That can describe the collection process, maybe any differences or different ways to interpret the data, maybe different things that are specific to their collection, maybe some anonymization information, things like that. So to help people who use the data interpret it correctly. Any other questions or comments on 002? All right. If not, we can go onto RSSAC 000V7 with Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yes, thanks again. That's me. So this is the quick update on 000V7. We had some good discussions at ICANN75. One of the decisions we made at ICANN75 was how to deal with ties in the ranked-choice voting system. The idea was that if we experience a tie in the ranked-choice voting system and we can't eliminate one of the two people who receive the least amount of votes, then we'll hold a revote, then if we run into the same problem again, then we will use random selection to determine who gets eliminated.

The other discussion we had at ICANN75 was about motions. We talked a lot about that because I had added a section on motions, and I think the outcome of that discussion, and me also talking with Robert C., was that it's probably best to just not include that paragraph or that short section on motions at all, because it's not motions. The term isn't used

anywhere else in the document, so I just deleted that section. The document is out now for review.

The idea is to vote on it in the next meeting. There are no open issues still in the document, but it would be good if everyone can review it this week. We really do need to have a final version by, well, a week before our November meeting, which I believe, Ozan, correct me if I'm wrong, but is our November meeting on November the 8th?

OZAN SAHIN: It's on the 1st of November.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It's on the 1st of November. Okay. So we really need to have a stable version within two weeks by October 25th, that's when we need to send a stable version to the list. So please review it this week and the next, and I will send another mail on October 25th with the stable version. Any questions?

KEN RENARD: All right. So we will vote on this and then immediately use it for the elections in December, I guess.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: That's the plan.

KEN RENARD: Great.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: So please continue discussing on list and commenting in the document. I saw that Karl already commented, more comments from people if they have opinions would be great, earlier than later. Thank you.

KEN RENARD: All right, thanks Andrew. I think you have the next topic as well.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Oh, sure.

KEN RENARD: The Caucus Research List.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yes, so there was this discussion on the our RSSAC Caucus mailing list. I guess it was brought up by Paul Hoffman. The idea of having a list of research about the root service system, that's kind of curated either by the RSSAC Caucus or someone from the RSSAC Caucus or by staff. I'm amenable to this. I think ICANN Staff are amenable to this and we're certainly amenable to managing it ourselves as long as there's some really clear rules about how it gets managed.

I saw some support on list as well from researchers who do research on the RSS who thought this was a really great idea. So I guess the

question to this group is do other people think it's a good idea to have a list of research about the RSS that's curated? If people do think that's a good idea, then we can go about figuring out how best to manage it. That's the second question if people think it's a good idea to do it. So Liman, your hand is up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, Liman here. Thank you. I haven't really followed that discussion, so could you put in a few more words what type of research would be covered? Would it be internal to ICANN and external just in general to everyone who does it, and also, what would be the purpose of having this list? I'm not averse to it, I'm just trying to fill in some blanks here.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yes, there hasn't been that much discussion on those points. Fred forwarded an email from Paul Hoffman, and Paul, he brings it up in the context of the 002V5 work party where he says that the caucus should maybe have a project to create a list of research that is about the RSS. That's really academic work, let's see, it's just academic work papers written by individuals and any interesting use of digital root data.

Then some of the responses to that were a response from [00:19:54 - inaudible] who said, "I'm an assistant professor from Sangai University, and my interest include DNS security and internet measurement, and this is very interesting and valuable to me." We also had a response from [00:20:08 - inaudible] who's also a researcher, and said this sounds really good. Wes also responded, and I also see Wes' hand is up, so I will let Wes speak.

WES HARDAKER:	Yes, well, this is another case that Wes has turned to. So, I think that the concept is good and certainly a list of all academic or other publications related to the root would be highly valuable. That being said, the more I think about it, the more this is basically an impossible task because the number of papers and things that have been written related to root related studies, of which I'm an author on a number, and my colleague John Heideman, who many of you know, is an author on a gazillion, it's going to be really hard to even come up with anywhere near an accurate list.
	I'm sure we'd preface it with some comment, like this is not expected to be complete, but then there's also the concept of how do we even keep it up to date and things like that, which on a GitHub page or something, we could accept poll requests maybe. It's either going to be a lot of work and still won't be complete or we'll produce a single list once that'll be inaccurate and we won't maintain it as most lists end up being hard to maintain. So I guess the longer term question is who's directed to put in the energy to keep this up to date? I'm not sure we have anybody that we should target toward that role.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Liman here again. Yes, that's one thing. So I still have haven't heard anyone say, we need this because X and it's going to be useful and save us time, or give us more information or anything. So I still don't really see the purpose of this. Not saying that it isn't there, but I really don't see it. If we don't have a clear purpose, then we don't have-- I think

that the people who actually benefit from this should be tasked with running the list and keeping it up to date.

I think the only way forward there is to do something along the lines of what we're suggested, something where you can submit your own data and say, here's what I'm doing. A GitHub page is one good way of doing that, there may be others. unless we have a clear purpose where RSSAC or the RSSAC Caucus actually benefits from this, only if we have that, then we should task someone in that group to actually keep that to date. Unless we have some real use for this, I think you we have to leave it to someone else to do it, because we have enough on our plate already. Thanks.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. Ken, how should we handle next steps? I feel like there's we should communicate something back to the RSSAC Caucus mailing list. I'm not sure who should communicate it and what should be communicated, but there should be some communication back there.

WES HARDAKER: You could ask for volunteers.

KEN RENARD: Yeah, I think --

WES HARDAKER: Sorry, go ahead.

KEN RENARD: No, go. That's fine. Thanks, Wes. Asking for volunteers or even asking that question, who's going to benefit from this, and posing that question that Liman asked about what's further defining the purpose and maybe asking them for, hey, is a GitHub page, going to work for this type of thing? Yes, I see this as an attempt, I don't see it as a real effort to be 100% accurate, because yes, that is nearly impossible. If I could think of a reason, if there's people that are interested in the root server system that may want to-- here's a collection of things to read up on, that's my guess. So Andrew, you and I can work on a message to the caucus and relay that question of how it might be implemented.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay. I guess one thing we could do thinking about this a bit more is have just appoint someone from the caucus who really is interested in having this list and appoint them as the shepherd of this list. Just set up a GitHub repository or whatever, and then they're responsible for merging things with that list. That might be one way to handle it, that would keep it away from being an authoritative list of everything having to do with the RSS that is always up to date and always perfect, which we're never going to have.

KEN RENARD: Right.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Anyways. I see Russ's hand is up.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Andrew. Yes, I was going to suggest something quite similar, but rather than even necessarily have it be inherited from the beginning as an RSSAC or an RSSAC caucus thing, particularly, if one of the two professors or associate professors that indicated an interest, if they would be interested in at least initiating something themselves, and whether it's a prototype listing or some set of collection of papers, and then bring that back to the caucus to see if the caucus would find that useful, that might be another way to at least get more of an idea of what the output outcome might be. Thanks.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: That sounds like a possibility. So I think, Ken, you and I-- I'll draft something and send it to you, and then we can work on it and send it to the caucus eventually. I think that's probably the way forward.

KEN RENARD: Okay. Sounds good.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Okay.

KEN RENARD: All right. Any other questions, comments, thoughts on the research list? All right. The next work item is the presentation for ICANN DNS Symposium. So I'm going to put in into chat here the link to the

symposium. The topic of the ICANN DNS Symposium is diversity and something else with respect to the DNS. Matt, go ahead.

MATT LARSON: Hi, thanks, Ken. Yes, it's basically extremes, centralization as well as diversity and decentralization. So, you can see trends in either direction of the DNS, and those are the theme we're working with. What we found is we're getting other submissions that are not necessarily related to that theme, but really compelling anyway. So what we've decided to do is have one day devoted to the theme and then have not a wild card day, but a little more flexibility in a second day.

So this is one of the presentations that will fit great in that second day. So even though it doesn't fit the stated theme, we're going to expand that. In fact, I'm sending out a message today to various mailing list letting the community know that we're making this slight change and casting a wider net for presentations.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Matt. The idea here was to talk about the diversity within the root server system. So the other part of this would be, let's do this as the root server system, not necessarily an individual RSO. So I wanted to give an opportunity for RSSAC and members here to comment and try and drive this presentation.

So I have put together a set of slides that is an extremely rough draft, and that link is now in the chat. Consider it a very, very rough draft. I will continue to work on it with others, but please, if there's comments

or questions or topics that we should or should not discuss on here, make them comments on the document, send them to the RSSAC mail list, or send them to me individually, I'd appreciate any and all input on this. I want this to be the perspective from roughly all of us versus any one individual.

This follows the RSSAC 042 independence document, explaining that the root server system is made stronger by having this diverse set of operators, diverse set of funding sources, diverse set of organizational things. So going a little bit about the root server system itself and all the independence factors, and then starting to talk about at least the idea of governance and how that's going to work going forward. So I appreciate any thoughts, topics now and the mail list in the document. Thanks. Wes.

WES HARDAKER: So I'm going to direct this both to this discussion and to the proposal for speaking to the GAC because there's a related topic. While at the last ICANN, I was eating lunch rather hurriedly sitting next to another table where I was overhearing a conversation that greatly concerned me, I wish I had had the time to go sit with them and explain their viewpoints were lacking information. So the conversation was centered around how broken the root server system is from a communication point of view, and a lot of statements were made.

One person was educating the other two as to how much the root server operators are completely independent, don't even talk to each other, they might be serving different data, all sorts of things, that type

of statement. Clearly, it was spoken from a lack of understanding or a lack of education about how the RSS works and how RSSAC works and how the root server operators and RZERC, and all those types of roles work.

So my plea to both this presentation more generically and the one directly to the GAC, is we make sure to talk a lot about how communication works, how we make decisions, how even though we are independent in the terms of architecture, diversity, and operations, and everybody does what they want, we've done things like all pledge to serve the IANA root, and we all get our data from the same place, and we have meetings both as our second root ops, and things like that. So I apologize for throwing this grenade, but it wasn't my grenade to start with.

KEN RENARD: How perfect. I think that really hits home and that's a really good statement to make, and that's what I was thinking when you told me about that at the last ICANN meeting. Yes, we need to do a little bit more on the PR front here to make sure that these things aren't misunderstood. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I just want to fill in there that we absolutely need to try to present to the GAC because they rotate people on the GAC rather frequently, not like RSSAC, where we've been sitting on our bottoms for 15 years. So the RSSAC rotates people every two, three years, and we have done presentations in the distant past, but we probably need to step up and

keep educating, especially the GAC, I think, but also the other parts of ICANN, to make ourselves more available.

I don't think it's sufficient to have the root service system overview presentations that we do have. They're good, but they're not attended by the right people, so we actually need to push ourselves into the other venues, and for lack of a better word, force our information upon them. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Yes, call it a road show, call it a PR effort, but I'll talk more about the GAC in a little bit. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, thanks. Just wanted to add some to what Wes had already put forth. All those are good points, but I think another really important point that we need to include whenever we talk about this is the fact that the root zone itself, the content that's served is all DNS.

Literally, anyone in the world can verify that it's consistent coming from all the roots. So you don't have to just believe us when we say it's the same information, you can go check yourself. I think that's an important aspect of the point to be made to folks when they're having discussions akin to what happened here at the meeting. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Ross. This is a definitely useful information. Suzanne, I see your comment. Any more thoughts on this presentation to the IDNs

symposium or ICANN DNS symposium. All right. Well, thank you, and again encourage everyone to take a look at those very rough draft slides and comment in any way that you see fit. Okay. Onto reports.

As say, so chair, vice chair specific, go back to the GAC. I did reach out to the GAC, and they were very receptive of the idea of doing a presentation, something like the presentation we do about the root server system may be tailored just a little bit towards GAC and some of these misunderstandings.

So the question is, and I think we'll discuss this in the admin group, is whether we do this virtually between now and the next ICANN meeting in March or do it in person in March, or potentially both. Yes, so there's lots of new people coming in and out of the GAC, and getting them up to date on this stuff would be very good. Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: There we go. So Liman here. Yes, I think it's very important to do it in person. I think it's very important to show human beings on the stage being root server operators so that they can see us and that they can interact with us in the corridors during the ICANN meetings and so on. If we want to add a virtual version of that between the meetings, that's fine, but we absolutely must be there on stage. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: Okay. Show them that we're not creatures that sit in a dark room unshaven. That would be good. Thank you. I think that's it for me, and let's go on to Wes with the liaison from the ICANN board.

WES HARDAKER: I don't really have much to offer this time. The ICANN board has had their heads down on a few other non-root related subjects, and there's not much to bring forward with respect to that. The only thing that continues to be discussed is alternate naming space type concerns and things like that, but nothing concrete since the ICANN meeting, essentially, that's worth reporting.

KEN RENARD: Okay, Thanks Wes. Daniel, I see your hand. I'm just going to do real quick, the CSC report. Again, thank Liman for all of his years as the liaison, but the CSC has not met since the last RSSAC meeting, so there's nothing to report there. So Daniel, your comment as well as the RZERC and IAB reports?

DANIEL MIGAULT: So, I don't have much to comment from RZERC nor from the IAB, except that maybe there will be an ITF soon next month, so maybe that's the only thing related to the ITF for now. My comment was more about onstage presentation.

So just to follow up from Liman, I think what is useful to have is the real RSO representative as opposed as I would say to ICANN staff. The reason being that if it's ICANN staff presenting, people still don't know who the RSOs are, and it might give an impression that we're hiding behind ICANN. It's just a comment I have and that might help to improve the communications with the others.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. Good point. Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: I just wanted to raise the issue, I know a number of us are intending to be at the IDS conference. Should everybody who's a root server operator sit on the stage, should we try to be like massing bodies up there? I'll be there, certainly.

KEN RENARD: I still think we should all wear t-shirts with our letter on it, but.

JEFF OSBORN: I love it. One of these target signs, shoot us here.

KEN RENARD: I think certainly mentioning that there are root server operators in the crowd, and come talk to us, buy us a free cup of coffee.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. I'm just wondering how it couldn't hurt if they had one of those arrangements where there's a panel discussion at any point and there's a row of chairs, maybe it wouldn't hurt to fill them. We can jump off that bridge when we get to it.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. That goes into the, at least, the mindset of the PR effort here for the root server system and what it should look like, how it should feel to the audience. Daniel? Oh, sorry. Go ahead, Wes.

WES HARDAKER: No, Daniel's hand is up.

KEN RENARD: Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: It's an old hand.

KEN RENARD: Thanks. Wes.

WES HARDAKER: Yes, so just be careful guys, don't restart the cabal feeling. We need to avoid that at all costs.

KEN RENARD: Okay, thanks. Next is the SSAC report from Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Ken. The wonders of worrying about public relations and not overdoing or underdoing something. Anyway, SSAC has been relatively

quiet since the ICANN meeting, nothing particular to report. I did want to just let folks know that the work of the annual SSAC workshop is like the last week of this month, so that week, probably most of the SSAC people will be locked up and not terribly responsive. That's really about it. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: All right. Thanks, Russ. IANA Functions. James.

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi, everyone. Just that I'll be in person at the IDS ICANN DNS Symposium on the 17th at the IANA Community Day. We haven't released the agenda yet, but one of the topics will be taking off the study into the root zone [00:41:38 - inaudible] interests the people here. At that stage, we'll just be presented the project and then looking at draft, and this is all draft, but then they're looking to solicit community engagement and input into considerations, the projects, and to follow the same processes for the [00:42:09 - inaudible] with the design team of mixed staff and volunteers. So I'll be there as well, so I look forward to probably meeting some of you in person. [00:42:29 - inaudible]. Thanks.

KEN RENARD: All right. Thanks, James. Yes, it'll certainly be interesting to hear about that. GWG report. Brad, can you start us off on that update?

BRAD VERD:	Yes, I don't think there's much to update. We haven't met since the last meeting or since KL. I think everybody's got their homework assigned to take the discussions we had in KL back to their constituency and just try to get more input. Certainly not trying to get consensus from your constituency, just trying to get more input on the governing principles that we talked about. We are meeting not this week, but next week I think.
KEN RENARD:	All right. Is there any more information yet about the workshop? Do we know anything new about that?
BRAD VERD:	That's still scheduled or being scheduled for the first full week in December? So the week of the fifth.
KEN RENARD:	Great. Thanks. Anybody else want to make comments or have any questions on the GWG work? All right. On to any other business? Ozan, you want to talk about the next, I guess two topics?
OZAN SAHIN:	Yes. Thank you, Ken. Hello everyone again. So you may recall that in June, 2022, RSSAC submitted its fifth and final implementation progress report on the second organizational review of RSSAC. Finally, during its meeting at ICANN75, ICANN Board approved the completion of the second organization revoked to RSSAC.

Also, if you look at this final paragraph of the resolution, the ICANN Board requested the RSSAC to provide periodic updates within six months from this board action on the progress towards completing the implementation of the two recommendations for which RSSAC has reported the work is dependent on the Root Server System Governance Working Group.

So these are the recommendations related to RSSAC and RSSAC Caucus memberships and recommendation 1A and 6A. The RSSAC admin team reviewed this board resolution, and the admin team is fine with providing progress reports to the board. I just wanted to flag this board resolution to the RSSAC for any comments you may have. Thank you.

KEN RENARD: All right. Any comments on that? No. Back to the agenda. The next regular RSSAC meeting will be the 1st of November, on Tuesday, at its regular time slot. Is there any other AOB? Any last comments before we adjourn? No. All right. With that, thank you for attendance today and participation. We will see you again on the 1st of November.

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Ken.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]