
FRED BAKER: Okay, great. So who do we have from Cogent here? DISA? John, I heard you.

JOHN AUGENSTEIN: Yes, John Augenstein here.

FRED BAKER: ICANN?

TERRY MANDERSON: Terry Manderson is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ISC, Jeff and I are both here.

JEFF OSBORN: Roger.

FRED BAKER: NASA?

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Barbara is here.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Netnod?

LARS JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here.

FRED BAKER: RIPE NCC?

RAZVAN OPREA: Razvan is here.

FRED BAKER: UMD?

KARL REUSS: Karl is here.

FRED BAKER: USC?

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here. I don't see Suzanne yet.

FRED BAKER: ARL?

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

FRED BAKER: WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro Hotta is here.

FRED BAKER: Then we've got a number of liaisons that should be on the call. Wes, you're here. Ken, you're here. Liaison to the RZERC and the IAB. Daniel, are you here? SSAC. Russ, are you here? IANA Functions Operator. James, are you here?

JAMES MITCHELL: James is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay, RZM. Duane, are you on online?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. From staff, we have Ozan, we have Andrew. Andrew, are you here?

OZAN SAHIN: This is Ozan. I believe Andrew is an apology for today, and I don't see Danielle on the call. I don't see Steve yet.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool.

OZAN SAHIN: I wanted to mention Kaveh Ranjbar just joined the call after your—

FRED BAKER: After I called for the RIPE? Okay.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes.

FRED BAKER: So let's come back to the agenda. I believe the next thing on the agenda is you Jeff talking about candidates.

JEFF OSBORN: Yeah. Thanks, Fred. We had one candidate this month. Hafiz Farooq is a Saudi citizen and an ICANN Fellow. It was really funny. I got his application while sitting in a GWG meeting in Kuala Lumpur. I was looking at his LinkedIn page when he walked in and sat down next to me. I turned the computer and showed it to him. I think he looked like he saw a ghost, it was pretty amusing.

There's an issue with Hafiz and the Membership Committee had quite a discussion. I really want to bring this up here. This is a guy who is very qualified from the generic communications point of view. He's got a Masters in Communications. He was an ICANN Fellow. He's got an important job as a network architect in Saudi Arabia, which all of which are underrepresented. But he does not have a whole lot of hands on experience with DNS and certainly not at the root server level.

So the Membership Committee thought it would be important for me to just ask the group, what do we think about broadening the diversity of the membership where the Bylaws sort of specifically say you should have some pretty hands-on DNS experience? Especially with a guy being an ICANN Fellow who was so involved, he physically came to all the meetings, do we want to bend to include more people or do we rather pragmatically let people know, come back when you have a little more experience? Lars has his hand up. Lars?

LARS JOHAN LIMAN:

Hi. Yes. I do recognize this conundrum, this problem that we've had before. It is exactly what you say. We kind of started out with DNS people, then we realized we needed some more expertise so we widened it. We had really a rather diverse group of people but we also ran into the problem that some of them had no experience at all that was necessary for the work of the caucus. So we narrowed it down again to DNS expertise. But now we're starting to see the pendulum swinging back again. So this is a balance.

I am not averse to invite people who are good at routing, for instance, because that's something that we sometimes investigate in the anycast sense and to have someone who knows about routing and can contribute is a good thing. On the other hand, I didn't really want to open up again. So we have this plethora, we would have to kick people out again. So we need to be careful. Is there anyone in the group who knows this person and knows why he wants to contribute and what he can contribute well with? Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN:

Lars, we are in lockstep. That's literally exactly my feeling. I spent about half an hour with him after that meeting. ICANN has an outreach and gets people who come to the meetings and are interested in being involved and seeing how they can contribute. He is certainly eager. And like you said, the problem is this is not a guy with hands-on DNS experience. He's got routing experience and his degree is literally in networks. So if you'd like us to make the decision as the Membership group, I think the slight tilt we got was what the heck, let's say let the guy in. If he is either not feeling like he's contributing or we think he

should do more, we can have that conversation later. I don't mean to be mealy mouthed. It's just it's a tough call. Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you. Maybe to add some background information. Correct me, Jeff, if I'm wrong. I think we have never rejected anyone, just for the record. Am I right?

JEFF OSBORN: That is not true. We very specifically, about a year ago, got the feedback that there are a set of requirements that strongly prefer hands-on DNS experience and prefer it operating at a root level. So we have let people know, "Thank you for your interest. We appreciate it. If you get a little more experience in the DNS side, please come back sometime." Ozan writes the gentlest letters. But we have let people know they didn't have the experience.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. So thank you for that. I think maybe another piece of maybe useful information. I don't know the guy at all. But I think Saudi Arabia is the latest addition to the GAC. I think they were formerly represented at GAC just this September. So, maybe there is a bit of a pique of interest from people from the government affiliated to explore ICANN more. I don't know. I'm just guessing.

Finally, I think I would agree that letting him in might have value because it is optional, which work parties they participate in or how much they participate in caucus. I assume if you're not an expert in a

particular field, they won't participate. But on the other hand, the connections, the expertise, or other qualities they have might be useful in other places, including the candidates we send out to different committees or parties from time to time. So my suggestion is if we don't find a reason not to accept then do accept and welcome them to RSSAC Caucus.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. Thanks, Kaveh. Lars, is that an old hand?

LARS JOHAN LIMAN: No, it's actually a new one.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. Lars?

LARS JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Sorry. I thought I was further down the line. Yes, I agree with Kaveh. I think not in black and white terms, but on the gray scale, I think we should accept him. There's also now, as opposed to earlier, we have better tools to evaluate the contributions of the various members of the caucus so that if it turns out that he is not contributing or even worse, then we have the tools to ask them to step down nowadays. So with all these things in the basket, I say yes, invite him. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks so much, Jeff. I totally understand the quandary here. Yes/no kinds of questions are raised with such a thing. But one of the things I wanted to just bring up here is I guess it was the last publication that SSAC did, the overview of routing security and the need for routing security, especially with respect to DNS and DNS operations. I don't know whether or not the RSSAC members feel it as important as some of us in SSAC do, but on the basis that he is obviously more focused on routing, switching than he is on DNS, I think having that type of experience at least available in the caucus would be of benefit to the caucus. As Liman just said, we have much better tools today to evaluate ongoing contributions and useful participation. In my view, it would be better to say yes, and then observe, and hopefully he can make the kind of contributions that people would hope for. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Yes. Excellent points, Russ. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: Hi all. So let me start with a question. Did you get any feel from him when he has expertise in routing that that included some notion of anycast?

JEFF OSBORN: I did not specifically, but I don't see any reason to think he would, frankly.

WES HARDAKER: Okay. So we all come to the table with different experiences. My knowledge of routing is dwarfed by my colleagues and my knowledge of DNS is probably better than my colleagues because we all have different roles to play at least at USC. Routing is critically important. To say he doesn't have the skills to actually help the caucus with projects and decisions is probably wrong if his knowledge of routing really is as good as what is written on the paper. So I would have no problem accepting him. Even though it's not DNS-specific, it's still routing is so critical to the deployment of root instances these days that he definitely has a skill that could help. So though it may not be about DNS the protocol, it's still potentially helpful about actually serving the DNS regardless of whether it's DNS or HTTP or whatever it needs to be routed.

JEFF OSBORN: Well, thanks, Wes. This is showing that I think the Membership Committee was right to ask me to kick it up to you guys, because unless somebody has radically different opinion, the Membership Committee said I should recommend him if that was what we felt like was a better idea than being so strict on hands-on DNS experience. So at this point, I would say the Membership Committee is going to recommend that we admit him to the caucus. I can't remember how this works. Fred, do you poll a vote at this point?

FRED BAKER: Yes, a vote gets polled. If you want me to do it, I'll do it.

JEFF OSBORN: Please. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So let me ask first. Is anybody going to vote no? Is anyone going to abstain? If we have no negative votes and no abstentions, then I think we've accepted him.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Fred, and thanks all for the input.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now, Ozan, you have a slot here.

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, everyone. Thank you, Fred. I actually had one discussion on the draft minutes from the October meeting, and then right after Jeff to talk about 2023 RSSAC Caucus Membership. Which one would you like me to cover now?

FRED BAKER: Go ahead and talk about the minutes.

OZAN SAHIN: Okay. Starting with the minutes, I circulated the draft minutes from the October meeting two weeks ago with the RSSAC members. We haven't

received any questions or comments about the draft minutes that were circulated. So if RSSAC members have any questions/comments about those, I think this is the right time to talk about those. The minutes will be a vote item for today's meeting.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Does anybody have any comment on the minutes? Okay. Is anybody going to vote to not accept the minutes? Is anyone going to abstain? Failing that, I think we've accepted the minutes. Ozan, you've got a thing under the Membership Committee.

OZAN SAHIN:

Yes. Thank you, Fred. RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee is currently composed of Jeff Osborn, the chair of the committee, Shailesh Gupta from RSSAC Caucus, and Dave Lawrence again from RSSAC Caucus, and also RSSAC vice chair Ken Renard is the ex officio member of the committee.

I have recently checked with the Caucus Membership Committee members to see if they're interested in serving another year in 2023, and all of the current members are willing to serve for another year. RSSAC Operational procedures state that the committee members serve for one year, but it doesn't specify any term limits on how many times the members can be reappointed. So given that the Membership Committee members are willing to serve another year, all of them, I will stop here to see if there's any discussion in RSSAC whether to reappoint them. Historically, RSSAC reappointed the members for another year if they were interested in serving. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: I'm sorry. Liman?

LARS JOHAN LIMAN: I will be hard pressed to stand in the way for anyone who wants to do work. So I wholeheartedly support this. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yeah, same here, full support. I want to also thank the committee members for standing again. I know it takes a lot of time. So thank you very much. Full support.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Any other comment on that?

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks for the kind words. It's an honor to serve.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now, I don't see a star on the agenda. Are we supposed to take a vote at this point?

OZAN SAHIN: Fred, I think RSSAC didn't take a formal vote on this item in the past so we didn't put a star. But if there's no objection, then I will inform the current RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee members accordingly.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I didn't hear any objections. So I think you can inform the caucus.

OZAN SAHIN: Great. Thank you. Will do.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Now, Ozan, you're supposed to talk about travel support.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. ICANN76 will be held in Cancún, Mexico in March 2023, actually from the 11th to 16th of March. RSSAC has six travel support slots. One goes to the RSSAC chair and this will be the incoming RSSAC chair who will be elected in December. One slot goes to RSSAC vice chair and there are four slots for the RSSAC members. Typically, since Ken Renard became the RSSAC vice chair, he does not accept the travel support to attend ICANN public meetings, so this one slot will also go to RSSAC members, making it five slots.

Earlier today, I circulated a link to a form where you can indicate a request for travel support to attend ICANN76. So please make sure to complete the form by Tuesday next week, 8th of November, if you're interested in requesting travel support to attend ICANN 76. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you, Ozan. So moving on to work items. Our next thing is a vote on RSSAC000 version 7. Before we do that, does anybody have any comments on the draft?

WES HARDAKER: Sorry. I raised my hand just to say thank you, especially to Andrew, who put a lot of hard work into revising this document. There was a lot of work that went into this. And thanks, everybody, for the discussion. I think it was highly valuable and it's much better document than last time we published it, which is always the goal.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you, Wes. Are we ready to vote then? If we're ready to vote, does anybody have any objection to this document? Is anybody planning to vote no? Is anyone planning to abstain? I believe then that we have accepted this document. Moving on to RSSAC 1 version 2. Duane is not on the call.

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is on the call.

FRED BAKER: Oh, hi, Duane.

DUANE WESSELS: Hello.

FRED BAKER: Hi. Could you give us an update on the work party there?

DUANE WESSELS: Sure thing. I believe the work parties had one or two meetings since our last RSSAC call. We've been making pretty good progress. One of the first things that the work party did was to firm up or be more consistent in the language used around expectations. Previously there were some places where it said must or will or whatnot. Now it pretty much uses the word expectation or expected to throughout the document.

We've also cleaned up a lot of the terminology to make it more consistent with current RSSAC terminology. One obvious example is the old document had a lot of things where it said something like "root servers are expected to do something," and now it will say "root server operators are expected to do something".

We're kind of just starting to get into the meat of some of the expectations and finding lots of things to talk about and possibly change there. So we have a call coming up in a couple of days. My hope is to sort of go through the documents in order and start to accept or resolve the outstanding comments about the specific language in the Expectation section of the document. I think that's it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Ken, where do we stand on RSSAC002?

KEN RENARD: Hello, everyone. Yes, RSSAC002. Work party met last week or the week before. A couple of things to note. Within the document, we're trying to stay away from mentioning specifically encrypted transports, mostly since they're not thoroughly defined for authoritative servers yet. But we were trying to point out that the UDP and TCP measurement and counts are really meant for native transport over 53. So, for example, the UDP counts will not include anything over QUIC.

Also talking about a readme.txt file for each RSI to talk about specific measurement processes that are used that might affect interpretation of the data, exceptions, things like that, per RSI and do that in a change log format so that history can be kept. As things change, you can interpret certain sections of time on the data.

The work party will not meet this Thursday, the 3rd of November, but we'll meet again on the 17th. That's it. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Andrew, do you want to talk about the RSSAC FAQ?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. Since Andrew is not on the call, I can go ahead and talk about it briefly.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

OZAN SAHIN: Any work plan suggests RSSAC Admin Team to start reviewing the FAQ update in November, and then RSSAC to discuss it in December. In the coming days, support staff will be circulating a version of the FAQ for you to review and update as needed. Then it will likely be an agenda item in December meeting for the words. So this is the regular annual update of the Frequently Asked Questions on icann.org. Just a quick reminder, FAQ was translated into five UN languages. Once the updates are completed, these translated versions will also be updated. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I guess I should turn to you also for this research list.

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. I can provide a few updates on that, too. One, this research list idea came up during the discussions held in Kuala Lumpur at ICANN75. Then in its October meeting, RSSAC had a discussion on this, and the action item from this meeting was for Ken and Andrew to work on a draft message to RSSAC Caucus to find out any interested members, any caucus members interested in maintaining this research list. Ken and Andrew worked on it. A message was sent to the Caucus list. Eventually, we had two RSSAC Caucus, William Sotomayor and Baojun Liu, who were interested in maintaining the list. I think most recently on Friday or over the weekend, Baojun Liu shared the link on the Caucus list to first draft of this list and seeking input. So RSSAC Admin Team did not have an opportunity to look at the list collectively. I think this will be done

tomorrow. If there's any feedback from RSSAC on the list that Baojun shared, please provide your feedback. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. This thing at the ICANN DNS Symposium, who wants to talk about that?

KEN RENARD:

I'll talk about that briefly. I just put in the chat the link to the document. These are the slides. So the ICANN DNS Symposium is in two weeks. The idea was to present along those topics of diversity, collaboration, and independence in the root server system. So this is really meant to be a presentation from the RSSAC to the world to kind of clear up some misconceptions and talk about the diversity as a strength of the overall system.

So I had some great input from several folks and the slides are nearing their steady states. But if anyone wants to take a look through those and provide any comments, it would be greatly appreciated. There's some formatting issues or just slide format backgrounds, things like that that'll be done, as well as there's some old slides at the end that will be removed. But I appreciate any feedback. This is our presentation to the world and I want to let everyone have a voice. So thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. Anybody have any comment on that before we move on? Okay. Now we're going to move on to Reports. One thing here to note, we've added several liaisons. I've been talking with the liaisons in

the last week or two. Just kind of how are things going in your part of the world and is there any way that we can help you that you need? Those have all been interesting and haven't had a lot to report, but we have several of the liaisons will be talking later in the meeting.

So the first report, I guess, is from Ken and I. I don't know that there's a lot to report that you guys don't already know. We recently had a meeting in Kuala Lumpur. I was unable to be there. Ken, do you want to talk?

KEN RENARD:

Sure, real briefly. Just now that 75 is wrapped up, we're starting to look at 76 in March. Just looking at some of the feedback from ICANN75, generally good. The complaint, if there was one, was session conflict. The planning for 76 coming up the 27th of January is the session deadline. Even though that seems like it's far out, it's coming up close with the holiday. So Admin Team will be trying to plan for that. Yeah, let's go, ICANN76. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

We'll start with that planning tomorrow. Okay. Wes, do you have anything from the ICANN Board?

WES HARDAKER:

Find my mute button fast enough. Briefly, so the ICANN Board right now is very much concentrating on how ICANN75 went. Specifically, I guess one of the things with a changing chair and vice chair, we're also looking forward toward how we can best communicate and exchange

information with our constituencies, which includes RSSAC. So certainly, if anybody has thoughts and ideas for the best way that that RSSAC and the Board can meet and communicate, are the meetings and constituency meetings working out okay, or do we want any change in format or anything like that, now is sort of a good time to throw those ideas at me.

On both the IAB and the ICANN Board and ICANN as a whole, there's still hot topics that are related to the root service in particular. DNS abuse, of course, will always continue to be a hot topic for a long time. But the alternate namespace in particular is bubbling up both in the IAB and in the ICANN space and is consuming a lot of time and energy. With respect to the DNSOP publishing .alt and things like that, potentially coming up, as well as SAC113 publication.

So just be aware that there's a lot of talk about that. And there's a lot of talk about will this affect the root servers, in particular, with the extra traffic of these domains leaking to the root that shouldn't technically be answered. So not much there other than discussion, but know what's happening. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. Ken, do you have any comments from CSC?

KEN RENARD:

Sure, briefly. CSC met on the 19th. One of the things discussed was the remediation action process in case IANA is not performing its function

properly. To date, that process has not been used. So they're considering a tabletop exercise to test the process.

Other talk is about how to elect and approve alternates, attendance and quorum as sometimes an issue because it's such a small set of voting members. So that's going on September 22. All the thresholds are met 100%. There are no SLAs currently being considered for change and no escalations, so all is good from the CSC front. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Daniel, comments from the RZERC?

DANIEL MIGAULT:

Hi. From the RZERC, I think I sent the current status of the report of the charter of RZERC. So it's close to almost be finalized. It's going to be through a period of public comment at some point. But I think it might be interesting for you if you can have a look at it and if you have any comments, so that would be welcome. I can share the link on the chat again, if you want. But that's the last e-mail I've sent.

Maybe Duane can also comment on that, but I do not see any major changes. So far, I think the only maybe perspective is that there are some discussions on whether RZERC's scope is limited to, I would say, the root server system. Let's put it, very frankly, I mean, is it only the system in charge of the RSO as opposed to considering also this—I forgot the name—the IP local architecture.

So to me, this is what I understand from all the discussions regarding the charter. That's all I'd like to say regarding RZERC. If you have any

comment, just let me know. I'm happy to carry those to RZERC. So please have a look to the current charter, the draft.

Regarding IAB, as was mentioned, I just wanted to raise that the awesome discussion, especially regarding the .alt, there are also some small discussions regarding .int, but I think those were not a huge interest. If there's anything that needs to be carried through the IAB, please do so, or the IETF mailing list. I think the conversation and discussions are being recorded. But I think that it would have been nice maybe to have a session where we can exchange some opinion regarding such topics without being recorded. That's what came to my mind. That's all I have to say.

FRED BAKER: Okay. What is the impetus behind .alt?

DANIEL MIGAULT: What is the?

FRED BAKER: What is driving people to want to create an alternate root system?

DANIEL MIGAULT: That's a good question. It's also the question I'm wondering.

WES HARDAKER: But I can help there.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay. Yes. I'll give you the floor. But just in one sentence. The idea is that there is no coefficients between different naming systems. Now, whether it's the right approach or not is another question. To my mind, I have the impression that it's basically preserving the current naming system and saying to the others that if they want to have another namespace, they should build that namespace so that they do not affect the current existing one, which I think it may be hard to get adoption. But, Wes, I'm happy to get your feedback.

WES HARDAKER: I think your last sentence there, Daniel, was spot-on and perfect. SAC113 was created to request that the ICANN Board and IANA assign a name for alternate DNS space. So private DNS space, equivalent of RFC 1918 address space but for DNS. So everything inside of that recommendation will be a DNS name. The problem is that it doesn't cover a lot of alternate namespaces like the GNU DNS or Ethereum Name Service or lots of cryptocurrencies. Like .wallet is in contention between two different cryptocurrencies that want to make use of a fictitious TLD that's actually not technically the DNS but isn't squatting on the root.

The impetus for why all of this is happening stems way back to the IETF and DNSOP decisions. I want to say they're about eight years ago where they allocated .onion for the TOR project because it was sort of too big to fail and turned down a bunch of others at the same time. The IETF, I think, most people agree that that was a mistake because they've sort

of opened the door for a while. If you get to be too big, then we'll have to accept you. So there's a lot of ways for a lot of people using TLDs that do [inaudible] to the root and we get queries for them, and you get queries for them.

But that's not the right way to go about it. The right way to create a new naming space is to completely revamp everything. But it's very hard to go revamp all the dialogue boxes and all of the web forms and all of the URL acceptance to have a completely new naming specifier. So they try and make their stuff look like DNS names as much as possible so that all of that infrastructure behind the scenes doesn't need to be rewritten and they can put in some shim to sort of redirect a application to an alternate naming system. Obviously, squatting on the root is not exactly the best way to do that. So the purpose between the .alt naming system is only hoping that people will take it up and use .alt as an ending so the resolvers can actually just drop those requests on the floor and won't send them to the root. But there's no way to force people to do this. We can only hope that if people want to create alternate naming spaces that they actually will do so under the .alt label so that we get this separation of everything above .alt is inside the DNS and everything, below .alt is deliberately not so the request can be dropped on the floor. I think there was one other thing I was going to say but that's probably sufficient for today anyway. Warren and Suzanne also have a lot of context but neither one of them is here today, actually.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. But, Liman, you had your hand up briefly.

LARS JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I was just going to ask whether the impetus was politically motivated, but it seems that it's not. I received the information I needed. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER: It's not politically motivated. It's mostly technological. But there are politics associated with people that really don't like to be blunt. ICANN and centralized naming services because they want a decentralized service. All of them end up having to come back to some form of centralization. One of the other interesting aspects of .alt is will there be a registry of alternate naming spaces under .alt? Well, the instant you put in a registry then you are actually putting in centralization, which is the very thing that they're trying to fight against in the first place. So that's actually one of the outstanding issues in DNSOP is, will there be a registry underneath .alt for naming spaces registered there? That's still to be decided.

LARS JOHAN LIMAN: How about we give them the class X.25?

WES HARDAKER: Well, one of the discussions I had yesterday at the ICANN Board Workshop was we should have fixed this with class naming structure, but class is sort of always in now.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Maybe one question I have for you is suppose .alt is being published tomorrow, who has shown some interest of using it?

WES HARDAKER: That's a good question. Wouldn't it be nice if even .onion moved underneath .alt? That would be a wonderful thing to happen. The GNU naming people have said that in their specification that they would recommend, because again it's a generic naming service that it's decentralized so people can do whatever they want, but they would recommend that people do gns.alt as the default prefix for people that are creating these alternate names would register underneath. So they are actually willing to help play by the rules. They were originally very annoyed because they requested .gnu back in the same time the .onion was allocated and didn't get it. The IETF said no. So they got very mad and started squatting on the root. I don't know if you remember, but there was an ICANN presentation by the GNU DNS people that recommended that ICANN never again assign any TLD because they're squatting on all of them. They backed down a little bit, but that just shows their level of frustration. They are they're willing to use the .alt namespace or at least recommend to their users to use it. So there are some precedents. We can't force people to use it. We can only hope that it alleviates some of the problems.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Russ, you had your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Fred. I was going to comment in response to Lars's question about was it political. My answer would be somewhat different than Wes's in that yes, I believe there is a lot of politics and political views here but not necessarily government political views. They're technologists' political views. They don't necessarily have a strong technical justification for doing what they want to do. So I would describe it as political but non-governmental kind of political perspectives in many parts of the discussion around this topic. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. Once upon a time, I was on the IAB. The first e-mail that I received as an IAB member was from a gentleman who wanted my fax number so that he could copy me on a lawsuit because he hadn't yet been given his TLD. I just find myself wondering what all is behind all this that's going on.

Okay. Does anybody else have comments that they would like to make on this topic? Failing that, let's move on to your comments from the SSAC. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. Thank you, Fred. The SSAC, we're in this relatively long timeframe between the meetings, but we've just finished our workshop last week. One of the things that was discussed—and it is far from finalized so I suppose to just not spread this too far because it's not definitive yet—but we will likely be expanding the topic space for the DNSSEC and Security Workshop, perhaps even further than what we have in recent times. So if folks have ideas of things that they would like to present or

know of other people that have some interesting ideas that they think would be useful to present at the workshop, please keep an eye out for the call for participation. We'd love to get a lot of other perhaps broader things than what we've dealt with historically in the workshop. So that was one of the things that I wanted to mention.

The other thing that I did want to mention is that I would like to ask folks here to think about any additional, any modifications or changes that they would like to see to our joint RSSAC/SSAC meeting from what we've been holding out at the last set of meetings. I think what we've been doing is probably very useful because it keeps each group updated on what the other is up to. But I'm also happy to hear suggestions from anyone on additional things or additional ways that we could plug in more or different topics than what we covered in the past.

So we've got time to think about it. So that's why I wanted to bring it up now so people could give it a little bit of thought time to see what they might want to see in the future, both for the workshop and the RSSAC/SSAC joint meeting. Anybody has any comments now, I'm happy to take them. But otherwise, that's all I have, Fred. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Does anyone have any comments? Failing that, I'll move along to the IANA Functions Operator. James, do you have anything?

JAMES MITCHELL:

Hi, everyone. Not much. A lot of is covered through the CSC work. Speaking at the IANA Community Day, which is the 17th of November, an

extension of the ICANN DNS Symposium on a couple of introducing projects for the key rollover, as well as introducing a project for the algorithm rollover of the DNS root zone. But other than that, IANA has also been working for about three or so years on updating the root zone management system. This is the system where the operators submit the changes to the root zone data, the contact data, and also the information needed for the delegation. So yeah, that's a two-year project set to launch on December 13. There's no impact to this team. But obviously, given it's immediately upstream, I thought it might be interesting. That's all from me.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Thank you. Duane, do you have anything from the RZM?

DUANE WESSELS:

Hi, Fred. No, I don't have anything to add at this time. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Next, we have the GWG Report, which is sort of a committee of the whole. Who would like to comment on the GWG progress?

BRAD VERD:

I'm happy just to speak up, Fred. We're continuing to work through defining the principles that will be used to defend the fundamental documents that we're putting together. We're really spending time getting ready for the upcoming workshop in December and that's kind of where our focus is.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Now we move on to the various liaisons that we've added to this meeting who don't usually talk. Amir, do you want to share any comments from the Nominating Committee?

AMIR QAYYUM: I think that the Nominating Committee member is now Hiro. But anyway, I can share if you want.

FRED BAKER: Well, you're our designated representative. So yeah, I'd like you to share, please.

AMIR QAYYUM: Okay. Thank you. The Nominating Committee has just convened its first meeting for the NomCom 2023. The new delegates have started working the first phase of this year. NomCom is to work on the application, because every time we have several questions on whether the application that's appropriate for getting the right candidates or not. So the Application Sub-committee has started working. I think within one or two weeks, the next sub-committee which is the Outreach Sub-committee will start working once the call for application will be out reaching different candidates in different regions and different constituencies and different backgrounds—technical, academic, business, etc. So this is the main work right now in the NomCom 2023.

I'm currently appointed by the Board as the chair-elect, and Hiro Hotta is the delegate from RSSAC. As we all know, the two liaisons, SSAC liaison and RSSAC liaison, are the non-voting members. But anyway, they participate in all the polling, discussions, comments on the candidates, evaluation of application, even interviewing. This is for the NomCom. If you want anything else or if you have any questions, I will be happy to answer.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Does anybody have any questions for Amir? Great. Moving on then. Amir, you are also one of two representatives to the ICANN Fellowship Selection Committee. Do you have any comments from them?

AMIR QAYYUM:

Yes. The ICANN Fellowship Selection Committee just convened its meeting in the last month of October two or three times, and they finalized the selection of candidates for ICANN76 in Mexico. We have received 206 applications from different candidates interested in different constituencies of ICANN like ALAC, RSSAC, GNSO, etc. There were 206 candidates. The Fellowship Selection Committee members who are six, they were given 125 candidates to evaluate. So, it was a rigorous process taking a good number of days for these evaluations. After the evaluation, we have finalized 42 Fellows who are selected and I think about 12 Fellows who will be the alternates. We selected the alternates just in case any last-minute issues in the visa or travel arrangements or something else. So, 42 selected candidates who have

been notified and 12 alternates who will be replaced in case any selected candidate is not able to join the meeting.

FRED BAKER: Okay, great. Thank you.

AMIR QAYYUM: All these Fellows belong to different constituencies, for example, RSSAC, SSAC, ALAC, GNSO. And how we say this, they belong to different constituencies, each Fellow has to identify in which constituencies they are interested in working in the future. So, we try to balance this out also apart from balancing the regional diversity of the Fellow. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Let me ask you a question. One of those 42 then will have listed the RSSAC as his/her constituency. Is that person a member of the caucus?

AMIR QAYYUM: I think we have Afifa, if I'm not wrong. She is the person who is the Fellowship mentor. So, every constituency usually has to designate a mentor to these Fellows. And different constituencies have to nominate their mentors because they can better prepare those new Fellows to their work. For example, ALAC mentor would be more interested to bring the new Fellows closer to the ALAC work, and similarly, the RSSAC Fellow would be in a better position to guide those Fellows how they can contribute in the RSSAC work. So this is the task of the mentor to

give sufficient knowledge to these Fellows so that if they are interested in the RSSAC work, they can start working with it, associated with the work parties or start participating in the meetings, etc.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Then maybe I misunderstood you. I thought you said that when a person applied to be a Fellow that they listed as constituency that they would be from.

AMIR QAYYUM: No. They mention the one, two, or three constituencies in which they would be interested to work in the future.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Anybody else have any questions for Amir? Let's move on to Afifa. Afifa, what's happening with the Mentoring Committee?

OZAN SAHIN: Hi, Fred. I don't see Afifa in the Zoom Room.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Moving on then to Abdulkarim. Abdulkarim, you're representative to the NextGen at ICANN Selection Committee. Do you want to comment from them?

OZAN SAHIN: Fred, I do not see Abdulkarim in the meeting either.

FRED BAKER: Okay. I'm bearing out. Do you happen to see Dessalegn?

DESSALEGN YEHUALA: Yes. Thank you, Fred. I don't have much to say about my role in the NextGen mentoring. I will not tell you something new because I already suggested last time what needs to be done how to make the Fellows aware of what RSSAC is doing. A couple of weeks or days back, we had a liaison meeting with the chair and Ozan. I've mentioned a few things. Most of the NextGen participants are drawn from law schools. They don't have the technical background to be interested more about RSSAC. Last time, I raised one issue. The current membership requirement is a little bit of a constraint for people with other backgrounds to join RSSAC. So membership recruitment is a tough thing to do as a mentor. That's one challenge.

Second challenge is there is no material currently, which gives some introductory things about RSSAC. Last time I raised this issue, I think what I was told was the OCTO, the Chief Technology Officer Office, is preparing some custom material. I don't know when it will be published. But that material is important, because it will help not only NextGen participants, it will also help ICANN Fellows. So preparing that material is I think it should be the priority task. That's my suggestion. ICANN75 was my final meeting as a mentor. I was serving as a mentor for two terms. So I totally enjoyed my time as a mentor. Thank you for the opportunity given.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Does anybody have any questions for him? Failing that, let's move on to Work Stream 2. Robert, do you have any comments from Work Stream 2?

ROBERT CAROLINA: Thank you, Fred. I would only comment that the meeting tempo for Work Stream 2 continues at a relatively slow pace at the moment. Our next meeting is coming up on the 10th. The topic under discussion is still implementation of various diversity recommendations. Other than that status report, I have nothing new of substance to report. I should know more next month.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. Anybody have any questions for Robert? Daniel, you just dropped a question into the chat. Is that for Robert?

DANIEL MIGAULT: No. That was more a follow-up to Ozan.

FRED BAKER: Okay.

OZAN SAHIN: Fred, I can go ahead and respond to Daniel. The online learning platform that ICANN has is called ICANN Learn, Daniel. So this is the platform where this new course being prepared will be published.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Just to clarify, my point was mostly not to suggest but to also know if we want to broaden the scope even outside ICANN. That was the reason I was asking that. But that probably will require more work.

OZAN SAHIN: I don't know the full range of courses that are available on the e-learning platform called ICANN Learn. But I believe the courses there are not specifically for the ICANN fora. But depending on their content, they may be related to broader areas. But I'm just not aware of the entire courses available there yet.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay, right. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: You're welcome.

FRED BAKER: Okay. We've reached the AOB part of the agenda. Before we go on, is there anything that anyone would like to bring up? Liman?

LARS JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I just wonder if you are Ozan would like to comment on the upcoming chair election.

FRED BAKER: Ozan, do you want to comment on that?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, sure. I actually had another business item. I want to clarify the next meeting time, which is on the 13th of December. RSSAC typically holds its monthly meeting on the first Tuesday of the month. But since the Tuesday, 6 December meeting would conflict with the Root Server System Governance Working Group Workshop, we are planning on having it on the 13th of December.

In response to the question from Liman and related to this timing of the December meeting update, initially we had announced that the 30-day nomination period for the RSSAC chair elections would start in the final week of October. But given that RSSAC was planning on approving the updated version of the Operational Procedures in this first of November meeting, I held off on starting the nomination period last week. The 30-day nomination period will start tomorrow and it will close on the second of December, and then the election will be held during the 13th of December meeting. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Thank you. Okay. So you're looking for nominations now?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes. I will start that period tomorrow by circulating a note on the RSSAC mailing list and copying the relevant section of the newly approved RSSAC000 version 7.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Is there anything else that people would like to talk about before I close the meeting? Failing that, as Ozan mentioned, the next meeting will be on the 13th of December. I expect to see you there. So with that, we're adjourned.

LARS JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you all. Cheers.

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Fred.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]