OZAN SAHIN:	Welcome everyone to the monthly RSSAC meeting held at 14:00 UTC on Tuesday, 2nd of May, 2023. With that, over to you, Jeff.
JEFF OSBORN:	Good morning. Thanks, Ozan. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. I guess this constitutes us being called to order. And did somebody count a quorum, Ozan?
OZAN SAHIN:	Yes, Jeff, we do have the quorum.
JEFF OSBORN:	Excellent. So we will proceed to the roll call. I saw that there a second ago. Here we go. Cogent, Paul or Brad? Hearing none, DISA? John, I saw Jill. John Augenstein?
JILL PLACE:	Yes, sir, we're here.
JOHN AUGENSTEIN:	Yes.
JEFF OSBORN:	Excellent, thank you. From ICANN, Matt and Terry? No one from ICANN. This is Jeff Osborn. I'm here from ISC. Rob Carolina is on an airplane

somewhere. From NASA, Barbara and Tom? Barbara and Tom. All right, Netnod, Liman? On the long chance, Patrik? No Liman, no Patrik. Hans said he might be late, Hans or Paul?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: I'm present.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent, thank you, sir. And from UMD, Carl and Gerry?

KARL REUSS: [inaudible]

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent. Gerry?

KARL REUSS: You're not going to see Gerry at these meetings ever.

JEFF OSBORN: Not going to see Gerry, okay. Well, we've got to go through the format. I'm going to go through the format. Wes, and is Suzanne here?

WES HARDAKER: I don't see her on the list.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. And Howard and Ken?

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

HOWARD KASH: [inaudible]

JEFF OSBORN: Howard here, good. Brad from Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Yes, sir.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent. And Hiro?

HIRO HOTTA: Yeah, I'm here.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Hiro, and I'm assuming Jun is not. Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: I'm still here.

JEFF OSBORN: He's here. and Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Hello there, Russ is here.

JEFF OSBORN: Hey Russ, how are you? James from IANA? No, James and Duane? Duane? All right, no, Duane? As noted, apologies. And staff, we do have Andrew, Danielle. Duane is here and having audio problems, okay. Somebody caught that before I did. Good job.

And I believe that is it for the roll call. The agenda is here in front of us. The two most interesting pieces, I think, are going to be the discussion about voting membership on the NomCom for RSSAC and one other item, I think it was planning for 77. I don't have my notes. I thought I did. First, Ozan, I believe the draft minutes from the April 4 meeting?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, thank you, Jeff, and hello everyone. I circulated draft minutes from April meeting about two weeks ago. It's been under RSSAC's review, but we have not received any questions or requests for revisions. So if you have any questions or comments about the draft minutes, please share. I'll stop here to give you some time. If there is none, this will be a vote item for RSSAC today.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. What are we looking for? Is it a second or a move?

OZAN SAHIN: Motion to approve the minutes.

JEFF OSBORN: Motion and a second.

KEN RENARD: Ken moves to approve.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. So, absent any opposition, the draft minutes are approved. RSSAC caucus membership, the candidates we had, if you'll forgive me. I'm in a little bit of jet lagged here, Ozan. I'm trying to remember the status of what we did on these. I think I missed that meeting.

OZAN SAHIN: No problem, Jeff. This is Ozan speaking. My recollection from the most recent meeting of the caucus membership committee is that two applications are being recommended to RSSAC for caucus membership. So these are coming from Wataru Ohgai and Sachchidanand Upadhyay. We have the SOIs for each of the applicants.

JEFF OSBORN: I apologize. I had a little memory lapse there. I remember that now. I think we were pretty overwhelmingly in favor of both candidates. So again, I'll apologize for not remembering. Do we have to move and vote

on them or are we simply accepting them as the recommendation of the membership committee?

OZAN SAHIN: Again, Jeff, so we need a motion to approve for each of the applications. So let's start with Wataru Ohgai and see if there are any discussions in the RSSAC on this application.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay, the membership committee had recommended Wataru. So if somebody would like to make a motion.

KEN RENARD: This is Ken. I'll move to approve Wataru.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you. And a second. And for, oh my God, I'm going to mangle this name. Ozan, you had it better than I did.

OZAN SAHIN: Sachchidanand Upadhyay.

JEFF OSBORN: Wow, that's good. Looking for a motion.

WES HARDAKER: Motion.

JEFF OSBORN: And a second.

KEN RENARD: Second.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. If there's no opposition. So approved. Excellent. NomCom. This is a discussion item where I think we need to figure out whether we want to make some public comments. Ozan, this is the issue where the board is talking about adding a voting representation from the RSSAC to the NomCom, and then we have elections for the nominees as well.

OZAN SAHIN: That is correct, Jeff. So I can go ahead and provide some background information on that before proceeding to the election of the RSSAC liaison to 2024 ICANN NomCom.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you. That would be helpful.

OZAN SAHIN: You're welcome. Hello again, everyone. So, before going to the vote on the liaison to 2024 ICANN NomCom, the RSSAC liaison, there's a public comment proceeding that has recently opened. This is about the bylaws

amendments and documents to implement the NomCom 2 review. So, let me actually take this link and drop it in the chat. If you'd like to read the public comment proceeding yourself. So, this proceeding is open until the 28th of, excuse me, 29th of May. So 28 days remaining.

The RSSAC has been discussing this for a while, and this was expected, and the discussion in the most recent RSSAC meetings were whether RSSAC would like to provide its input to this public comment proceeding.

So this public comment proceeding seeks community input on a number of documents. There is a statement defining the unaffiliated ICANN board directors. That's one of the three documents that you would find in this public comment. Another one is a proposed NomCom standing committee charter. And then, finally, there are standard bylaw amendments on a few articles of the ICANN bylaws. So, there's a redline document showing these amendments.

And what RSSAC is most interested in these amendments, I believe. So, there's an amendment changing the NomCom delegates terms to two-year terms, instead of one year. This is transforming all NomCom delegates into voting delegates, except for leadership, the NomCom leadership. Currently, the RSSAC, SSAC, and GAC representatives are in a non-voting liaison role. And then, again, per the proposed bylaw amendments, it suggests creating a NomCom standing committee to provide continuity across annual NomCom cycles and to build the institutional memory of the NomCom.

EN

So, again, there are 28 days to go before this public comment proceeding closes. If RSSAC would like to provide input, support staff is, of course, available to help with that. And as a reminder, RSSAC had published RSSAC 35 to address the circular relationship, had these recommendations gone through, and then RSSAC liaison became a voting delegate. So, these are the changes relating to Article 12 that the RSSAC members will no longer be appointed by the ICANN board. So, this is also part of the ICANN public comment proceeding that's open now. I'll stop here to see if there are any comments on whether RSSAC should provide any input to this proceeding. Thank you. Or take any comments. Jeff, should I manage the queue?

JEFF OSBORN: Yes, please. Thanks.

OZAN SAHIN: Okay, I see Brad.

BRAD VERD: So, I mean, these changes are ones that we advocated for and asked for. And I'm curious how long ago, I mean, this is four or five years ago this started that we've been waiting to get this done, right?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes.

EN

BRAD VERD: Yeah, okay. So, this is just open for public comment. We're seeing if we want to comment. I'm not sure we should comment because we advocated for it. These are changes that we've requested. So, I'll leave it at that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bylaws changes take a long time.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Brad. I see a hand from RSSAC caucus member Abdulkarim. Abdulkarim, did you want to add something?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Yes, I wanted to, first of all, find out that, yes, I was thinking it would be good to make a comment, just to probably say, yes, these are good changes. And also to find out, so if this is implemented, is it going to be implemented immediately or is going to take effect from a certain period of time, after a certain period of time.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Abdulkarim, for the comment. So, relating to your question about when these changes would take effect. So, sequentially, what will happen is after this public comment closes, the board will review the comments received and then make a decision on whether to adopt these bylaw changes. And following that, some of the bylaw changes here are standard bylaw changes that will require empowered community's power to approve. And some other bylaw changes are

standard bylaw changes that will trigger the empowered community's power to reject.

And we are expecting currently if all this happen without any objections, the changes suggest that the new delegates that will have the voting powers will start their terms by the following annual general meeting. So, it is possible that this new appointed RSSAC delegate with a voting power will take the role by the annual general meeting in Hamburg. Again, assuming these are all approved. I hope that answers.

And one thing to add here is, I think, is important. The bylaw changes also suggest an initial one-year term for some of the groups to support the staggering of the delegates and RSSAC is one of them. So, who will make an appointment for one year in the initial term. So, assuming this will take effect by Hamburg meeting, RSSAC will first make an appointment for one year. And then following that, these groups will also switch to making appointments for two years as suggested. So, I have now Hans Petter and then Brad. Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Yeah, thank you. So, I believe I was on the NomCom in 2015 from the ASO and this was a tension back then. So, it's really been a long process here. Even if RSSAC actually requested this, I do believe that we should make maybe a really short acknowledgement that, yes, we requested this in the first place and we support the changes as put forward so that we kind of acknowledge that it's happened. I think that's a good practice.

I think following this, this also comes with the great responsibility on us when we appoint the candidates to the NomCom that we make sure that we actually send the candidates there that are members to the NomCom that actually works in the best interest of not only RSSAC but the whole internet community. Yeah, I'm not saying that RSSAC hasn't done that, but it's important to think that this is just not any other appointment. It's really an important task that we're taking on. It's increasing in importance when we get the voting right, although it may not be such a big change. But I think it comes hands in hand. We get more formal influence and we should then take the matter of appointing right representatives there even more seriously. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you. And Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, just echo what Hans just said. I think it's a super important role that we need to make sure we put the right person in. I also just want to clarify, just to make sure that other people didn't misinterpret what maybe you said, Ozan, this is not a new role for us. We've always had somebody on NomCom. We're just changing the responsibility of that role. That role is now going to be a voting seat. So I just want to make sure that that's clear to everyone.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Brad. Correct. Yeah. And the current RSSAC liaison to NomCom, Hiro?

HIRO HOTTA: Yes, this is Hiro. Through the experience I am having as a NomCom delegate from the RSSAC, I strongly support the amendment and I support the things what has been said here. So, for example, just a couple of delegates cannot vote in the process of making a shortlist. Even just making a shortlist, I cannot vote on that. So we strongly should recommend that this amendment is going forward. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Hiro. Do we have any other comments or questions about this process? What I heard so far is your support to do a brief supportive comment and submit it. Jeff?

JEFF OSBORN: It sounds like we have something of a consensus that because we've wanted this and this is the thing we've accepted that both Brad and Hans Petter have put together that I think we should have a strong comment saying, thank you, we think this is a good idea, we are in favor of this, rather than just having a lack of comment. That sounds like a consensus. If I'm missing something, please correct me, but that sounds pretty obvious.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Jeff. And I see a hand from Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Yeah, so I just have a question. So I'm fully supporting that. So I'm not trying to put any question on that. But I'm just wondering, is the reason to have a voting vote important? Is that because we want to have more—we feel that if RSSAC does not have a voting role, then the technical aspects are not well represented? Or is there anything different?

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Daniel, for this question. And I believe the hand from Hans Petter to address that. Is that correct, Hans?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Yeah. So I think the effect of this may vary from year to year and from chair to chair. In my three years on the NomCom, plus my two years on the NomCom plus three years as chair, so I was there for five years, the non-voting liaisons have kind of various degrees of participation in the process. In some years, they were allowed to participate in all straw polls and everything all the way up into final confirmation, so they were fully participating in the decision, but there was a formal vote in the end where only the voting members ...

Another year, it created great tensions because some people saw that the non-voting liaisons, if they hadn't taken part this and that way in the straw polls, then the results would have been different, so there started to be politics internally. So I think bringing everybody on the NomCom on equal terms is really important for having a good working relationship in the NomCom. And I think the reason RSSAC didn't have a voting status in the first place was that RSSAC and SSAC were appointed

by the board, so it would be a circular reference. And since RSSAC now for all practical purposes are not appointed by the board, then this is a natural development.

But I think taking away that and taking away the time each NomCom spends on discussing what rights the non-voting should have and all the tensions coming from that, that in itself is a reason by itself. So yes, I would also argue that it's giving a stronger voice from the technical community and less voice to the lawyers, because you can imagine how many of the GNSO constituents appoint somebody with a law degree and people got really pissed with me when I said that, oh, but he's a lawyer, so we shouldn't appoint him. Then somebody needs to play that role in order to balance things out, right? So I think all in all, many good reasons for doing so.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Hans Petter. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks. Just a quick comment. I agree with Hans Petter that—well, he and I happened to be on the same NomCom for at least for a while, and I've been on other ones, and I have observed a great deal of variation in how the NomCom operates. And I think this change will not only strengthen the input from the technical community, but it will make all members—put everyone that's on the NomCom on equal footing and eliminate a lot of what I see as an unfortunate consumption of NomCom time arguing about exactly what procedure and process should be used for the non-voting members. So I think it would be a good idea if RSSAC

did put in a public comment that said, yes, we support this. It's a great idea. Thanks.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Russ. So, Jeff, shall we take an action item as support staff to initiate this small draft and then work with RSSAC Admin Committee to submit this on time?

JEFF OSBORN: Yes, I think I think that's definitely consensus from the group. We need to do that. So thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: Great, thank you. And looking at the agenda, there's the RSSAC liaison to 2024 ICANN NomCom election, but before going to that, let me touch upon one more point that you raised on the RSSAC mailing list about NomCom rebalancing. This is a separate track. And this is not in this public comment that we just have talked about. So ICANN board is still looking for input from ICANN community on a separate track on NomCom rebalancing. And since you said we would discuss this during the meeting, there are a few scenarios currently on the table on the NomCom rebalancing. And on the document that you shared on the mailing list, you can see a slide deck showing these different scenarios. So within the current structure, this is the weight of each group participating in the NomCom. And I don't know how convenient it is for you to see these slides, but there are different ideas. Keeping the same structure, giving one of the giving the business constituency given away

one of seat for the NPOC—Not for Profit Operational Concerns Constituency—these are under GNSO, Generic Name Supporting Organization.

Another scenario would be keeping the same structure and GNSO would discuss its rebalancing internally. Another scenario, removing the GAC seat, maybe have it allocated to another constituency. And there's another scenario where all of the SOs, ACs and the IETF would have one vote as opposed to current voting structure. You know, there are various scenarios there and the board is looking for input from ICANN communities on whether to keep the current structure or go for NomCom rebalancing following any of the scenarios there. Thank you. Yes, Hans Petter.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: I think I make the comment when I was on the NomCom that I want to start a new GNSO constituency for musicians because then we would get a seat on the NomCom, because the GNSO seems to be growing by creating new constituencies in order to get new seats. So that was my sort of rather joking approach to this whole thing.

I think fundamentally it's a question for what does ICANN want to be. If ICANN is the GNSO society, like the business of ICANN is generic TLDs, well, then the current structure is good. If ICANN wants to have a sort of a more generic leadership role that takes all kinds of internet governance into effect, well then one of these radical proposals would probably be a good idea.

So I think to some extent it's a fundamental question from what kind of ICANN do we want. No, I know that the numbers community have kind of resisted to get too involved in ICANN or maybe explain to ICANN that, well numbers people meet at 10 meetings a year around the world, there is no way that we can centralize that to ICANN. And even more meetings like that if you have regional meetings. So ICANN is really a place for names people to meet and that is the reality today. So yeah, I guess that's my thoughts on that. What does ICANN want to be and from there they can make the composition of the NomCom and make the composition of the board.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you Hans Petter. And then Daniel and then Amir.

DANIEL MIGAULT: So it's more a question. So the rebalancing, is it expected to be effective in Hamburg?

OZAN SAHIN: No, ICANN board is still collecting feedback on that. There are no public comments or there are no suggested bylaws changes on that.

DANIEL MIGAULT: Okay, so no date where it's going to be effective.

OZAN SAHIN: No. You may end up in a situation where the suggestion is to keep the current structure of the NomCom. So it's just ICANN board collecting feedback from ICANN community on that, not via public comment, but they just would like to know what the community thinks. Because this is one of the recommendations coming out of the NomCom review, recommendation 10 I believe, so let's see. Yeah, recommendation 10. Thank you. Amir and then Jeff.

AMIR QUAYYUM: Yeah, thanks. Just as part of NomCom on behalf of RSSAC, I was the RSSAC liaison, and many at times when the NomCom make their decisions and come up with a slate of candidates which are finally selected, sometimes there are some of the comments received by the NomCom that look what type of selections they have made.

However, the constituencies and people and the ICANN constituencies forget that ICANN NomCom is not a constituency in itself. It's a composition of representatives coming from different constituencies, and they make the decisions. ICANN NomCom is in itself is not really a permanent type of constituency where people have their own thinking and some bylaws and some criteria where they can say, okay, we will select this and this and this type of people. The delegates are coming from different constituencies and its structure is very, very, very important.

I am trying to just emphasize that giving some comment on this structure and rebalancing is important as Hans Petter has also mentioned, because these are the delegates who select the final

EN

selectees. If there is a tilt in a vote just because of any reason, like you were saying that there are lawyers or they will select lawyers and there are more technical people or they will see no this time we will select this type of expertise and skill set, all is in the hands of the delegates.

So the structure of NomCom is very important, and it's a good time to give comment on how this can be balanced. So that not always—I don't want to say something on the lawyer side, but if we would like to have a more technical community represented in the ICANN board and in the different, even SOACs, let have their say and their vote in the NomCom. Otherwise we will continue to have the same type of selections made by the NomCom.

So sometimes I feel it unjust to have the comments on the NomCom why they have selected only male and only female and this and that. There is no permanent NomCom. NomCom is just a constitution of representatives coming from different constituencies, permanent constituencies like RSSAC, ALAC and GNSO. So its structure is very important and this is a good opportunity to provide some feedback for balancing. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you Amir. And for those who do not remember, Amir was the RSSAC liaison to NomCom before Hiro took charge and Amir is still on the NomCom, 2023 NomCom as the chair elect. Jeff?

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks Ozan. I just didn't want to let Hans Petter's comments get away from us. I think we would really be remiss if we didn't put something in this document as a comment stating that if you want to be the GNSO club you can be the GNSO club. But there is a concentration of power if you look at the structure that sort of belies some of the inclusivity that people try to talk about. So I guess what I'm doing is I'm sort of begging Hans Petter, could you put a comment together in there with your experience on how this works and the way you put it so well? Is that something you'd be willing to do?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Proposing the musicians representative on the NomCom you mean?

JEFF OSBORN: I would go with that if I was doing it, but I meant the entire idea.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: I will see what I can do.

JEFF OSBORN: I appreciate that. Thank you very much. I don't have the skill.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: What's the deadline for this?

JEFF OSBORN: When is the comment open until Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN: End of June.

JEFF OSBORN: All right, well, the staff then is going to put together a comment that this is something we would like to do and Hans Petter will put together a comment that ICANN really needs to think about what it wants to be. And the current structure looks like something a little different than it sometimes claims to want to be. Wes?

WES HARDAKER: One more comment when looking at the three options. One of the things that we struggle with on the IETF side of things is that the time commitment to the NomCom is huge. And I'm sure some people here can probably back me up on this, but it's a decent time commitment. And so it's actually hard to find enough people and maybe a smaller pool would actually help distribute the load by multiple people able to do it every couple of years as opposed to taking all of the seats that we can possibly find in one year and then having to reuse them a lot. Just food for thought. So like the radical approach number two example, which has one seat per agency is possibly, it might have an advantage by being a smaller group. They would have to do a better job channeling the voice and the concerns of the people behind them, though. I will say that I actually don't have an opinion and probably shouldn't have opinions since I'm on the board, but the important aspect is there are multiple things to think about. And I'm not sure that there is a good or bad in every way, but when we are putting less people on, you have to

EN

do consider the ramifications and is that providing extra load is actually a benefit. You know, is there a reason why the waiting was done originally and probably even looking into past history about why the GNSO had so many seats in the past, for example?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Yeah, I'll try to think about all of these things. I'll share a draft with the rest of you and then you can comment on it.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you very much. That would be great. Is that it, Ozan, for item 4C1, the public comment?

OZAN SAHIN: Unless we have any questions, I think we're done with 4C1.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. So then we have the elections of the nominees for the NomCom. Now, I'm sorry, I'm trying to remember, we have Hiro currently in the seat, and I don't remember the structure. Do we have two seats or is this a replacement for Hiro? Jeff, we have one seat and then Hiro is the liaison to the NomCom and Hiro's term is through the annual general meeting in Hamburg in October this year. And this appointment is for the new RSSAC most probable delegate with the voting power for one year, starting with the AGM in Hamburg at ICANN 78 for one year.

JEFF OSBORN: So those one-year terms really make for a whole lot of motion.

OZAN SAHIN: We started the nomination period about a month ago, and we do have three nominees from RSSAC caucus. One is Harish Chowdhary. And some of the candidates shared their expression of interest on the RSSAC caucus mailing list. The second candidate is Desalegn Yehuala. And then we have Rao Naveed Bin Rais as the third candidate interested. All of the candidates have seconds. And if there are any discussions on any of the candidates, I'll stop here before we proceed to start online voting.

JEFF OSBORN: All right, is that something where we'll then take the vote?

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, for RSSAC operational procedures, we will start now 72-hour online voting. We will accept one vote per RSO. So I will also circulate the link to the vote on the mailing list so that any RSO representatives who are not in attendance could also work within the 72 hours. So for rank choice voting, if we don't get the majority, we will start another vote if you don't get enough votes. And this will close on Friday, the 5th of May at 15:00 UTC. So let me also drop the link to the online vote in the chat, reminding that only RSOs will be allowed to vote. And we will accept one vote per RSO. Thank you. And I'm sending now the email on the RSSAC mailing list.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Ozan. And I believe we are at D.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, the other appointment. So it looks like I'll talk a bit more today. We have two upcoming potential appointments, which the RSSAC admin team has discussed and wanted to share with the RSSAC for its consideration. So one of them is the second IANA naming function review. I took the slides from the April 2023 slide deck from ICANN Org. In the bylaws, there are periodic IANA naming function reviews after the first one, not less frequently than every five years. So there was one in 2018. And I believe Suzanne Woolf from RSSAC was a representative to the first IANA naming function review team. And now there's the second one being convened. The scope is evaluation of the PTI performance against the requirements of the IANA naming function contract, the review of IANA naming function statement of work, the review of PTI's openness and transparency procedures, and the consideration assessment of any changes implemented since the first IANA naming function review in 2018.

So RSSAC admin team wanted to share the news with you, see if there are any interested RSSAC members to be an appointee to this team. And accordingly, RSSAC will consider making an appointment to the IFR2. Any comments? Russ, please go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks. I think this is a really important activity for RSSAC to participate in, especially since it is all centered around the names function of IANA. It's a really critical activity. I spent a little bit of time looking at what it is

because I found it a little confusing. It's almost like it's another version of the CSC, but they say it's not. One of the things that from the SSAC side that we got is a comment back from the SSAC member of the first IFR. It really was not that much that time intensive, and I could see where that could be the case, but I could also see where it could end up taking a bit of time to do. But if it does take a bit of time, it seems like the reason that that would, if that does happen, it would be because of knowledgeable people for what the IANA is doing or not doing or the way in which they are doing it. So I think it is a really important activity that it would be good for RSSAC to find a knowledgeable participant to represent. Thanks.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you for adding comments, Russ. Do we have any other comments? Any interested members? You may take your time to think about joining the second IFR team and let RSSAC Admin Committee know if you're interested. So if there are no other comments, we can go to the next agenda item. Which is this time the appointment of representative and an observer to the implementation review team for future rounds of new gTLD applications. And I shared a related note in April with RSSAC members, I think about two or three weeks ago. And this is due 7th of May, so by the end of this week.

During the working group phase of the future rounds of new gTLD applications or subsequent procedures as it was called in the past, RSSAC had published RSSAC 31 to provide input to the process, the response to the GNSO post development process working group on the gTLD subsequent procedures and talked about delegations per annum

being the wrong way to think about the problem and it talked about the rate of change in the in the root zone, so provided such input.

And as I stated in my note, the RSSAC Admin Committee agreed to step in to be in this implementation review team because this is viewed as an important initiative. Unless there's no other interested member from RSSAC, so please again, raise your hand, share your comments if you're interested in being in the implementation review team for the next rounds of the gTLDs. And I'll stop here to see if there are any comments. Ken.

KEN RENARD: Thanks Ozan, this is Ken. I think this is pretty important. I feel like the understanding throughout the community of RSSAC 031 is not quite there what it needs to be, so I definitely think it's important for us to have somebody here. I will volunteer as either the representative or observer but gladly step back if somebody else wants to volunteer as well. Thanks.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Ken. Do we have any other volunteers for this appointment? And this is the final outputs report from the new gTLD subsequent procedures working group. I think Brad Verd was a representative to this group, providing RSSAC concerns to the group and then eventually some of the points that RSSAC made in its publication, made it to the final outputs of this working group. So you can see all this security stability related topics that made it to the final outputs report. Sounds like the only volunteer we have is Ken.

KEN RENARD: Can we nominate Brad?

BRAD VERD: I'm happy to help Ken. All you have to do is ask.

KEN RENARD: Well then I nominate Brad.

BRAD VERD: I thought we were going to do it together.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent. Thank you guys very much. That's important work. Ozan, does that get us to item five?

OZAN SAHIN: I think so. Let me talk about the ICANN 77 planning and the registration and the RSSAC schedule. So ICANN 77 registration is open for in-person attendees. The deadline to register is by 7th of June, and let me drop the link to the meetings page. If you would like to get more information about ICANN 77, it will be from 2nd through 15th of June in Washington, D.C., United States. And yeah, you can get all other information on this page.

The RSSAC Admin Committee worked on a draft schedule for RSSAC for ICANN 77, and there's a link to this schedule on the agenda. But based

on the comments we received today, the submission deadline is tomorrow, actually. So I'll go ahead and submit the sessions based on the discussions today. And we are working with the support team to get a placeholder for a potential RSSAC closed session, which will likely happen on Tuesday. And then the RSSAC Admin Committee also envisions two RSSAC work sessions and an RSSAC meeting. So the work sessions and the RSSAC, one of the work sessions and the RSSAC meeting is on Wednesday. The other work session is being planned for Thursday currently.

And on Monday, the first day of the meeting, we have some technical sessions and no RSSAC meetings. And there will be two high-level, high-interest sessions. One is on the new gTLD program next round. That's happening on Monday. The second one on Tuesday is the board listening session on the CEO search. And there will be, of course, some networking opportunities at the end of each day.

So especially if you have any comments on the RSSAC work sessions and the potential topics on these work sessions, I'll be happy to listen to those and based on the discussion after this with the RSSAC Admin Committee, we'll go ahead and start with the sessions. Thank you. Hans Petter.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Yeah, this is just from personal preference. If we could shift all the sessions at least one day earlier, I would appreciate that. But it's also a question of what's the importance of tech days to us and does that really pay back? Or should we rather start earlier with all our sessions so

EN

that we, if needed, would have time at the end of the meeting if we needed additional time?

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you for the suggestion, Hans Petter. I'll take this to RSSAC Admin Team. One consideration is that I don't know how SSAC team would be flexible in moving the session, RSSAC SSAC [inaudible] session, but that's something we can check. And regarding the technical sessions, since we are just looking for a few RSSAC sessions in this meeting, initially we didn't want to have a conflict, but that's not a must, I guess. Yeah, Wes.

WES HARDAKER: Thank you. A couple of points. One, certainly I think some of the slots could be moved. You know, certainly the ones on Thursday might have an easier time to move to the Tuesday slots, for example, that are blank. But it's rather important that the technical community is attended by the root server operators when possible. During the writing of RSSAC 37, we actually missed tech day and DNSSEC workshops for about three years because we were so heavily involved we needed like every time slot we possibly could. And there's definitely a negative impact on the perception of the community when the root server operators are not participating in a lot of the other ICANN venues.

I think Jeff has already expressed concerns where people aren't even realizing today that the root server operators actually attend ICANN. He heard a comment in the past that if only the root server operators would show up. So the technical venues are an obvious point where that is a prime place for us to interact and contribute to the

conversations. So I will argue that that's actually an important set of meetings that I really prefer when we don't overlap with.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you. Any other comments on the on the proposed schedule for RSSAC? Okay, then I guess back to you, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. Work items, item six. Duane, what's the state of one version two.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah, so RSSAC 001 version two. About a month ago or so, we were in kind of a last call phase with the document, and then we got some comments. And there's a couple of now sort of pending suggestions for changes. So one of the one of the changes that there's an expectation that RSOs publish certain information about their operations in the interest of diversity. And the proposal is to sort of soften that instead of to make that information public, the proposal is to commit to share it within the RSO group and possibly make public some kind of summary of the diversity of the whole, but not anything about individual particular roots of our operators. So that's still up for consideration.

There's also a change to—a slight rewrite to the service capacity expectation, which I think is just, it doesn't really change the particular, but it just rewrites the title a little bit. And then the last thing that we're still dealing with in RSSAC 001 v2 is its relationship to RFC 7720, also known as BCP 40. It seems like there is now sort of agreement that

maybe there's no need to update the RFC and to leave it as is. However, we sort of uncovered this annoying problem, which is that BCP 40 or the RFC refers to kind of the root service as a whole. Whereas the expectations apply to individual root server operators. And so there's some text in our document that says RSOs, an individual RSO is expected to meet some requirement in the RFC. And we need to figure out how to word that so that it makes sense, I guess. Wes, if you'd like to say anything about the status of the RFC, please do. Otherwise, we do have a meeting of this working group on Thursday, and we'll be taking up these issues there.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, thanks Duane. So I think definitely decoupling 001 as much as possible from the RFC is a good thing because it's unclear when and if the RFC is going to be updated. I think at the meeting that we had was, I guess, at the IETF, there has been more discussion that actually the existing RFC shouldn't be updated, because there's actually multiple opinions, including two of the authors, that because the existing RFC isn't broken, it shouldn't be updated. And if we do want to add recommendations that are not binding into must level RFC agreements, that they should be put into a separate document and published separately.

So I'm not sure there's consensus again with where the RFC is. Therefore, I would do everything we can to just publish 001 pointing to BCP 40, which is, I think, the important change to decouple it as much as possible. We don't necessarily have to wait for the other document,

which I think was Paul Hoffman's actually original suggestion that we don't bind even the publication times together.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. So that's it for me, Jeff. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. Thanks, Duane. Ken, on 002 v5.

KEN RENARD: Thanks, Jeff. I'll take the next two items. So, RSSAC 002 v5, that document has been pretty stable, and I think we are ready to go into the two-week stability period. It was not ready to vote on as an update for this RSSAC meeting, but it should be available for the June meeting to vote and approve, hopefully, RSSAC 002 v5.

The next one, RSSAC security incident reporting. Steve and I took some of the discussion and comments from the last session at the last ICANN meeting and updated the statement of work. We see that here. The only two comments here left in the document, I guess it's near the bottom of page one. The original thing was that this work party would— only security incidents that have a material effect would be in scope. Changed that to work parties should focus on that. The idea that a security incident that doesn't necessarily meet the threshold for reporting could still be optionally reported on by the RSS saying, hey, look, we saw this, but yeah, it wasn't a big deal. So leaving that open for the work party.

And the next one is the end of page two, section three. This is also based some of the comments from the ICANN meeting was, yeah, we were getting a little bit too into the weeds in the statement of work. So the proposal is to actually remove some of these details that are highlighted here. So I'm pretty confident with both of these changes myself. If there's any last minute comments here, love to hear them. Otherwise, I think this will get put out to the RSSAC for a two week stability period that could also be voted on at the next RSSAC meeting. So any comments here would be appreciated. Thanks everyone for their contributions.

JEFF OSBORN: Nice work, Ken. That looks good. And back to agenda. So Ken just can't get out of the spotlight. For my purpose, I got to say I'm fighting off a cold and this is my third of six ICANN related meetings today. So I am kind of feeling a little overwhelmed between a fever and trying to keep all these straight. I really don't have anything to report other than the issues we've already discussed.

WES HARDAKER: Jeff, do you really want to go head to head with number of ICANN meetings? Just asking.

JEFF OSBORN: Oh, Lord, no. I bow, Wes. You win. That's all I've got. Ken, do you have anything? Nothing else new for me. Thanks. Okay. Back to you, Wes, since you asked.

WES HARDAKER: So I just got off a plane yesterday from a four day board workshop. So hence the reason for the joke. Starting the next day with a 7:00 AM meeting is always a good thing. There was actually a number of fantastic discussions over the past four days, some of which are relevant. I think as you know, there was board listening sessions. I think we're up to 10 to 12, something like that, and there's four more to go. Thank you to RSSAC in particular for contributing. We heard good advice from RSSAC and heard a lot of good advice from the IETF IAB listening session as well.

A couple of, I guess, three things that might be of at least now or future relevance to ICANN. One of the things the board is considering doing is creating some better mechanisms, which they're calling templates, to describe where review processes are for advice and things like that. So they'll be designed to actually get SOs and ACs the ability to have a better template for producing documents that are easy to read and understand because they'll be sort of consistently formatted. I can't describe that very well because it's still very new in contribution. So that would be probably a while down the line before it actually affects us directly, but know that it might be coming.

There was a meeting with the European Union and the interesting takeaway from that. There was a lot of things that apparently happened in the discussion. It was between the senior leadership of the board and so I wasn't there. They have been told traditionally in the past that the root is technically strong and resilient, which they greatly appreciate it. They were told that by the technical community and people they trust,

EN

but they do have a fear of what they do not understand. And so the interesting analogy that I think came out of the meeting is medical professionals said early in the pandemic that the pandemic wasn't going to be a problem, that they could stay on top of it. And that was clearly wrong, where it really did take over the entire world. And so they're having a similar sort of thoughts on the root, right? When technical people say the root is strong and resilient in the same way that medical professionals said the pandemic wouldn't be that big of an issue, they're wondering what they are not seeing. So I have this fear of the unknown, which I doubt is going to be a hard one for us to fight to say we really are strong and resilient. We don't see anything coming in any direction because it's hard to fight somebody that's creating fictitious viewpoints that aren't grounded in fact, for example.

There's been more discussions on the new gTLD program, which is SubPro as it's referred to within ICANN. There are multiple things happening there. One of the things that's constantly being discussed is how the application process is going to happen, which affects what that application process will look like. And that affects the timing, which is the other thing that's often discussed is the timing in the next round. I think there is going to be a timing publication sometime soon that will indicate when the first application will be accepted. I don't think it's public yet, though.

And then the other interesting one is whether to move to multiple rounds or a continual application process. We had one round, it was in 2012, I want to say was the start of it, which may be wrong. But there's always been an outstanding question in the community of are we going to have multiple rounds or will we actually start and have one round

and then do continual enrollment? So that will obviously affect us as to whether we get things that occur sort of in bulk and/or whether we get things that occur continuously from now on. And we've already given advice that there is a rate limit that we can handle. And so we'll need to revisit that over time. But how the application process continues, of course, will affect our own ability to take in new TLDs, for example.

It's very unclear what the size of the demand will be for the next round. They tried to predict that for the first round and got it off by a factor of two. Nobody's quite clear what the demand will be for the second one. That's hard to predict in advance. One thing that I have done every time these discussions have come up is that I've explained that the root server operators are ready today. You know, nothing else is ready today. Everything else is—that's not quite true. Everything else is continuing to get work and policy development and technical implementation and everything else. And I've explained multiple times that the RSOs are ready today and that we're good to go. That's it from my side. Let's hear questions.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Wes. That's helpful. Ken, how are things at the CSC?

KEN RENARD: Thanks. Good and boring from the CSC. The SLAs are met 100%. Things are going well. The toughest part is the conflict of GWG meetings and the CSC meetings. I'm going to keep that hidden so Brad doesn't schedule something. Next meeting is in two weeks and we'll report back again. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Sounds great. Hiro, anything new on the NomCom?

HIRO HOTTA: Yes, this is Hiro. Application window for leadership positions was closed at the end of March. 155 applications were received on nine open positions, including three board members. I think 155 is a record. Around 100 has been the number of applicants in the past.

In April, NomCom met to make the first pass for assessment of all applications using their applications, CVs, and additional information on the web. Now NomCom has a short list for ICANN board, PTI board, CNSO, CNSO, and ALAC. And we'll start online interviews this week. What I reported now can be read in the NomCom2023 website. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you, Hiro. Daniel, news from RZERC.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I don't think I have anything to report.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. We've already discussed the public comment closes on the 8th for the charter review. Anything for the IAB then, Daniel?

DANIEL MIGAULT: No.

JEFF OSBORN: All right, Russ, SSAC.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Jeff. Nothing directly from the SSAC. Just want to mention that the call for participation for the DNSSEC and security workshop is still open. And if we do have a slot or two available, if anybody has any ideas on things they think would be of interest to the broad community, please think about responding to the call for papers for the upcoming ICANN meeting. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Russ. I can't remember. James, are you here for the IANA functions?

OZAN SAHIN: I don't see James on the call.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay, yeah, I thought not. And Duane with his clear working audio.

DUANE WESSELS: Nothing additional to report, Jeff. Thanks.

EN

JEFF OSBORN:	All right. Amir, the fellowship selection committee.
AMIR QAYYUM:	Just to report that we have completed the selections for the fellow till Hamburg meeting and the new appointee to the fellowship selection committee will take the charge and they will continue their work for the selection of the fellows for the subsequent ICANN meetings. So for the next two meetings, the Washington DC meeting where only the alumni are considered and for the Hamburg meeting where everyone is considered, the fellowship selection has been done. Thank you.
JEFF OSBORN:	Great. Thanks, Amir. And Afifa, the fellowship mentoring committee.
AFIFA ABBAS:	Thank you, everyone. I don't have much to share. I have been working as a fellowship mentor for six consecutive meetings. That will end with ICANN 77. So the mentoring process for ICANN 77 started from yesterday, and it will continue after the 77 meeting as well. It's been a great experience so far and thank you everyone.
JEFF OSBORN:	Thank you, Afifa. And Abdulkarim, the NextGen@ICANN.
ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE:	Thank you very much. I don't have a lot to share also. The NextGen selection committee, we've actually done the selection up to Hamburg

meeting, and hopefully we'll have a few applications, probably maybe because it's happening in the European region. So generally I think there's no problem so far, and thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: And thank you, Abdulkarim. Ali Hussain, NextGen ICANN mentoring committee.

ALI HUSSAIN: Hello everyone. I started the NextGen mentoring role starting the ICANN 76, Cancun, and during that, that was very well, except some comments about parallel sections so as to reduce [inaudible]

OZAN SAHIN: I believe Ali is having connected issues.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, I would just ask for an email update and move on, because we can't hear anything.

JEFF OSBORN: That's a great idea, Brad. Thanks, Ali, if you could provide an input by email, that would be terrific. Rob Carolina I know is on an airplane. So for the GWG, I'm going to throw it to Rod.

BRAD VERD: I assume most people know GWG had a workshop two weeks ago in DC, and we are starting to gel on the principles. We essentially narrowed it down to less than a handful that need more, more discussion and work so we're making progress.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent. Thank you, Brad. I have no other business. Anyone else? If there's nothing else, it looks like we might be able to give you a few minutes back on this time. Oh, I'm sorry, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, myself and Liman. I thought we were going to add to the agenda, the public comment for RZERC. Are we going to make a statement, have a discussion if we wanted to make a statement to the RZERC charter changes?

JEFF OSBORN: That is in my notes and I missed it. I'm sorry, Brad. Good point. That is worth a discussion. I'm not sure how to go about this. What would the normal process be for putting together a response to this?

BRAD VERD: I think I've been maybe the most vocal one here so I'll just say it again, I feel pretty strongly, I'm a little frustrated that with the charter changes. It's easy to be on the outside looking in and read the charter changes and see the changes as no big deal. I feel like since we've been on the inside and since the first charter change, RSSAC was very vocal, because

I was in the middle of that, very vocal about it because if you guys recall, the original charter included everything within the RSS. And so we had to push back on that and kind of narrow the scope.

What I feel is being removed that's so important is the history piece of how we got to where we are. And the reason I feel strongly about that is, I think down the road if this happens again in two, four, six years, losing that context will diminish any discussion that goes on. So, I'll leave it that, but if the group wants to comment, we are running out of time.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: My hand is up already because I had the exact same question. So I feel this issue has been kind of lost a bit. So I am at a bit of a loss out how to continue, but I definitely think that RSSAC should have a comment on this. So I am going to propose since Brad and I are probably the two people who are most interested in this, do you have time later today, your time, Brad, to sit down and draft a comment that we can send to the list later today American time?

BRAD VERD: My calendar doesn't free up until 430 this afternoon, my time, so which would be really late your time. We could find some time early tomorrow maybe.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, let me check out early tomorrow—

EN

BRAD VERD: Let's take it offline, you and I can figure something out and happy to work with anybody else.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And I can suggest in this case that we make a draft, and if we do get buy in from RSSAC over email, then we can submit it as an RSSAC comment. If not, then I suggest that you and I, Brad, submit it as personal comments.

BRAD VERD: Wes.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, just a quick comment. You know, thank you for working on a draft. I don't really have a strong opinion myself. I'm too new to RZERC, or at least to being a member of it. I would suggest that if you write something up saying that you want the history to go back, you give very clear precise indications of why it's important and know what the downsides are of removing it.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's a fair comment.

EN

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. Thank you, Liman and Brad, for offering to put that work together. Look forward to it. Is there any additional business? I believe our next meeting is in Washington at ICANN 77. So, if there is nothing else, we'll see you all there. Take care. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]