

---

JEFF OSBORN: And it's call to order time, so let's do a roll call. For Cogent, Paul or Brad? Paul or Brad? DISA, John, Peter?

PETER MARTIN: Peter's here.

JEFF OSBORN: Peter's here. John? I don't hear John. From ICANN, Terry from the other side of the world?

MATT LARSON: Matt's here.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. And Terry's wisely sleeping. Hi, Matt. Rob is on vacation. I don't think he'll be in, and I'm here. And for NASA, Jose and Brad?

JOSE NUNEZ ZAPATA: Jose's here.

JEFF OSBORN: Jose. Brad? From Netnod, Lars? Patrick? Nobody here. Hans Petter or Paul? Europe is batting zero. We can talk about them behind their backs. UMD, Karl?

---

*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.*

---

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

JEFF OSBORN: Karl's here. Kevin?

KEVIN HILDERBRAND: Present.

JEFF OSBORN: Great. Wes and Suzanne?

WES HARDAKER: I'm here. I don't see Suzanne today.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. Thanks, Wes. Ken?

KEN RENARD: Ken's here.

JEFF OSBORN: Ken's here. Howard?

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

---

JEFF OSBORN: Howard's here. Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yes.

JEFF OSBORN: Hey, Brad. And Jun and or Hiro?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro's here.

JEFF OSBORN: And Jun is not. Good to see you, Hiro. So, let's see in the liaisons to the Board. Wes is here. Ken is here. Daniel? Daniel?

WES HARDAKER: Daniel sent apologies.

JEFF OSBORN: Okay. And I saw Russ earlier. Hi, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Hi, there.

JEFF OSBORN: James for IANA.

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. James here.

JEFF OSBORN: Hi, James. And Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, Duane is here.

JEFF OSBORN: Hey, Duane. Okay, I'm going to assume everybody on staff that says they're here is here, and we will move along. The agenda review, I reviewed it. If everybody wants to take a look, it's pretty simple. It really follows all of the basic guidelines. We have a total of three items to vote on. I'll give you just a minute to take a look. And while we're doing that, or after we're done with that, Ozan, if you want to pull up the draft minutes from March 5. We need to vote on these.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes.

JEFF OSBORN: That is about as basic a set of minutes as one could imagine.

OZAN SAHIN: And the action items from this meeting have been completed.

---

JEFF OSBORN:                   Excellent. You can insert some controversy if we want, but otherwise, this is pretty simple. Hans Petter, good to see you. We'll put you on the roll call. Thank you.

HANA PETTER HOLEN:           Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN:                   All right. If that's it, then anyone opposed to accepting the minutes or do I need to get a second and all that, Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN:                    Yes, a motion and a second and move to approve.

JEFF OSBORN:                   All right. Wes?

KEN RENARD:                   Second, Ken.

JEFF OSBORN:                   Thank you, Wes. Thank you, Ken. All in favor? No. All opposed? Anyone abstaining? The minutes pass. Thank you.

---

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: Liman here. Sorry for joining late. Zoom had thrown me out.

JEFF OSBORN: Glad to see you, Liman. I think it's funny that when the Europeans didn't show up, I said we could talk about the behind their backs and immediately two of you showed up. So that worked.

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: My Chinese listening station was on to you.

JEFF OSBORN: Your handler contacted you.

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: It was installed during my layover in Hong Kong.

JEFF OSBORN: Oh, well done. Wow. Congratulations then. I'm pleased you were able to do it. The draft minutes being done, we're up to the caucus membership committee. We have one candidate, and the SOI is there if you want to click on it. James is an interesting candidate who we, the membership committee, unanimously are in favor of.

But it's a little interesting because this is somebody who doesn't have a depth of specific DNS experience, but they do have a depth of research and publishing peer-reviewed papers in international journals like the IEEE and have had high positions in things like the ITU. I thought that is

---

a skill set that I think is valuable, even though it doesn't include the normal depth of DNS. So, it was the unanimous decision of the membership committee that James would be a good addition to the caucus.

WES HARDAKER: So, was that specifically because he had those other skill sets in the policy side of things? Is that the reason why there was a unanimous yes?

JEFF OSBORN: I think so. We went through it and all said, uh-oh, there's no DNS. And then Kailesh took a look and said, holy crap, look at the skill set though. Because research is always a hard one to come by and literally having presented in front of organizations like that, I think is something that-- Well, you know how I feel about this. I think increasingly we're going to have to show ourselves to the outside world in a favorable light. And so, skills, doing that to things like the IEEE and the ITU, I think are prima facie valuable skills.

WES HARDAKER: I agree. I move to approve.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks. Ken, do you want to second it?

---

KEN RENARD: Sure.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks. Any negative votes or abstentions? Then we pass. Excellent. Good. Ozan, ICANN80 planning?

OZAN SAHIN: I'm happy to talk about 80 planning, Jeff, but before that we have 4C under administration, so I can start with 2025 NomCom committee delegate selection process.

JEFF OSBORN: I apologize. I can't read tables. Thanks.

OZAN SAHIN: No problem. Let me start with NomCom committee delegate selection process. So, there was an action item from the previous RSSAC meeting for me to start a nomination period on that, and I have started it today. Since the new delegates will have voting power, and then there were a few more updates in ICANN bylaws with respect to the NomCom composition and the terms of delegates and their transition, so a few reminders here.

The new RSSAC appointment to the NomCom will be a voting delegate. Moving forward, the delegates will all be serving a two-year term, but for staggering purposes, some of the groups' delegates are starting with a one-year term, and RSSAC is one of them. So, this delegate will



---

serve one year. And then there is also a term limit, a new term limit on how long the delegates can serve. So, they will be serving a two-year term, but they can only serve a second term after stepping down for two years. So, after not serving a term, they can serve again, but for a maximum of two terms.

And in addition, anyone who served on the 2023 and 2024 NomCom will be ineligible for the appointment to the 2025 NomCom. And RSSAC had appointed Hiro Hotta for 2023 NomCom, and most recently, Naveed Bin Rais in 2024 NomCom, who will be ineligible for this process. So, with respect to the timeline, the plan is that the nomination period closes on the 29th of April, I guess, and then there will be a vote in RSSAC May meeting to complete this appointment. Any questions about this process? If not, back to you, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN:

Great. Thanks, Ozan. Now, I believe we are on--

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN:

Actually, I have a question. Maybe I didn't follow. I came back from Australia this morning. I'm not at my sharpest right now, so please forgive me. So where will we announce this? We go to the caucus and the RSSAC internal. Is that it, or are we looking in any other corners of the--?

---

OZAN SAHIN: This was announced on the RSSAC caucus list. So RSSAC is selecting the NomCom N delegate from the RSSAC caucus, and all RSSAC members are also the members of RSSAC caucus. So yes.

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Is that everything on the delegate selection process? And we move to ICANN80, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. So, we have already started planning for ICANN80, which will take place in Kigali, Rwanda, from 10th of June through 13th of June. That's a four-day meeting, a bit shorter than the other two meetings in the calendar year. And the RSSAC admin team had a chance to draft and look at an initial draft of the RSSAC schedule for ICANN80.

So, on Monday, on Day 1, 10th of June, there will be some technical sessions. And we continue to try to refrain from scheduling sessions, RSSAC sessions against them to the extent possible. So, you see tech day sessions and DNSSEC workshops in the afternoon. And the second one there's also, for the final block, there's also a plenary session on WSIS+ 20.

On the second day, Tuesday, we have a joint session with SSAC, and two RSSAC work sessions are planned in the afternoon. Wednesday starts with two GWG sessions, and then another RSSAC work session and

---

RSSAC meeting. So, the three RSSAC work sessions that are currently on the schedule are mainly planned for the messaging session. The other one is for a potential security incident reporting work party session. And another one for a potential prep meeting. The new potential work party that could be set up on the root server, changing root server addresses.

So, these are what the three work sessions stand for. And we have the RSSAC meeting on the final day, Thursday. We have two more GWG sessions. And in the afternoon, there's a placeholder for an ICANN Board and organization session. So, this is the only time before we start submitting the sessions on the internal events submission form that RSSAC could review this schedule. If you have any comments or questions, I'll be appreciating the feedback.

JEFF OSBORN:

Lars.

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN:

Yes, I just want to comment that this looks like a good schedule to me. Impressive. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN:

Thank you, Liman. Hans Petter.

---

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Yeah, thanks for this. I agree. It looks good. Just a question for clarification, you list day zero, high-level government meeting. So that is on the Sunday, it's not earlier than that.

OZAN SAHIN: As far as I know, the high-level governmental meeting will be held on Sunday. I think it will take all day. I didn't include any specifics about the high-level governmental meeting there because it's primarily a Governmental Advisory Committee, I think. But if you wish, if there's a final schedule for high-level governmental meeting, I can also add it to the schedule if there's interest.

HANS PETER HOLEN: No, it was just out of personal interest, because I'll reach out to GAC to see if they have any interest of inviting the NRO there or the ASO there. But it's not related to RSSAC. It was just to understand the planning and the timing. Thanks for this.

OZAN SAHIN: Got it. Thank you, Hans Petter. Ken?

KEN RENARD: Yeah. Just Hans-Peter, I haven't heard for certain yet, but I believe the high-level government meeting should be open to observers. So, if anybody wanted to just sit in, they should, but please wait for confirmation on that. And the other thing was that the RSSAC bilateral

---

meeting with the GAC, which was scheduled for Kigali for this ICANN80, has been moved to the fall 81. Thanks.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Ken. Jeff, did you want to add something?

JEFF OSBORN: Well, Ken literally answered my exact two questions. Ken, is that for certain then, that the GAC-RSSAC interaction is Istanbul, not Kigali?

KEN RENARD: Yes, I heard that from Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: So, let me step in to add a bit more to this discussion. It's not 100% certain yet, but I'd say 90% that it will not be during ICANN80, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: Right. We understood with the time constraints, it was unlikely to happen. So, I'm not surprised. That's fine.

OZAN SAHIN: Right. The challenge GAC is having, that this is a very short meeting. This is the shortest meeting of the three. And I think they're also busy with the high-level governmental meeting there. So, I think before the end of the week, we will know for sure whether this meeting can happen in Kigali or not. But the two options we were offered with the

---

most probable chance that it will not happen, that we could have a virtual meeting prior to ICANN80 with GAC, or if RSSAC wanted to have a face-to-face meeting, then it could be deferred to ICANN81 in Istanbul.

JEFF OSBORN: I don't have any sense of urgency at all. I thought there may be some somewhere else, but if nobody else is pushing it, I'm happy with Istanbul. That's fine.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you. Any other comments or questions about the schedule?

JEFF OSBORN: I think it looks good too. I like it.

OZAN SAHIN: Back to you, Jeff. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Great. And that takes us to the supported travellers funding guidelines. I think that's been posted for a while. Hasn't that been up basically for comment, Ozan? And there haven't been a whole lot of additional comments?

---

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, Jeff. Actually, we started a stable period last week, a seven-day stable period, which finalized yesterday, and we haven't received any additional comments. So, the document is now stable and up for a RSSAC vote in this meeting.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent. Well, I had my input and I've read it several times. If people hadn't, I guess we can give you a minute to take a look. Lars?

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: Yeah, I read it again last night. There was one thing that I think was sort of odd wording-wise, but I didn't care enough to actually think that we should delay a vote in order to make any last changes. So, I'm for it, and I will make a motion to approve it.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Lars. Ken, do you want to be the traditional seconder?

KEN RENARD: Sure. Second.

JEFF OSBORN: The second team is three straight on that. Excellent. Does anybody dislike this document and would like to vote against it? Any abstentions? I call that all in favor. Excellent. Another document done. Thanks, all. Thanks, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: You're welcome, Jeff. We will go ahead and start the selection process for IETF 120 with the approval of this guidance. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN: Terrific. On a related topic, anybody who is a supported traveller by ICANN should have gotten the notice yesterday, and it is a very short fuse. You need to have that done by next Monday. And I spent hours on it last night. The Kigali travel is complicated. So, if you're a supported traveller, you really want to get on that, I think. It took quite a bit. And I will ask you more about that, Ozan, when we meet again later today, because it's a--

KEN RENARD: The fuse is always short on those.

JEFF OSBORN: This one's insane. My best fare, best connections, I literally spent a night in Munich and a night in Brussels on the way there, which seems insane, but they make it cheap. So, we will move forward to the guidelines for changing route server addresses. Duane? Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, I'm here, Jeff. Hey. So, this is something we talked about in our last meeting. We put together the statement of work. We sort of got ahead of ourselves a little bit by sending the URL out for comments, and



---

people started, I don't know, commenting on the document as though the work party had already started. I believe we're not yet ready to vote on this. I think we missed the deadline. And talking with Andrew, he said maybe we could do the vote by email. Otherwise, vote at the next meeting, I guess. I don't know if Andrew's on the call today.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Hi, Duane. Yeah, that's correct. We're too late for the cutoff for this call, but we can do a vote by email. But now would be a good time if people have any questions about this document to raise them before we launch that vote, which would probably happen. We probably wouldn't do that until early next week for the vote.

DUANE WESSELS: So, most of the comments here, I think, were not really-- No one was arguing for changes to the statement of work. The comments were really, like I said, sort of as though the work had already started providing additional input to the final product.

JEFF OSBORN: I'm sorry. If you want to leave this open, do you want to drop a link in the chat maybe, and then next week it'll go up for a vote? Or do you want to leave the comments closed?

DUANE WESSELS: Well, I mean, I don't really want-- I don't think it's helpful to have more comments in the document itself unless they are really related to the

---

statement of work, proposing changes or something like that. I will put a link to the Google Doc in the chat.

JEFF OSBORN: I think Andrew beat you to it, but thank you for your--

DUANE WESSELS: Oh, good. Thanks, Andrew.

JEFF OSBORN: Hard to keep ahead of staff.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, yes.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. Thanks, Duane. Back to the agenda. Oh, Ozan.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Jeff. I just wanted to add that a stable period started on Thursday with an email from Andrew for this statement of work. So, if you have any additional comments, as Duane suggested, please make sure to submit them. Otherwise, by the end of the week, the document will become stable.



JEFF OSBORN: I'm sorry, what?

OZAN SAHIN: I'm sorry, I think I missed your question, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN: That's all right. I was saying the RSS messaging, I think, we did a great year-long effort and put together two documents, one fairly long and technical, and one the slide presentation that you've all seen. And I feel like they're close enough to done that I think we don't need to have a series of scheduled meetings, but it's entirely possible that based on like feedback from the BTC, we may want to call a meeting of that. So, I'm trying to understand what is the status of this. Should we just remove it as a work party and say it's done, and then we can call an ad hoc meeting if we're trying to get input? I'm just trying to understand the procedure, the protocol. Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah. So, I mean, like you said, Jeff, there's two things. There's the presentation and then there's the document. I think the document still has a fair bit of work to be done on it. And I think the last I saw from Robert C was that he and Wes were going to meet and do some more work on it before we held another meeting. I feel like one of those work streams is mostly done, like you said, but the other one may require another meeting, but I'm waiting to hear from either Wes or Robert C on that.

---

JEFF OSBORN:

Robert C has been on vacation. Rob's been on vacation for a couple of weeks and then he's going to be at my all hands meeting in New York next week. So, he and I are discussing it next week in Manhattan, but it's going to be at least the week after that before we kind of figure it out. It'd probably be useful for Andrew, Rob and I and Wes, maybe or maybe a subgroup of that to sort of sit down sometime in the next month. But again, the compelling nature of it has changed. Wes.

WES HARDAKER:

Yeah. So, the plans are at this point that Rob is on vacation and yes, he has the all hands next week. So, he and I are planning on talking through a final section in two weeks on Monday. And in a conversation with Andrew in mail, we have agreed that it would probably be good to get, once we're done, to bring it back to sort of the full group for everybody to rip apart and say it should be started again from scratch. No, hopefully not. But I think that the goal is, if Rob and I are done with it, and then you have your presentation form of it, Jeff, that the whole group should comment again on it and make any final changes that we think is perfect, of course, but.

JEFF OSBORN:

No, I agree completely, Wes. What I didn't want to do is start scheduling a series of biweekly meetings that it doesn't need. What it needs is--

---

WES HARDAKER: I would start with a single meeting sometime in, say, four weeks or so. Well, that's the GWG week, so maybe in five weeks. And then we will see the results of that to determine are we basically done or are everybody finding lots of things that Rob and I left out or whatever.

JEFF OSBORN: Right, and the BTC presentation will have happened by then. Thanks. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Jeff. Yeah. Last time you did the presentation to the SSAC and our joint RSSAC-SSAC meeting. Is there something that you would want to do again on a final product? I'm not sure it will be that much difference than what's been done before. But I thought I'd ask because just agenda planning is always a challenge.

JEFF OSBORN: I don't think it's necessary. I mean, it's amusing. I would buy drinks for the people who want to come listen to me give it in a bar somewhere. But I think as little time as SSAC and RSSAC gets together, I don't know that that's a good use of that valuable time.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to check. And, of course, that's subject to change if something comes up, but that's what we'll plan on for now. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Great. But the bar offer is legit, and I would buy. It'd be interesting. Ozan, I believe that takes us to Recommendation 7, which you can explain better than I can.

OZAN SAHIN: Let me try. Thank you, Jeff. So, there was a cross-committee working group, CCWG, on the new gTLD auction proceeds and what to do with the auction proceeds. And this group published their final report, and there was some discussion related to another aspect of this work in the previous RSSAC meeting.

But a point coming from their final report and recommendations is that there's a Recommendation 7. And after the publication of the final report, ICANN come in to identify some gap in these recommendations where the funds, the auction proceeds could have had to be used on legal cases if individuals wanted to take the decisions for the grant applications to using the ICANN accountability mechanisms, possibly the independent review mechanism, and appeal them.

So, ICANN come to identify a gap there and recommend that then ICANN Board to kind of update this recommendation, which is Recommendation 7, basically removing this part in bold. So, the appeal mechanisms cannot be used to challenge a decision from the independent project applications evaluation panel. The current recommendation says basically removal of this part that is bold.

And ICANN Board chair Tripti Sinha reached out to the chairs of the chartering organizations, which are the ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees and asked whether they would support such an update to Recommendation 7. And RSSAC admin team reviewed this and decided to give a green light to the ICANN Board in removing this part and updating Recommendation 7. But the admin team also wanted to take this to the RSSAC before going back to ICANN Board and see if there are any concerns around it.

In addition, there's an ICANN public comment proceeding to support this process because ICANN Board also found out that getting green light from the chartering organizations itself wouldn't be enough. It had to also update the bylaws to kind of limit the access to accountability mechanisms for this particular scenario of appealing grant program decisions. So, if you think it's okay for the RSSAC admin committee to go back to ICANN Board and give the green light to update Recommendation 7, that's what we're going to do. If you have any comments or concerns, please raise them. Thanks, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN:

I had Tripti and a couple of other Board members spend a fair amount of time individually with me on this. Just to make it really clear, what happened is they want to give grants and they realized because ICANN has a way to challenge every decision made by Recommendation 7.

That they realized everybody who loses the grant is going to be able to go through an exorbitant process of demanding that they have their grant reconsidered. And they imagined a scenario where they were



---

going to spend all the grant money on legal challenges to why didn't I win the grant. And for those of us who write grant requests all the time, you get turned down all the time. And the writing always says, you lost, you lost, you have no right of coming back after us unless you've got some criminal crazy idea.

So, what they're trying to do here, I think is pretty reasonable because they're simply saying the normal processes of having a decision reconsidered should not apply to a grant making process. The concern is we could spend all of the grant money defending ourselves in lawsuits and that would be wrong. That's the short answer to this and that's the answer I was agreeing to in a nutshell. Any questions?

WES HARDAKER:

No, you nailed it perfectly from the board's point of view.

JEFF OSBORN:

Oh, thanks, Wes. All right. Well, I think that means we are going to say as far as RSSAC is concerned, this is fine, and we approve. But it sounds like they also have a bylaw issue to go through. Does that cover everything you believe that they need from us, Ozan?

OZAN SAHIN:

I think so. Yes, Jeff.

---

JEFF OSBORN:                   Excellent. Good. All right. Moving to reports. I just gave you mine.  
Ken?

KEN RENARD:                   Nothing else for me. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN:                   Great. Wes, who's from the Board?

WES HARDAKER:                Yeah. It's going to be boring today because I think since our last meeting in Puerto Rico with their sort of a slowdown after ICANN and a pause of all the technical stuff because of the IETF, because all the technical people go to the IETF too, we've really only been concentrating on internal things that are not directly relevant to ICANN. So, I actually have nothing important to announce unless everybody has questions.

JEFF OSBORN:                   Fair enough. Thanks, Wes. Ken, CSC?

KEN RENARD:                   Pretty much the same from the CSC. There has been nothing since ICANN79 in Puerto Rico. I expect the monthly report from CSC any day now. Thanks.



LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: Physically or mentally?

JEFF OSBORN: Either.

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: I actually arrived back home to my house in Stockholm at 8:15 this morning. It's now 4:38.

JEFF OSBORN: Jesus. Get some rest.

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: I fear that if I try to do that before 8:00 o'clock, I will not make the meeting with the IFR2.

JEFF OSBORN: That makes sense too. Wes, did you want to state anything about IAB or skip Daniel?

WES HARDAKER: I'll mention some things that actually Daniel hasn't heard yet too. So, first off, Tommy Pauly was elected as the new chair of the IAB, which I think he'll be an excellent candidate. That started in the IETF a week or two ago. The only thing worth noting with respect to the IAB and

ICANN is the IAB is trying to figure out if we need a greater amount of collaboration with ICANN in general. And what that amounts to is making sure that both parties are under active engagement with respect to policies that we're working on and things like that.

The IAB doesn't really do policies as much, but ICANN really does. And just making sure all those are aligned. With how that actually comes to light with respect to RSSAC and the root server system remains to be seen if it's going to be at a higher level than that. I'll also note that Harold Alverstrand's term on the ICANN Board, which is appointed by the IAB, is up for renewal coming in this November when the change period starts.

And there will be a decision sometime possibly tomorrow, in fact, about whether we want to do a selection of candidates versus call for feedback on him versus all sorts of the other options. So that will likely be coming up and that will be a visible event that will occur from the IAB to try and decide what to do. Harold's been sitting in that seat for six years at this point. And certainly, if the IAB calls for feedback, it would be highly advantageous if everybody could provide feedback if you have opinions on how Harold has served the IETF and the IAB in general.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thank you, Wes. Any questions for Wes? All right. Russ, news from the SSAC.

---

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you very much, Jeff. Well, we're getting the program together for the DNSSEC and security workshop. So, the announcements for proposals for that should be out imminently. If anybody has any ideas, please submit, although it's a shorter program than usual.

The other big focus of activity in the SSAC realm of things is to try to get the NCAP work completed. This seemingly almost never-ending effort is nearing completion. And I think that folks are still expecting it to be on schedule, which they want to get it wrapped up in the summer to fall timeframe. And so hopefully, if there is any impact on the RSSAC from that, things can start moving forward through the broader ICANN process.

And if additional information or data or whatever it might turn out to be is needed from RSSAC, then that should get put together in the relatively foreseeable future, 6 to 18 months kind of thing, hopefully. So that's the main thing to report from SSAC today. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent. Thanks, Russ. James, news from IANA.

JAMES MITCHELL: Hi. No updates for me.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. Duane, RZM?

---

DUANE WESSELS: Hi, Jeff. Yeah. Also, no updates for me as well. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: All right. And again, I'm going to pronounce A-L-L as Brad. Brad?

BRAD VERD: Really, no update here. I think everybody knows where we are. Some meetings have been conflicted with IETF and whatnot, picking things up and getting ready for our workshop. Happy to answer any questions if there are any.

JEFF OSBORN: Fair enough. Great. Boy, we're on track to finish this meeting in half the allotted time. That makes my heart sing. Any other business? A. Now, this is an issue where we were asked to comment on public interest commitments of the Public Registry Voluntary Committee, which has all kinds of great acronyms to it. And we basically said this is really not in our remit and really doesn't affect us.

Then I got a letter from Tripti saying, please reconsider because there are some important parts to it. And the letter that you see here, if you look at Item 2, that's the one where if we felt like going into the sticky wicket and getting or whatever it is that you get into the wrestling with torballs, there is a concept of ICANN messing with content if you read this the wrong way.

And I can see where you might want to make the statement that, gee, when you start messing with content, that's kind of a dangerous thing.

---

But I think, frankly, RSSAC would be wise to simply say it is not in our remit. Thank you very much. Wes?

WES HARDAKER:

Yeah. I mean, so I agree with you absolutely, Jeff. We have always had the mandate that we do not get into content policing and policies at all, and we only serve the root as IANA publishes it, period, flat out. We make no decisions on what the root should contain.

As your liaison to the Board, so I actually didn't know this letter was coming, I would suggest that the right thing to do is I will have a one-on-one with Tripti to figure out what the impetus behind this is, because I was actually sort of surprised to see this, considering she understands that policy.

So, I'm wondering if, to get more backhand information about why do they really want us to respond to this. Because it really doesn't make a whole lot of sense. We could put language in that more carefully states we refuse to talk about content because our job is only to serve it, not to participate in what makes up the content.

JEFF OSBORN:

I'm 100% with you, Wes. Can you owe the action item of let me know when to respond, and I'll wait until you do?

WES HARDAKER:

I absolutely will.



JEFF OSBORN: Appreciate it. Thanks. Liman.

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: Yeah. Liman here. I wholeheartedly support Wes's stance on this as well. And I would even go a step further to say that we can argue that getting involved with any content-related issues actually jeopardizes the-- What's the word I'm looking for, sorry?

JEFF OSBORN: Legitimacy?

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN: No. Independence, our independence from ICANN and that process. So, I strongly agree with Wes. Let me face it that way. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN: Great. Thanks, Liman. Brad.

BRAD VERD: That letter hasn't been shared, right? That went just to you and not to--

JEFF OSBORN: This went just to me, and I talked to Ozon about whether to share it to the RSSAC, and I did.

---

BRAD VERD: Oh, you did? Okay.

JEFF OSBORN: Correct. This went out, I believe, yesterday.

BRAD VERD: I missed that.

JEFF OSBORN: In advance of this discussion here, I wanted everybody to have a chance to take a look. 24 hours isn't much in email time, I realize. I apologize. I literally am testing positive for COVID right now, so I'm still at about half.

WES HARDAKER: You've got 24 hours to go before you really sink in.

BRAD VERD: You seem to be doing really well, so.

JEFF OSBORN: Thank you. It's challenging. It's being challenging. Okay. If we're in agreement, then I will literally wait to hear back from Wes, and I suspect we will simply move some words around and say we have no interest in commenting on this.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah, sounds good. I hope to meet with her after the IAB meeting tomorrow, because I suspect there may be a topic--

JEFF OSBORN: I'm around all week, and next week I've got my staff, so I'll be a little sluggish to respond, but I'm on. It's just I've got a bus full of lunatics driving to and from Eclipse. Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Jeff. This was an interesting point that came out, and sorry I missed your email too. But thinking back to the IANA transition activities and discussions, and of the primary functions and the primary responsibilities that IANA takes care of, this falls into the NAMES realm, and the NAMES realm is overseen by the ICANN community. And this is purely Russ Mundy speaking an opinion here, based on both heavy participation in the transition as well as following this as a liaison for a long time.

If part of the functionality that's done by IANA that's under the control of ICANN decides they want to change the process in some way so that it impacts the contents of what is delivered to the RSOs, then that is within ICANN as an organization, and the NAMES function, that's within their purview. But from an RSO and RSSAC perspective, what's been said on the call so far, I think is exactly right.

Whatever ICANN determines is going to be in the contents of the root zone, and this goes back again to the transition and the description of

---

responsibilities, that the RSSAC and the RSOs will serve exactly that, and not be involved in any of the content determination, and that's totally in alignment with what the transition plan laid out. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN:

Thanks, Russ. Wes.

WES HARDAKER:

Thanks again. By the way, the PICs and RBCs discussions, it's actually fascinating to listen to. I've listened to a few of them, and the recording in Puerto Rico is probably available for the public meeting that was held with a bunch of examples and what people thought about it and stuff. It's a really interesting set of discussions on slippery slope type of analogies. But actually, what I got in mind to say was, Russ, can you comment on what SSACC did? Did they comment on this? And I guess if they didn't comment, did they get a similar letter?

RUSS MUNDY:

Well, I have no knowledge, actually, as to whether or not SSAC made any comment on it, nor have any knowledge at all about whether or not there was a similar letter. I can make an endeavour to see what I can find out, and possibly tomorrow, I think, is a meeting, I might be able to sit in on it and get some information. But I will see if I can.

---

WES HARDAKER: I don't think it's actually necessary, Russ. It was more from a curiosity point of view. I don't think it'll affect our decision-making process at all. So don't add extra work to yourself.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. If I hear anything, I'll pass it on.

JEFF OSBORN: Excellent. Additional commentary? I believe back to the agenda. And our next meeting is in May. Hopefully, there'll be no snow on the ground here. That would be nice. And if there's nothing else, I give you your 40 minutes back. Thank you all. We'll see you when the accident happens. Hope you enjoy the eclipse, if you're seeing it. And otherwise, have a great week.

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, all.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**