EN

ICANN75 | AGM – RSSAC Caucus Work Session (2 of 2)
Tuesday, September 20, 2022 – 10:30 to 12:00 KUL

OZAN SAHIN: Hello and welcome to the RSSAC Caucus Work Session 2. My name is Ozan Sahin, and I will be the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put into proper form, as noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of the session.

If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you're done speaking. The session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that this transcription is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions

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.

using your full name. For example, a first name and a last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

With that, I will hand the floor over to our Steve Sheng.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you and welcome to the RSSAC001v2 Work Party face-to-face meeting at ICANN75. We have a brief agenda. We'll begin with a status update of our RSSAC001 Implementation Survey. And then Duane will lead us with a discussion on expectations versus requirements in the document. I think that's a mailing list discussion that happened a few weeks ago. And then we'll spend some time discussing the next steps.

Those are the two. One is to assign reviewers to read through the document just to make sure the use of the terminology of this document matches what's in the RSSAC lexicon. I think that's RSSAC026 and the IETF terminology document. I forget the exact RFC.

Finally, a discussion of the next steps. Who gets to decide if RFC 7720, which is a companion document that specified the protocol requirements, should be updated.

There's an AOB to discuss regular meeting time cadence. Are there any other business that should be raised?

Here now, I think, since we are face to face and also remotely after resuming from the pandemic, I felt that we should … Those in the room, let's do an introduction. Come to the front of the table, please. Thank you. all right. And we will begin with Hiro.

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro Hotta from one of the RSOs, RSSAC member.

DESSALEGN MEQUANINT: Dessalegn Mequanint, Caucus member.

KARL REUSS: Karl Reuss, University of Maryland, D-root operator.

KEN RENARD: Ken Renard, U.S. Army Research Lab. Also an RSO.

BRETT CARR: Brett Carr, Nominet, Caucus member.

DUANE WESSELS: Hi. Duane Wessels. I work for Verisign, but I'm the work party leader here. So you'll hear more from me later.

STEVE SHENG: Steve Sheng, ICANN staff support of the RSSAC.

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: Andrew McConachie, ICANN staff, RSSAC support.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Lars-Johan Liman, Netnod, root server operator and RSSAC member.

JEFF OSBORN: Jeff Osborn, ISC, RSSAC member, and root server operator.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. And those on remote, we will take attendance via Zoom. Okay? So now I think I will hand it back to you, Duane, to run the meeting.

DUANE WESSELS: All right . Thanks, Steve. So first on our agenda is the status update of the implementation survey. At our previous meeting we asked the ICANN staff if they would be willing to take a stab at this. And, Steve, you've been doing this work, so why don't you tell us what you've got so far?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. Thank you, Duane. We have reached out to the root server operators via RSSAC just to provide links if they have responded

to RSSAC001. So we have begun that process. That process is ongoing. We've also done some research to find some of those public responses. And so far, we have response from four operators. The first one is WIDE, M-root. The second one is IMRS. The third one is Netnod. And the last one is University of Southern California.

So those are the ones that we found so far, and the process is ongoing to document the responses to RSSAC001. Once we have the answers, we'll probably go through those responses and provide an analysis to the working group. And the purpose of that analysis is to see whether RSSAC001 expectations are worded clearly and then if there are any concerns from root server operators implementing those. So I think that's the purpose of the analysis.

So we started it, but we will report back to the work party. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Great. Thank you, Steve. Any anybody have questions or feedback for Steve at this point? Okay.

STEVE SHENG: There's a hand raised somewhere.

DUANE WESSELS:	Oh, Erum wants to speak. Go ahead, Erum.

ERUM WELLING:	Hi, thank you. Can you hear me?

DUANE WESSELS:	Yes.

ERUM WELLING:	Okay, thank you. Erum Welling, one of the RSSAC Caucus members, a new member. Looking forward to getting rolling in a lot of these things. So this implementation survey. Steve, was everybody who's a member of this particular Working Party copied on that survey distribution? I need to go back and look if it was. Thank you.

STEVE SHENG:	Yeah, that was sent to the RSSAC. So I'm happy to forward that e-mail again so that it stays on top of people's mailbox. Thanks.

ERUM WELLING:	If that's not much trouble, that would be great. Thank you so much.

STEVE SHENG: Sure, no problem.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Thank you, Erum. Any other comments? Brett.

BRETT CARR: Steve, you just said that was sent to the RSSAC, but obviously the Caucus won't because it was only sent to the RSSAC. Right?

STEVE SHENG: We will compile the responses once we have it. Yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: All right, so let's move on, then, to the next item on the agenda which is discussion about expectations versus requirements. And thanks to folks that have had some of this discussion on the mailing list already, started by Paul—and Wes and Peter contributed to this—we may be well on the way to resolving this.

But the question before us is, you know, the current version of 001 uses sort of mixed language when it talks about expectations. Sometimes it uses words like "must" or "shall" or "should" or "will."
And I've actually gone through ...

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

Can you put up the working document? I went through the document starting yesterday some time, and hopefully ... It's in in blue highlight for you. I don't know if it shows up that way for you. Maybe go down to Section 3, Steve. I tried to highlight the places where I felt ...

So there's an example in the first one. This first expectation says, "Root server operators are to publish, etc." So I went through the document and highlighted the places where I felt we might need to make changes based on the decision we come to regarding the language of expectation versus requirements.

In the e-mail discussion, everyone who contributed was pretty squarely in favor of just using "expectation" as the language. No one was really advocating for anything stronger than that, but we should have a further discussion here in the room if anybody feels that "expectation" is not the right way to phrase this. And now would be a good time to say so. And I guess I'll open up the floor for that before we take any further actions.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can I just ask someone to paste the link to that document in the chat unless it's already done?

DUANE WESSELS: So if this is sort of settled and everyone agrees that "expectation" is the right way, then the next step would be to go through the document and look for places like the ones I've highlighted that need to be changed.

In the interest of simplicity, my initial proposal would just be to be very repetitive in all of these sections and say, "Root server operators are expected to …" Almost every recommendation would start like that.

Paul, you have your hand raised. Go ahead.

PAUL HOFFMAN: I just wanted to note that instead of just saying "expectation," I also gave a sentence that I think should be in the introduction about what we mean by expectation. And I'm about to paste that into the chat, except I also want to put in Wes's change.

So I think it's important for us to say what is an expectation? Again, we know, but we're certainly expecting people who are unfamiliar with the RSS to be reading this document. Because, especially, I would like to dial back the idea that an expectation that is not met is going to have some consequence. It won't at this point. It might in the future, but it won't right now.

So this is the wording that I had suggested for somewhere in the introduction, and Wes just said that. And so, yeah, that's ... I believe this should go into the introduction of the document.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Paul. So I did actually paste your text just above where we're currently looking at the document. There's your version and my slightly-modified version as well. So that's where this currently sits in the document. I think that was your suggestion, was to put this in Section 3. My version came out a little bit different than yours, but I think they sort of addressed the same thing.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Right. So do we want to try to edit that now or should we just do that in the document over time?

DUANE WESSELS: We could do a little editing right here today. It's fine with me. I think we have the time. And since this is something on our agenda, that's okay. If we get bogged down in the weeds, then obviously we need to take it offline.

PAUL HOFFMAN:

So one thing I would … In your wording you say "this section," but in fact since we talk about the expectations in other sections as well, that's why I used "in the document."

DUANE WESSELS:

Right. Yeah, the reason I changed that opening sentence was because you had quoted the word "expectation" and I found that the word "expectation" did not occur all that often throughout the document. But more likely to say "root server operators are expected to." Not that versus "this is an expectation of the roots of our operators," but we're sort of nitpicking a little bit. Right?

PAUL HOFFMAN:

No, no, no. I think that that's actually fair. The reason why I put "expectation" in quotes was, one, just because I'm used to doing terminology both here and in the IETF. But also because we number these things with an "E" which would be like E.3.1-A—which we see on the screen—where that "E" actually stands for "expectation."

DUANE WESSELS:

Right. Yeah, so let's get some input from other Caucus members, perhaps, and see which way the winds are blowing here.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Right. But to be clear, these two look similar. These two feel similar to me.

DUANE WESSELS: Go ahead, Ken.

KEN RENARD: Yeah. Like Paul said, they're pretty much effectively the same thing. I like that if an RSO is not going to meet it, just a brief explanation why. I think this is perfectly good.

BRETT CARR: I think a minute ago, we were talking about using the word "expectation" consistently across the whole document. Paul's sentence about "in this document" makes sense. And maybe the word "expectation" or its derivatives [as well].

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, sure. Any other feedback on this? Paul, is your hand up again? Sorry.

PAUL HOFFMAN: It is. Now that I'm reading your … Sorry, I had not read yours before. I had lost the link to this. Your second sentence says, "An RSO …" And by the way, we can use abbreviations. "An RSO

should make all reasonable efforts to satisfy these expectations." But the third sentence has the word "unwilling." So "unwilling" in the third sentence sort of fights with the second sentence.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes, it does. I agree. Okay, we'll strike it.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Right. I think it's fine to assume that an RSO being unable is something ... If they're actually unwilling, that's a much bigger issue, and that could actually be dealt with as we go through Section 3 and figure out which things are generally accepted expectations.

DUANE WESSELS: Right. I think that "unable" could be general enough to cover the unwilling case as well. "I am unable to because my legal counsel says I can't do it," or whatever.

Erum, go ahead.

ERUM WELLING: Thank you. I have a question. So it's probably been a year or so when the financial component of the RSS evolution document was being worked on. And I recall that there were some

conversation about something called SLE, service level expectations. Did that ever …

I'm not sure. I just want to make sure that we're going to use the word

expected" and it's not going to somehow also be used for service level expectations, that somehow things are going to get confusing. I just wanted to throw that out there just because I'd heard that term "service level expectation" used a while back when there was discussions about financing root operations. Anyone recall that, by chance? Or am I the only one who—

DUANE WESSELS: You're right. That is something that has been discussed in the GWG context, SLE/SLA. And, say, that in this document, in RSSAC001, "SLE" never appears and probably "level" never appears either. So that's good that … We shouldn't be getting these confused, but you are correct that it does talk about service expectations. Are you sort of advocating that maybe there needs to be a caveat paragraph that says, "Nothing in this document is to refer to service level expectations"?

ERUM WELLING: I'm thinking about whether … For example, in ITU they used the word shall." Right? They don't use the word "expected." So I'm just thinking that this is early on in the process. So if we want to

think about using a different term to avoid confusion with other things that are going on, this would be a good time. But that's just my thoughts. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thanks, Erum. Paul. You're muted, Paul.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Too many buttons. We certainly believe that RSSAC001v2 is going to be finished before the GWG is likely to be finished, and certainly before whatever the GWG does is implemented. These are expectations just in the fact that RSSAC001 was published many years ago. These are current expectations that are not necessarily related to the outcome of the GWG.

I think we might be better off keeping "expectation" like we have here, and as the GWG works through things or whatever group that they formed, the governance group, works through these things, then they can say things like, "When we say service level expectation"—if they even say that—"we mean the same thing that's in RSSAC001v2," or "we mean something different."

But I would say let's keep these expectations current and pretty much ignore the GWG for now.

DUANE WESSELS: Thanks, Paul. Karl.

KARL REUSS: Yeah. I was pretty much going to say the same thing. It might be worth adding a small section here that says, "This is the current expectations, and these may be superseded by work done by the GWG" just to prevent confusion there.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. I would say feel free to find a spot that you think is appropriate and insert some suggested text there. That would be good.

So since it seems like we have consensus on keeping these just as expectations, are the Caucus members okay if myself and the ICANN staff work together to start making some of those edits in the document and tidying that part up before the next meeting? Okay, that would be good.

Anyone else have comments or questions about this aspect of expectations versus requirements? I guess. Oh, maybe I know why Paul raised his hand, because … Do you want to talk about the recommendation section, Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN: No. You don't know why I raised my hand. No, I want to talk about Section 3.7 instead, which is the measurements which is also directly related to RSSAC02v5. So I propose since we talked the other day about … That that work party would try to align their language with this one, I propose that we put a more definitive statement in Section 3.7 saying "This is actually about RSSAC002" so that when we align the expectation language in the 2 that there's no question that somebody reading this is going to come away without knowing that really …

I mean, quite frankly, if we wanted to get rid of RSSAC002, we could stick it in, make a very long Section 3.7. I think that's a bad idea for history reasons, but I would like to have us put an expectation in here or put some wording in that subsumes the expectations that will be in RSSAC002v5. And then, yeah, we can talk about the recommendations later. But I think the recommendations are actually trivial, relative to aligning the expectations.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, let me see if I understood what you were just saying. First of all, you want the text in this document to be more explicit in referring to RSSAC002, whereas—

PAUL HOFFMAN: Specifically this is the text in Section 3.7, yeah.

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. Right now it's in a footnote, but it could be more prominently in the expectation itself.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Yep.

DUANE WESSELS: But then you said something which confused me about superseding the other document?

PAUL HOFFMAN: No. Subsuming the other document.

DUANE WESSELS: Subsuming?

PAUL HOFFMAN: Sorry if I was not clear. That is that once we have RSSAC001 as the set of expectations, RSSAC002's expectations sort of are subsumed under the RSSAC001 expectations. Once we finish these two documents, I would consider RSSAC002 to be a subdocument of this because it's just one of the many expectations.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

And I don't know whether other folks agree with that. But instead of having them continue their parallel lives, I would very much like to make it clear that the expectations and RSSAC002, starting once they're both published, exist because of RSSAC001.

DUANE WESSELS: Stevie, go ahead.

STEVE SHENG: Paul, in reading through the Section 3.7, I think the expectation 3.7-A and 3.7-B, those are related but slightly different monitoring and measurement. Section 3.7-A talks about measurement that a root server itself to do to monitor its operation. And many of those may not be made available to the public. Section 3.7-B talks about publishing statistics, and that was related to RSSAC002.

The challenge of subsuming it together is that the RSSAC002 has its own review cycle. So it may be best to keep that review cycle going on in whichever the latest version. Maybe some language here to say [inaudible] will adopt the latest version of RSSAC002 rather than updating … Whenever RSSAC002 needs to be updated, then RSSAC001 needs to be updated. So I think—

PAUL HOFFMAN: Fully agree.

STEVE SHENG: —logically that's simpler to separate rather than putting them together. Thanks.

PAUL HOFFMAN: I fully agree.

DUANE WESSELS: Fred, your hand is up. Go ahead.

FRED BAKER: Sorry. How does that relate to RSSAC047?

DUANE WESSELS: So, RSSAC047 is the metrics that are performed by a body that is not A-root server operator outside of the Root Server System. So to me, that is separate. It doesn't fall under an expectation of something that a root server operator should do other than to meet the thresholds.

Paul.

PAUL HOFFMAN: I was with you until that very last phrase. I'm fine if we want to put an expectation that they'll meet the thresholds. I think that we

can rathole on that for a very long time, particularly since half the thresholds are for the RSS not for each individual RSO.

I would propose that we keep them separate for the very reason you said, Duane, which is that those are outside measurements and the purpose of those measurements is for the future body, not for current ones. And so I would say let's keep RSSAC047 as something that will be used by whatever comes out of the GWG.

It could be used by individual RSOs looking at stuff. But there's not an expectation. I would hope there's not an expectation. If there is, I think we're going to really have to then reword a bunch of stuff in RSSAC047 to bring them in alignment. Whereas, I don't think we're going to have to do anything beyond what we're already talking about for RSSAC002v5 to bring in an alignment with the expectations here.

DUANE WESSELS: All right, thanks. Ken.

KEN RENARD: Yeah. Really along those same lines, just kind of clarifying if meeting the thresholds. If RSSAC047 is not going to be an expectation of this document, it may be an expectation of the GS the governance structure. So, yeah, I say keep those thresholds—

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

KEN RENARD: —out of this. But it effectively still is, but from another authority.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay.

KEN RENARD: Don't cross those [streams].

DUANE WESSELS: Right. Okay. Are we done with this Section 3.7, then Paul? Did you … Anything? Okay, so we're done there.

So another thing that came up in the e-mail discussion was the language in the actual recommendation sections of this document, which … Is that 7 or so? Section 5.

Okay, so there are two recommendations in in RSSAC001, and these are recommendations essentially to root server operators versus some other RSSAC documents which might make recommendations to the Board.

Paul, I think you were advocating for removing these, whereas some of the other comments in the e-mail discussion were for keeping them. For myself, personally, I think they should remain.

But Paul, I know you have a thought. And hopefully other people have thoughts as well. Go ahead, Paul.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Duane, you were generous when you said "some other RSSAC documents [to the] recommendations to the Board." In my scan, they all are recommendations to report except for this one, which is where the confusion is. I'm fine with keeping "the recommendations." I propose we don't format them like we format them in every other document when they are recommendations to the Board.

And I say that partially as ICANN staff who has to deal … I will have to explain to the people who take the recommendations from our RSSAC and SSAC documents and the SO documents as Board advice. I'm going to have to say, "No, no, no. In this one, it's not really Board advice" to make my life easier. And maybe that's not a big consideration. I do get paid to do this.

But we could just actually change these. And quite frankly, if we want to keep these recommendations, I would put them up front not at the end. That is so somebody who's reading this document, they say, "Oh, this has some expectations in it." They will see that "and you're recommended to do this right up front." That's not a summary. That's an introductory. Others might disagree.

DUANE WESSELS: Go ahead, Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONOCHIE: Yeah. Just to kind of follow on what Paul said. There's a kind of automatic process when the RSSAC publishes a document. If there's a recommendation in it, it gets input into the action request register and then it goes through this whole process of being handled by someone like Paul's team.

So I think if you just put something in that section like "These are not recommendations to the ICANN Board" I think it's fine. As long as that automated process … Well, it's not really. It's a human, but as long as the human reading doesn't think that these are meant to go to the ICANN Board, I think it's fine.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. And Andrew or Steve, as people who do a lot of RSSAC document formatting, do you have any opinions on relocating the recommendations to earlier in the document? That would be a difference from every other document that I'm familiar with? Right?

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. In the usual RSSAC template, we put recommendations towards the end because that usually follows the exposition of the issue [inaudible] of the matter. And then the final section is

recommendation. I think RSSAC cannot only make recommendations to the ICANN Board, but it can make recommendations to the ICANN community.

That's part of the RSSAC Charter. And in this case, the RSSAC is making recommendation to the root server operators. So I don't see that as much as a conflict. I think in RSSAC002, the RSSAC also recommends the operators to collect these measures. So I think the recommendation is in line with that.

KARL REUSS: Yeah. I think it just reads better having the recommendations at the end after you've talked about what it is to do, than recommend that you're documented versus saying, "Document what we're about to talk about." But, yeah, these are the documents that you've been looking for. Actually, I think you've found four them so far. And the fact that it says "recommended here" is probably why we don't have our document out there somewhere. Which we should.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. So we're about halfway through the time slot here, I guess. Right? Should we move on to the next topics?

So we have two next steps listed on the agenda here. The first is asking for volunteers or assigned people to take a pass at the

whole document with an eye towards terminology and the lexicon and whatnot. And speaking for myself, when I went through it yesterday and today, I think it's pretty easy to find places that need to be fixed.

We're sort of a little bit loosey-goosey with root server versus root server operator, for example. The root server identifier concept came after version one of this, and so there may be cases where we want to use root server identifier and then, of course, all of the other root and DNS-related terminology issues.

Were you volunteering, Karl?

KARL REUSS: Yeah, I was going to take a shot at that.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay, great. So we've got Karl willing to do that.

BRETT CARR: I'm happy to have a look as well.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. Brett, thank you. Thank you very much. Along the same lines, I want to reiterate something Paul sort of said in passing, which is currently, I think, in v1 of the document. In all cases, it

spells out root server operator, and the abbreviation is never used. So we might make our lives a little bit easier by using the abbreviation a lot more generously. So feel free to make suggestions and comments in the Google Doc, and we can go through those in the future. And anyone else, please, take a stab at this particular item.

I should check hands. Any other thoughts or comments about terminology? As people go through the document, you'll see that there are already some comments and maybe suggested changes to the text that we're not really going to go through today. We'll save those for a future meeting addressing particular expectations or sections of the document. But as you go through it, and if you see something that stands out to you, again, just make a comment, make a suggestion. That would be great.

Another thing that we wanted to talk about today was RFC 7720. And I talked with ... I know Wes is on the call. I talked with Wes in the hallway about this earlier today, about how are we going to decide if we need an update to the RFC or who owns the document and gets to decide if and ...

I'm going to sort of channel West because he might only be listening rather than being able to speak. Wes's feeling was that this is really a Caucus document. So if the Caucus feels it's necessary to update this, then we should initiate that. Take it to

the IAB and it should go relatively smoothly with the IAB. But it's really up to the Caucus to decide if we want to update this.

And Liman, as the author of the current document, what are your thoughts?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I didn't know that you had spoken to Wes, but that's exactly my take as well. So I suggest that if we see a need to change it, initiate it here. Bring it to the IAB, but also after the IAB, ask for endorsement from DNSOP. Not as a DNSOP document, but at least run it by them so that they have a chance to have a look at it before it's published. Because I seem to remember that that's what we did last time, and we actually got some good feedback there when we presented.

So I think we will have a better general endorsement from the technical community if we take it to a slightly wider group than just the IAB. And then it's up to the IAB to say if they want to appoint someone else.

In the last one, we had me from the RSSAC side and we have Marc Blanchet from the IAB side to co-author this document and then be the persons to run it together. There was lots of input from RSSAC and the other side. So our names are just as editors rather than as authors. And if they want to do a similar setup, that would be a good idea.

If it's any help, I can take on to be the one pulling the train from the RSSAC side, from the corporate side this time as well, if you'd like to.

DUANE WESSELS: Paul, go ahead.

PAUL HOFFMAN: So I did a little bit of research on this last week, and we actually have an interesting political issue here which is that this is actually not RFC 7720. It's actually not an IAB document. It turns out it's an IETF document. One would think that's not a problem. Politics rears its ugly head everywhere. Before we start on this …

I'm assuming we're going to at least take a look at it and say either, "7720 is fine. We don't need to do it." Yes. And Wes has the correct sound effects there in the chat. But somebody—and I will say it is Wes—needs to talk to the IAB about this, about whether they even want this to be an IAB document.

It was processed in the IAB, but it actually came out as an IETF document. One of the reasons for that, just to get into the weeds a little bit, is that documents published in the IAB stream are always informational. This is considered a best current practice. The only stream in the IETF that can do best current practice

documents is the IETF itself, which would probably, as people have been saying, go through DNSOP.

It doesn't have to go through DNSOP, by the way. It can be discussed there. But as Liman just said, this could be an individual document. We just need to find an IESG member who's willing to sponsor it as an individual document, and then we won't get stuck at the end of the very long DNSOP queue.

So this is all politics that can easily be dealt with, but I noticed last week that it does need to be dealt with.

DUANE WESSELS:	Thank you for that dire warning, I guess. That's interesting. Steve, can you scroll us through the RFC 7720 so that we can remember what's really in it? And my recollection is that it's quite short. And we can save ourselves a lot of time, I guess, by deciding that it doesn't really need any updates. But I guess … Let's encourage all of the work party members to …

This is the meat of it. Right? The Section 2 is the protocol requirements. It's this list of—what is it—six or seven sentences. And if the Caucus members can take a look at this and give their opinion on whether or not there are any updates that should happen here, that would be great to have for the next meeting. And if there are no updates, then I think it becomes a lot simpler. Until then, I'm not sure there's much we can do about RFC 7720.

Paul, your hand is up again or it's [inaudible].

PAUL HOFFMAN: Because we were just talking about expectations, and as Steve scrolled through that, we saw the word "must" a lot. I think "musts" are completely appropriate for this document, but let's be aware of that.

DUANE WESSELS: Good point. Yes, thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I would also ask everyone reading the document not only to look at what's in the document as it sits, but also what's maybe lacking because technology has evolved. One thing that strikes me that we may want to discuss is whether we want more modern transport mechanisms in there. For instance, [QUIC]. Probably not as a "must" at this point, but bear those things in mind. Look into the future and see what we need to have in this document. Thanks.

DUANE WESSELS: Paul.

PAUL HOFFMAN: For those of you not seeing, I was shaking my head as violently as I could. I believe that any document that we do that's a BCP should only be talking about IETF standards. And alternative transports to authoritative servers are not IETF standards. And due to the fact that there's so little interest in the [inaudible] Working Group, they may never become standards.

I am one of the authors of the document that's trying to push it through and having great frustration and the lack of support for doing so. So I think it's actually a terrible idea to even hint in that direction since we easily could end up in a situation where there are no standards for recursive to authoritative.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. That's just the type of comment I wanted to tickle out to the Caucus, you included. So that's very good information. Thank you.

DUANE WESSELS: All right. I think that gets us to the end of the things that we had on the agenda for today. And if folks like, we can stop early. If there's something that somebody is really excited to talk about in the draft document that we haven't gotten to, we can do that as well. My inclination is to save some of those other details for the next meeting, though.

Steve, go ahead.

STEVE SHENG: Thanks, Duane. We have an AOB to discuss the regular meeting time and meeting time cadence.

DUANE WESSELS: Yes. I had thought about that, and then not thought about it for a while. So we haven't discussed this yet in this work party. Correct? We discussed it in the RSSAC002 Work Party where consensus was for meetings every other week. Which I think it works well for these kinds of work parties. So I would offer that as a suggestion for this one as well—meetings every two weeks.

I would expect we would do a Doodle poll, as usual, for a good time. I would just like to note that I had to do a Doodle poll today for the other one and it was really hard because I couldn't get my time zone to change to anything other than Malaysia. And it was very confusing for imagining when I would be back home and what time to meet. So maybe we can wait until people are back home to start the Doodle poll.

KARL REUSS: If you create a Doodle account and sign into that, you can change your time zone. It's a lot of extra … It's not clear what time zone it's using. It's very [inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS:	They're trying to upsell me on a Doodle account. I get it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	[inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS:	Paul, go ahead. Sorry.

PAUL HOFFMAN:	If we do end up going to an every-other-week cadence—and this is just personal—I would love it if, since I think there's going to be a high overlap in the group between this work party and the other work party even though they're different topics—it's one digit off—I would like people to consider having the two back to back.

So if the result of the Doodle poll is that many people might be able to do 8:00 or 9:00, that we do one of the work parties at 8:00 and one of the work parties at 9:00 just so ... And I'm not sure that will work out because of the large number of time zones. But if it does, I would love to see them go back to back.

DUANE WESSELS:	Okay. Interesting suggestion. Maybe we'll follow up with Ozan who ran the other poll and see if there was a two-hour block

where a lot of people were available for the other one and sort of use that as a starting point and see if it works.

There was a hand up but it went away, so maybe that was the same suggestion. Oh, Abdulkarim. Go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Hi. So my own suggestion was a little bit different, originally, that if we can alternate it since it's going to be two weeks—one this week, the other one the following week. But I don't know what the other person is thinking about.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't have a super strong opinion about that. If other people do, speak up. I feel like the upcoming conference season may impact our ability to meet throughout October-November. But we'll just have to deal with that as it comes. All right. Thanks for the feedback, everyone. And we'll work with the staff to figure out how best to approach the meeting scheduling.

Ozan, go ahead.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you, Duane. So for clarity, I just wanted to check. First I thought if we have back-to-back work party calls aligned with the other work parties, I had the idea that there would be no need for

a separate, second Doodle poll and we would use the results from the other work party's Doodle poll. But going back to Abdulkarim's idea of alternating in the weeks between the two parties, I'm a bit confused whether we need a separate Doodle poll now for these work party calls.

DUANE WESSELS: I don't know, either. We need more people to express opinions, I guess.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That will depend on the amount of overlap, I would say. If we have an almost total overlap, we probably don't need a second Doodle poll. But if we only have 50% overlap between the two groups, we probably do need that.

DUANE WESSELS: You mean overlap in participants?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Exactly.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. So should we start there, Ozan? Should we look at the list of participants for both work parties and if there is significant

overlap, then we can propose back-to-back meetings? How does that sound?

OZAN SAHIN: Sure. I'll report back on that.

DUANE WESSELS: All right, thanks.

OZAN SAHIN: And the other point I wanted to clarify is whatever we come up with for the next work party meeting time, will this be a standing time for the upcoming work parties? Or are we going to need additional doodle polls moving forward before each party meeting?

DUANE WESSELS: I like the standing time. That's the way that I think we've been doing most of the work parties. And I think that works well. I also remember, at least, I think we had one work party years ago where we alternated the times meeting to meeting to accommodate people in different time zones. I'd be open to that, but I know it can be a challenge for people doing calendars. I think standing time would be my initial suggestion.

BRETT CARR: I would agree. Standing time is better. And I think if most participants are in North America and Europe, that's fairly easy to do. It just depends if we've got people in the APAC as well.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you for the feedback.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Thank you, Ozan.

STEVE SHENG: [I'll] summarize [inaudible].

DUANE WESSELS: You want to summarize now?

STEVE SHENG: Yes.

DUANE WESSELS: Okay. Steve is going to wrap us up and summarize the actions and whatnot. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE SHENG: Yeah. Thank you. Let me quick quickly summarize the decision and action items. So on RSSAC001 Implementation Survey, we

will continue to collect responses from our RSOs, summarize and analyze the responses and input to the work party.

Discussion on expectations versus requirements. I think that's a decision to add Paul or Duane's text in Section 3. We'll let the editing be done by chair and staff.

In regard to review terminology, Karl and Brett have volunteered to go through the document for terminology. And you can make updates to the document directly and come back by the next meeting.

On the RFC 7720, the Caucus members to review before the next meeting and raise any points if RFC 7720 needs to be updated.

I think there is another action where Wes was to follow up offline on the RFC path. Okay?

The regular meeting time and cadence is bi-weekly—or bi-monthly. And then I forgot. Did we decide to do the poll or not?

DUANE WESSELS: We're going to look at the overlap of the participants first before the need for a poll.

STEVE SHENG: Got it.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

DUANE WESSELS: All right. So I think we're at the end. Thanks, everyone, for participating. And thank you, staff, for being so helpful today. And we don't have a next meeting scheduled yet, but look for that in the e-mails, I guess. All right? See you.

OZAN SAHIN: Tech support colleagues, please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR