
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – Root Server System Advisory Committee Meeting
Tuesday, March 10, 2026 – 9:00 to 10:00 IST

DANIEL GLUCK

Hello and welcome to the RSSAC March monthly meeting. My name is Dan Gluck and I am a participation manager for the session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. The session is largely for RSSAC members and their invited guests, but is open to observers. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to RSSAC Chair, Jeff Osborne.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Daniel. And I believe that constitutes calling this to order. So, I'm thrilled that we have a quorum. Look, touch and go for a minute there. So, let's do the roll call. And I heard from Paul yesterday, but is he here? Paul, are you on the line? Paul or Brad? No. From DISA, John Augenstein and Peter Martin?

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.

PETER MARTIN

Peter's here.

JEFF OSBORN

Hi, Peter. John?

PETER MARTIN

Hey.

JEFF OSBORN

Was that, hey, yes, that was John, or was that Peter saying it?

PETER MARTIN

That was Peter saying, hey; I haven't seen John online.

JEFF OSBORN

Sorry about that. Okay.

PETER MARTIN

I'm not sure if he will be since it's like 11:30 here.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay. I'm pretty sure John is not on. Matt, are you here?

MATT LARSON

Matt's here.

JEFF OSBORN Matt's here. I'm here, Rob. Oh, Rob, are you on? Rob is not here.
From NASA, Jose? Jose is not here. Netnod, Liman? Frederick?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Liman is here. I have no idea if Frederick is online. He's not in
Mumbai, at least. Frederick, are you online?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Frederick?

JEFF OSBORN Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Thinking about it, there's an event going on in Stockholm, so he
would probably not be able to join.

JEFF OSBORN It's also the middle of the night. So, I'm not hopeful about that.
Hans Petter or Florian? I don't blame you guys at all. We're missing
them. Kevin is here.

KEVIN HILDEBRAND Kevin's here, and Carrie expresses her regrets.

JEFF OSBORN I hope she's sleeping well. It's what, 4 a.m.? Wes?

WES HARDAKER Wes is here. Suzanne's probably in SSAC.

JEFF OSBORN Got it. Okay. Suzanne's out. Ken?

KEN RENARD Ken is here.

JEFF OSBORN Ken is here. And Howard is wisely sleeping. Brad?

BRAD VERD Yes, sir.

JEFF OSBORN Thanks for being here. Is Afshan on?

AFSHAAN ABDUL Hi, Jeff. I'm here.

JEFF OSBORN Hey, Afshan. And from WIDE, we have Hiro?

HIRO HOTTA Yes, Hiro's here, and Jen apparently not.

JEFF OSBORN

Apparently not, okay. From the Board, Wes, Hero, Liman, Daniel. Daniel, another middle of the night guy. And Russ? There's an SSAC meeting, isn't there? Maybe he's at that. Oh, Russ is here. Okay. I can't hear you, Russ, if you're speaking.

RUSS MUNDY

Sorry, I had second mute on. Yes, Russ is here.

JEFF OSBORN

Good to have you. Thanks. James? He remarkably consistently here, James, is not, so I'm concerned about audio issues. Okay. And Duane?

DUANE WESSELS

Duane is here.

JEFF OSBORN

Hey, Duane. Invited guests, we have Abdulkarim here. Hello. And then Robert and Erum. Robert is on. I didn't see Erum. Erum? Okay. And that concludes the roll call. We have a quorum. That's good.

Next item, agenda review. This is all in front of you. And did you drop that widely? Okay. And you have a link to this in the chat if you want to roll it forward. I don't think we have anything you wouldn't all be aware of. And this isn't going to have to be a really

long meeting. So, our friends on the East Coast of the U.S. will be able to get to a reasonable hour. That looks like it. If there isn't anything else, then Daniel, I think you're the first item.

DANIEL GLUCK

Great. We have the draft minutes from the February 3rd RSSAC meeting. These were circulated around. We haven't had any comments or edits to this. So, if it's okay with the RSSAC, I'd like to see if we have a motion to adopt.

KEN RENARD

This is Ken. I move we adopt.

DANIEL GLUCK

Yes, seconded.

JEFF OSBORN

And Wes is trying to second the motion, but he's incapable of handling the audio equipment. So, is anybody opposed to accepting the minutes? Anyone abstain? We have a unanimous acceptance of the minutes from the last meeting. Thank you all very much. Next item is Ken, Caucus Membership.

KEN RENARD

All right. This is Ken. We have one candidate for consideration for the RSSAC caucus. This is Sean Donelan from Verisign. If I can pull up the SOI. The membership committee has reviewed this and they

recommend that he be accepted into the caucus. So, that's up for consideration and vote for RSSAC. There're any discussion or comments on this SOI? This is about Sean's participation in the caucus.

JEFF OSBORN

He's only been part of the IETF for 34 years. Do we think that's sufficient? This is a pretty impressive CV, I guess.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

I'm surprised he even wants to join the caucus. Dave?

DAVID CHRISTOPHER

Mic. As an observer.

JEFF OSBORN

Yes, please. Go ahead.

DAVID CHRISTOPHER

So, RSSAC caucus membership committee. And I think this was one of the first, you know, fastest, like Daniel, I think, sent it to the list and like within 30 seconds, he's like, why are you even asking us?

JEFF OSBORN

This is like putting Jesus up for sainthood. It's kind of not hard. All right. So, motion from the usual suspects? Oh, come on. Second.

All right. I'm going to ask if anybody is opposed or if anyone abstains. And if not, we have a unanimous acceptance. Let's hope he sticks around because that's that sounds like a guy who can contribute. Excellent. Welcome aboard, Sean. Back to Kevin. Back to Ken.

KEN RENARD

All right. So, RSSAC caucus member activity tracking. So, Ozan sent us a list of some activity tracking, looking at how many caucus members are active and let's see, sent out, reached out to 29 caucus members who are, quote, inactive. Four said they wanted to be switched to observer. Five said they wanted to be removed and nine said that they wanted to increase their activity.

So, that's the message there is that that's that activity tracking is in progress. And people that are inactive are being either switched to observer role or participating more or being taken off the caucus list.

JEFF OSBORN

I got asked the other day and I didn't know the answer. Do you know the actual number of active caucus members like today, rough, with plus or minus a couple?

KEN RENARD

Around 100.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay, that's what I used. I worried I was lying. Thank you.

KEN RENARD

It might be just a little bit below that because we've been actively culling the list. But all right. And then the next topic is the 2025 RSSAC caucus member recognition update. This one's usually an easy thing for the membership committee to do because it's obvious that certain people are very active and contributing a lot from the caucus.

Only caucus members are eligible. So, if you're an RSSAC member as well, you're not eligible for this. There're limitations such that if you've received the award in the past three or four years, you cannot get it again. With that, we didn't really find anybody outstanding. We've asked around looking for suggestions. So, I think this year we're going to not nominate anybody for the caucus member recognition. And just open that up to questions or discussion. Anybody has any thoughts?

JEFF OSBORN

No participation trophies. That seems legit.

KEN RENARD

All right. That's it for that part. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

All right. Thank you. Daniel, mailing list?

DANIEL GLUCK

Yeah. First, a little bit more context. There's going to be a lot more opportunities this year, I think, with 001B3 coming back into place and a couple other SOWs out there, CIP kicking off. I think there's going to be a lot more opportunities for caucus members to get involved in the first place. And that'll lead to additional availability for the membership recognition.

So, yeah, we definitely thank all RSSAC caucus members for all the work that they do. And we look forward to this year being even better than the last. So, on the Ask RSSAC mailing list, this is what is listed in RSSAC documents. It's listed on our website and publications. I think it's on the root server's website as well.

The way it works is there's a bunch of staff on it. There's all the RSSAC leadership. And there hasn't been a message sent to it in a long time. Actually, that's not true. There are hundreds of messages sent to it every week, and they're all spam. So, staff gets them, and they're just sitting in our inbox, and they've returned to be somewhat of a security risk.

So, we've pitched to the RSSAC Admin Committee to turn that into a static web page, having a static web page with a form on it and a captcha, just to see if we can beat the fraudsters. I don't really know. But yeah, this is just something that we've pitched and wanted to see if there are any feelings about it, one way or another.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Liman here. Go for it. Second it.

JEFF OSBORN

It was hard to figure out why not, but definitely worth bringing up. One moment.

WES HARDAKER

Let me do add a little bit of additional color, which is that that was created a long time ago because there was no mechanism to contact Root Server operators at all. And RSSAC agreed to be the front man for how to, when you have a question of how do I get an instance in my building or whatever that might be, that functionality is extremely important to continue carrying on. It does not need to be the form of an email. It needs to be a web page would be just fine with, you know, appropriate anti-spam stuff.

KEN RENARD

Yeah, just noting, I believe that's still the way to contact RootOps as well.

WES HARDAKER

It's the way to ask any question about the RSS, because it's the only contact point in existence. So, yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Liman here. It's the only way to contact RSSAC from the outside, possibly. But the RootOps have an info email address. And that is,

as I was looking into my email here, at the system admin meeting today, that will be deprecated because we have installed a web page to contact RootOps that way. So, there are mechanisms and they are now being aligned. So, this is, in my view, all good.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, no, thank you, Liman. I forgot that the info alias actually got created after RSSAC, after the Ask RSSAC thing a couple of years later. Absolutely.

JEFF OSBORN

Did I hear you wrong? Did you just say the RootOps meeting later today?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

No, the RootOps sysadmin meeting later today. There is a small group of system administrators that operate the collaborative tools.

JEFF OSBORN

I've been in calendar hell all week. So, thanks. Sorry about that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

How did you get out? I want to know.

JEFF OSBORN

Stop taking responsibility.

DANIEL GLUCK

Duane, I think I saw a hand. Is that still up or do you take that down?

DUANE WESSELS

No, Liman said what I would have said. So, thanks, Liman.

JEFF OSBORN

All right. If that's it on the administrivia, we get to work items. And let's see, this will be interesting. Three of the four folks are here for this discussion. Do we want to just hand it off and see who wants to start the discussion of the 001 version 3? Duane, you want to start?

DUANE WESSELS

Well, I can. Not really. But I want to thank Andrew for covering for us at the meeting that was, I don't know, some number of days ago that I was not able to make. And covering the changes to the statement of work. I think the Work Party leaders now have a plan to resume the meetings and get this thing going again. So, I think that's very good. I don't really have much more to add than that.

JEFF OSBORN

I'm going to walk through the three of you who wants to go. Abdulkarim, I'm looking at. So, you want to go next?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE	Morning, everybody. I think, yes, we are ready to restart the work again. And yes, just as Duane mentioned, we've agreed to do that. And that is going to go on very soon.
JEFF OSBORN	Robert?
ROBERT CAROLINA	It's been covered.
JEFF OSBORN	Daniel?
DANIEL GLUCK	Yeah, and I just wanted to say, Robert, we will be able to share the DIP doc. So, be on the lookout for that. Thank you for your summary email as well. Yeah, that was very well said.
JEFF OSBORN	Sorry, I was thrown because that was so shockingly short. Did we really cover what we need to for that item?
DANIEL GLUCK	I think so.
JEFF OSBORN	Wow, okay. Ken, metrics.

KEN RENARD

All right. This is Ken. So, it was last month or a month or two ago, we had a proposed statement for a work party on interpretation of RSS metrics, which we decided to not adopt. It wasn't enough consensus to go forward with that. But that kind of kicked off a string of events.

So, Paul Hoffman a couple days ago presented on the current status of the RSSAC047 implementation. And the challenges associated with that and just kind of getting everybody up to speed. If you want to take a look, I'm assuming that session is recorded and available. Yeah. So, whether that leads to a new version of RSSAC047 Work Party or not, it was just informational. And that's where we stand with metrics. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Any questions for Ken? Oh, I'm watching hands. I'm sorry, Brad.

BRAD VERD

Yeah, I guess I'm curious. Ken, I think, I don't know if you raised it or somebody raised the original issue that led to the series of events of Paul presenting the other day. So, that was really interesting to go back through that because it had been a while.

But Paul seemed to kind of say, this isn't useful to a lot of stuff. And I guess I'm curious if that changes the sentiment of the original question or something else. I'm kind of curious. I'm curious what

the action is based upon the first ask, which was we need to do maybe this statement of work and group on metrics on stuff.

And then it led to 47 going, you know, us going through 47. I'm just curious what that, how it relates or if there's anything there. So, maybe that's a direct question to you, Ken, I'm not sure, but I don't know who put that original one together.

KEN RENARD

I think, well, I put the original one together, the interpreting metrics, and that's really independent of 47 in my mind, because it's only how would External Parties, how should they look at a measurement of the root server system. But during that discussion of that statement of work, it was brought up that how does this relate to 47, et cetera. So, that's how we get back to that.

BRAD VERD

Sorry, maybe I didn't pose my question very well. So, let me try again. So, the original ask was, how do people interpret these metrics? And in listening to Paul, you know, Paul's like, oh, we should, you know, obviously the group thought we should look at latency when we did 47.

And when you talk to Paul, Paul was like, well, you can measure latency, but it really doesn't matter because you could be sitting right next to the server and your latency could be really big, or you could be sitting, you know, halfway around the globe and your

latency could be really small because it's all based upon the network routing.

So, I guess I'm just curious, is this, I don't know, I don't know what I'm curious. I guess was the original issue that was brought up addressed with Paul's stuff, or does it just raise more questions?

KEN RENARD

In that example specifically, you know, Paul's answer, and I think that's a lot of our answers is latency, well, it depends. You could be right next to it. And that was the original idea of the interpretation document was to put that stuff in writing. It depends.

BRAD VERD

But I think it was like, it depends on pretty much all of them, but correctness, right? I mean, if you go back through Paul's presentation. I mean, we don't need to have this discussion now. I was just, these were questions I had after that one that I was, you know, I wanted to have when, you know, we talked about this again.

KEN RENARD

Okay. Yeah, I think the status of that SOW that was not adopted last time is that we will see how things progress over the next 6 to 12 months and revisit it if it makes sense.

BRAD VERD

Okay. Thanks.

KEN RENARD

Duane. Duane, go ahead if you're...

JEFF OSBORN

Duane, can't hear you.

DUANE WESSELS

Oh, thanks for the reminder. I apologize for not being able to make the meeting where Paul gave his presentation and whatnot. But I want to reiterate something that I've kind of said before, which is, you know, I feel like RSSAC spent quite a bit of time, invested quite a bit of time in developing 047. It got to the point of an initial implementation or even a partial initial implementation and then went really no further.

And so, I feel like RSSAC probably shouldn't spend really very much more time talking about 047 style metrics unless ICANN Org or someone is willing to commit to really building out such a system. Thanks.

WES HARDAKER

So by the way, Paul's session is recorded. I actually chatted with him over Mattermost and DNS Org's Mattermost, that is, and told him that a lot of people were probably going to watch it later. I was not able to attend at the time that it was done, too, because I had a

conflict. But so, I would encourage everybody to go back and look at it. I know I will to see what he stated.

I think that there are some important lessons learned from it, even if, you know, whether or not we change our own publications and documentation. One of the things that I think of when I think of Ken's desire to go back and look at metrics again is 047 was how can you quantify how well the root server system is doing?

And I think what Ken's initial attempts for starting something new was documenting things that we've never really written down anywhere for how does it matter to you personally or your organization? Does latency actually matter? We don't actually have anything to point at saying you could have a two-second latency to the root and you're still going to be fine.

And so, 047, you know, tries to actually measure to make sure that the root overall is, you know, has a latency lower than that. But the reality is it doesn't matter as much. So the context of the readership, I think, is significantly different for 047 than it is for, you know, some future documentation that helps the general public understand things.

I do think it's interesting that, you know, I think Paul's lessons learned for what elements of 047 are really difficult or, you know, don't matter are important things for us to consider.

And we could maybe in the future consider an 047, but I think Brad or Duane, I forget who, said, well, if you can't implement it, then

why are we defining it? And that's a perfectly valid point. I think Paul's conclusion was because the Root Server System has so many instances around the planet, you could never build a measurement system that has enough vantage points to actually do the measurements we want to do. To some extent, that means we succeeded in our deployment of the root server system, right?

KEN RENARD

Yes, this is Ken. Real quick. An interesting thing that came up, I forget who mentioned it in the session with Paul Hoffman was, gee, could we put instrumentation inside the resolver? And people could optionally turn that on. But yeah, Wes, to your point, the idea that I had about what I was trying to do was explaining how to interpret the metrics, not just 047, really just any, I mean, a lot of people measure root server system latency and root server uptime.

How do you interpret those? How do you say, oh, my gosh, my latency is 30 milliseconds. That's way too long. No, it's not. It's and one of the things we've discussed, especially with Paul's presentation was the vantage point problem. How many do you need? How reliable are the vantage points? Just explaining those issues of just measuring really any system you need on the internet, you need a good vantage point.

So, I'm happy to revisit this in 6 to 12 months if anything changes. Thanks.

DANIEL GLUCK

Brad?

BRAD VERD

Yeah, I agree with, I mean, what the discussion is here. I guess it's, I just hope that the lessons learned from 047 inform our decision on what we do here. And because I think at one point Paul even said that even if somebody brought up Atlas and they talked through Atlas and they said, even with Atlas, that that's not a silver bullet. It doesn't fix the problem of not having enough points of presence because again the network routing is the network routing and you're not going to solve that. But anyways, thanks.

DANIEL GLUCK

Russ?

RUSS MUNDY

Yeah, thanks. I think I was the one that mentioned embedding it or trying to get it embedded in the resolvers around the world. But we had, the work session itself was actually a two-part work session. And Paul was not present for the discussion on the second part, the interpretation of metrics part.

And I would say as whenever it is appropriate to discuss this further, since he was involved very much in not only the implementation, but in producing the 047 and the update to 047, that we be sure to get his participation in whatever decision we make or discussions, we have in the future. Because he was, he's the one that's been in

the middle of getting the code out there and trying to have it do useful things for us. Thanks.

KEN RENARD

I think that's a great idea.

JEFF OSBORN

Ken, anything else? All right. I believe that gets us to Daniel, if I'm not missing something.

DANIEL GLUCK

Yeah. Continuous Improvement Program. So during RIPE, we split the session in half with Paul in 047. We talked about the Continuous Improvement Program afterwards with Christian Wheeler from the ICANN support staff. Yeah. I think we came roughly to an idea of continuing to update the SOW to reflect a plan to allow us to use resources that are already available to us.

Mainly that second link there, which is a draft that I believe Naveed and maybe Naveed and Erum completed when going through the original Continuous Improvement Program drafting process. And that'll be our strawman for our response to the Continuous Improvement Program.

There are three phases, of course, to the program, and this is going to be the first one. Potentially the most labor-intensive per Christian, and it is something that we already have good guidance for. So, definitely thanks to Naveed and Erum on that, and wanted

to see if there were any questions, anything that we didn't cover during that session that we'd like to discuss here.

KEN RENARD

This is Ken. So, Naveed and Erum came up with a great draft of our how the questions or metrics, measurements we ask ourselves and continuously evaluate. That's been at this point over a year since we've done that. So, I think it would be worth RSSAC members taking a look at that because we can update this. We own this process, and we can change it, evolve it as we see fit, and we measure ourselves. We give ourselves our own report card. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

I think we're actually ahead of the process compared to other organizations within ICANN, which is kind of nice. So, if you see Erum or Naveed, give them a pat on the back, because they did a lot of lifting on this. It's pretty good. Agenda...

DANIEL GLUCK

Back to me for Public Comment. So, Public Comment, three available right now. Well, there's more than three available right now, but three major ones available right now that may be of interest to the RSSAC. I guess going by when they are due, in 21 days, there's the Fundamental Bylaws Amendment on the IANA Naming Function Review and the CSC Charter, and I think we're lucky to have our liaisons to both the CSC and the IANA Naming

Function Review before Hiro stepped out. But there he is. So I wanted to see if there were any thoughts from our liaisons to the CSC and the IFR2 to, I guess, submit something for this Public Comment. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

So, Liman here. For the IANA Functions Review thing, can you remind me what was the timeline for that one? When do comments have to be submitted?

DANIEL GLUCK

21 days.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

21 days, okay. I'll undertake to come up with something during next week. I won't promise to do it this week, but next week to make an assessment whether we have to comment or not on that. And hopefully it will just be a statement of support.

There were very few things from the IANA Functions Review team that needed to make it further. So, there shouldn't be a lot in that thing to comment on, so to speak. But I undertake to make a proposal to the group around that by the end of next week.

DANIEL GLUCK

Hiro, any thoughts on the CSC perspective? All right. So, Liman, we'll wait to hear from you next week on that. Second on that list

would be the proposed Root KSK Algorithm Rollover. 28 days on this one. Back to Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

A question. This is the regular time-based KSK rollover, right? This is not the Algorithm Rollover that's planned for later?

DANIEL GLUCK

No, this is the Algorithm Rollover.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

It is, okay. Because then we probably want to comment on that one.

DANIEL GLUCK

Duane?

DUANE WESSELS

Yeah, well, I was just going to clarify what you already did. Yeah, this is the Algorithm Rollover. And I would like to see RSSAC make a comment on this. I think that would be very helpful. I'm not going to volunteer to lead it because I'm sort of conflicted here, but I would like to see RSSAC make a comment on this.

JEFF OSBORN

Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Yeah, Liman here. I totally agree with Duane. And I think as my brain processes this, that this should probably be a statement that is a little more extensive than just saying we support this because we probably want to create a feeling of comfort in whoever reads the comment from RSSAC should receive it with a comfortable feeling of this is going ahead with the full acceptance of the root server system and that we predict no important impact at all on this. So, that we make a statement that we have read this, we are part of this, this is all good.

DUANE WESSELS

Thanks, Liman. This is Duane again. I wanted to, I guess I just want to provide a little bit more technical detail on why I think this is very important for RSSAC to make a comment on. So, due to the nature of an Algorithm Rollover, things have to happen to the KSK and the ZSK at the same time. And there's basically, you have to use a double signing approach and so on. And this has pretty significant impacts for response sizes and truncation and fall back to TCP.

So, there's an element of the plan, which is to reduce the size of the zone signing key to 1536 bits. If that for whatever reason does not happen or is rejected, et cetera, then the root servers could be faced with a really significant amount of traffic coming over TCP, something like 90%. So, I do think it's very important for the Root

Servers Operators to, or RSSAC to make a comment on this.
Thanks.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, and adding further, I think I agree completely with both Liman and Duane. The important thing to state is that the Root Server Operators have reviewed it and will support it from the technical basis of which we have to. It's not just that we think it's a good plan. We have to say our servers will tolerate this plan. And I think Duane's point is we appreciate the reduction in key size because it would make it harder to support other plans. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Thanks, Liman here again. I totally agree with you and that prompted me, my brain. Maybe if we all haven't already, maybe the Root Server Operators as Root Server Operators should make a statement, joint statement along the same lines, so that we can publish that on the Root Server Operators page.

That's not for this group, but I'm putting the seed in my mind and in the mind of other Root Server Operators that we should probably take this with us and create such a statement, I think.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, I actually really like that. I think that's a really good idea, too. I hadn't looked at the timing, if Daniel knows the timing of when the comment's due.

DANIEL GLUCK

28 days.

WES HARDAKER

It would be really nice if we had actually put together a quick rapid time evolution test to verify that all of our appropriate hardware and software actually operated as according. But 28 days would be really hard to turn around that much of a technical evaluation. We have homework.

DANIEL GLUCK

We submitted a comment on the study itself, I believe. The RSSAC submitted a --

WES HARDAKER

Right. That may be true. But I mean, it would be nice if we actually, as Root Server Operators, either individually or collectively had tested. I have test machines that we -- before we make any rollouts of major changes to our systems, we use our test machines first to make sure we're not rolling something out that doesn't work. And so, I can probably hopefully commit on our end to do that, but I'm not sure that I can do that entire timing suite because we actually have to create root zone data with the new key sizes and stuff it takes a bit of effort.

-
- DANIEL GLUCK So, what are our Action Items, I guess, from the RSSAC? Are we --
- WES HARDAKER So, Liman's going to spearhead a work party and I will help. So, Work Party is the wrong name and this actually comes from RSSAC. It's a lightning party.
- LARS-JOHAN LIMAN So, in more clear terms you and I work together to create a statement from RSSAC. Is that what we undertake to do.
- WES HARDAKER Yes, and Duane, we'd appreciate your help. We understand your, and Brad's help, if he wants to remove some bias, but certainly your expertise would be critical.
- DUANE WESSELS Yes, of course.
- WES HARDAKER Thank you.
- JEFF OSBORN Excellent. Daniel, you're still on for a couple of bullets.

DANIEL GLUCK

Yeah, we have, I think, at least one more that I would say is of interest, and that is our standard bylaws amendment on the specific reviews. This is going to add a paragraph or so into the ICANN bylaw. That's going to say that we now, within the bylaws, have the okay to pause the reviews that are there and go into the Review of Reviews process. So, this is going to facilitate, I believe, that work, but I'll hand it off to Wes now for, I guess, some more info. Ken?

KEN RENARD

Yeah, I mean, I think this is a pretty straightforward, at least for the suspension of reviews. I think we've already kicked the review can down the road once. This would be a second time, but given what I perceive as the pace and very likely success of the Review of Reviews, gosh, that's hard for me to say given the high chance of success for that group, I think this is something that we could support.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, speaking from the political side, from the Board perspective the community is very happy. I think that this is generally going forward, and I'm sure Ken has heard that in the meetings. And who's the other representative that's going?

JEFF OSBORN

Me.

WES HARDAKER

Thank you, Jeff. So, thank you both for doing that. It's an incredibly important element of the governance system of ICANN and upholding the multi-stakeholder model, and I can put all the buzzwords in, but the critical point that I want to make is the feedback received very early is this cannot go on forever. And so, the bylaw amendment is the effort to try and say, to constrain it so that it doesn't become a permanent pause.

JEFF OSBORN

You know, the idea was to prevent a pile up, because when you keep having deadlines that pile up on deadlines, the pile up on deadlines, just stop adding them. So, the two pushbacks mostly we've gotten are, why don't you just keep piling it up? And the answer is, duh. And then the other was, are you sure you're not just kicking it down the road? And I think pretty convincing case can be made.

The Review of Review groups, it's a lot. It's a lot of work. It's a lot of time. The cadence is kind of insane. And Ken and I think have very respectfully let them know we don't have that big a dog in this fight because we don't think it is as important, but we recognize that a multi-stakeholder system, to be credible, requires doing this, and we are utterly willing to do our civic duty. I'm going to use that word a lot because Ken came up with it yesterday in the Board meeting and it really worked. So, it's our civic duty.

DANIEL GLUCK So, is the RSSAC in favor of submitting a comment in favor of this?

JEFF OSBORN Yes. And I suspect if we have to draft one, it's going to be us. Ken, you want to jump on this grenade with me or...?

KEN RENARD Sure.

JEFF OSBORN Okay.

DANIEL GLUCK All righty. Thank you. And that's all I have on Public Comment. We should expect a few more shortly. I don't know how many of them are going to be RSSAC related really, but I'll keep you updated if they do. Now we move over to reports.

JEFF OSBORN And on to reports, just checking. Hans Petter's not on the call, is he? Okay. Well, not much to report from my seat just because I've done the pile of the work we've done this week and the RSSAC with a reduced quorum I think has done everything expected of it this week. And showed well. I've got no comment. Anybody have any

comments for me or for the group or something you wish we were doing that we're not? Good. Wes?

WES HARDAKER

It's funny, the Board goes through these periods of quiet and then when the Board gets like really, really active, I have a hard time remembering everything we just did in the past four days. But the review of the reviews, of course, we already talked about, which continues to be important. But we've been on the ground since last Thursday or earlier in some of our cases.

Obviously, the Next Round is still a very important topic and does affect us. The Next Round opens for applications at the end of April. It goes for, I want to say, six months. So, I'm pulling that from memory. And then so in a year-ish or something, the route will grow in size and that obviously affects us. The exact timing of that, I'm not sure that we have yet.

The Board, of course, is looking forward to starting discussions around the GWG report, which is tangential to this group. And then the other big one for me is the RDRS mechanism for looking at WHOIS data, which doesn't affect the Root Service System directly, but affects all of the TLDs and the registries and the registrars, specifically the support the RIR model. That's a very hot topic in the next three Board work sessions. I have to give Public Comments responding to it because I somehow got roped into chairing the Board caucus on that.

But it's being heavily discussed and you'll see a resolution related to that on Thursday to not adopt something, which is always fun wording, confuses people, but we're not adopting some recommendations related to that.

Any questions? Those are sort of the high-level topics, obviously.

JEFF OSBORN

Dave?

WES HARDAKER

I should say, Dave, my colleague is here. If you have anything to add, please do so.

DAVID CHRISTOPHER

Yeah, the one thing that I can add about the New gTLD program is the application period is expected to run 15 weeks, so about four months. And they expect that the first approvals for updates to the route zone would happen in early 2028, so just over a year.

JEFF OSBORN

Do you say 2028?

WES HARDAKER

Yes.

DAVID CHRISTOPHER

Okay.

WES HARDAKER

Do we have a ways, fortunately? It doesn't affect us. As we keep telling the Board over in many Board RSSAC meetings, you're not going to throw stuff at us at a rate that we can't handle because the paperwork process is much slower than we are ever concerned about.

JEFF OSBORN

Good. I just want to throw in, especially because we see so much of it this week, that the two of you guys, I'm in awe of people who've managed to have family lives, work lives, and serve on the ICANN Board. So, way to go, guys. Better you than me. I'm really constantly impressed. Brad has his hand up. Brad?

BRAD VERD

I just have some commentary to add that really is a perfect segue from Wes's comment on the rate. So, as I understand it, going back to my pre-GWG days, I volunteered to be on the New gTLD program from RSSAC to just kind of watch it and kind of make sure I don't know, any red flags came up. As I understand it, based upon what they've talked about, adding New gTLDs to the root, when they do it, they are going to go right up against the percentage recommendation by RSSAC. And we put in a specific percentage, like don't do X amount of percentage per month change. And as I

understand it, they're going to go right up to it until they deploy all of them. So, just letting you guys know.

WES HARDAKER

That's all. Yeah. Thanks, Brad. I think, fortunately, the 5% per month rate that I think we capped them at is completely, I don't want to say irrelevant, but compared to the number of applications they expect.

BRAD VERD

I would agree, but the only caveat that I, reason I share it really, because I agree 5% is like 5% of zero is still zero, right? But as I understand it, they aren't doing 5% over the month. They are literally going to queue up 5% and submit all 5% at once.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah. No, thank you for that clarification. That is important. I greatly appreciate it.

BRAD VERD

Yeah. So, I just want people to be aware of that. That's all. I still don't think it's a showstopper. It's just, it was something that was interesting that got called out.

WES HARDAKER

It's worth pointing out that a lot of stuff is being released this week, information wise, both David, Lawrence, to my right, and I are

conflicted out of the Board because of conflict of interest so that we actually don't participate in the Next Round. So, we're learning things about the same time you are that everybody else is just because the Board has a very strict conflict of interest policy.

JEFF OSBORN

So if I'm doing math right, 5% a month is roughly 75-ish.

WES HARDAKER

Well, that's the interesting thing. Go do the graph sometime because we published 5% is okay. I think in five years, if they actually did 5% a month for five years, we'd begin to look a little more scared because that exponential curve is exponential, but yes.

JEFF OSBORN

Because my other question is, is PolyMarket or somebody else doing an over under on how many of these things show up? Because I would love to put some money on it.

DAVID CHRISTOPHER

Why not? All the other insider betting on PolyMarket would. What are you, a congressman? Yeah. The one thing I want to point out, but just about even that 75 figure is, they only have projections, best guesses about how subscribed the program might be.

JEFF OSBORN

I was just taking 5% of 1,450, which was the last number.

DAVID CHRISTOPHER

Oh, okay. That would be existing.

JEFF OSBORN

That's all.

DAVID CHRISTOPHER

Right. There's kind of guesses, again, not conflicted out of the actual discussion, but the information I get back, the public information is they're making their best guess at how subscribed the program is going to be and budgeted accordingly. There are some sectors of the industry which are pushing for more, in the way the landscape has changed in the past 15 years, to have more brand TLDs than currently exist. If brands are jumping on that bandwagon, you might see quite a bit more subscription.

WES HARDAKER

And they've been pushing for more internationalization and universal acceptance domains as well, as well as the crypto things that have taken off and have all said that they're going to be a registry too. So, there's a lot of unknowns, I think is what David and I agree upon.

JEFF OSBORN

Yeah. The IDN space is, they're doing their discussion right now on how the hell it works. I'm going to have to go watch the tape. I think that'll drive a lot of it. And that's really hard to predict. Somebody, what? Oh, sorry. Hiro, news from the CSC.

HIRO HOTTA

Okay, CSC. This is Hiro. CSC had a meeting yesterday. Three items to report to you. The first one is the result of February SLA measurement was satisfactory. BTI satisfied the server-server agreement by 63 out of 64 metrics. One missed case was that the time to ensure the result of database change exceeds by two minutes against the threshold, 10 minutes, because target TLD server was unreachable by some network issues then. So, I believe it's not an IANA problem.

So, the second one report is CSC started to work about the necessity of SLA definition changes, which will take several months to make proposals. And third topic, there was an annual election for chair and vice chair of CSC. Rick Wilhelm from PIR was re-elected as chair and I as vice chair. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

Congratulations. Liman? I'm sorry, questions?

HIRO HOTTA

I don't have questions.

JEFF OSBORN

I was trying to save you, but Liman made me. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Sorry, Liman here for regarding the RZERC. And the only thing I can report is crickets. There's been no activity whatsoever. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

Fair enough then. Anything from the NomCom?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Yes, I think we have been looking at the candidates. The application closed a while ago. And we are probably going to start the interviews in about a week time, in a week. And hopefully we should conclude our work before the AGM. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER

Thank you for taking on that role. I know how big it is.

JEFF OSBORN

Absolutely. Better you than me. Thank you. Russ, news from the SSAC.

RUSS MUNDY

Hey, thank you. Yeah, I really just let folks know that the open mic session with RSSAC and SSAC is tomorrow morning. And then tomorrow afternoon is the DNSSEC Security Workshop. There's, as with most ICANN meetings, there's a ton of things going on that

folks may be interested in going back and hearing or looking at the recordings in case you had an interest in the session and were conflicted out.

And one of them I'd like to just mention is the plenary on that SSAC helped organize the other day on, I forget the exact title of it, but it was an emphasizing survivability and what's ICANN's role and so forth. So there'll be, I think, some useful things for folks to go back and review after the meeting. But busy meeting and thanks all for joining, especially for the joint session tomorrow. I hope everyone can make it. That's about it. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Russ. And, oh, I've got a hand up.

WES HARDAKER

I'll help you out, Russ, because it was on my calendar. From stability to survivability, ICANN's role in the future of the internet resilience.

RUSS MUNDY

Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

And that was interesting. I got caught a part of that. Duane on the RZM?

DUANE WESSELS

Oh, thanks, Jeff. Nothing further to report from me.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay, I'm going to assume GWG, because of the big event coming up, nobody's got anything in advance of that. Brad, do you want to make?

BRAD VERD

Presentation today. We'll see how it goes.

JEFF OSBORN

Good luck. Good luck, all. Thank you for doing that, Brad. Thank you very much for doing that.

BRAD VERD

Looking forward to it.

JEFF OSBORN

Review of reviews, you heard from me and Ken. Anything else, Ken?

KEN RENARD

Yeah, really quick. There is a session tomorrow, plenary session, this time slot. I'm sorry, Thursday, Thursday morning. There's a really nice chart out there. I couldn't find the link to it right now. I probably won't. But look for that session Thursday. And there's a lot of work going on. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Excellent. And I love that we have five minutes left. I believe that is it for report. Nope, Daniel, you want us to run over? Okay. AOB, is there anything else? Daniel?

DANIEL GLUCK

Yeah, so I just wanted to run through the rest of the week here. Sessions of importance, there's a how it works and RSOs later. That is in the afternoon. And then the GWG after that. Tomorrow, we have the Open Mic with the SSAC, followed by the DNSSEC Security Workshop after that. And then Review of Reviews Thursday morning.

I do want to point out we do have NextGen presentations right after this and then the same block tomorrow. Those are definitely of interest to people here. And they would love it if our RSSAC members would show up. Just wanted to make everyone aware of the schedule.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, quick comment on the NextGen presentations. If you haven't been to them, they're quite interesting. They're young people full of enthusiasm. They really love their topics. Because they're newer in their careers, sometimes they make statements that are not entirely grounded in facts about the root server system. So, it is worth attending just so that you can be part of that dialogue.

JEFF OSBORN	I misunderstood. This isn't other functions talking to the new kids, this is the new kids talking to us? Oh, that's way more interesting. Okay.
WES HARDAKER	Yeah, they're really interesting presentations to watch. If you have the time and you're not conflicted as I often am, it's worth attending.
JEFF OSBORN	Thank you for noting that. That's a big deal, Wes. I appreciate it. Liman?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	Liman here, just a question to Dan. Any specific instructions for the dinner on Thursday?
DANIEL GLUCK	After we stop recording.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	Okay, thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Dinner is Wednesday, not Thursday. This whole week is wrong because it started and we work through the weekend and I will make no sense of it ever.

Any other business? I believe we meet next on the 7th of April at a reasonable 1500 UTC. Anybody got anything else before we give you back a minute and a half?

All right. Thanks, everybody. See you again soon.

DANIEL GLUCK

Session is now concluded. Please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]