
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – RSSAC Work Session (4 of 4)
Sunday, March 8, 2026 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

DAN GLUCK

Hello and welcome to the fourth RSSAC work session. This is the RSSAC Caucus 001 V3 work party. My name is Dan Gluck and I am a participation manager for this 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 guidance to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference.

This session is largely for the RSSAC Caucus and its members and invited guests, but we are open for observers, so thank you everyone for joining. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room or as otherwise directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I do also want to recognize that our newest RSSAC Caucus member, Nefertiti Marquez, is in the room, so we welcome them. Let's get started. We will get started with Andrew to give us an update.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Okay. Thanks, Dan. My name is Andrew McConachie from ICANN staff. I will briefly be going over the agenda and then I will be discussing the differences between the old SOW and the new SOW.

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.

That is agenda item 2A. After that, we will go to Wes for discussing some of the motivation for the changes. After that, I am going to turn it over to Abdulkarim and Robert Story. We have got Abdulkarim in the room and Robert is online. They will lead the work party discussion and discuss next steps, when we want to have the next meeting, and whatnot.

With that, that is the agenda overview. Now I am going to try to do something in Zoom that hopefully works. I tested it. I am sharing my desktop. I wanted to get both V1 and V2 up at the same time. I am just going to walk through the differences here. The top document is V1. The bottom document is V2. You can see that first paragraph, which is two sentences, did not change. The second paragraph did change quite significantly. It is just interesting to read them next to one another. The first version talks about specific technologies and whatnot. The second version gives a little bit of the history about how this second version of the SOW came into being. It talks about questions of scope, direction, progress, and whatnot. That third paragraph as well, which is a single sentence, changed.

Then into the scope. This is where most of the changes are, actually. You see the scope for the first one is pretty significant. The scope for V2 is much narrowed. Let's just put these on the screen at the same time. From the first one, we basically kept item four and item five, with the word requirements removed, and item six. From the first one, we added item four into the second one, which is about keeping editorial changes to a minimum. I will just leave

those on the screen for a little bit. Maybe people have not compared these to see the differences here, so I will just let everyone read that for a second.

Moving on. There are very few other changes to this document. Same text about RFC 7720. Then there was one small change under deliverable, which was basically just like an editorial change. It is this final sentence here where it says in version two, "Material submitted by the work party will be considered by the RSSAC for publication as an RSSAC document," as opposed to the first version, which is a little bit different about voting and whatnot. Expected date of delivery has not changed because there were not any dates in there anyway. The guidelines for construction of the document have not changed either. So that is it. That is a high-level overview of the differences between the two documents. Now we are going to go over to Wes to talk a little bit more about the motivation. Wes, do you want me to leave V2 up as you talk through it?

WES HARDAKER

For now, put back the two scopes. Let's start with the two different lists of scopes of work that you were on a minute ago. That is probably perfect. First off, thank you to the work party in general for performing a decent amount of work before. Dwayne and Daniel cannot be here today. They are actually the shepherds for the work, and I agreed to substitute on their behalf since they are not here. We talked about the work that the work party has done in a number

of meetings. We really felt that it is our fault for not having provided better guidance on what we need.

RSSAC 001, in our ongoing operational procedures, we have to review it on a regular basis. What we are really looking for is substantial changes that are needed. What are critical things, like new technologies that we are missing, or this just does not make sense anymore, more than just wordsmithing and making the document clean and perfect. The thing about needing to do this on a regular basis is that we cannot take an extensively long period of time to do it. We have to think of the set of changes we want to do on a technological basis.

That is where the emphasis came from reducing the scope down: to make it easier to get this done. This does not mean that if the work party flags other things that we might want to create a new work party in the future to do, we can consider that. But for now, we want to restrict the scope to just these four items to make sure that we can finish in a timely manner. Our goal is to start. One of the questions was whether we should start with a clean copy or from where we left off. Our thinking is—and please the rest of RSSAC, correct me if I am wrong—that we would start with a clean copy of RSSAC 001 V3, but you can incorporate changes that you think are important to come back if they meet the criteria of the scope of being substantial changes.

Start with a clean copy of RSSAC 001 V3 and then find any substantial changes that are needed. We identified four changes

that we actually thought were highly important. These are examples of the types of things that we are looking for. Andrew, let's pull up RSSAC 001 V3. I should have asked you about this earlier.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

The diff doc?

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, either way. I am looking for E31-B. The work party identified that removing E31-B was a good change that the RSSAC thought was actually flagged as a substantial change that would be highly helpful to potentially remove in the future. That is a good example of the type of change that we are looking to make. E32-B is another substantial change because the work party identified that we do not talk about rootservers.net, and clearly the root servers need to be serving that too. Good find. That is the type of thing that we are really looking for.

E32-D, there is just an acronym expansion. The work party noticed that we had not expanded RZM.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yeah, RZM.

WES HARDAKER

So RZM. Excellent. That is actually a critical readability kind of change. The last one is E36-A, which is also a substantial change.

My apologies, I do not remember which that one was. Oh, right. RSOs were expected to publish and review yearly. That was a substantial change in letting us know the frequency of which we should try and make sure that on the RSSAC side or on the root operations side, we are responsive on a regular, timely basis rather than that being indeterminate. Those are four examples of changes that when we went through and looked at the diff document, we were like, "These are what we are looking for."

Hopefully with that guidance, that gives Abdulkarim and Robert some direction going forward for the types of changes that we need to flag and continue forward for. If there are more, great, but we do have to get to the point of publishing this document and it cannot drag on for a substantial length of time with a lot of rewording and other things. It is not that that is not important, but from a process point of view, we really need to get this done more quickly. Does that make sense? Is there any RSSAC members that want to add anything to what I have said? All right. So with that, I think we will turn it over to Abdulkarim and Robert to go forward and decide what they want to do with the rest of the day, as well as being ready to start work party meetings again on a regular basis.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you very much. I do not know if anybody outside of the RSSAC Caucus has any question. Okay, so no hands up. We are going to probably just continue to the next item on the agenda, which is the next step. I do not know if Robert is online?

MTS AV

Yeah, he is here.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Oh, okay. I do not know if you want to add anything.

ROBERT STORY

Nope, I am good.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay. In terms of next step, my suggestion is we need to reconvene the work party. We need to have a schedule for the work party to reconvene. We need suggestions as to probably going back to our old timing. I think now that we have a reduced scope, I believe we shall be able to finish this in time, hopefully. Any suggestion as to when we need to reconvene back?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

I do not remember the regular time slot we had for this work party, but I think the idea would be to just use that time slot again. It was every two weeks on Tuesday? I do not remember the exact time, but we can look up that. Dan and I will figure out what the next best time would be and then reach out to you and Robert and confirm that that time still works for you. We will just kind of assume that it continues to work for the work party unless someone voices a

different idea. I see we now have a hand from Kunle. Kunle, go ahead.

KUNLE OLORUNDARE

Thank you very much. I think I want to agree with you that we should consider the time slots we have been using before this time. Peradventure, maybe if we want to get more inputs, maybe we can just do like a Doodle on the At-Large platform to see if perhaps there may be a more popular opinion that may be different from the time slots we have been using before. If not, I think the time we have been using before is okay, but just in case some other people may have different opinions. Thank you very much.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So what we can do, Dan just informed me it was Tuesday at 16:00 UTC. We can send a message to the RSSAC Caucus mailing list saying, "This is the previous time we had. If anyone has an issue with this time going forward, please raise that now." If no one has an issue with that time, then we will just schedule the next meeting for the first reasonable Tuesday at 16:00 UTC. We can get that message out pretty soon to the RSSAC Caucus mailing list. Does that sound like a plan?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Yes.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Okay.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

I think that is done with that item. I believe the next item is any other business. In the absence of other business, I think we are going to have some time to ourselves. I am going to say thank you everybody for joining and enjoy the rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]