
ICANN86 Seville | PF – RSSAC Work Session (1 of 2)
Tuesday, June 09, 2026 – 14:45 to 16:00 CEST

DAN GLUCK

Hello, everyone, and welcome to the RSSAC001v3 Work Party meeting. 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 guidelines to participate in the session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. This is an RSSAC Caucus session, so that means that it is open for RSSAC Caucus members. If you want to raise your hand, you can speak, and if you want to just write in chat, you could write it in chat. But please note that this is for RSSAC Caucus members, and thus non-members will not be able to participate in the session. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak at a clear and moderate pace. I'll now hand the floor over to Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Good afternoon to us all, and welcome to this special meeting of the RSSAC001 version three Work Party meeting. I want to welcome us all, depending on where we are, because I know there are a number of people joining us online. And I believe we move to roll call.

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.

JEFF OSBORNE	Jeff Osborne, ISC.
ANDREW MCCONACHIE	Andrew McConachie, ICANN staff.
DAN GLUCK	Dan Gluck, ICANN staff.
ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE	Abdulkarim Oloyede, the RSSAC member and the chair for this Work Party.
DANIEL MIGAULT	Daniel Migault, IETF liaison to RSSAC.
PETER MARTIN	Peter Martin, DISA, G Root.
KEN RENARD	Ken Renard, ARL.
KEVIN HILDEBRAND	Kevin Hildebrand, University of Maryland, D Root.
ASHISH AGARWAL	Yeah, myself, Ashish Agarwal from Technical Community India.

WARREN KUMARI Warren Kumari, RSSAC Caucus.

WES HARDAKER Wes Hardaker, USC-ISI.

DAN GLUCK And I see joining us online, we have Hans Petter, we have Florian Obser, Nefertiti Marquez, Kazunari Fujiwara, Wouter Ogaai. We have Brad Verd online, Darren Cara, Eddie Winstead. Sorry, scrolling. Ray Bellis, Robert Story, Russ Mundy, Shinta Sato. Is there anyone I missed?

DANIEL MIGAULT Florian Obser.

DAN GLUCK I think I said Florian.

DANIEL MIGAULT Okay.

DAN GLUCK If I've missed your name, please go and add it to the chat. I also do want to note that in our helpful links on the agenda are the RSSAC Caucus member statements of interest. Just for everyone to know, those are public and are available on the RSSAC Caucus website.

Thank you, Carl. And with that, I can pass it back over to Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you very much. So we move straight to agenda item number two, which is to review the document. So if we can have the document displayed, please. So we have a number of comments on this document. I noticed that some comments were put in today. So I believe we're going to go through some of the revisions, and I think the major one we have is the one that is being displayed, which is this, that was deleted from one part and is going to be put here. So I would allow us to look at this and see if there is anything that we need to change. This was actually in the early part of the document originally, and we decided we're going to move this to this part, and I believe this was discussed in our last meeting. So I believe this should probably be pretty much it. So I would open the floor if we have any comment on this new addition, which was moved earlier to this section.

ROBERT CAROLINA

So Abdulkarim, I want to jump in.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Yeah.

ROBERT CAROLINA

So this is not text that was moved. This is the change log and a change in formatting. And if we can scroll up a little bit to see 7.1 and 7.2, the previous change logs were very succinct. They just said where things were changed. And one of the things that happened in this document is there were some things that changed from version one to version two, and we were talking about switching it back, and we ended up having to go back and look at context for why things were changed. And the version log does not give any context. So if people, whoever was participating in the previous versions of revising the document, were around to explain things, we were left on our own. So one of the things that we thought would be a good idea here is, when we're making changes, to not just document that this was the change, but maybe have a little bit of context for why we changed it. So that is what 7.3 is. This is all new text that Duane put together, talking about the changes. We can scroll back down to 7.3 again, giving some context to why we changed what we changed. So this is not something that previously existed. This is new text from Duane, just to explain what we've done so far. So just some context there.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Robert, for that clarification. Yes. Okay.

ROBERT CAROLINA

And then I'll just jump in and say, there was some support for this on the last call. I myself personally think it's a good idea to have this context. So other opinions are, of course, appreciated.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

So do we have any other comment on this new addition, which is stating the changes that were made from the original version to this version three, from version two to version three? In the absence of no comment, I will take it as—oh, sorry.

RAY BELLIS

No, I've got a hand up.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Oh, okay.

RAY BELLIS

Yeah. Thank you, Abdulkarim. Yeah, I've still got issues with E3.6-B, as Duane's pointed out actually in an earlier comment, and I had done in previous comments, which have been resolved. We say in bullet three of this section, sorry, no, bullet two, that we don't apply expectations, sorry, that's two and three, that we don't place expectations on RSOs collectively, but only on individual RSOs, and then that's immediately contradicted by bullet six.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Ray, I didn't really hear what you said, but I believe it's on 3.6-A.

document does not apply to RSOs collectively. 3.6-B says otherwise.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Okay. So just to be clear, I want to see if you're clarifying the change log or you're having an objection to the collective requirement, because that did come up quite a few times in calls.

RAY BELLIS

It came up on a call that I was on about a month ago. I was unfortunately unable to join subsequent calls until today. I am primarily objecting to the collective requirement. I could potentially live with it if it was rephrased to say something along the lines of, each RSO is expected to participate in the collective publication of the diversity report. I think weaken it slightly. At least that's something that I want, something that I can actually say in my RSSAC001 implementation report that says, "Yes, we did this." I can't say that when it's a collective expectation. I'm done. You can pick progress up.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Apologies. I think the sound quality in this room, I'm finding it extremely difficult to follow.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Is the sound quality bad for everyone or just some speakers in particular?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

The sound quality remotely is excellent.

DUANE WESSELS

In the room, it's just an echoey room, so it's just kind of hard to hear speakers in general, I think.

WES HARDAKER

The ICANN Board met here for three days, and it is a very echoey room where every surface is reflective. The best we could do is don't move much and talk very slowly.

DAN GLUCK

Yeah. We're going to enable some captions. Maybe that can help.

RAY BELLIS

I'll just try to speak more slowly.

DAN GLUCK

If you are in the room, headphones might also help, connecting to the Zoom audio directly without having to hear any of the echo.

DUANE WESSELS

So we've got hands up from various people, so maybe we should go to those. And if it's helpful, I understand what Ray is saying, so I can help restate his position.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Probably one more. Okay, sorry. We'll move to Russ, then we'll come back to the explanation if there is a need for Russ to have a better understanding.

RUSS MUNDY

Thank you, Abdulkarim. The sound on the remote is quite good, so I believe it's probably a room-focused hearing problem. But the reason I raised my hand was to support the idea of having explanations and context in the change log. I think this is very useful and will be very useful in the future when the document comes up for review again, so that the short version, like the earlier changes had, don't provide any ideas or information around why changes were made. So I think this is an excellent modification. And with respect to Ray's comment about rewording 6.3-B, I think that that would be a wise thing to do. And he did have one suggestion, and I think maybe Duane has another one that would be good. So I'm in support of that also. Thank you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Duane?

DUANE WESSELS

Thank you, Abdulkarim. So yeah, Ray and I are on the same page with sort of the issue that we're discussing, which is, in editing this document over the last few months, the Work Party agreed to make changes to focus the expectations on RSOs individually. So it used

to say things like, "RSOs are expected to do something," but now it says, "Each RSO is expected to do something." And we also talked a lot about Expectation 3.1-B, which used to say, "The RSOs are collectively expected." Now it says, "Each RSO is expected." But we still have Expectation 3.6-B, which uses the word collectively. And so in describing these changes in the change log, it occurred to me that this is a bit of a contradiction, because everywhere else except this one place, we eliminated a collective expectation. So Ray proposed some slight rewording of 3.6-B, which I thought was a good change. I don't know if it entirely eliminates this situation, but I think it's better, and it's probably something that we can all live with, and we can get past this. So I like Ray's suggestion. Ray, if you would be willing to type that in, I think that would be good so that we can focus on your specific wording, if you still remember what you said.

RAY BELLIS

If Robert doesn't mind me jumping in, I have actually already typed it in as a comment under 3.6-B, but noting that I've also wanted to propose that the frequency of that be every two years rather than annually, on the basis that RSOs don't actually frequently change their architectures. And I think at the moment, doing it annually is unduly burdensome an expectation to put on the RSOs, who are basically doing this as a voluntarily extra part of their work. But other than that, I think the first part of the text I've put is the gist of what I was trying to propose.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay. Thank you, Ray. So I think we have the text. I can't see the hands. I will move to Robert. Oh, okay. Hans. Okay.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Thanks, Abdulkarim. So can we scroll up a little bit and get in context 3.6-B? I'm trying to remember. So I agree with Duane, and with what Ray initially said about a change to this, which is slightly different than the text that he put here, in that if we're going with RSO requirements is what we're going to stick to, then changing the text to say each RSO is expected to participate in the collective publication, I think that's great. As to the second point of changing it to two years, I'll note that in version two, the text said from time to time as the timeline. And there was a lot of discussion, from the beginning of this Work Party, to change that to a specific timeframe, which was one year. And so this is backpedaling, and I think a one-year timeline is fine, and that it's perfectly reasonable to republish the previous year and say everything's still the same. I don't think that's a huge burden. Again, I think the purpose of this is for transparency, and there's a lot of support for the RSOs being more transparent. So I agree with the change to make this an RSO expectation and tweak that bit of the wording. But in my opinion, I think we should stick with the one year that we previously agreed upon in the Work Party meetings.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thanks, Robert. So I believe there are two issues now, but which probably will be best for us to, first of all, agree on the timeline, then we'll probably come back to the text. But I will give the floor to Hans.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah, thank you. So I also wanted to comment on the frequency here. I support keeping it as one year. While each one of us may change the architecture every five or 10 years, then that would mean between one and three changes every year in the document. So doing this biannually or every second year also means that we kind of lose the ability to update the document, and it takes more effort to do it, rather than having a scheduled activity in, let's say, February, March, to update it and republish it. So I think an annual pace is good since we're that many root server operators together.

RAY BELLIS

Yeah. I'm sorry, I accidentally just resolved my comment. I was trying to edit it. I can live with one year, so I'll retract that. If I could just find a way to unresolve the comment, put the rest of it back, and then I can edit it.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay. So thank you, Hans. Thank you, Ray. So I think Ray has agreed to change that back to one year, and based on Hans' comment, I know that RIPE NCC has just published a diversity report recently, which is a good one. So can we go back to that

comment and paste Ray's comment, changing that back to one year so that we can see those changes and agree on to that?

RAY BELLIS

Go back where?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

To paste Ray's comment into the actual text.

RAY BELLIS

Oh, there it is. That's fine.

RAY BELLIS

Again, in line with this document being about each RSO's responsibilities rather than collective responsibility, I would still like to keep the text that says, "Intended to be published annually," phrasing there. I think that puts the expectation there without it being an expectation on the RSOs.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Is there any objection to the annual publication of the report? I see no objection to changing it to yearly review. So, yeah. Robert?

ROBERT CAROLINA

Yeah. Just two things. One, in the chat, Peter Martin and Ken Renard had supported Ray's new wording. And so if part of their agreement was for the longer two-year timeframe, just want to say

they should speak up about that. And then the second thing, there was a slight difference in what Ray said and what's in the document, and here the expectation says, "Reviewed yearly or annually." And Ray used the word publication, which is a good point.

RAY BELLIS

So Robert, that was actually an error on my part, and I've revised my comment with what I actually want to put in as my proposed wording.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Okay.

RAY BELLIS

Please do see the latest version of that comment in the live doc.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

So I believe it's reviewed annually. Robert, are you okay with this? Because I didn't hear you clearly.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Yeah, I'm just not sure if we have an expectation on the publication. If we can publish it once and then review it for five years and not publish something new. I think we all understand what it means that we should do, but do we want to clarify the publication timeline as well?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay, I understand. I think what Robert is talking about is it should be reviewed within a timeframe of five years, but there should be a publication annually. So I will open the floor for us to have a discussion on that.

ROBERT CAROLINA

I don't have a strong feeling on it, but...

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

I will give the floor to Hans.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah. So now I'm seriously confused because the text on the screen says publication annually. Ray's comment in the document and in the chat says publication annually, which is what I support. So I don't understand where the review comes from. So I will support text that's in the document now as publication of a diversity report intended to be reviewed annually. If we review it, we need to publish that we have reviewed it, right? And if there are changes, those need to be made public. We can't just keep the same document forever.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Hans, I think I heard you saying you want us to keep the existing text?

HANS PETTER HOLEN I would expect the document to be published annually after a review, yes.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Okay. So we should change the existing text to publish annually, correct? Okay. I don't know if, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY Yeah, thank you. Yeah, full agree. I think that in the interest of transparency and clarity to the community, we should just have this read published annually. What may occur in reality is it just gets reviewed and there's no changes, and that's fine. But just published annually is a clear statement of time. If there's no work, no changes to be done, fine, the same information gets published. And I think in the interest of both transparency and clarity to the community, that's the proper wording for this requirement. Thank you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yeah, I think so. I think that will solve the issue of five years, that Robert was also talking about, about reviewing. So is there anybody that has a contrary opinion to changing that to published annually? So can we amend that to—

RAY BELLIS

Sorry, Abdulkarim. It's unclear whether people have seen my updated comment for the proposed text. Bearing in mind what Hans Petter said, my intention in my wording here was to not put the expectation necessarily of annually in this. But what I've said there, and I'll read it out in case people haven't seen it, "Each RSO is expected to participate in the collective publication of a diversity report, intended to be reviewed annually." Now, I think it's implicit in reviewed annually that if there are changes, those changes will be published. But what I'm also trying to do is to not make the wording so strong in this document that the annual publication is effectively part of RSSAC001, which only sets expectations on the operators. So the operators are expected to review it annually, and if there are changes, they should put those to whoever collectively is collating those changes and will then publish them. That's my intent with this phrasing. I saw Brad doing a thumbs up. I'm not sure if that was to what I was saying or to something earlier, or an old one.

BRAD VERD

Exactly what you were saying. Thank you.

RAY BELLIS

Thank you, Brad.

-
- ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Ray, can you please edit the text? Because it's a bit difficult to follow what you're saying in the room. I know you said you disagree with published, but I didn't really get your explanation.
- BRAD VERD Can somebody just grab the language that is in the chat that was put in there and put it in the document so people can see it?
- RAY BELLIS It's in the comments of the document. Hans, before we do that, did you have a contrary view?
- ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Hans?
- HANS PETTER HOLEN I was on mute, I'm sorry. While I agree with the logic in your language, if I look at this from the outside and looking at the root server operators, and then I see one year there isn't an updated version of this report, I have no way of knowing whether it's because there are no changes or whether the root server operators collectively forgot to do it. That's why I think from the external perspective, from everybody watching us, it's important that every year it comes out and is updated with the change log of no changes this year. So it's an additional overhead. It doesn't change the things. I can live with the wording that Ray proposed, but I think

from the external perspective, I think it's really important that we're on the pace here.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay. Thank you, Hans. Robert?

ROBERT CAROLINA

So I'm actually going to backpedal a little bit and support Ray's new wording. If we are saying this document is expectations for the RSOs, all an individual RSO can do is review the document and provide updates for themselves. And so the government, the working group or Root Ops or whoever, is the organization that receives all these things, reports from the individual RSOs and publishes it. That's where the expectation is to publish it annually. And so that's outside the scope of this document. And just each RSO participating in giving their information annually is, I think, the right text. So I'm backpedaling a little bit and fully supporting Ray's change. I will support that logic.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay. Thank you, Robert. Thank you, Hans. So Ray, is what we have on the screen, does it reflect exactly what your input is that has been agreed upon by Robert?

RAY BELLIS

Yes, it does.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Okay. So the green text.

RAY BELLIS Yes.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE So we're talking about the green text, right?

RAY BELLIS Yes. I would quite like to hear from Duane if that satisfies his concerns about the change log as well.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Duane?

DUANE WESSELS Yes, I think it does. We'll just have to find out how to describe this change a little bit differently, but yeah, I think it addresses it.

RAY BELLIS Yes. I meant in the context, not the actual exact words, but yes. Thank you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay. So we have the text in green that has been proposed by Ray, agreed to by a number of people. Do we have any objection to the text in green? Russ.

RUSS MUNDY

Thanks, Abdulkarim. I don't particularly have an objection, but I wanted to note for the group that in this document, we are not saying anything about who will actually publish the consolidated diversity report. And earlier discussions in the Work Party, there was a lot of talk about that, and I don't know if a statement belongs in this document about who will publish the consolidated report. But right now, I don't believe there's anything that says even who is responsible for seeing that it's going to be published, let alone who will publish it. Perhaps Robert knows better. Thanks.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Russ. I think Russ has raised a very important point. Robert?

ROBERT CAROLINA

So this is a can of worms that was opened and stirred up quite a bit in the security incident Work Party as well. And personally, I felt that talking about a governing entity, which, again, in my opinion, Root Ops is a governing entity. It's what we got now. And the GWG is slowly plodding along to get a legal entity in place. But we don't have one now, and there was a lot of opposition in the security incident reporting Work Party to do anything other than give

recommendations for what the eventual legal entity is going to do and be in charge of that. So I think we're in the same place, that there's nobody that we can name yet because nothing exists in the absence of putting wording about Root Ops in somewhere, which, again, as I said, didn't really have any support. So I think I'm going to say we should let sleeping dogs lie unless we get a lot of people saying, "No, we need to put some wording in somewhere." Maybe not this document. Maybe we need another working party to talk about this. So just for some context from previous discussions on this topic.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Yeah, I think I agree with Robert, to the extent that we cannot predict what's going to happen in the future. So talking about a governing body at this time would not be that productive for my thinking. So I would allow us to have some discussion on this. Is there any thinking going further with this text?

ROBERT CAROLINA

I'll just say that in the chat, there are several people saying, I think essentially agreeing with staying away from this can of worms.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Yeah. So if we're staying away from this can of worms, then we need to revise this text.

ROBERT CAROLINA No, I think the text is fine as it is because it doesn't say who publishes, just the RSOs are expected to participate.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE But it's talking about collective publication of a diversity report.

ROBERT CAROLINA I don't think it was the intention of Ray to remove that, just to clarify that the RSOs are just expected to participate in whoever is doing it. I don't want to speak for Ray. If he disagrees, please step up. I think this discussion was in response to Russ' comment that it wasn't saying who published the report, not to Ray's change here.

RAY BELLIS That was Russ' comment, but yes.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Okay, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to make it clear that I am not making any strong advocacy of saying who does it. I wanted to make sure that the Work Party took the time to realize and think about this document not making any statement at all about who publishes the report. Personally, I think the words that we have in 3.6-B are perfectly fine as they are, whether or not any words are inserted into the document about who publishes it. And I'm fine with leaving

it silent as it currently is. I just wanted to make sure that others were fine with that also. Thanks.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Russ. From an outsider point of view, me, I personally see this statement as being vague, but I am happy for us to go with this text if we all understand what we mean by this text. But from an outsider reading this text, I think it's quite vague. Yeah.

RUSS MUNDY

It wouldn't be the first time RSSAC published something vague, yeah, that's for sure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER

All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. So I think I want to agree with you that this is really vague. We need to be explicit. We need to know who is doing what. If the group of RSOs are the ones responsible for publishing, I think it should be explicit. Let it be clear so that it won't be like we are creating a lacuna, and at the end of the day, we still have to come back to it and start discussing, "Oh, whose responsibility is it to publish it?" I think it's better we resolve that now. Thank you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you. Robert.

ROBERT CAROLINA

So, for people that have been participating in this Work Party, they will know that it was suspended for a period of time, and kicked back up to RSSAC to examine the scope that we were given, and that scope was reviewed and reduced significantly. And one of the things that was clarified was that the intended audience for this document is the root server operators, not for everybody else, not for the general public. And so we eliminated a lot of changes that were in line with improving the document, with clarifying, with reorganizing, that were largely intended for external readers. And so what the RSSAC said about those changes is that if there was a lot of support in the caucus for wanting to improve the document, to reword it and reorganize, that we could send back a request or a suggestion that a new Work Party be formed to essentially do wordsmithing. And the extremely limited scope that they wanted this Work Party to focus on is the technical content of the expectations. So I also agree that there's a lot of things that could be done to make a lot of RSSAC documents more accessible for external parties. I pretty strongly feel that it's outside of the very limited scope that we were given from RSSAC, after we tried to make such changes, just for some recent history and context on that.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Robert. I'm not sure. I don't think this is outside of scope completely from the guidance we had, and I'm sure Duane is here to guide us. So like I said earlier on, I think if those that the

document is intended for have a clear understanding, I'm happy to go with the group. But I will give the floor to Hans.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yes. So thank you. So following the discussion so far, the focus now seems to be to make sure that this document clearly specifies service expectations for root server operators individually. That means that at some point, there needs to be a separate document describing what the collective is doing. And that's complicated to write now. That, I would argue, is outside the scope of this working party, and it's complicated to write that before we know what the governance model is. What one could envision, although, is that Root Ops would make a statement to say that it takes on very specific tasks, like publishing this document, which Root Ops is actually working on and has done once before. So I think the best we can hope for right now is that we need clarity on the future governance structure. That's with the ICANN Board. In the meantime, Root Ops will take on some limited parts of that, such as publishing this document. But I don't believe that belongs in this document. Thank you.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Hans, and I think that's a good suggestion. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS

So, my comment on the topic of whether this expectation is vague is that the Work Party can't have it both ways. This document either

applies to RSOs individually, which I think it does. We've removed anything that referred to the RSOs collectively. That was the direction this Work Party went, and to bring that back in at this point with something about who is going to publish this, I think is non-productive. I think we should declare success with what we have right here, and move on. I will say, as an RSO, for me, there's nothing vague here. I know exactly what's expected of me in terms of the service expectations and publishing diversity reports, and thank you, Robert, for pointing out that the target audience of this document was refocused to be the RSOs. So I think we're in a good position.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you. Wes.

WES HARDAKER

Thank you. With the re-scoping of this document down to just requirements to an individual RSO, I think the scope of the document remains quite clear. We are doing a disservice, I think, to the intent of the requirements that we want to say that the system will live up to, and by removing all entities on how the system should behave, we are doing a little bit of reputational damage, which I'm not in favor of. One possible way of getting out of this situation is to ask the IAB, who publishes RFC 7720, which documents the requirements of the system, and including has a section, which I just lost in front of me, deployment requirements, which is section three. We could ask them to add a note saying that

the diversity of the root server system implementation must be published annually by somebody. And it could be the IAB. We could be requesting IANA to do it. I don't know. But I'm trying to figure out, how do we do what is right? And by trying to duck it at all possible mechanisms, we are not doing what is right. So if it's outside of the scope of this document, it should be handled somewhere, and a note to the IAB may help.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Wes. Brad.

BRAD VERD

Yeah, thanks. I strongly disagree with anything going to the IAB. We have very clear directions in this Work Party, and as has been stated numerous times, if there are items that are out of scope that this group feels need to be addressed, they should be documented somewhere and sent back to RSSAC and let it be addressed. That's the direction given. Seems like we've identified something. We have very clear instructions on what to do. This is not complicated and/or vague. Thanks.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay. Thank you, Brad. I think, given the comments we have, my own suggestion going forward is that, do we have any objection to the text? This document, the guidance we have is for the RSOs. The RSOs are clear on what this document is saying. Do we have any objection going further with this text? Seeing no hand, going on,

twice. I think yes, we would agree to this text, so we're going to work on this during the management meeting and put this. So, we would move on. So given we've agreed on this, can we go back to the original? Yeah, 7.3. So do we now agree on the section E3.6-B? So the word "collectively" has been removed. Any comment on that? Seeing no objection, so can we now agree on the entire new text? Okay. So I think we've agreed on this new text, so we look at the other new additions that's been added to this document.

DUANE WESSELS So Work Party agreed.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yeah.

DUANE WESSELS So just to be clear, the Work Party agrees on the text in 7.3?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yes.

DUANE WESSELS Okay. To be merged later. Okay.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE So we will clean it up later. Then I could see that there were some other comments that were made in this document. Some were made today. If we can probably look through.

DAN GLUCK So start from the top?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yes.

DAN GLUCK Okay. There it is.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE So, I think this one is an old one. This has been worked upon, yeah. Yep. I think this has been resolved. So I think there was a comment... Sorry, Andrew.

DAN GLUCK No.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Oh, okay. Okay. So we have—

ANDREW MCCONACHIE I think that comment from Paul might be the only thing left, unless someone wants to correct me.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Okay. Can we go to that comment?

DAN GLUCK Yeah. It's Ray.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Oh, okay. Ray, you have the floor.

ROBERT CAROLINA Ray, you're muted if you're trying to speak.

RAY BELLIS Sorry. Thank you, Robert. I was looking at the comment about the expansion of the Root Zone Maintainer phrasing, or indeed the use of the abbreviation. Noting that in our implementation reports and in the summary section, the new section eight at the bottom of the document, that RZM only appears in its unabbreviated form in the title of E3.2-D. So I'd like to propose that actually that title of that one specifically says Root Zone Maintainer and not RZM. I will highlight the text I mean. No, I'm looking at here, in the title of the E3.2-D. Because these titles are often used standalone, I would like to propose that that actually says Root Zone Maintainer instead of RZM. Thank you, Hans. Okay. That was me.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay.

ROBERT CAROLINA

I think with that change, eliminating the full expansion in the explanatory text right underneath it. Yeah.

RAY BELLIS

Yeah.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Just looking at and using RZM, it goes hand in hand with Ray's change, which I also agree with.

RAY BELLIS

I'm ambivalent as to whether RZM should be put in as an abbreviation in that title or not.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

So we'll remove the bracket. No, in the next line.

RAY BELLIS

I think that's—

ROBERT CAROLINA

Yeah, I think because of the previous full naming in the earlier one, that we don't need to have it there, and that we're just expanding it to the full name here because the requirement itself is often

pulled out. And having the full text there, I think makes sense. But in the explanatory text, it's already been expanded and parenthesized once. I think we can just use the abbreviation. That's my two cents in supporting this discrepancy in normal abbreviation usage.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay. I see no problem with that. Is there any objection? Well, I think in the other RZM on the second line, we need to remove that bracket.

DAN GLUCK

Which one? Oh, RZM?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Yeah. Since we've removed the full text.

DAN GLUCK

Oh, they are removed. There's little dashes there. You're good.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Oh, okay. Yeah. So can we now go to the other comment now? Duane, do you want to explain this?

DAN GLUCK

Oh, yes, I can.

ROBERT CAROLINA

So I started to jump in, since Duane didn't jump in. But I do agree with Duane. We've already had additional text talking about collaborating, and I see that Ray also just commented, I think. I think we're fine with the text as is. So in line with the guidance that we got recently, earlier, to reduce the wordsmithing, unless there are other people that feel strongly that this additional clarification is needed, I think we should drop it.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Any objection to this? Seeing none—

RAY BELLIS

No. Sorry, not an objection. But following the logic of the discussion we just had about the Root Zone Maintainer phrasing, I actually think this should be in here now, thinking about it, because again, these headline expectation lines are often used standalone, without reference to the following text.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Please go back to that.

RAY BELLIS

No, that particular text isn't relevant to what I just said, other than it being an exemplar. I think it was Robert just spoke before me, who was saying that we don't need to say with the other RSOs, because that's what's described in the following text. But because

the implementation bold text is written standalone, both in the summary of the document at the bottom and in our own diversity implementation reports, sorry, our own implementation reports of RSSAC001, I actually think it's quite useful to say with the other RSOs here, because we're actually not expected to share these with other people outside of the RSOs. Oh, okay. Sorry, I may... Okay, sorry, I retract all that. I thought Paul's edit was actually to the title of this topic, not in the paragraph text.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Ray. Seeing no objection to this, I believe we have almost come to a conclusion on this Working Party, and I will probably give the floor to—

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So what's the decision on this, "with other RSOs"? Is the decision to reject this suggestion from Paul or accept it?

ROBERT CAROLINA

Robert. It's to reject it.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Thank you.

ROBERT CAROLINA

And then, I think before we're done, in the beginning of the text, there was a big change deleting text, and I think there was a

comment from Darren in there, and I wasn't sure that we addressed or discussed that.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Robert, can you guide us back to that?

ROBERT CAROLINA I think it was in the introduction or somewhere where we deleted a big chunk of text.

DARREN CARA All the way at the top, yeah.

ROBERT CAROLINA Yeah, right there.

DARREN CARA Yeah, mostly it's just paring it down and perhaps, like I suggest there, dropping a lot of the historical documentation down to the bottom, either into a new section. I know that we're handling some of this with the change log stuff. But an introduction should really be succinct and shouldn't have to reiterate, "Well, we discussed this in version one, this in version two, and this document became obsoleted," in my opinion. So this was just an attempt to clean it up, because the introduction should stay pretty static, in my opinion, about the document. If we come back to this again, we

shouldn't really be re-editing the introduction every time. That's just my thought on it.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE So I think this is on the deleted text.

ROBERT CAROLINA So I think there's two things here. One is, I think Darren, and correct me if I'm wrong, supports taking out this specific text.

DARREN CARA Yes.

ROBERT CAROLINA But he also proposed a new section listing foundational documents. And again, I'll say that that kind of thing is something that we did have in the document before the scope clarification came down from RSSAC. And so I think this falls into the things that we think should be done but are outside of the scope of this particular Work Party, and we can add it to the suggestions for a future Work Party to do general document improvement, because it's outside the scope of technical changes to the requirements or correcting errors.

DARREN CARA Sounds good to me, and yes, I agree with removing the deleted documentation. So I'm fine with that outcome.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Great, thanks. Okay, so Andrew, we can say that these changes were accepted, too. But just one last thing. I know that once we click to accept the changes or reject the changes, these comments disappear from the document, and I just want to make sure that this suggestion is added to our list of things that we can send back to RSSAC as ideas for future documents, or a potential future working group for general document improvement, along with the idea earlier of talking about publication. So those are two things I think we've talked about today that are outside the scope, but we want to keep in a list somewhere, I'm not sure where that list should be, to send to RSSAC for consideration for future work.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

That's why I'm not resolving any of the comments.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Okay.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

And I'm just putting the disposition as an addition to all the comments so that we have this history, and we can figure out what to do with that later.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Thank you, Andrew.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Thank you, Robert. My suggestion is probably maybe we open a separate Google Doc where everybody can put in whatever they want to put in. Then we have a final meeting just to look through that document. Andrew, do you think?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Yeah, I think we'll have a typical admin meeting with you, me, Robert, and the shepherds.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yeah.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE And basically act on all of the comments that have been put into the document and create a final document, and then make sure that final document is okay with the Work Party. I don't know if we need to have another Work Party meeting for that. That's for you to decide. We could also just send it to the mailing list. But I'll leave that up to the chairs to decide.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Robert, what do you think?

ROBERT CAROLINA I think we can talk about that in the next admin meeting. And so then what I would say to the caucus and RSOs is, essentially we're

saying we think we're pretty much done. So if everybody can review, reread the entire document instead of just proposed changes and make sure that we haven't missed anything. And at the next admin meeting, we can see if anybody has either commented to the list or made changes to the document. If so, we may decide we need another meeting, and if not, then we'll probably go ahead with putting to the list that final call for changes and then sending up to RSSAC.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Robert, I think we're talking about two different things here.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Okay.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

We're not talking about changes to this document. We're talking about the suggestions that we need to put together based on some of the things we believe that needs to be changed on this document that were not changed. I think that's my own understanding. I believe on this document, it's just for us to clean it up, and next steps will probably be explained in the next agenda item. Am I correct?

ROBERT CAROLINA

Okay.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Okay. Thank you. So we have Warren.

WARREN KUMARI Yeah. Just a quick note. I generally just snark and am cynical, but I did want to note, I think that, what's his name, has been doing an awesome job chairing this. Robert has been doing a really good job dealing with a lot of the complicated and drama-filled bits. So I just want to acknowledge that.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Thank you.

WARREN KUMARI And Abdul, obviously, too.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Oh, thank you so much.

WARREN KUMARI That was it.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE So I think we'll move to the next item on the agenda, which is next steps. So I think I'll give the floor to Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

I forgot this item was on the agenda. Right. So, as we wind this document up, and as Abdulkarim and Robert said, we'll be discussing the next admin meeting. That means the admin meeting for this Work Party. We'll be discussing next steps for this document. But assuming we don't receive any more comments, I'm guessing that a final draft of this document will be sent to the RSSAC Caucus, and then there will be a period of review, which typically lasts two weeks. And then after that, depending upon comments received, it could come back to the Work Party. If there aren't very many comments received, the chairs feel as though it can be just resolved quickly, it may just stay on the list. If there's a lot of comments received on the caucus mailing list, it might come back to the Work Party. And then there could be another review back to the caucus based on that. Once it finishes being reviewed in the caucus, then it will be forwarded to the RSSAC for a vote, and then after that, it will be published. And that's basically the process. I don't know if there's any process questions. It's the standard process we follow all the time, but that doesn't mean that it's well-known. So please, if there are any questions about how a draft document becomes an RSSAC publication, now would be the time to ask them, or if there's any questions about what happens after this document leaves the caucus and goes to the RSSAC, now would be the time to ask them.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you, Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE And there's a hand from Warren. Oh, okay.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Russ.

RUSS MUNDY Thanks, Abdul. I think that I have one request in conjunction with what Andrew just laid out, and I think it's an excellent description of the process. And since we have a little bit different situation with this document than we do with a number of other RSSAC Caucus Work Party documents. And that different situation is that the Work Party has at least some suggestions to send back to RSSAC of other things that might need to be changed by a different Work Party in the future. Would it be reasonable to ask to see the list of things aggregated together at more or less the same time the final version of the document gets sent to the caucus? In other words, so people could read, do a final review of the document, and at more or less the same time, see those items that are going to be sent back to RSSAC that says these should be considered by a future different Work Party. Would that be reasonable?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE From Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE It sounds like we have a fair bit of work in our next Work Party admin call, because we'll be finalizing this document and then also coming up with that list. But I don't see any reason why that wouldn't be possible. Sounds like a good idea to me.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yep, I totally agree with that. Then, Andrew, then I'm thinking, is it possible for us to have input from members of this Working Party on the suggestion so that it's not just going to be from the admin?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Do you mean suggestions from the Work Party on the document of possible future issues that we'll be bringing back to the caucus? Sure. Whatever the chairs want.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE That's fine. Do we have any other comments?

DANIEL MIGAULT So maybe just a clarification. Was Russ asking for a diff or no? So for this...

ANDREW MCCONACHIE My understanding was Russ was asking for a separate document, which will list the issues that will go back to the RSSAC along with this document, that are issues that this Work Party did not address, but that are potential future issues for future Work Parties.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Yeah, and which I think is exactly what Abdulkarim suggested earlier in having a new Google document for that. So I think we've already talked about that and agreed that that's what we'll do, and making sure that the caucus or the mailing list have additional input on that, I think is what we're expected to do and what we will do.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Okay. So moving to the next item on the agenda, which is AOB. Any other business? Yeah.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Just a heads up that the RSSAC Caucus does meet at the IETF next month. That's our next thing on the schedule for the RSSAC Caucus. There will be an update about this Work Party, but there will not be a Work Party meeting. And with that, if we can close it out.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Yep, I think so. If there's nothing on AOB, I want to probably thank everybody who has participated during the long lifespan of this Working Party, and to thank the RSSAC, and thank everybody, and I believe we'll have a clean document. We'll share it with everybody, and hopefully, there'll be guidance as to if we're going to meet again before we close out. So thank you, and enjoy the rest of the day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]