

---

ICANN86 Seville | PF – Root Server System Advisory Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, June 09, 2026 – 16:30 to 18:00 CEST

DAN GLUCK

Hello, and welcome to the RSSAC monthly 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, Expected Standards of Behavior, and the Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in chat for your reference. This 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 the Zoom room 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 Osborn.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Daniel. I am calling the meeting to order, and I'm going to repeat something that Wes said that was really helpful in the last session. The acoustics in this room are really unforgiving. So to make up for that, I think we all need to be a little forgiving. So feel free to say, "I didn't hear that," and feel free to speak clearly and slowly, because it's always an issue with all of our languages and being nervous about talking. But I think in here, the speech really

---

***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.***

---

gets garbled easily. So I'm just kind of upfront saying, let's try to be kind.

I believe this takes us to the roll call. And there we go. Let's see. I didn't see Paul or Brad, but I hadn't looked at the incoming remotes. Paul or Brad from Cogent? DISA, do we have John and/or Peter? John online.

PETER MARTIN

Peter's here.

JEFF OSBORN

Peter's here. And was that John online? Yeah, John online. Excellent. Thanks. Hi, John. ICANN, Matt?

MATT LARSON

Matt's here. I don't believe John is.

JEFF OSBORN

John is not. Okay. From ISC, I am here. Hello. And Rob, did you make it online?

ROBERT CAROLINA

I'm here. Thanks.

---

JEFF OSBORN                      You're here. Glad you made it. NASA, Jose and Brad? Jose and Brad? All right. I believe Netnod is at full strength, as they say in hockey. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN              Liman in the room, yes. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN                      And Fredrik.

FREDRIK LINDEBERG              Fredrik in the room as well.

JEFF OSBORN                      Hi there. Let's see. Florian and Hans Petter, remote?

HANS PETTER HOLEN              Yes, present.

JEFF OSBORN                      Oh, he is. God, that's very heroic showing up with your illness. I'm impressed. And is Florian here as well?

FLORIAN OBSER                    I'm online. Florian's online.

---

JEFF OSBORN

Terrific. Thank you. Kevin?

KEVIN HILDEBRAND

Kevin's here.

JEFF OSBORN

And Tim. Tim? Not here. USC, Wes, hello?

WES HARDAKER

Yep, Wes is here. Suzanne's in the building, but I don't see her in the room.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay, so Suzanne might be a late add. ARL, Ken is here.

KENNETH RENARD

Ken's here.

JEFF OSBORN

And Howard?

HOWARD KASH

Howard's online.

JEFF OSBORN

Howard's here. I've got a good count. Verisign, I do not see Afshaan or Brad.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

She'll be back.

BRAD VERD

Brad's here. Afshaan will be right back.

JEFF OSBORN

Hi, Brad. Okay, and Afshaan will be right back. And for WIDE, we have Hiro?

HIRO HOTTA

Yeah, Hiro's here. Jun's not.

JEFF OSBORN

And we're sadly missing Jun Murai. All right, two liaisons. Who was missing? Daniel.

DANIEL MIGAULT

I'm here.

JEFF OSBORN

Daniel is here. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY

Russ is here.

---

JEFF OSBORN

Hey, Russ. James?

JAMES

Hi, James is here.

JEFF OSBORN

Hi, James. And Duane is also still here.

DUANE WESSELS

Duane is here.

JEFF OSBORN

Excellent. Invited guests. Abdulkarim? There he is. Hello. Thanks. Glad you could make it. Daniel. Those are not... Ram. Is Ram here? She may show up. I don't think she's here in person, but maybe we'll get her online. All right. Do I want to make the statement about the SOI, or do you want to?

DAN GLUCK

Go ahead.

JEFF OSBORN

You... No, you do.

DAN GLUCK

Sure. So as you see here on the agenda document, and as I will post in chat in a second, the RSSAC member statements of interest are

---

the same as the RSSAC Caucus member statements of interest. To be on the RSSAC, you do need to be appointed by your root server operator. So it should be fairly clear who people are and who they represent when they're at RSSAC meetings. With that, we can go back to the agenda.

JEFF OSBORN

I do want to add one thing about that, though. It's important, if you have had a change in association, whether your employer has changed or you've taken on an additional role of any sort, to please change your SOI and keep it updated. We're trying to figure out a light-touch way to enforce this, but the concern is if you have things to say and people go look up what your attribution is and you are no longer with an employer you said you were with, or another organization like that, it gets uncomfortable for everyone involved. So especially if you have a change in association with something, please update your SOI. Ken.

KENNETH RENARD

This is Ken. That goes especially for caucus members as well. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Yes. Oh, absolutely. I'm sorry. That is for the RSSAC and the RSSAC Caucus, absolutely. Where are we? Agenda review. We do not have a long agenda, but we don't have a blank one either. The big thing coming up we're going to be talking about is the poor bastard who



LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Liman, so moved. Wes, wake up.

JEFF OSBORN

Wes, wake up and second it.

WES HARDAKER

I was not at that meeting, so I shouldn't have seconded.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Hans Petter seconds.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay. Is somebody who was at that meeting willing to second? Hans Petter, thank you very much. So, we're so moved. Are there any votes in opposition to approving the minutes? Is anybody abstaining? Then by acclamation, I believe we have a full-on win.

DAN GLUCK

Cool.

JEFF OSBORN

Congratulations. Next is the caucus membership update from Ken.

---

KENNETH RENARD

Yeah, this is Ken. Nothing, no new applications this period. I think we have one that just came in, and we expect usually more after an engagement like this, so see you next month.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Ken. I believe the next item is the chair election, and that's yours, Dan.

DAN GLUCK

Sure. And I'll maybe point it in a little bit more flowery terms than you did, Jeff, but whoever gets to spend the next two years in admin calls with me and Andrew and Ozan, so it's actually pretty great if you ask me. But here's the election procedures and our timeline here. We're discussing this now, and then we'll go in two weeks to a 30-day nomination period. After that, we'll have the August RSSAC meeting where nominations will be accepted for the last day. After the 30 days, you are allowed to nominate someone at a meeting. And if there is only one person nominated, they will be voted by acclamation. And if not, we can go to an online election. You see that there. That'd be the week of the 10th to the 13th of August. Finally, we get to the chair transition at ICANN87. So yeah, you have one more meeting after this, Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN

Those of you who've suffered through me for the last four years recognize that my sense of humor can sometimes be unusual. So when I said some poor bastard's going to take this, this is a role that

required a lot more hours than I had expected. There are more ICANN meetings you get called to than I expected. There is more travel than I expected. Having said that, it really, really is rewarding. It really does feel like you get to make a little bit of an imprint on something that obviously all of us think is important. So I'd say if you had any interest in doing it, the two things I did that I'd really promote anybody else to do: check with your partner, and check with your management, because that really made it for me. My board of directors was like, "Don't do this half-assed. Give it everything it needs." And my wife said, "Whatever it takes, go do it." And that really helped a lot. So just recognize it's a big deal, but I'm really proud of having spent the time and done it, and I hope I've been effective. So anyway, don't not do it just because I like to whine. It's not fair.

DAN GLUCK

Any questions, any thoughts on the election timeline?

JEFF OSBORN

No bumper stickers or lawn signs going up?

DAN GLUCK

Oh, yeah.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay. We are on work items. That was quick. Duane or Daniel, who wants to talk about RSSAC001? Duane's lit up.

DUANE WESSELS

I can talk about it. This is Duane. So the RSSAC001v3 work party just met right before this session and spent a lot of time talking about sort of fixing up one last expectation which used the words "RSOs collectively," used that word in a way that the work party sort of would rather that it not be used. And so we did some editing of the document in real time and got that tweaked. And I believe there were other comments in the document that have also been addressed. And at this point, there are no outstanding items in the document. So I'd like to thank Abdulkarim and Robert for leading that work party and getting us to this point. Hopefully, we're almost to the end, and we can call it done. So I'm happy. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks for all the work on that, everybody involved. Triple zero, Andrew?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yeah, thanks, Jeff. So this is Andrew McConachie for the record. So RSSAC000 is the RSSAC operational procedures. Version 9 is what the RSSAC is using now. This is the work party that is creating the new version, version 10. The work party has met three times. It'll have its fourth meeting tomorrow in block three. I think at this point, the document has received multiple edits, but there's nothing really outstanding. So the goal for the work party meeting tomorrow is to review all of the changes that have been made to

---

the document and see if we're good to go, basically, see if we're done. We might still have some more tweaks to the language, but I think at this point, I expect and hope, and hopefully I'm not cursing the work party by saying that hopefully tomorrow we'll be finished. And we can make a final version and send it to the RSSAC for a vote after the work party meeting tomorrow.

JEFF OSBORN

Nice. Thank you, Andrew. Joint open mic. We are having an open mic session again with the SSAC on Thursday. And these are always a lot of fun. I really enjoy them. And Ram and I have enjoyed doing the last few of them. We wanted to make sure, though, that they tend to start slowly. And the way that we get the ball rolling seems to really reflect on the whole session. So how we do that is going to be an interesting question. You guys all have access to this, right? Everybody can own to it. And if we thought about... You want to slip the link in the chat, Andrew or Daniel? Okay.

All we really started with is these were a few questions that Andrew thought were interesting that he pulled from the FAQ. I added a couple at the bottom of it as well. And if anybody wants to throw in a good question, I think the way we intended to do it was rather than try to plant something in the audience, to simply say, "Here's a question I get a lot." If we say, "Are there any questions from the floor?" and we have deer in the headlights to start. So Ram and I both figured we can say, "Here's a question I get a lot," and answer it, and then that hopefully leads to other questions. But if

---

anybody's got a good one, let me know. Everybody in here, I'm sure, has been asked a question or two or three about the root server system over the last even day or two. And if you have a good one, why don't you throw it up there? Because I think the better questions sort of precipitate a better discussion. And if we use the old boring ones, you don't get as much participation. All make sense? Questions? Good questions to throw in there? All right. That, I believe...

RUSS MUNDY

Russ Mundy.

JEFF OSBORN

Whoop. I'm sorry, Russ, I missed you.

RUSS MUNDY

Oh, thank you. Not a problem. I just wanted to say thank you to you and Ram, the staff, who picked this up in my absence due to one of these wonderful weather emergency things. But I am in full support of the conclusion that you all reached, and that is to have questions like this that you would start the discussion with. I think that's a really excellent idea. And I wanted to just say thank you, guys, for picking this up. And I hope everybody joins us on Thursday.

JEFF OSBORN

Well, we're hoping for the best. Our thoughts are with you, Russ. Nature can be a horror show, and I saw from the pictures the

---

devastation. So obviously that's more important than making it easier for Ram and me to take care of the farm and the trouble there. So our thoughts are with you.

RUSS MUNDY

Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Yep. Next is the chair and the vice chair. I don't have anything I haven't said. Any questions from the floor? Otherwise, Hans Petter, do you have anything to report?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Nothing from me either.

JEFF OSBORN

All right, glad to hear you're improving. Thank you. Wes, news from the board.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah. First off, I'd like to take a moment. The board lost a member of our board last week. Alan Barrett was a wonderful person. You all would have loved him. He was extremely geeky. He was one of my favorite people to sit next to on the board or on a bus to any board-related event. He was an absolutely outstanding person, and we'll miss him greatly. There's a memorial being held for him tomorrow during lunch, I believe. Oops, thank you very much.

Yeah, in memoriam. So attend them if you want to learn more about him. He was a great person.

The board, of course, held our workshop for the last three days. There was nothing incredibly too root server system-centric. The next round continues, as you all know. That'll continue for a while. All the applications are now open. I know nothing more than that. I'm recused from most of it. AI's effect on the DNS is the hot topic of the world, of course. Again, that's probably not too RSS-specific. At least we don't expect AI agents to be submitting applications for the next round. But who knows? There's a lot of other stuff that's affected other parts of the tree, including ICANN as a whole, Review of Reviews, next round, SSAD supplemental recommendations. It's been a large part of my life. And unless you want me to pull up presentations about the difficulties of accrediting law enforcement for making requests to WHOIS, I think I'll just go on.

You all know that we are not going to Oman. We do hope to go so again in the future. That has been announced. We're going to Bali instead. When you make last-minute choices, we're difficult. My understanding is that Bali has a number of very good large convention centers. It's not because it's a vacation destination; it is because there were limited opportunities that we could select from when making such a late switch. But we're looking very forward to going to Bali and very much would like to return to Oman at some point. I know I was looking forward to it. I've heard great things about people that have been to Oman. I have yet to go and look

---

forward to it myself. So I think that'll be it for me at this point, unless there's any questions.

JEFF OSBORN

No questions for Wes. Hiro, news of the CSC.

HIRO HOTTA

Yes. This is Hiro from CSC. I have nothing to report on monthly SLA evaluation today. But regarding the SLA change discussion, potential appropriate changes of SLA definitions are under discussion by CSC and PTI. And hopefully, the draft proposal of the SLA change will be done by September. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

All right. Thank you, Hiro. Liman, RZERC or something else, or just a hand up?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Thank you. Liman here. It was actually a hand up to begin with. So Hiro, can I please ask that you circulate the proposed texts for these things inside RSSAC at the suitable point in time?

HIRO HOTTA

Okay. Thank you. I'll ask the other members whether we can do that or when we can do that. Thank you.

---

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Thank you very much. So I'll continue with the report from RZERC, which is very brief, because there's nothing to report. Thank you. No activity whatsoever.

JEFF OSBORN

That was it? That's impressive. Abdulkarim, news from the ever-hardworking NomCom.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

For NomCom, we've been interviewing candidates in the last three days. We concluded our work this afternoon, and hopefully we're done for this cycle. And at some point in future, there will be an announcement. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks, Abdulkarim. Daniel, news of the IAB?

DANIEL MIGAULT

No. I'm still waiting for... I think during the IETF, we should organize something, but I don't have the details for that. So I've only been told it should happen.

JEFF OSBORN

I'll ask again in Vienna. Next.

DANIEL MIGAULT

I will probably have some updates before the meeting.

JEFF OSBORN

That's even better. Russ, news from the SSAC.

RUSS MUNDY

Nothing further, other than encouraging folks to come participate in the open mic session on Thursday.

JEFF OSBORN

Absolutely, and bring good questions.

RUSS MUNDY

Yes.

JEFF OSBORN

Duane, the RZM?

DUANE WESSELS

Nothing to report at this time from the RZM. But you did skip over James, IANA. I don't know if he's on the call.

JEFF OSBORN

Oh, no. James, I would like to apologize from the bottom of my heart. How are things in IANA world?

JAMES

Things are going great, thanks. No updates for me this month.

JEFF OSBORN                      Excellent. Thank you, and my apologies. Duane, thanks for pointing that out. Anything from RZM?

DUANE WESSELS                No, nothing to report.

JEFF OSBORN                      Okay. I'm going to skip item J, unless somebody has anything. Right. Good. Review of Reviews. I'm going to give that to Ken. I've been talking too much.

KENNETH RENARD                All right, the Review of Reviews. I'm actually getting good at saying that now. It's not a tongue twister. But they're getting towards a conclusion. There's a draft report. I'm going to paste the link to that in the chat. Please take a look at that and provide any comments. I can act as a conduit to bring those back, as well as just putting the comments in the document. But these are reviews of ICANN, its structure. This is not reviewing RSSAC itself. That's a different program. So have fun with it. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN                      That has been a lot of meetings. Ken really deserves a pat on the head or buy him a beer or something, because he's made meetings

---

I didn't at 02:00 AM and all the rest of it. It's really been a lot of time.  
Do we have Ram on yet?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

No.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay, it would've been interesting to hear about this. But the acronym that was thrown around was GNSO DNSAN, not M, PDP, at the SOAC meeting, and I sat with an ICANN board member for 10 minutes trying to go, "What the hell is a DNSAN?" And then they finally said it was a typo. And so it was kind of amusing. Any other business? Matt, you want to talk about OCTO?

MATT LARSON

Sure. Thanks, Jeff. So you may be aware that ICANN OCTO had been running an RSSAC047, what were we calling it, a proof of concept, a pilot implementation. And Paul Hoffman wrote it and was running it, and he discovered recently that a couple of the systems had actually broken. And so we don't have real good monitoring in place. As far as we know, nobody had ever asked for the data or was looking at it, and so we made the command decision to shut it down. We hadn't sensed a lot of interest in RSSAC, in the data, or RSSAC047. Everything is automated and could be brought back up if necessary. In fact, somebody else could run it if they wanted it. This was on VMs in various places. So we just decided that there really wasn't enough interest to merit keeping

---

this effort going, so we have shut it down, and I wanted to let everyone know.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks, Matt. I'm going to steal a slice here if I can. With the wrapping up of the RSSAC000 and the RSSAC001 work groups, we may end up finding we have the time to proceed with a CIP, and at that point, I would really like to have a round of applause for the work Naveed has done on this. This is a huge amount of prep for it. And with us not having a couple of work groups, it looks like we might have the free cycles to actually get into that process. And so I'm going to hand it to him because he's much smarter about this than me. And thank you for all the work you've done on that. That's going to make this easier when we go through it. Thanks, Naveed.

DAN GLUCK

Yeah. Thank you. And yeah, we're going to take some of the work that Naveed did. Ozan and I are going to format that into a strawman, following all of the different rules and guidelines set out by the CIP program, and then circulate that with interested RSSAC members. I know Ken was interested. I think Duane might have been interested a few months ago. So yeah, that's what we're looking forward to for the summer.

JEFF OSBORN

Hans Petter and then Liman. You're on mute. Hans Petter, you are on mute.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah, that's for the better. I don't have too much of a voice, so maybe it's better muted. On the topic of RSSAC047, I'm a bit surprised that there hasn't been any interest in it, because I think one of the first things I started to ask when I joined RSSAC is, "Do we have any measurements here?" And I was told that ICANN had that, and I never was able to get any insight into that. So I'm kind of curious to see whether this is just parked, or whether it's just we're not interested, or whether we're not listening to people from the outside there. Because I think there is an interest in the larger world to review how well the root server system is functioning. So whether RSSAC047 is fit for purpose or whether we need something else, I don't know. But personally, I think something is needed here.

JEFF OSBORN

Matt, did you want to respond?

MATT LARSON

Yeah. Paul Hoffman gave a presentation about RSSAC047 to RSSAC. It was within very recent memory. I don't remember exactly when, though. And we just didn't detect a lot of interest. He would have to elaborate. He thought there were some issues with the data itself. So, yeah. I think in theory, the idea of monitoring the root server system is certainly a good one. Nobody's arguing with that. I think in practice, what we had was not evidently meeting anyone's requirements.



---

came from? Because that kind of sounds like an action in ICANN's court, maybe?

MATT LARSON

Yeah. I actually have Paul Hoffman on Slack. I seem to recall that RSSAC at one point told us that basically they weren't interested in RSSAC047 implementation. Now, I'm seconds away from having Paul refresh my memory on that, and I could be wrong. These things aren't free. Certainly, an RFP for a professional implementation could be done, but certainly, OCTO doesn't have anything in our budget to do an implementation like that. I think my overall message is that we have not detected any enthusiasm about RSSAC047 from RSSAC in some time. So if that's not the case, we can change course.

But the situation we had was paying for VMs that, in some cases, had issues. They weren't monitored. That's on us, but it seemed like it was producing data that nobody was consuming, so there just didn't seem to be a point. If that's not the case, if there's a groundswell of interest, then we can revisit that decision. I have to say, the reason that we shut it down and then told everyone was because if we said we're thinking about shutting it down, it's very easy for somebody else to say, "Oh, no." So I guess what I'm kind of saying is the ball is now in RSSAC's court to give a compelling reason or to renew interest in RSSAC047.

---

JEFF OSBORN

Okay. Thank you, everybody involved in that little discussion for running down the road with it. It was feeling like it was hanging. I have Wes and then Hans Petter.

WES HARDAKER

Thanks. Speaking especially with my board chair hat, just knowing what types of things come to the board that we have to decide upon, Matt is 1,000% right that things cost money, and there's always an associated with what value are you getting from that money, and that's the irony behind it all. One of the things that I think OCTO's implementation showed is that, A, it's not cheap to actually establish and run it. It took a decent amount of effort by Paul. And then two, one of Paul's conclusions was it was very difficult to get the level of measurements that we really wanted, considering the breadth and diversity of the RSS. It's very hard to come up with a measurement system that is equally as breadth and diverse as the RSS in order to measure it. And so because of that, even if we were going to turn it over and get a bigger, wider measurement system, would it be used? Would it be valuable? And is it worth the cost?

I know that if a new recommendation came down the line saying, "RSSAC recommends that ICANN commit to this," there will be a question of, well, what's the right value? What is it going to be worth? Where does the money come from? Does it come out of Matt's OCTO budget? Yeah, Matt just said no. That's the type of thing that eventually has to come to, what's the cost of it all? So I'm

---

not saying don't do that. I'm just saying be aware that the ramifications of making a recommendation like that are not trivial.

JEFF OSBORN

Hans Petter and then Ken.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah. So reviewing my mailbox, it looks like this was presented at the RSSAC meeting at ICANN86 in March, where I was not present, so apologies for missing that. One of the reasonings I have brought this up earlier is that RIPE NCC runs a global measurement network with more than 13,000 lightweight probes and a large number of bigger probes. And I've been asking the open question, can this be used to implement RSSAC047? And one of the things that held us back from starting something here is that ICANN has been working on that. Now, I fully recognize that this doesn't come for free, but if there is something that can be done with this infrastructure in order to produce these measurements, maybe the total cost of that is lower than building something from scratch. So I'm more than happy to put my heads together with those of you from ICANN or others that have looked at this to see whether there are any low-hanging fruits here to produce something that can give some visibility to the outside world on how awesome this system is. I see a thumbs-up from Brad, so he volunteered.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks, Hans Petter. Ken?

KENNETH RENARD

Second thumbs-up from me. Ken. Yeah. The data was interesting, but that's I think all it was at this point. I think as far as a consumer of the data, the governance structure would probably be the next consumer of that. So, yeah, putting this on hold until that would work. Just thinking, were there any potential other updates to RSSAC047, v4, v5, any ideas that would be in the next version if we were to take that on? I was thinking of you, Duane. Do you remember any?

DUANE WESSELS

Yeah. I was trying to find the raise hand button to get in the queue. Yeah. So my recollection of the history of RSSAC047 was we had the initial document. I think right away we found some things to revise in that. Paul's implementation advised some of those revisions, and the presentation that Matt referred to, I don't know, within the last year or so, also led to some discussions about did we get it right in RSSAC047, or would we make some changes? I think my comments at the time were that RSSAC probably should not spend time talking about revisions unless we knew that an official system was going to be built at some point in time, right? If there was never going to be an official implementation of RSSAC047, then it didn't make sense to propose changes. But if we were to go down that path and there was to be an implementation, I do think that we learned things from the initial implementation that we would change. So yeah, there probably is still work to be done on it.

JEFF OSBORN

Duane's the last hand up. Anyone else? Matt?

MATT LARSON

Yeah, I was just familiarizing myself with our RSSAC047 requirements, which, my bad, I should've done before the meeting. But they confirmed my dim memory, which was, if you look at them, there are three recommendations, and recommendation one was the genesis of an initial implementation, is what it's called. And then it says that, "Insights learned from the implementation will inform future revisions of this document, if necessary." And then recommendations two and three talk about an official implementation and what attributes it would have, and then considering additional work. So basically, the ball is kind of in RSSAC's court. You recommended to the board that there be an initial implementation. The board directed the org to do it. Such things roll downhill, and they landed on Paul Hoffman, and he did it. And so at this point, I think it's up to RSSAC if you want to go further, if you want to recommend to the board that there be follow-on work. But I think that needs to be the next step, is RSSAC needs to decide what it wants and recommend something to the board.

JEFF OSBORN

That generated some hands. Wes, and then Robert, and then Hans Petter.

WES HARDAKER

Again, everything Matt said is spot on. The other helpful thing would be, who's the user? As Matt said, there hasn't been a huge demand for the data itself, and so we don't want to stand up something that's not going to be used in the long run. If we got a ton of people saying, "Hey, these metrics are great, and we need them for these purposes," regardless whether it's monitoring or research or whatever, that'd be great. But that's not what the initial implementation showed. So we just want to be careful of not building something that people don't come to.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay. Rob, and then Hans Petter.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Yeah, I just want to agree very strongly with the sentiment in the room, and especially with what Matt said and the way that he presented it. I think that from what I can tell, and I remember this subject being discussed off and on over a bit of time as it was working through, it felt to me that ICANN, I think, has done about as much as it can technologically at this stage, given the current state of understanding of what it is we want. And I think it's a good challenge and an appropriate challenge to lay down, both in the sense of, it sounds to me as though there is some ongoing discussion to be had about revising or modifying RSSAC047 in a way that we can get some measurements that are a little easier to

measure or even possible to measure, and more appropriately match, I guess, what I would call the actual end-user need for the root server system, as well as then working on technological implementation. And I'll go a step further. I want to congratulate Matt on drawing a line under it now, because I think one of the worst mistakes you can make in a situation like this is to continue to try to do multiple iterations of technological revision and argue about, ultimately, what's a policy issue in that way. So I think he's put the ball in exactly the right court, and we need to take up that challenge.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks, Rob. Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

So it seems like the term "lessons learned" should inform actions going forward. So I can't find the lessons learned in the minutes. So is there a document that... I'm sorry, I didn't catch that.

JEFF OSBORN

Nope. It's okay, Hans Petter. They are muted.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Okay. Thank you. So I don't know if you got my question. Where are the lessons learned that can inform our actions going forward? Are they in a document somewhere, or in the presentation, or? Because we can't go to the ICANN Board and recommend anything without

---

basing it on what it says here, the lessons learned. We don't have to spend time on that now, but we can pick that up in a separate track.

MATT LARSON

I think the closest we have to that is probably Paul's presentation from a few months ago. I think the lessons learned... Excuse me, I think something more formal than that. I will volunteer Paul's time to contribute to that, but I don't know that it makes sense for OCTO to be the owner of doing that document. Certainly, Paul would be a major contributor because he has the implementation experience, but I think other people should also be involved.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Let's start with what we have. Let's not create new documents. But then if somebody can point me to that presentation, and I can review that and see if I have further questions.

JEFF OSBORN

Russ, you have your hand up?

RUSS MUNDY

Yeah. Thank you, Jeff. One thing I wanted to just point out here that I haven't heard brought up in the discussion today about RSSAC047, and that is that one of the driving reasons for the existence of RSSAC047 was the need to be able to have some metrics and monitoring for the RSS as a whole. And that's different than the many monitoring systems that exist that look at each of

---

the individual lettered servers. And whether or not RSSAC047 was successful in describing and defining those, that's something I think we need to discuss. But perhaps we also need to re-ask ourselves, as the RSSAC, whether or not it's important to try to have metrics and monitoring for the RSS as a whole. Because, by my knowledge, and I've not heard anything to refute this, there isn't any existing metrics and monitoring for the RSS as a totality at this point. And that's the fundamental reason the work on RSSAC047 would start. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

Matt.

MATT LARSON

Just to echo what I put in the chat, I just emailed Paul's presentation from ICANN85 to the RSSAC mailing list.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks for that, Matt. I'm not sure what follow-up we need to have from this, but it does seem like maybe either Paul or Matt and Hans Petter need to have a communication of some sort to just not leave it hanging. Matt, does that seem fair?

MATT LARSON

Sure.



MATT LARSON

I do.

JEFF OSBORN

Okay. Russ, you want to go?

RUSS MUNDY

Yeah, I do too. And my suggestion is that we have a bit more focused discussion on this at the July meeting and then decide what makes sense to do from there. I think it's a good idea to have Hans Petter and Paul and Matt have a discussion, but have it on the agenda item for July. That way, we develop some decision, some more structured formal decision. That just was my suggestion. Thanks.

JEFF OSBORN

It's a good idea, Russ. Thanks. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS

Thanks. A couple of points. So first of all, I think the initial implementation should stay shut down. I don't think there's any need to bring it back. But I would request, if possible, maybe the data could be made available. I did actually get data from Paul in the past, so I was at least one user of it and found it interesting. And so I think whatever data has already been collected would be useful to make available to RSOs to examine. And then also, I am willing to work with Hans Petter or anyone on more formally documenting

---

the lessons learned or whatever is necessary for the next step. So you can sign me up for that.

JEFF OSBORN

Thanks, Duane. That's an old hand now. I'm going to leave this hanging in the air for a minute in case anybody has a final thought and they're looking for the unmute.

DANIEL MIGAULT

Maybe I have one question. Do we have a document about what the updates would be? No.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

We're not talking about updates to a document here.

DANIEL MIGAULT

No, no, I'm talking about the RSSAC047 update.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

There is no proposal to update RSSAC047 on the table as far as I know.

DANIEL MIGAULT

But even OCTO, so we don't know what would be the updates. That's my guess. I know there will be some update.

---

MATT LARSON

I'm sorry, update to what?

DANIEL MIGAULT

From RSSAC047.

MATT LARSON

I'm sorry, I'm not understanding the question.

DANIEL MIGAULT

So my understanding is that it's not a request, but the update of RSSAC047. Do we have anything to update on the document, or is it just reactivating the testing environment?

MATT LARSON

I think we've had this discussion and already decided there's no need to update RSSAC047 at this time.

DANIEL MIGAULT

Okay. But there will not be update, but the title is update. So what I'd like to understand is, is it changes that could be done in the document versus the code on OCTO perspective?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

The title was an update from OCTO under their work on RSSAC047. So they have now updated us on the status of their work.

---

DANIEL MIGAULT

Okay. So that would have been the document from them.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

And the presentation was just circulated to the list. And we will now put together a small party. I noted myself, Paul... And I can't read my own handwriting, so I'm sure I can have staff remind me later on who will do a first grab on that. I will read all this stuff, and then I will see if I can put together a problem statement before the next meeting so we could have it on the agenda there. Does that make sense? Did I capture that? Maybe my head isn't working.

JEFF OSBORN

All right. Matt.

MATT LARSON

One last comment from me. So I've got Paul here on Slack. Duane, Paul says you have data that's good before the flaws that he noticed crept in. But could I suggest that Paul will talk to Duane and make sure that you get all the data. And we'll make all the data we have available, even if flawed, for sure.

JEFF OSBORN

Wonderful. All set on that? We are wrapping up very early it looks like. Our next meeting is on the 7th of July, and I will interrupt my fabulous day refinishing my kitchen cabinets with my brother to hold that meeting. Anybody have a conflict with that? It makes sense. We're all good. The next RSSAC Caucus meeting is in Vienna,

# EN

---

right? Okay. At the IETF. Anything else before we bang the hammer?  
Thank you all for coming, and I appreciate your consideration with  
the shitty acoustics. Thanks.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**