ICANN86 Seville | PF – RSSAC Work Session (2 of 2)
Wednesday, June 10, 2026 – 14:45 to 16:00 CEST

DANIEL GLUCK

Hello. My name is Daniel Gluck, and welcome to the RSSAC000v10 Work Party session. I'm the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in chat for your reference. This session is for RSSAC members and invited guests, but is open for observers to view what is happening. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in Zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to Andrew McConachie to get us started.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So hello, everyone. This is the fourth meeting of RSSAC000v10, which is the 10th version of the RSSAC operational procedures. We've gone through everything in the SOW, the statement of work, in previous meetings. So all those things have been discussed. There's been text. I think all the text has been proposed. The text is in the document, and I don't even think there's any new text in the document necessarily. But my idea with this meeting was to review

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.

the entire document, all the suggested text in the document. I'm guessing this will be probably the second time that people have seen it, which is fine, or maybe it's the first time. We've got plenty of time if any of the items need more discussion or need further text or whatnot. So if we get through agenda item two there, traverse the working document and review all suggestions, then we can talk about whether or not this is ready for an RSSAC vote and whether I should be producing a final version. So with that, I'm just going to hop over to the document, if Zoom will cooperate. There we go. So I'm just starting at the top. I'll go back all the way up to the top so people can see that there's nothing else, and we're just going to go top to bottom.

JEFF OSBORN

Daniel has put the link to the document in the chat.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Here we go. So I had an action item a while ago to kind of go through all the different liaisons and positions and whatnot, and look at how it aligned with terms and term limits and that kind of thing. So this is an old comment I made on May 4th just to confirm that this Section 1.2.7.6 aligns with what is in the ICANN Bylaws. I think we can just close out this comment. There was no addition here to the text. There's not actually really anything to discuss. There was some discussion about whether or not we add text

pointing to the ICANN Bylaws, but I don't know. Oh, go ahead, Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yeah. I think there is a discrepancy if you go back to the top document. It's saying, for the NomCom, no individual may serve as a delegate for more than two terms. I'm not sure that is correct. What is correct is the next line, which is no individual may serve in consecutive terms. So I want us to check the first line. I'm not sure that the new guideline is saying no more than two terms.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE When I checked the Bylaws, so it says, "The term for the outgoing RSSAC liaison of the ICANN Nominating Committee shall be two years." That's definitely correct. "No individual may serve as a delegate for more than two terms."

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yeah. That is what I need us to double-check, and I don't think that is correct.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE So what you're saying is you could be a delegate for more than two terms as long as they were non-consecutive.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yeah.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Okay. I'll have to check that.

JEFF OSBORN Daniel?

DANIEL GLUCK I have the Bylaws if you want me to pull it up on the shared screen.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE We have time.

DANIEL GLUCK Why not?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Yeah. Liman from Netnod here. What's the limiting factor? Is it the Bylaws for RSSAC or the Bylaws for NomCom?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE In this case, it would be the Bylaws for the NomCom. I mean, the RSSAC can't appoint someone to the NomCom if the NomCom won't have them.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Fair enough. I'm just trying to set the borders right for myself. Thank you.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE I guess it's that second sentence: "No individual may serve as a delegate for more than two terms." So that would say even non-consecutive terms would be forbidden.

DANIEL GLUCK Yeah.

HANS PETTER HOLEN This is interesting. That's not what I remember, but it's clearly what it says.

JEFF OSBORN Yeah, same for me. I was not aware of this.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Well, there was a review, right? Oh, go ahead, Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yes, there was a review, but I'm not sure if this is reflecting the review. But maybe this is what the review came out with.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN Yeah, I think definitely this is what the review came out with, because before it was one-year terms when I served on the NomCom, and the NomCom encouraged supporting organizations to send back people, so we had some continuity. But then you couldn't serve more than two at the time. So that was a change to make this staggered. And then I was not aware that there was a limit on more than two terms in total, the way I read this. But yeah, that's what I read.

JEFF OSBORN Daniel?

DANIEL GLUCK Yeah, there was a public comment in 2023 for Bylaws amendments and documents to implement the NomCom 2 review, and one of the proposed amendments was to change NomCom delegates' terms to serve two-year terms instead of one year, and then the other updates with terms coming from that.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Hmm.

JEFF OSBORN Just to be clear, you can't serve for four years. You have to serve for two years, sit out for two, and do another two in order to do your two. So it takes six years to do two terms. Okay.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE That is how I read it, yep. Abdulkarim, is that a new hand? Oh, okay. Can you stop sharing, Dan? Thank you.

HANS PETTER HOLEN So it seems like you've actually copied and pasted the text from the Bylaws.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Well, this is text from v9, so it could actually be that in v9 we just basically took it from the Bylaws. I don't remember.

DANIEL GLUCK Timeline.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Mm-hmm. Given this discussion, does anybody have any issue with me just closing out this comment?

JEFF OSBORN So to be clear, v9 was the source of this and is consistent with what the current ICANN Bylaws are for the NomCom, right?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Yes. So there's no suggested changes here in v10. This was just kind of a confirming exercise. So I'm going to resolve this. Hello, computer? What's going on? Oh. My mouse is misaligned with the screen. Okay. All right.

DANIEL GLUCK Hello, clerk? What? Are you not a... Wow.

WES HARDAKER You have entered expert mode.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE This is an editorial change I made in a couple places in the document. I found that it said, "from time to time," and I really didn't know what that meant, and I don't think it actually adds anything to the document. People are free to disagree with me about that.

JEFF OSBORN That's a tic of lawyers.

DANIEL GLUCK From time to time?

JEFF OSBORN Yeah. I have never seen that be meaningful, and I've seen lawyers do that. It's like peeing in a corner if you have a cat.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE I'll take that, yeah. Either way, I don't really like it, so okay. Does anybody really like the term "from time to time"? Nobody even likes that term from time to time. Okay.

DANIEL GLUCK There are no lawyers in the room, I don't think.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Then I will remove that. I'm not going to actually merge these things because I need to remember them, but I will mark it here. This, in Sections 1.2.7.5 through 1.2.7.8, I found a little bit... Well, it's not actually true. That's the issue, because it's not actually true in all of those sections because there can be different rules per liaison. So, yeah, I just wanted to strike it. It could just say, "Unless otherwise stated," right? Comma, without these section titles. And I see Abdulkarim has raised his hand.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE I just wanted to clarify again. Is it the RSSAC Caucus Membership Committee that appoints liaisons or the RSSAC itself?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Is it the RSSAC... Oh. That's a good point. I hadn't seen that. I think it's actually the RSSAC via vote that appoints outgoing liaison roles. I think that sentence is actually incorrect.

HANS PETTER HOLEN Well, it says that the membership committee may recommend appointees.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE True. That's true. It just says recommend. It doesn't say appoint. I don't know if we've ever actually... I guess we have done that in practice a few times, so that is actually accurate. It hasn't been done all that recently, I don't think, where the membership committee has recommended liaison roles, but it has happened in the past.

WES HARDAKER Yeah, confirm. That has happened, and it's just a recommendation. It still gets voted by the quorum.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Okay. So we'll leave it there.

MATT LARSON Is it just me or does that sentence not make sense? "A person may only serve for two consecutive terms unless there are no..." Shouldn't it be, "if there are no other candidates"?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE It starts with, "Unless otherwise stated, a person may only serve for two..." Unless there are no other candidates for the outgoing liaison position.

MATT LARSON I don't know. The sentence doesn't read cleanly to me, but maybe it's just me.

JEFF OSBORN Yeah, the two unlesses are funny.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE "A person may only serve for two consecutive terms if..." Do you think the first unless should be an if? Or the second unless?

WES HARDAKER So this is part of the issue that I was bringing up before, right? The document is hard to read because we have references that say, "Unless otherwise stated," and then try to say the section numbers where things might be stated, and then try to say, "But there's an exclusion; unless otherwise stated, you can do this." So I'm not sure of the right fix, but it feels like maybe two sentences here would be the cleaner way to go. Or either that, or put it at the end, right? "A person may only serve for two consecutive terms unless there are no other candidates for the outgoing liaison position, unless contradicted in..." Actually, one of the things I want to do is remove

the section references entirely because it just reads confusing, right?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Well, you could say, "Unless otherwise stated above," because this is at the end of the section where we go over all of the different liaisons. But I hear you. There were hands. Oh, Abdulkarim, go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Then I think, generally speaking, for those that are listed below, I think the tradition has been to allow someone to serve for the second time.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yeah, there's no rules stated. You're talking about where it says, "In addition to the outgoing liaison positions documented in Sections 1.2.7.5 through 1.2.7.8, the RSSAC has previously appointed liaisons to the following groups"? Yeah, I don't think there's any rules stated about how those should be managed.

JEFF OSBORN

Abdulkarim, are you referring to... I don't see it stated either, but I know I've always, when there's been an election, at least as chair when I was doing the membership thing, said two terms, if allowed, is a good thing because having continuity is a good thing, and then

stop when you get to the limit. Is that what you're trying to say that's not stated anywhere in here?

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Yes.

JEFF OSBORN Yeah. It is an actual practice, but it's not documented anywhere. Maybe we don't need to have it, but it's definitely the practice.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Matt, go ahead.

MATT LARSON I've been looking at this sentence since Kevin mentioned it, and I believe he's absolutely correct. The second unless should be if, or are we past that and while I was researching that, we came up with other language? Well, I hate to be pedantic, but who's the candidate? Does that mean one candidate in addition to the incumbent? Or does the one candidate mean the incumbent?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Liman here. It's intended to mean one candidate going forward. In this case, it doesn't matter whether it's the incumbent or not, I think. We need to appoint for the coming period someone, and we have only one candidate. It may be incumbent, it may not. And we're allowed to break the rule if we only have one candidate.

MATT LARSON Okay, I get it. I like that. Could you just phrase it to no other candidate as opposed to one candidate? This rule may be broken if no other candidate is available.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Yeah, but the thing is that then we get into the problem of defining the "other" than what. But if you have only one candidate, it doesn't matter whether it's the incumbent or not.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Keep in mind, this document is for the RSSAC and is to be interpreted by the RSSAC in the future. So as long as everyone understands it, right? It's not going to be tested by someone outside of the RSSAC, I don't think. I'll put that at the end, we think.

WES HARDAKER You can never quit, Andrew.

JEFF OSBORN Plenty of reason to just agree that it's good.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE I'm hearing that Liman's text is the text that we like for that troublesome sentence.

JEFF OSBORN Is anyone violently opposed to that?

HANS PETTER HOLEN To start every sentence with, "Unless otherwise stated"?

JEFF OSBORN The Liman-suggested sentence that's now purple.

HANS PETTER HOLEN Oh, there. Okay, sorry. I was reading the comment.

WES HARDAKER We need test vectors to see if everyone understands the same thing.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE I see probably an old hand from Abdulkarim, and then I think a new hand from Ken.

KEN RENARD Yeah, this is Ken. This may depend on if we're going to keep the table below, because the exceptions, unlesses, are pretty much documented in that table, so...

ANDREW MCCONACHIE I can move the table. But for sure, I guess we could consider the table as being an exception.

KEN RENARD Or even replacing this paragraph.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Well, let's go down to the table and see if this counts as... But this table just aligns with what the rest of this section says, so it shouldn't introduce any new exceptions. Ken, is that an old hand or a new hand? I see a hand from Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Liman here, commenting on Matt's suggestion. As I read your text, the regular situation is that you're only allowed to serve for one period, and I don't think that's what we want to convey. And that's why it gets complicated.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Which text are you referring to?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN The one just deleted.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Oh, okay. That's easy. Dan?

DANIEL GLUCK Yeah. That's the first usage of the word rule in this document. Does that mean anything? Within Liman's suggestion, if that's taken, does that have any specific meaning?

JEFF OSBORN Would you rather say practice?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Yeah. Liman here. I'm not married to the words, so if you find a better word, please.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE I think practice is a little bit more practical.

JEFF OSBORN Yeah, there's no way. Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN I agree with that totally.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Moving on. We have this new table. I see general support for the table. Just see a bunch of plus ones. No one didn't like it. It has this star in it for a flexible approach. I will turn that into a footnote and not just have it spill onto the next page. Does anyone hate this table? Does anyone like to see it adjusted? Plus one, everyone. Okay. Table stays. Hiro, go ahead.

HIRO HOTTA Thank you. I may not have said this clearly, but I changed my status from alternate to primary as an outgoing liaison to the CSC. So, does the change of status reset my term limit?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Can you serve two terms as alternate and then two terms in the same position as primary? Is that the question? Because you're in the middle of one term, you change from alternate to primary? We go by person. It says we use the word person everywhere, so a person may only serve. So Liman's going to contradict me. Go ahead.

HIRO HOTTA Yeah. Mm-hmm.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN I think Hiro makes a very valid point here because the thing that he was first appointed to is not in your table, for instance, which is the alternate. The alternate is not the representative. So CSC liaison is one role, and alternate to CSC liaison is a different role. And does the term limit get reset when you are, so to speak, elevated from alternate to regular?

HIRO HOTTA Exactly. Yeah.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE I was confused. I thought it was alternate and primary to RSSAC. But, okay, so you were primary CSC liaison, then you were alternate CSC liaison. That circumstance.

HIRO HOTTA RSSAC liaison toward CSC. Yeah. They don't talk about the alternate, but the text above mentions a delegate, and I think the delegate as well as a liaison does not include the alternate. The alternate is just here.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Hans Petter, go ahead.

HANS PETTER HOLEN Are there any rules on the receiving end here that can give us guidance on that? Because if we go and say, "Okay, it's fine that you serve two times two terms as alternate and then two times two terms as primary," that's fine with us, but then is whoever we send this liaison to fine with that? That's going to be the limiting factor, right?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Yes. Liman here. I saw in the table, and I'm now trying to verify in the text here, it says for chair, no flexibility, but only two years. And that doesn't rhyme entirely with at least my intention back 12 years ago when we put this in place, which is that you're only allowed to serve for two consecutive terms, and then time to move on. And then you can be reelected again for another two consecutive terms if that's the case. Because if you have a really good chair, it should be possible to reelect him, but there should also be a limit that throws him out after four years. And then he can be off for a year and then come back. Sorry. Yes. Let's finish the alternate discussion first.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Two plus two years.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yeah. That's okay. Okay. Yeah. We'll come back to that. Yeah, this question of the primary and the alternate liaison and how... Because it says here an alternate outgoing RSSAC liaison may be appointed to serve concurrently with the primary RSSAC liaison. And I think that Hiro's question is, if you were the alternate serving concurrently with the primary, can you then become the primary after that? Or does that conflict with the operational procedures? And I don't really know the answer to that. Ken?

KEN RENARD

Yeah. I'll propose that we basically add another line to the table as the alternate, and would we be willing to accept the fact that somebody could serve two-year terms, four years as an alternate, and then another consecutive four years as a primary to CSC? Given the number of people we have here, I don't see a problem with that, but that's a proposal to put on the table.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So if I understand, serving as the alternate would not have any impact whatsoever on your serving as the primary and vice versa. So you could do two terms as a primary, then two terms as an alternate, or two terms as an alternate and then two terms as a primary?

KEN RENARD

You could spend eight years with the CSC if you wanted to, and that's just a proposal for discussion.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So I've got Kevin and then Jeff.

KEVIN HILDEBRAND

Just to play devil's advocate, what happens if the primary was sick for his entire two terms and the alternate basically served for those, then wanted to renew?

KEN RENARD It's a non-voting position in the CSC. It's there just to liaise between. So it's not... Yeah.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE So I've got Jeff and then Liman.

JEFF OSBORN I would argue, without getting too into what is the meaning of the word, the alternate is not in a role. The alternate is an alternate. Alternate's an understudy for a play. So we don't even need to have them in the table because alternates don't start racking up credits for how long they can stay or not, I would argue. I would argue if you're an alternate, you're an alternate and none of this counts, because until you're in the actual role itself, these are not meaningful. But just a thought. And the idea that somebody gets sick for two years and actually does it, that's quite a corner case. But I would just argue for one thing, we wouldn't have to fix anything if we simply said alternates are alternates, and they don't have these requirements. Because it's an alternate. You're literally not doing anything. You're an alternate.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Liman here. And to add to that, the committee has the ability to reelect someone if they find that the person performs poorly. So

I'm happy to go with either of these cases, either proposals. Thanks.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE And I've got Hans Petter.

HANS PETTER HOLEN I just started to read the internal procedures of the CSC, and they actually have provisions putting a minimum requirement of presence. So if you're sick for two years, you would actually not qualify as a member anymore. So they're taking care of that internally. So it may be worth actually reviewing those in detail to make sure that we align with those.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE And I also note the comment from Duane about the document should explain the rationale for having the alternate. So what I'm hearing is that it probably does make sense to add some rationale for why the RSSAC has the alternate, and it's my understanding the RSSAC has the alternate because sometimes the primary isn't available. And what I'm also hearing is that the alternate or the alternate liaison being in that position doesn't actually accrue time that gets in the way of becoming the primary liaison at some future date. So it's not really limited. You are an alternate for the primary, but after that, you can be selected as a primary if the RSSAC chooses that. Is that a correct interpretation, Jeff?

JEFF OSBORN

I think that makes sense. The idea that you are an alternate to something for eight years does not mean you have accrued dictatorial power. That's the idea, I'm assuming, is you don't want people in charge so long that you've calcified governance. But being an alternate is... I can't see why not. They're the substitute teacher. Who cares?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So is there no limit for being the alternate? You can be the alternate forever?

KEN RENARD

Just a little bit of history. The alternate was requested by the CSC maybe three, four years ago because people weren't showing up. Yeah. So fine either way.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

But here again, there are actually provisions in the ICANN Bylaws regarding this as well, so it may be worth aligning with that.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Okay. So this sounds like an action item to me to add some text in this section that aligns with the ICANN Bylaws. But I think I understand what the RSSAC wants. You want this to be simple. That's what I'm hearing, and you don't really want to have to think too much about term limits for the alternate, if possible. But we

have to abide by the ICANN Bylaws. And we would like some rationale for why there is an alternate, which is probably something I can reference in the Bylaws as well. So this is an action item to me to write some text in 1.2.7.7. Sound good?

KEVIN HILDEBRAND Sounds good.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Okay.

WES HARDAKER So I have my hand up. A couple of things. There are probably three things to check. So normally, liaisons from a group to another group are dictated by the terms of the sending body. Not always. Oh, Daniel just gave me a thumbs up. But we... Okay. So the CSC text says that. Whether the ICANN Bylaws say that is probably the other thing to double-check. Oh, I'm getting a double thumbs up. So we can do whatever we want, is my reading. And to try and accommodate this and all of the other discussions, I have added a new comment to the purple text above that everybody hates, with probably four sentences now that you can consider as an alternate to Liman's alternate purple text. But there's no win scenario in this, so... Praise Daniel for managing to read that quickly.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE For the CSC specifically, that is the case. Any more comments on this 1.2.7.7 section before we move on to Liman's comment on the table? Okay. Moving down to the table then, and coming back to that tabled comment from Liman about the chair essentially having the inflexible approach. Liman, go ahead.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Liman here. I actually went back to the written text in 1.2.4, which is the section, and the text there is correct, or at least it's along my view of things. So it's the table that could use a little amending here by saying term limit two consecutive instead of just two. Because the text is quite clear that your eligibility to be elected is reset after these two terms.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Yeah, I hadn't thought about consecutive versus non-consecutive in the table, but I can just add the word consecutive here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN I think that would solve it. Thank you.

JEFF OSBORN Well, wait a minute. The chair isn't the only one that's allowed to be consecutive, right? And board liaison, I think. Wes?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Vice chair as well, I think.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, it should go into the column, I think. Well, so again, we actually have the ability to do anything we want, but it should go into the column if that's what we want, probably, because it affects everything, I would think.

JEFF OSBORN

Right. There's that prior paragraph, though, that makes it sound as if only non-consecutive terms are allowed, and that's why I was confused. I wanted to make sure I understood it. But then we get to this table and it's like that's not true for the chairs or the vice chairs or the board liaisons. And I don't know about the other three. Okay. So there's a statement in the paragraph above this that says consecutive terms have to be separated by a non-consecutive vacancy. I'll defer to Wes because he's making a lot of sense.

WES HARDAKER

I would think it applies to the NomCom, probably is actually affected by external rules, because that's very specific. Daniel just said that there is no difference for CSC, so we can do whatever we want, and that's probably true for the IRZRC as well. Right. So that's why, if we just put it in the column header, it applies to them all, and that's probably what we want.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE So you're suggesting we put consecutive term limit basically in the column header as opposed to putting it in each individual cell? Okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN Yes.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE Then if that column is saying consecutive, that would change the one for the NomCom. Because NomCom, you can serve two. Yeah.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE Double asterisks. I need to find those funky symbols, like Wingdings. Yeah, so that's really ugly, but I can prettify it. But that's basically what we want the table to look like, right? It is functional.

WES HARDAKER How is it we've not gotten to emoji-based footnotes yet?

JEFF OSBORN That's correct then for the NomCom liaison, it is non-consecutive terms? I did not know that. Thanks. It's functional.

HANS PETTER HOLEN Since you now have two different semantics in the same column, you may want to split that column in two, so everyone says two consecutive term limits, and then for NomCom, it says one, but

then there is another column for maximum terms, and then there are none on everybody but NomCom. It avoids a footnote at the expense of another column.

WES HARDAKER

So I actually missed. What is the double asterisk for? Why is it different? But two terms max ever. So because we have 24 members and you can only serve two terms each, in 48 years, we will have no appointments.

JEFF OSBORN

Because NomCom is non-consecutive. You cannot do two consecutive NomCom terms. That's what that says there, and the only difference is it's non-consecutive. So if we were to take that fourth column and squish it all down and figure out how to write a shorter version of flexible approach to limit, we would have a column called consecutive, which would have yes in everything but NomCom. This is why there are only 13 root servers.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

But you can only do two terms ever. Yeah. So that means we need more root servers in that many years, or we need to renew the council. Well... I always wanted to do footnotes. Are you sure you can't do that?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

All right. I do like the idea of just adding another column to the table, so I'll just do that. I don't want to have the asterisk, double asterisk, cross, whatever. So this is retiring RFC 3797 and then replacing it with OCTO-041. Folks said they thought that was okay if staff wanted OCTO-041 instead of RFC 3797. I think this is the only place in the document it actually appears. Opinions on this?

WES HARDAKER

Double frowny face. So did we discuss that and agree to it yet? I don't remember. Or is this the discussion about that? This can be the discussion about it. We did discuss it on an online call. I gave a little presentation about how OCTO-041 works, and then what I heard from the RSSAC was, "We don't really mind. It's up to staff, whatever they want to do, whatever's easiest." You're welcome to voice your own opinion right now.

JEFF OSBORN

I would've thought, Wes, we'd discuss this in an admin meeting too, but either I... I'm just saying, I know I've had the discussion with these guys, and I don't talk to them much outside of meetings. Didn't we have a problem with the mechanics of this and had to turn the crank way more times than we wanted to? The results didn't work for some reason, because we didn't have enough... I think I might be confusing another voting thing. Never mind.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Yeah, but that wouldn't count. Is there any other body in ICANN that uses either the RFC or the OCTO-041 rules? Daniel, please. Knowing those geeks, being one of them, I doubt they're going to change. But are they considering it? Do you know? Yeah. I'll let Matt and then Hans Petter go.

DANIEL GLUCK

Yeah. The SSAC uses 3797 for their travel support. The other advisory committee that you're a part of, the SSAC. There's no considerations for operational procedures at this time for the SSAC, so no. Are you talking about the mechanics as in Andrew not being able to physically run 3797, or are you talking about the mechanics of... Yeah, no. Yeah.

MATT LARSON

I think Hans Petter was first. Okay. So I'm totally not impartial about this, but the whole reason Paul Hoffman developed this is because 3797 is so complicated and difficult to implement, and OCTO-041 is sort of elegant in its simplicity. So, it doesn't matter what we use, but Paul was sort of offended at the complexity and difficulty of 3797 and said, "Why can't we just have something simpler?" So that's why he wrote OCTO-041. So, I don't know. I guess if we're okay with the current process, that's one thing, but it's there. This is the express purpose it was written for, for ICANN groups to use it and not have the difficulty and complexity of 3797.

HANS PETTER HOLEN No, you were on the top of the screen.

JEFF OSBORN Andrew, you look like the co-author. So if Andrew promises not to quit or get hit by a truck, we should definitely put in 041.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE I am the co-author, and I'm also completely conflicted here because I really like 041, because I wrote that document with Paul. So in reality, staff never actually runs 3797. There's a bunch of implementations out on the web, and we just pick one and we use it. The algorithm is too complicated to just run it on the command line or something, and the reason why, I think, or at least me, I can only speak for myself, I can't speak for Paul, but the reason why I like 041 is because I can do it on a command line, and in about 10 seconds, as opposed to just going out to the web, finding an implementation of 3797, and then trusting that it will be accurate for some definition of accurate. There are two implementations. Paul wrote one in Python, I wrote one in PHP. It's dirt simple to do in Bash. It's also, you can just do it on a command line if you understand how a hash works, and you know how to use vi. So, to me, it feels better than just plugging values into a website and praying. But I'll let Hans Petter speak.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah. So since nobody neutral has been willing to express an opinion, I will express a strong opinion for going for OCTO-041 for the reasons stated. Thank you.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Wes? Jeff?

WES HARDAKER

I'll expend a weak opinion for the RFC, and the only reason why is that I think it's good when a bunch of standards organizations sort of agree to do things in sort of the same way. Everybody, I think, in the IETF probably has issues. We've certainly run into issues with the RFC in the IETF side. It would be wonderful if OCTO-041 would get proposed as 3797bis or something like that, and the entire world would switch to it. I'm not going to get in the way, but my leaning would be stick with the thing that everybody is using and not being the one-off trying to do something different. But no shade at all on 40... I've already lost numbers in my head. 041. So, I think that's great. No, they're all completely independent. I will say that there were complaints in the past from caucus members that didn't understand the RFC, and that was actually, I think, one of the other impetuses for why 041 was written, because people were like, "We can't follow that math. Please stop using it." No, as I said, mine's a weak opinion. We will vote, because when this RSSAC000v10 comes, there's way too many numbers, comes up, I will vote yes for it, even though this little element would not be the one I would pick. That's fine. Nah, let it come to the full document.

Let's not repeat too much. Can I get the universe? We can pick five days to run both algorithms and see who wins rock, paper, scissors.

JEFF OSBORN

Is there really much of a crossover between what people are using for this? Does the fact that somebody associated with the IETF is using a different method than we are using, is there any interrelation at all? Does anything happen? Are we kind of doing it in our own hermetically sealed little world? I'm going to go with the vice chair and follow Hans Petter's lead and say that I like the idea of running with OCTO-041. If somebody has a really compelling reason not to, that's fine. But otherwise, I've been part of that discussion where people say, "Tell me why I didn't get picked, explain the math." And I certainly couldn't. So I'm going to go with that. So, we don't vote, but there are two votes. Well, there's been a lot of discussion. Do you want to just have a quick vote? Is this worth it? No? If nobody is vocally unhappy with agreeing to keep OCTO-041, and Andrew's already written it there, then I'm going to say let's just go to the next step. Fair? All right, cool.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So I'm going to point at the chair and be like, "I'm horribly conflicted. I'm not going to make this decision, and I'm going to make it your problem, Jeff." We could use sortition to pick one. I lied. It actually appears twice in this document. Yes, exactly. So this is another deletion of "from time to time." There were just a couple in there. There's large blocks of text here somewhere. Ah, yes. No,

this is actually significant. So this has to do with RSSAC Caucus meetings at IETFs, and we discussed this a fair bit. And what we settled on in the end was the first. So the RSSAC Caucus will meet at ICANN Annual General Meetings and the first even-numbered IETF meeting of each year. Correct. Well, previously, it was three IETF meetings every two years. And the interesting side effect of that is we have 12 slots every two years to send people to IETF meetings, which means if we do one IETF meeting a year, we are sending six people to IETF meetings as opposed to four people to IETF meetings, because 12 divided by two is six, and it's divided by three is four. Just, that's the math. Any discussion on this item? Seeing nothing but thumbs up, I'll move on.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

No, no. I tried to use AI in the last call, didn't I tell you? But Gemini came up with one, and ChatGPT with the others. So they boiled it down to whether you want to be modern and practical, or whether you want to be purist and aligned with the powers of the IETFs. So, it characterizes me and Jeff's opinions there, right? Then we need to have the discussion again then.

JEFF OSBORN

Which implies one IETF meeting per year. Down from the previous one or two. But what that helps with is you get deeper into the organization and providing people a space. We had a discussion about this the other day where... Is Naveed here? Naveed had done a huge amount of work with kind of implicitly he was going, "Now

can I get my support for IETF?" And I was like, "Oh, that's so unfair." And we would have the depth to be able to do that kind of thing with this. I think this is a big improvement.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So there was a lot of discussion, mainly coming out of the RSSAC001v3 work party and whatnot, about proposing work items and the interaction between the RSSAC and the RSSAC Caucus work parties, as well as the role of the shepherd. So I made some changes to 2.5.1, and then there are some other changes down here to 2.6.2 on the role of shepherds. So, I'll just give people time to read Section 2.5.1. Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

So, only RSSAC can propose work for RSSAC, and only RSSAC Caucus may propose work for RSSAC Caucus. It probably needs to explain to me what kind of work RSSAC does and what kind of work RSSAC Caucus does. No, I get that part. That's fine. But I was kind of wondering, what kind of work parties do we put together of only RSSAC members that RSSAC does, and what kind of work parties do we put together from RSSAC Caucus? Which is the ones that I'm familiar with, right? But we only have RSSAC members in this work party? That's what confuses me, right? I'm all for openness and transparency and inclusiveness, so don't get me... I'm not pushing to exclude anyone. I'm just trying to understand here. As a caucus? RSSAC Caucus.

JEFF OSBORN

Well, the first piece of the RSSAC Caucus members is the RSSAC members are a subset of it, right? Well, and guests. Good point. Any idea? Are we violating a law? Are we just bending a rule, or? Oh my, Wes looks like he has a hand up. It raises the interesting question of if we need to define what constitutes a caucus work party versus an RSSAC-only one. I'm sitting here, Abdulkarim being a contributor to this, the most logical thing in the world, but this is actually technically, I think, was designated somewhere as an RSSAC-only, but there hasn't been an RSSAC-only, I can remember, in a while. That's why I said invited guests. And then once I said it, I was like, "Well, wait a minute. How come everybody in the caucus isn't always an invited guest?" Maybe it's a slightly larger issue. See, we knew we would have to fill the time on this meeting. So that's what we're doing, apparently. I don't know. Is there a place that it's defined this is why you have an RSSAC-only meeting, and this is an RSSAC Caucus-only, or is this just a matter of practice? So when we define a statement of work, we classify who... Oh, okay. Hans Petter, all of this could be yours. Of course, Abdulkarim.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

This is a work party. So RSSAC000v10 is an RSSAC work party. So this is an RSSAC-only work party, essentially. And we've had other ones in the past which are RSSAC-only as well. I'll just say the RSSAC used to do a lot more RSSAC-only work parties. But I have Abdulkarim and then Jeff. This is an RSSAC-only work party, but

you're the chair, so if you choose to let Abdulkarim speak, then you're allowed to do so. It's defined in the statement of work. Yeah. Okay, Abdulkarim, speak.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah. And adding a statement trying to explain the separation would be good. In general, our policy for the last decade probably has been all work should be in the caucus whenever possible. There are times, however, where the resulting work affects RSSAC directly, and RSSAC000 is probably a good example of that, where we don't really mind input from everybody, but the reality is this is our operating procedures that affect RSSAC directly. And I'm trying to think of where the other recent examples have been. But anything that is really targeting the RSOs themselves as part of RSSAC should be an RSSAC-only work party. That's been the only cases where that's going to be, or ICANN policy or something. No, even that's not right. Now I'm rambling.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE

Thank you. Then I think, just as a follow-up, there is a need to define what a work item is. For example, what happened with RSSAC003, that the caucus is coming up with. Is there a list of work items for the RSSAC to do? RSSAC003 that we concluded yesterday. Because this is not talking about work parties, it's talking about work items.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

You're talking about the list of work items that are going to exit the RSSAC001v3 work party and then be potential work items for the caucus in the future? Yeah. Those will have to go through whatever the standard process is, which is basically they're going to need statements of work. The idea that ideas come up, and they get discussed and whatnot, and eventually, if they become statements of work, then they can become work parties. But there's often a lot of things that will kind of percolate in the caucus that never get to be work parties. Yeah. This is about proposing a work item. This is kind of the formal process. This happens after that percolation has happened in the caucus when people have discussed things for a while. I'm going to go to Ken now. Hans Petter?

KEN RENARD

I like Wes's description of the fact that we try to do everything with the caucus, but on occasion, there are things that are RSSAC-only. Brought up an example, it wasn't technically a work party, but the RSSAC001 rewriting the statement of work was something that was RSSAC. So I would like to nominate Wes to draft a sentence or two to that effect.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah. So that case is actually covered in the text further down on the approval. So that's one of the things that confused me a bit, because if RSSAC Caucus proposes a statement of work for an RSSAC Caucus work party, it still requires approval by RSSAC in order to become a work party. So the tollgate, the RSSAC Caucus

can't go out and decide on doing work on their own. It needs to be approved by the RSSAC, right? The way I read the second and the last paragraph here. So the RSSAC actually gets to decide not only what work will be started, but also in the end, the document will be subject to a vote and approval by RSSAC, right? That's correctly understood? Yes. Thank you. I get something right.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

That is how the RSSAC has always done it. Abdulkarim, is that a new hand? Okay, no worries. And then Jeff, I'm also assuming that's an old hand. So is there any more discussion on this text? Or maybe it would help if we went down to 2.6.2 and looked at that text in combination with this text, because they are somewhat related. So this has to do with the role of the shepherd, which was pretty heavily exercised in the RSSAC001v3 work party. And there was some text in here that was just stuff that the RSSAC had never actually done. Like the shepherd was the initiator of the work party. We just never actually done it like that before. So what I tried to do here is just write it the way that the RSSAC does it. And in my memory at least, is the way the RSSAC has always done it. One other change I made, which I thought was a little bit weird in the old text, is it said that the shepherd could be an observer, and I guess I promoted the shepherd to either being a contributor or reviewer, so they're not allowed to be an observer. But I'll let Duane talk.

JEFF OSBORN

Well, the only asymmetry I'm seeing here is the requirement that while the smaller group, RSSAC, can propose an RSSAC statement of work, the larger group, RSSAC Caucus, can propose an RSSAC large group statement of work. But if it's the larger group, the smaller group still has to approve it. I don't see that as a huge impediment, really, because the RSSAC is a subset of the RSSAC Caucus. This helps the question I had, which is that the statement of work specifically has to state whether it's the work of the RSSAC or the RSSAC Caucus, and that's where there's a good discussion about why would this only be. And I think there was quite a discussion about RSSAC001 and why it was, and in other cases, we have defaulted to working with the caucus for years now. So I don't know. Now that we've gone through it, I'm good with this language. But it's certainly open if people wanted to discuss it.

DUANE WESSELS

Thanks, Andrew. I just want to express support for this change. I think this is a good change. To match the existing practice is important. So, thanks.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Okay, so it looks like people like this text. Do we have... Right. So this I added because I guess we conceived work parties as just having one chair or one leader, but it's been a pretty common practice that work parties can have more than one leader. Two. I can't imagine a work party really wanting more than two. But so I just added this sentence saying a work party could have one or two

leaders. Jeff? Everybody likes this sentence. I don't know. What is this? Yeah, this just says you have to submit the work product to the mailing list. I just said, well, they can just submit it to the RSSAC. I didn't think it was necessary to say via the RSSAC distribution list. Because it's often the case that staff sends it. It's not the leader that actually sends it to the RSSAC, because they often don't even have posting rights to the mailing list. So that's pretty operational. This section I identified is something I don't think we've ever actually done. This is RSSAC work products with input from the RSSAC Caucus. I could be wrong. That's actually a good point. But look at how detailed this procedure is. It's got how many steps? 14 steps. So I don't know. I see no harm in keeping it, but it's also just kind of superfluous. Liman, you look like you want to talk.

JEFF OSBORN

Well, the only question is whether you have one and an alternate, or you have two, and in my advice, I'd say two is better because it's a lot easier to hand off. That is a lightly held opinion.

WES HARDAKER

I think we're doing that right now.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Liman here. I suggest we just spend no more time on it until we have a problem with it in the future.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

Fair. All right. Moving forward. What did I do here? I made sentences out of non-sentences by adding punctuation. And that is the end of it. So was there anything we skipped over that people would like to go back to and discuss further? Let's look at... This is one of them, right? Yeah, so I can just merge this into the text. Do people like Wes's text? And then there was something else by the table? Or was it this? So, this is in place of the sentence that starts with "Liman suggests." Right. So, the proposal here is to replace basically the "Unless otherwise stated" and the "Liman suggests" sentence with the text in Wes's comment here.

WES HARDAKER

So I did add two other proposals. One, because one of you made me do it a second ago, for text to insert defining the difference between an RSSAC work party and RSSAC Caucus work party. I added a proposed sentence for that, and then I added a longer four sentences to oppose Liman's proposal for way back in the liaison text that we have been over a few times. So I don't care if they're taken or not, but I did what I was asked. That is one of them. That's the last one I just finished. Specifically, Jeff had asked, if we don't have a definition of when something is an RSSAC Caucus work item versus the RSSAC work item, it would be helpful to have some guidance in the text, so that's what that sentence tries to do. I tried to channel my inner Rob as much as I could with legalese. Up a little bit more. Well, it's in a comment. Yeah, so it's in the otherwise stated comment. Yeah, that. But expand it so you can see it all. Though I have no doubt that the wording is not perfect, I would

argue that the more sentences helps for clarity. Which is in place of "unless," before that. Yes. That's correct. Although I want Liman's second approval, or else I'll retract my suggestion.

JEFF OSBORN

Oh, yeah.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Sorry. Liman here. Can we do one thing at a time? I'm still at 2.5.1 trying to read Wes's text, and I have a question. According to this process, what happens if the RSSAC Caucus proposes a work item which is discussed in the RSSAC Caucus and not picked up by the chair for discussion in RSSAC then? Okay. I'm fine with that. I just want that we kind of define that. Liman will add text to define that. But now we can go to, where were we? 1.2.7. So, what is your... Mm-hmm. Yes. Liman here. So, Wes's text in the note, I'm perfectly fine with that. I just wonder if we need the word "however" in there, but... Okay. Thanks. Yes. Thank you. Oh, there are two howevers. Okay. Sorry, I meant the second one. Whatever.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE

So, we're back to 2.5.1. I think what happens then, if something is discussed in the caucus but isn't picked up by the RSSAC chair, then it just dies in the caucus. Dies on the vine. Just to be clear, so there's an action item on 2.5.1 for Liman to add text for issues that do not make it out of the caucus, essentially. Okay, so then we will replace those two sentences, "Unless otherwise stated" and "Liman

suggests," with the text in Wes's comment. Okay. Do I need to add however? Oh, the except... This. Okay. Sure. Oh, exception, comma, "however." Okay. However. All right. All right. I think we have a minute left, and we finished. So, yeah, does anybody want to tell a story for a minute? No. We were joking about having a lot of extra time in this session, but looks like we took the full time. Does anybody have any closing remarks before we shut down the Zoom session? I think we made it all the way through the document regardless, so that's great. We don't have one scheduled, because I wasn't sure we were going to need another one after this, but I think we will. No, we don't schedule meetings the week after ICANN meetings. The staff will send around a meeting thing. I think we have a standing time for this, right, Dan? Okay, so the next meeting is then on the 24th of June. Thanks. And we're done.

WES HARDAKER

We've had issues in the past where it's really not within scope of RSSAC, and so that's typically when that has happened in the past, is good research idea, it doesn't fit RSSAC's scope. I propose Liman adds text to define that. 1.2.7. I didn't like it either. Except for the word "however." Yeah, if you could remove the exception, comma, "however." I think the other "however" was the one that bothered me. I'm not sure any of them are needed. So, you want to have that at the end? Or whatever? Hans Petter.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Oh. Remove "however" at the beginning of the second sentence. Oh. However. Question is, when is the next meeting? There is something scheduled next week? There is something in my calendar, RSSAC000 work party on Wednesday. Oh, that's... Yeah.

DANIEL GLUCK

Right. I will delete out the one for the 17th, but we should keep the one for the 24th.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]