ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – RSSAC Work Session 2
Tuesday, March 23, 2021 – 12:30 to 14:00 EST

OZAN SAHIN: Hello, and welcome to RSSAC Work Session #2. My name is Ozan Sahin, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form, as noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during time set by the Chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask a question or make your comments verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you're done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that his transcript is not official or authoritative. To read the read the real-time transcription, click on the closed-caption button on the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Hadia Elminiawi, who will kick off the session with a brief presentation from the NomCom. Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: [Thank you,] Ozan. Happy to be with you today. If we could possibly—yes. Here's the presentation. So the ICANN Nominating Committee is

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.

looking for leaders who represent a variety of cultural, geographical, and professional backgrounds, while also striving for gender balance. So we are looking for critical thinkers, people who have cultural awareness, knowledge of the Internet ecosystem, board or executive experience, and background in legal, government, technology, business, or non-profit. If you become an ICANN leader, you will be able to influence global Internet policy, impact the evolution of the Internet, develop professional skills, collaborate with a diverse group of industry leaders, and engage with a global community. So, for more information on how to apply, please visit icann.org/nomcom2021.

If I could have the next slide, please. So we're looking for leaders.

Can I have the next slide, please? So we have three open positions for the ICANN Board of Directors. This is a three-year term.

Could I have the next slide, please? And we have three open positions for the At-Large Advisory Committee. The positions are for the region of Africa and the region of Asia, Australia, and the Pacific. And the third region is Latin America and the Caribbean islands. This is a two-year term.

If we could have the next slide, please. We have also two positions for the GNSO—one for the Contracted Party House and another for the Non-Contracted Party House. Both positions are voting positions.

If we could have the next slide, please. Finally, we have one open position for the Country-Code Name Supporting Organization Council.

EN

If we could have the next slide, please. So, to summarize, we have three open positions for the ICANN Board of Directors, three open positions for the At-Large Advisory Committee—for Africa, Asian/Australia/the Pacific, and Latin America/the Caribbean islands—and two members for the GNSO, and one member for the ccNSO.

If we could have the next slide, please. The deadline to apply is the 29th of March, 2021. So you still have time. You have five more days. So please take a look. Take the time to visit the website.

Could we have the next slide, please? Here's the website. It's www.icann.org/nomcom2021. Take the time to navigate through the website. You have also the requirements for each of the roles. If you're interested, please go ahead and apply. We're looking for you.

Thank you so much. I hope that you apply. Thank you.

OZAN SAHIN: Thank you very much, Hadia.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: [I can take] any questions if you want.

OZAN SAHIN: Are there any questions to Hadia or Amir Quayyum?

I see no hands. No comments or questions in the chat. So I take that as no questions. So thank you, Hadia and Amir.

I C A N N | 7 0
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

EN

As we thank you and say goodbye, I will now hand it over to Lars-Johan Liman to kick of the second part of this session with the discussion on guiding principles.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. So, for our guests, my name is Lars-Johan Liman. I'm one of the members of the Root Service System Advisory Committee. The rest of this session is going to be dedicated to a document that we are working with and where I happen to be the principal scapegoat or editor for the document.

This document has its root in the large publication that RSSAC did a couple of years ago called RSSAC037, which is the discussion platform and the analysis regarding the root server system accountability and a model for how that can be evolving to the future. That model is now the discussion basis for the ongoing Root Server System Governance Working Group, which is a wider cross-community working group trying to devise a new model for accountability for the root server system.

In RSSAC037, we listed a number of key principles guiding the public root server system, and that's spliced into the document in the middle. It does turn out that people ask for these and we have to explain them back and forth. So we decided to take them out of that document and make a separate document to copy them out of that document and make a separate document that we can publish with only the principles. We will also add some additional text explaining these principles a little more.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

So that's the document you have in front of you. My plan is to continue to go through this document and discuss a couple of points. It's been out there. This is actually the second generation of the document.

We have received lots of comments from a couple of people in the RSSAC Caucus. Some of these are purely editorial. I have already kicked through a number of those, adding commas, changing spelling, and using other words that are better and more appropriate in the text. But we still have a number of things where I would like a couple of more eyes on the text and perhaps hear some opinions to see if we can balance things to the right point where we can publish this document.

So, moving right ahead, I hope that we have … Let me see. Do we have Paul Hoffman? Yes, we do. And do we have Wes Hardaker as well? Yes, we do. Because Paul and Wes are the biggest contributors of comments. So I certainly hope to hear from you in the discussions here so we can have a dialogue around this. I will also very much welcome input from other people. I'm very happy about the input from Paul and Wes, but I would be even more happy if more people got involved and discussed these things.

I have my own copy in front of me, so I will try to scan ahead and try to see … Let's start with the places where we actually have some juicy things to discuss so, if we run out of time, we have the more editorial stuff left over for another meeting or some other way of discussion. So I think we will … I will ask you … Is it Ozan behind the displayed version here, is it?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: It's Andrew, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It's Andrew. Hi, Andrew.

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Hello.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excellent. So, if you scroll to the bottom of the first page, we have the yellow one. "Today, the IANA function is operated by the PTI." There was a question on whether we need to involve the PTI in this document. I think so because I want to give a clear picture of how things are operated, and I want to make the reader aware that PTI is an affiliate of ICANN and that it operates a function called the IANA.

I think that was Kaveh—yes—who referred to that. I'm scanning here to see—yes, Kaveh is on the call. Kaveh, would you like to expand on your comment here?

By the way, Ozan, can people speak properly? Because we need to have a bit of discussion here. We can't really have some people where only and I Andrew should go back and forth.

WES HARDAKER: No, we're good, Liman.

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Excellent. So, Kaveh, are you on the call here? I see your name in the roster, but I don't hear from you.

Not having much luck with Kaveh. So let's leave that for the moment then and see if Kaveh returns to the call.

We will continue with the green text there. I initially wrote that it fulfills the IANA role under a contract with the ICANN stakeholders. While that, I believe, is correct, it could signal a slightly inappropriate interpretation of the word "contract." So we have gone back and forth, and now I'm asking Andrew: can we agree of the use of the word "agreements," [since …]

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: Yeah, I'm fine with "agreement." There's some other comments from other people, but from my end, "agreement" seems personably reasonable.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes [inaudible]—

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: And Paul has his hand up as well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Please, Paul, go ahead.

**ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM**

PAUL HOFFMAN: I appreciate the fact that we are adding text to the principles from 037 because adding more clarity for the future would be good.

I am concerned, Liman, with the text above about PTI, not because it is right or wrong, but as you said, you're trying to signal subtly something. In the DNS world, in our protocols, when things were signaled subtly, we would get them wrong and it would get wronger and wronger over time. I would say that, if you want to be talking about this, it needs to be stated clearly so that somebody picking this up a year or two or five years from now will understand exactly why that was added. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Do you still see value in having such text in there in a different shape?

PAUL HOFFMAN: Personally, I do not, but any of these principles, especially this additional text, is the principles coming from the root server operators themselves. Who do they believe IANA is? And such like that. The text, as it stood without the additional, I thought was clear, but you were the principal author of writing the additions. If you felt that there was a need to clarify, that's fine, but I would say clarify clearly.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, I'm pondering and reevaluating the text here. I have added the explanatory text as I saw that to be the task assigned from me from

EN

RSSAC. So I'm not married to the text as such. So let's see if I can reevaluate this.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Liman, if I might, really the questions is, do you want to say—it's not a question of need—in this document more about who IANA is? Or is the text from Principle #2 itself sufficient? And if you do want to say more of what IANA is, do you want to be the one defining that? Do you want IANA to be defining it? Where do you want to get that definition from?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Good point. I think the message I want to convey is that IANA is a function, and it's operated by an organization, and that organization happens to be the PTI right now. And we expect that for the foreseeable future, but I don't think we need to add that point. But I want to convey the message that the IANA function is operated by an organization which is a subsidiary of ICANN—or "affiliate" is the appropriate term here—because I want people to understand how the organizations are tied together. That can be important for them if they try to understand the governance model between these organizations.

Your mileage may vary on that, and I'm happy to have that discussion, but I would also like to hear more voices on that. If I'm the only one who thinks it's a good idea to explain this here and now, then I should definitely withdraw. But, to me, it carries a bit of value.

Any comments, Paul? Anyone else?

ANDREW MCCONACHIE: You've got three hands raised: Fred, Jaap, and Brad, although I think Brad was before Jaap. So I think the order is Fred, Brad, and then Jaap.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, I think this system actually keeps the order correct here. So, yes, Fred, please.

FRED BAKER: Question for you. Who are you signaling to? I can think of several organizations worldwide that have decided to insert themselves in the root system or stated that they would like to: the European Commission, the Russian Federation, the Chinese, and others—the BRIC countries in general. Which of them? All of them? Somebody else? Who are you trying to signal to?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That is a good question because I see myself as the executor of a task. We should back our to RSSAC and ask RSSAC, "For whom are we producing this document?" So that actually goes back to you as the Chair of the RSSAC.

FRED BAKER: Well, if you're shooting a question back to me, I've got another question that I think actually comes before this.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: All right. [inaudible]

FRED BAKER: The GWG document refers to the guiding principles of RSSAC037. Giving them this document worries me. It seems to me that they could say, "And that's the document we're referring to. We're going to eliminate the rest of RSSAC037," which I would like them to not do. So where are we going with this document?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That is a question for RSSAC. I'm not saying I'm opposed to anything here, but, like you, I would like to have the playing field understood. So where, where, where? I'm trying to think here with my usual [speed]. What—

BRAD VERD: Can I jump in, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah, please.

BRAD VERD: I was next in the queue, but, Fred, going to your comment that you were scared to give the GWG this document because they're going to throw away the rest of 037, they could do this regardless of this document or not. So I don't think that affects your fear. I don't think it makes it worse or better. If that's an issue, then I think we should take that back to the

GWG and try to work on that. Maybe that's a bigger discussion to have here within RSSAC.

Liman, going back to your comment—or Paul and Liman's discussion—about whether or not this text is needed, I think some of these guiding principles are sufficient with just the verbiage that's there. They're straightforward. It's just red is red, blue is blue. You're done. You don't need to explain why red is red and blue is blue, but they are.

And I would go on to ask the question of, how does this verbiage add to somebody reading this understand[ing] it in the guidelines? I understand—somebody's phone is going off in my ear. I don't know if it's mine or somebody else's. But I understand what you're saying, Liman in the sense that you want people to understand the organization and how it works, but there's lots of documents elsewhere that do that. I don't think you necessarily need that in a guiding principles document.

So that was my feedback on both of those comments.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Again, I'm happy to do that. I felt that I was tasked to add some commentary to these—

BRAD VERD: No, no. I think you were. And I think some of them need more verbiage than just the sentences that were in 037 to explain the intent and the mindset of RSSAC when we were writing 037. I think that's very

reasonable, and I think you did a great job. I'm just saying some of them are so clear that they don't need additional verbiage. That's all. And I think this is one. "IANA is the source of the DNS data." Period.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I am fine with that. So I'll go to propose a radical change, which is to … Let me see if Andrew has the live version. Yes, he does. I've now marked the entire follow-up text here in blue. What if we were to just remove it?

As I said, I'm not married to this text. I can definitely see, Brad, that some of my text makes the principle less succinct and possibly blurs it in the edges.

WES HARDAKER: We need somebody to do queue management. There's been two other people in the queue for a while. I don't know whose responsibility that should fall on.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That should be me, and I'm [a dead loss] at that. So, Jaap, please.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: I also had some questions about [what the audience asked] but without the political undertone [inaudible]. But I can see that the reader might want to know some details about IANA. So, as a compromise to you and Paul, this should be just a reference to where the IANA functions are described instead of being a tutorial. That might help.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay.

JAPPY AKKERHUIS: But on the other hand, without this paragraph, it's fine with me as well.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Liman. Let me go through what I think is a little bit more background of this particular document and why a separate document, I think, was thought as maybe a useful contribution.

It really, I believe, grew out of work from the Rogue Root Operator Work party. One of the things that we encountered there was, as various text went in and out with various reasons for it, we realized that a whole lot of the text was really based upon the principles from 037.

At one point—in fact, I think the Appendix A is still attached, even though we agreed to delete it this morning—the thought was just to make Appendix A the statement of just the principles out of 037. Then there was further discussions that said, "Well, maybe we need some explanatory text and have it published as a separate document."

So my sense is that's sort of how we got to where we are with having a separate document. Thank you very much, Liman, for raising your hand to take this on. But, in looking at it, my concern is, I guess, similar to

Fred's, and I share Brad's thought about that a lot of these don't need additional text. Or at least I don't think they need additional text. If we add additional text, we may actually change some of the meaning of the thoughts behind the guiding principles.

So I'm a little reluctant to push forward with adding more text to the principles themselves, though I don't totally object to it. But that's my thought on how we got here and if we ought to keep pushing forward on this. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Paul, I see your hand. I would like comment on one thing first. So what we could do is take a different approach to this editing session, which is to go through the actual principles and make a decision on whether we need explanatory text for that specific principle and, if so, if the text we have is sufficient or needs amending in some way—shorter, longer, different, or whatever. So, Paul, please?

PAUL HOFFMAN: Fred Baker, in the chat, suggested a URL pointer to IANA. I love using this web thing, so if we take out this paragraph, that certainly would be appropriate to make that a footnote for IANA so somebody knows exactly which IANA we're talking about. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That would work for me. Brad, please?

EN

BRAD VERD: Just lastly, if you were going to remove the whole paragraph that you had highlighted in blue—but I don't see it highlighted anymore—I'd actually leave the first sentence and then add the link to IANA. And then you could call it done.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. I agree with the first sentence. I think I would need the second one, [which is,] "This single source is the IANA [handling]."

                            Let me see. So I have proposed that we back up and look at the principles one by one and make kind of decision on whether we want to add explanatory text to it or if we should just delete whatever is in this document.

                            So I hear no protests against doing that. I hear a little support, but I've heard other support—

BRAD VERD: I'm …

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Please, Brad.

BRAD VERD: I'm certainly not going to protest doing that if the group wants to do it, but I think going through it just one at a time is also just as effective because you can focus in on one of the principles—"Here's what's been suggested. Is it beneficial? Is it complete? Is it needed?"—for somebody

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

to understand a principle or not, versus figuring out which ones you want to add content to or not and then going back and doing the content. It seems perfectly reasonable, but it seems a little disjointed, in my [opinion].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry. We talked across. I meant to do what you suggested here: to take one principle at a time, work through that one, and then go to the next one.

BRAD VERD: Perfect. Thanks. Sorry.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: And by working through that, decide on the text and, if so, fix the text. And then we're done with it. We go to the next one. So we get them in sequence and do everything.

So let's then … Andrew, please back up to Principle #1. To remain a global network, the Internet requires a globally unique namespace. The DNS namespace is a hierarchy derived from a single globally unique root. This is the key tenet of RFC 2826. And that is an RFC written by the Internet Architecture Board, which discusses the unique DNS root.

Personally, I think that last sentence needs one explanatory line, saying just that the RFC is a statement or discussion from the Internet Architecture Board, which we consider to be one of the key documents regarding the DNS name hierarchy.

Any comments? And then I would suggest just deleting the text that is here.

Actually, it's already in there, more or less. So I suggest deleting this sentence marked in blue now. Hearing no protests or comments, I'm going to do just that. Boink!

I suggest leaving Principle #1 like that. Any comments or questions?

There's a hand from Fred Baker. Please.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. And what I'm actually looking at is the paragraph immediately following that. So am I jumping ahead of you?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right now, I am again in marking in blue … Looking at this …

FRED BAKER: Okay, fine. I think, if I'm looking at this from the perspective of the BRIC countries, they don't care if the domain names are unique or the network is singular and universal. They want it to be separate. So what might be a better argument for them—this would be a comma and more text in that first sentence there—is, "and their names are not longer useful to identify a particular service."

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I see what you're saying. I suggest adding the text here: "names are no longer useful "… What is that for? Identifying? Or to identify?

FRED BAKER: For identifying a specific service.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: "identifying a specific service."

FRED BAKER: Comma, "and." Yeah, that works.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Paul, you have your hand up.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Two things. I do not believe we are good at predicting who is the target leader for this document in the same way going back to what I said earlier about trying not to give hints[.] Many people assumed, in the early for RFCs for the DNS that, for example, somebody reading this document is going to be a resolver developer. In fact, when an authoritative developer read, they got it wrong. So I believe we should word this for everybody as much as possible.

The second is I am happy for hesitant for us to say, "That group of people believes this or wants this. "Even if it happens to be true in this moment, it is likely to be untrue in the moments in the future when

EN

somebody is reading this. So the more universal we can make this, the better, but, going back to what Brad said earlier, only if it needs to be done to make things clear. So, for example, I don't find the current first sentence useful in the sense that it already said the first principle is to remain a global network. I think that says it sufficiently. Liman, I agree with you that it would be good to make it clear that RFC 2826 comes from the Internet Architecture Board, but I would strike this whole sentence unless we believe that it says something that wasn't clear in the first sentence in the bullet.

FRED BAKER: May I respond to that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Please.

FRED BAKER: So I agree with you as far as it goes: "To remain a global network, the Internet requires a globally unique public namespace." I'm concerned about a set of people—let's not put names on them—who don't understand why the Internet needs to be a single global namespace. That was the reasoning behind my, "Do you want the names to be useful?"

PAUL HOFFMAN: Fair point, Fred. I think I missed that and I think you're correct that pulling that out further … That's speaking to an audience is not just us

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

who understands this. So I withdraw my suggestion about taking out that sentence.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you both. So right now the sentence stays. By the way, this is a working session. This is not the last word. So there'll be more chances to comment once we leave this meeting.

I don't see any more hands, so I think we're good with Principle #1. I'm also trying to keep an eye on the clock. So let's move to #2 then. "IANA is the source of DNS root data. The root server operators are committed to serving the IANA global root DNS namespace. Root servers provide DNS answers containing complete and unmodified data, including DNS security extensions, DNSSEC data. In addition, IANA maintains the necessarily technical information identifying servers."

And there was the suggestion to just add a link to the IANA informational webpage. That would come out as … Let me see. I'm going to swap here to suggesting mode, I think. There we go. We strike this. So, yes, we don't go into the policy stuff. So how about this then? Grr. My keyboard is giving up on my laptop, so I often get double or no characters. What?! A-ha. Excuse me. Let's do this then. Yes. And then we strike the rest of it, like that. Gone.

So how about that? Any protests? Comments?

I see no hands.

So, in the interest of time, we continue to the third principle. "The root server system must be a stable, reliable, and resilient platform for the DNS service to all users. The root server operators have a responsibility to provide a high-quality service to the Internet. For example, if an RSO (Root Server Operator) should need to transition operational control to a successor operator, then root server operator will provide the Internet community with advance notice and take reasonable measures to facilitate a smooth transition."

The boldface text and the normal text don't really connect in my world, but that's actually copied from RSSAC037. So we have to live with it. This might be one where we don't need any extra explanatory text.

Brad. Oh, sorry. Russ is first in queue. Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Liman. Yeah, I think the explanatory text is extraneous here. In fact, I would also argue that the first sentence is, from a technical perspective, wrong. So I think it's better to just not have any explanatory text here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN: Well, this is going to sound weird, but I actually think a little bit of explanatory text is needed here, Liman, for exactly the reason you said,

which is that the boldface text does not seem to be that closely linked to the non-boldface text.

And I think a sentence that ties the RSS to the RSOs, which we haven't actually done here, would be really appropriate to simply say, "The RSOs are the parties that make the RSS stable," reliable, or whatever. So I would say strike the paragraph and put a comment that we need to later add as compared to sitting here, trying to do it live—something ties the RSS to the RSOs.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sounds like a good suggestion to me.

Russ, is that an old hand?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes. But I'm okay with that change. Yeah, that makes sense.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thanks. Brad, please.

BRAD VERD: I would just say carry on to the next one because, if you're okay, I'll just rewrite this paragraph if that's alright with everybody.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Alright. What I'll do is I'll mark it as stricken here, and I will add—

EN

BRAD VERD: Because I think there are pieces of it that are worth using, and I think it could be done just in one sentence that I want to work on real quick here while you carry on.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: "New text here [inaudible]." So I'm going to leave it like that, and you're welcome to hack along there.

Seeing no more hands, let's go on to #4. "Diversity of the root server operations is a strength of the overall system. Diversity in the RSOs' operational models and organizational structures increases the resiliency of the overall system."

Do we need to explain that? I don't know if it's obvious to everyone which is diverse. Actually, it's more resilient than a homogeneous one. And this is a very important principle to me, so I really want to get the message across.

Paul, please?

PAUL HOFFMAN: Let me first say I think that first sentence is incredibly important and should remain. And it is absolutely not obvious to a lot of operations people who might read this document. So, certainly, we should not delete the whole paragraph.

The rest of it, I think, is useful. It's not needed. If people want to leave it in, I think it's fine. Again, it's something that we know and that we have seen more than other people. To somebody who has no operational

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

experience, the question of, "Well, why should I be paying for five servers instead of one just really good one?" is one that comes up.

So I think that the paragraph is reasonable, and I like Wes' addition at the end. So even though we're adding a [lot] here, Liman, I agree with you that this is a fairly important principle, not because it's more important than the others but that it's one that we've all agreed to but it's not obvious to people outside this circle.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's well put. So suggest we leave the text in. I think we need to rephrase the text here: "even with the additions." If I accept the changes here … Let me do that, just to see what happens. Accept that. We accept that. Where are we here? I think these were the [inaudible] Wes' addition at the end here. So I think this sentence comes out slightly strange. Let me see this sentence here. So if the system is diverse, only parts of the system may suffer from vulnerability. Ah, now I see how … Again, it's my lacking English. The word "may" can be interpreted two ways here. My interpretation, as I read incorrectly, was that only part of the systems can be allowed to suffer from a vulnerability.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Liman, since I'm the one who did a lot of those little edits, I'll volunteer to work on this sentence.

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Okay. Thank you. I'll add a comment to that effect here. "Paul Hoffman to polish that language."
	Any other comments regarding this now?
	Seeing no hands, let's move to Principle #5. "Architectural changes should result from technical evolution and demonstrate a technical need. Root server operators should embrace emerging technologies affecting the root server system as long as the Internet's global unique namespace is reserved."
	This could again be one that doesn't need a whole of explaining. Then I read the text and I see that maybe we want to stress that the root server system is technical infrastructure because here I believe that there are misconceptions where people think that the root server system is a steering mechanism for the Internet, and that's not how I like to view it. This explanation here is possibly slightly more politically loaded than some of the others.
	Any comments or opinions?
	I see Hoff Paul. Go ahead.
PAUL HOFFMAN:	I wasn't going to say "politically loaded," but yes, but more going to the point of where we started with going through these one by one.
	I also don't think this paragraph is tightly tied to the words in #5. I think that it is like, "Now that we've said that—and we didn't say this other thing before, but we would have liked to—let's put it here." I don't think

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

that that's appropriate as an explanation of the principle. I think that the sentiments in that additional paragraph would make a fine start for a completely separate and much longer document about what do the RSOs do other than technical. But I don't think it belongs here because #5 is about that we do technical. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Fair enough. So what do we do about the text then?

BRAD VERD: If I may—I don't see any hands up, so I'll just speak—in my brief rewrite of #3, I removed a sentence that I think a couple people might want to have in it. If you add it back in it, which is, "The RSS must be designed to work under all circumstances"—that's part of the original paragraph, which I removed—as Principle #3, then Principle #5 leads right into that, where, "The RSS is a technical infrastructure due to its importance for the Internet and its role to be available under all circumstances as defined in #3," blah, blah, blah. You could tie it together that way and remove the policy action or the subjective of view of commercial transactions.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. So—

BRAD VERD: Have each principle feed each other, which was the intent.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I do like that. So going step by step here, I start with deleting this part here. And then let's see how we can tie this … We have too many "its" here, I see, and they are reflective in different ways. I'm scrolling back up to find your text here.

BRAD VERD: We don't necessarily [have to] do it live, but I guess I'm curious from people—Paul and Ken and others—as to if tying 3 into 5 versus the role as a carrier of commercial transactions is better received.

KEN RENARD: Sounds good to me.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay.

BRAD VERD: I think it certainly goes back to what the intent was when we were writing this.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. So, Brad, if you and I were to take on rephrasing this text that I've marked in blue there—"Brad and Liman to rephrase text and tie it to Principle #3"—

BRAD VERD: Happy to do that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Excellent. Thank you.

BRAD VERD: Paul, given your comments, does that make better sense?

                             Did we lose Paul?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: He was breaking up a bit before, but he's still in the roster.

BRAD VERD: But happy to work on that [with everybody].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. So let's leave it at that for the moment and continue downwards to Principle #6. "The IETF defines technical operation of the DNS protocol. The IETF and the IAB define the protocols underlying DNS implementation [in] request for comments and other documentation."

                             Any comments regarding that text—the supporting text for #6?

FRED BAKER: Is this one where we even need supporting text?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Pardon? Again, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Is this one where we even need supporting text? I think the principle is very clear.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm trying this out.

WES HARDAKER: I'm getting a little concerned that we are throwing out all text and we will end of this a document with just the principles. Maybe we don't need to add much, but the principles are very short in general. Explaining the background behind them, I think, was the important … I'm not saying don't do this, but it's getting dangerously close to restating what was already stated.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So now I heard you say two things. One is that we need text, and the second thing I heard was that text restates #6 but in more words. So would you like to see different text here? If so, please help me out.

WES HARDAKER: Well, I mean, the purpose is to restate the statement. The purpose is to restate 6 but with more explanation as to why we consider it important or where it comes from. I'm speaking generically.

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Do you think that this text does that or do we need the different text?

WES HARDAKER: I don't have a problem with it. Everybody else does. I want to hear why everybody else thinks longer sentences explaining it in greater detail is a bad thing.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sorry. You've [broke up for me.]

WES HARDAKER: So, for example, let me just pick on the last sentence. "The IETF is commonly accepted as the primary body for creating Internet-related technologies and is where the DNS is defined and being updated." That's not in the original principle. That's additional information. It does say it to highlight, "The IETF and IAB define the protocols underlying the DNS implementation," but it doesn't talk about it being an open body. It doesn't talk about the fact that it is a commonly accepted place.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Are you saying the principle doesn't?

WES HARDAKER: The principle doesn't have as much information as the extra paragraph.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Right. But I thought the idea was to add that extra information for people who are not familiar with the IETF and the IAB.

WES HARDAKER: Right. So why are you deleting the paragraph? Oh, look, there's a lot of hands. I'll shut up now.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Good. Good, good, because there weren't when you started to talk and I focused on the text and what you said. So, Russ, please go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: I would be fine with having some text here. What I think we want to be careful to avoid is that, by adding text, we don't, in some manner, change the idea behind the principle or give those who want to see things interpreted differently than what they were really meant to be ammunition to make such an interpretation. When I suggested dropping a whole piece, it was from the perspective of, do we need to say more here? Obviously, others might think so. I'm okay with saying more, but I don't want to say too much more that could be used as the basis to misread what the principle says. And I think that's possible with the current wording.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Fair enough. Thank you. Paul?

PAUL HOFFMAN: I want to differentiate why we added a pointer to IANA in #2 to why we should talk about who the IETF is. There are some people in the root server system who have different views of what the IANA might be in the future. We know that. So having a pointer to the IANA that we mean there seems good.

No one questions what the heck the IETF is, so I believe the additional paragraph could disappear and no reader is going to think, "Well, which IETF are they talking about? What do they mean by "technical standard"?" If someone is reading this document and feels that they don't understand what the IETF is or what a technical standard is, then no amount of text we were giving here … So I believe this paragraph is extraneous. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I will comment at that at the end. But, please, Suresh.

SURESH KRISHNASWAMY: I have maybe a slight concern in the way that the original principle is laid as saying the IETF and IAB define the protocols and the last sentence of the clarifying paragraph saying that IETF is commonly accepted.

So is the intent of the principle to say that, if there are pieces of the DNS that are defined outside the IETF, then it must be also standardized within the IETF to be considered a part of the DNS? Or are we not

stretching it? Are we just saying that then IETF is where we recognize most of the protocol development happening?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's a good question. I would like to turn it around a bit. This actually ties into … Sorry for commenting in the middle of the queue here. The important message here is that the root server operators and the root server system operates a DNS protocol as defined by the IETF and the IAB. There are forces who think that there should be additional places for standardization of Internet-related protocols and such—for instance, the ITU or other organizations. I want to convey the message that the root server system adheres to whatever is standardized in the IETF. The root server system needs to adhere to a standard, and we can't really adapt to everything that's developed in other fora. There must be a single source of definition of the DNS protocol. To me, that's the IETF and the IAB in combination.

Back to the queue. Ryan, please?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Sorry about that. Mute. I know we're on #6, but jumping back up to #5, there's one word: "critical." I understand that the RSS is considered a critical technical infrastructure. However, by using that term "critical," I'm wondering, because of the fact … NIS2 in the E.U. Commission … They're claiming that, "Hey, the root server system is a critical technical infrastructure," but then we see comments going back from root server

operators saying, "Well, it's more important than the other term that the E.U. Commission was using to identify the root server system."

So I wonder if we want to change that word "critical" because, if they are reading this …["Okay, the root server system then is critical. Ergo, we'll have it at the highest importance level."

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Excuse me, I don't think the word "critical" is used there, but I might be wrong—oh, yes, you're right. I only [inaudible] that it's critical [inaudible]. Right. That is in this sentence that Brad and I took on to rephrase it. So your note is taken into consideration here. I will add in "Be careful with the word "critical." [Create]—

RYAN STEPHENSON: Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: "especially in relation to these two." Good catch. Thank you.

Going back to #6 now, Brad?

BRAD VERD: A couple things. One, to Ryan, yeah, we're going to go off and work on that one. So don't think that's the final verbiage.

Two, Paul, I think Liman covered it rather well—actually to Paul and Suresh, I think. The intent, again, going back to the goal here … These

principles, when they were written, was that the operators will operate DNS as defined by the IETF and the IAB. And that specifically came up when there were people asking if root server operators were doing their own thing and specializing in their own way and they can go off and do X, Y, and Z. Then principle was, "No, we operate DNS as defined in the IETF and the IAB." That was just saying how we operate it. And the key takeaway there is that the root server operators don't do anything different.

Lastly, to Wes, I agree with Wes 100%. I think some of these paragraphs to us, to this group of people who understand the environment and understand the technology, are extraneous. But to people outside of this group that don't understand the intricacies and the back-and-forth, I think the paragraph should restate the principle in more words as long as it doesn't take away or add something like policy verbiage or something like that.

As I read the verbiage as its written in #6, I don't have a challenge with it. I don't think it is pointing to calling groups as what might happen or what we think will happen in the future or there's other groups going on. We're only talking about the principle. The principle was limited to the IETF and the IAB. So explaining the IETF and the IAB to the reader is not necessarily out of the question in my book, much like we provided a pointer to the IANA above, where the difference was you were adding the relationships between ICANN, PTI, and the policymaking of it. That was extraneous to the operation of it. So I think those things are a little different. And I'll let that be. Thanks.

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I see a hand from Ryan, but I think that's an old hand. So I will jump to Paul right now. Paul Hoffman, please.

PAUL HOFFMAN: But, Brad, don't go away. Something that you just said … By the way, I'm fine with people want to leave this text in, but something that you just said actually strikes concern in me, especially with Liman had said earlier. Liman's point was we want to say that the root server operators follow what the IETF says, not some other technical organization that creates its own standards. The text in here is a little bit wobbly. The IETF is commonly accepted as … This is something that, I think, Daniel is pointing out in the comments sa well. If we're going to leave this in, which is fine, then I think we need to tighten it down to say the IETF is X, and the root server operator—

BRAD VERD: Dude, you could tighten it down and say that the …

PAUL HOFFMAN: Go ahead.

BRAD VERD: You could say that, "The root server operators accept the IETF as …"

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

PAUL HOFFMAN: Yeah.

BRAD VERD: And remove the word "commonly." That would make it less wobbly. I understand what you're saying.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Yeah. I think putting in active statements about the root server operators here with respect to the IETF would both make it clearer who the IETF is but also make it clearer why we're talking about the IETF here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's a good point. I would just slip in that the word "commonly" was added by someone who suggested. I have accepted that as change. It's a good catch. I'm not happy with it, either, so I like the suggestion to say that the root server operators accept the IETF as blah-blah.

                       Wes, you're next in line.

WES HARDAKER: So, adding a bit of levity, I'm not sure we're talking about the Internet Advertising Board. We have not actually expanded that acronym anywhere in this document. And because the Internet Advertising Board has a much better SEO than the IAB that we're used to, we need to make sure that we clarify that.

EN

And I don't know if we actually want to talk about the IAB, too. To some extent, I actually sort of disagree with the original principle. The IAB doesn't define the DNS protocol. It never has. The IETF has always been responsible for doing protocols, not the IAB. The IAB helps define the architecture at a larger scale than that. But, anyway …

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Two comments. We actually do mention the Internet Architecture Board just under Principle #1. But we actually don't tie it to the acronym, which we should. So that's easily fixed.

I think the IAB is important, partly because of RFC 2826. There is this tie between the namespace and the operation of the protocol. So the IAB definitely has a place in these principles. We can phrase it in different ways, but I would like to keep the IAB in there, not as the advertising board, though. If we need to phrase things differently, then we should. Here the operation in Principle 6 is defined by the protocol, which is the IETF, but also, for instance, the RFC … Is it 7720?; the principle for root server operators, which is actually IAB-driven. So I really would like to keep the IAB in the—

WES HARDAKER: Well, we can't remove it from the principle because we're quoting something else.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Well, that's true. Phew!

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

WES HARDAKER: Whether to include another sentence of why that's in the principle, I think, is my point. We might want to expand and add in a sentence. I'm not sure quite what [to add it to].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Would you be willing to work with me on shaping text there?

WES HARDAKER: Of course.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I'll make a comment here. Can I do that? "Wes and Liman to add text regarding the IAB." Alright.

Russ, you're next.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Liman. On this particular paragraph, in the reworking of it, where it is maybe going to talk about then RSOs following the protocols, I think it might be also appropriate, especially when you look at where the principles are placed in the overall 037 document itself. They are tied to the RSS. It seems appropriate to say, "The RSS as supported by," or, "can only be expected to operate as a single system if the RSOs follow the protocols from one place." So I think working in the RSS, as well as the RSO operations, is a useful thing to do in this expansion.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I'm going to draw a line after Daniel and Brad, who are on the list here, because we're running short of time here. So, Daniel, please.

DANIEL MIGAULT: I think the IAB should be mentioned. So I'm just supporting what you said. That's all.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you. Brad?

BRAD VERD: So I think you covered it, but I just want to, for the record, state that the IAB has to be mentioned. The IAB—again, I feel like I'm a broken record here … These were written in the writing of 037, as Russ said, with the intent of the RSS and the RSOs[—]what were the guiding principles? As we stated in 037, the stakeholders were the RSOs, the ICANN community, and the IAB. You can't remove the IAB. Thanks. But I agree with adding some wordsmithing to make it stronger. Or I like Paul's reference of "less wobbly."

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah. These are all taken to heart. Thank you.

Daniel, your hand is still up. I suppose it's an old hand.

EN

So I think we have beaten this horse, and I think we should move onto the next principle. We have four more to go—sorry. Five more to go. #7: "The root server operators must operate with integrity and ethos demonstrating a commitment to the common good of the Internet. The root server operators should operate with high moral and ethical standards. They must be committed to sending and responding, to traffic without filtering, to serving the IANA global roots, DNS space, and to avoiding conflicts of interest and [inaudible] agreements." That's a mouthful.

I don't really know what to do about this one. With a bit of polishing of the language, I'm reasonably okay with the text here, but I see Paul's hand up. Please.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Specifically on #7, I can't imagine that you can come up with words that expand on this without modifying it. This is exactly where we get wobbly.

I would propose that we not try. I would say start from nothing again and see what needs to be added to clarify.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Occam's principles, more or less. Yes. Suppose that we delete all the supporting text here. What would you, the general audience, like to see in additional text, if anything? And I will be most happy if you say "nothing."

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

Suresh, your hand is up.

SURESH KRISHNASWAMY: I think it's fine if we don't say anything additional here, but when I read this document—I confess that I'm late to reading the document—when I read 7 alongside 11, I was kind of thinking to myself, "How are different are these two, and are they saying anything unique that must be spelled out?" So, if, when we get to 11, we found that there is way to clarify how 7 differs from that, I think that can be helpful to some readers like me.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Point well taken. I actually had the same feeling when I read them put together like that. I think this comes from a brainstorming session where we boiled down the various ideas and had them listed on a whiteboard. These two ended up at different ends of the whiteboard, but there could be small differences in there that we need to convey.

I see Brad has his hand up. You usually have a good memory regarding these details. Please.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Again, being the broken record here, I apologize, but when these were written, 7 was, again, specific to the RSO, and it was making sure that there was no hidden agenda by RSOs and that there was no malintent. So this was ethos, and we knew that, when we wrote it, it was a squishy item, much like Paul just alluded to: that, if you rewrite this one, it gets to be an even more squishy type of thing.

EN

But the difference between 7 and 11 is, with 11, you need to think of as they have to be apolitical, basically. As stated earlier, we operate based upon the protocol. The protocol is neutral and impartial. So an RSO must operate in the same way if you follow that guiding principle above. So this was, again, that our operations are not driven by the geopolitics of the world.

So I think they are very different—one having ethos and being good stewards, and one operating in an impartial and neutral [manner]. You could tie them together, but I feel it's important—and we felt when we wrote these that it was important—to call them apart because #11 was so … Well, and it still is out there. There is a lot of geopolitics involved around the root. When you operate a root server, you don't get to play in that world. You operate it in an apolitical, neutral manner. I hope that helps.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. I actually have a proposal here, which is to delete the text under 7 and replace it with a pointer to "This principle is compared to and further explained under Principle #11." We can make that comparison and do the explanation under 11.

How does that sound to people? Again, I would have to rely on your help to get the wording right there, Brad.

BRAD VERD: I don't know if I'm for or against that proposal. I would have to see how it works out, if that makes sense.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

EN

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Fair enough.

BRAD VERD: But I'm not opposed to doing [inaudible].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Are you willing to help me to an attempt to see if we can make it work?

BRAD VERD: Absolutely.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Excellent. A comment here then: "Liman and Brad to attempt to move this to #11 and compare them."

KAVEH RANJBAR: Liman, I can also support if it helps.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay.

BRAD VERD: Fresh eyes are always helpful, Kaveh.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, definitely.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

With that, I think we are done with #7 and we have still four more to go. "The root server operators must be transparent … " This at least is slightly different. "The RSOs must be as transparent as reasonable without compromising their operational security."

This is something that is fairly close to my heart as well. I'm not quite sure we need this amount of text here, though. This ties into my philosophy in life—one of my philosophies—which is that people don't worry about that they see. They worry about what they can see.

Brad, your hand is up. Is that a new hand?

BRAD VERD: Yeah, new hand. So I think, again, being a partial historian here, when we wrote this, we—meaning the RSOs [in] RSSAC—thought it was important to dispel that secret-cabal myth.

Going to what you said, Liman, this was an attempt at … We needed to be transparent, we need to be open, and we needed to talk to the community. When there were incidents, we should say something about them and explain things, but we shouldn't do anything to compromise the operational security. That was the intent when these were written.

I also agree with you that I'm not sure this many words are needed here.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Paul, please.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

PAUL HOFFMAN: On the "not as many words needed," Liman, I propose that you keep the first two sentences, which seem positive, and then drop the rest of it which is about: if we aren't transparent, here are the bad things that happen and such.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I like that a lot. I can jump on that bandwagon easily.

Suresh, please?

SURESH KRISHNASWAMY: I was actually going to suggest somewhat of the converse because I think that last sentence—"Transparency plays a role in strengthening trust"—is actually quite important here and ties back to the rogue operator document because, when things go wrong, I think what helps differentiate between an operator that is rogue and one that is not is a level of transparency you have in what went wrong. So I think that is important, so I would be tempted to keep that in there.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. I hear you. That's a good point. Still, I think Paul had a point regarding trying to be positive. I think we can turn what you said, Suresh, into something positive as well. But being transparent actually leads to a spiral of improvements, where, by observing the system, it becomes possible to improve and where eyes from the outside can help improve the system and strengthen it further. So we don't have to focus

on the downsides and the faults and failures. We can focus on the openness and the transparency being a way for people to chip in and add and contribute to the system.

I'll be willing to take a stab at that myself—to phrase that. I just have to make a note for myself because I will have forgotten this in roughly 20 seconds' time if I don't have a note here. "Add a comment here. Liman to rephrase this to positive. Transparency allows a contributors to help improve the system. Remove negative waves." There we go.

We're coming to the top of the hour and I think we are supposed to keep going on until 8:00. So I will read out the three remaining ones quickly, and then I will open the floor to comment on all three of them for the remaining minutes.

So, #9. "The root server operators must collaborate and engage with their stakeholder community. The RSOs must collaborate openly with other operators, participate in group meetings and activities, and engage in the IETF and the technical standardization process and respond to the stakeholder questions in a timely manner." That's fairly straightforward to me.

I'll do 10 and 11 as well. "RSOs must be autonomous and independent. And RSO should have autonomy and independence in architecting and operating their service while also adhering the standards and service expectations." This has an entire document of its own, and it ties into the diversity and resilience thing.

EN

Again, then: "The RSOs must be neutral and impartial." I think we can leave #11 because Brad and I are going to take a stab at that.

So let's focus on #9 and 10. Are there are any comments regarding those?

Brad, your hand is up.

BRAD VERD: Just real quick. #9 was that an RSO—a new RSO, and even existing RSOs—needed to participate in all the activities around being an RSO. That meant RSSAC. That meant IETF. That meant Root Ops. That meant all these different things. You can't just come in and do your own thing. That was the intent with #9.

With #10, #10 is a little tricky with the words here, I'll be honest with you. I've heard this explained to people in a couple different ways that are not in alignment as I remember them. The way that I remember #10—autonmous and independent; I know we have an independent document that goes into RSO independence—is that this guiding principle was that, if money was involved or if money was transacted for the services, nobody could dictate how the service was provided by the RSO. That was where I remember 10 coming in and being so important. There was a lot of talk around diversity and the obvious need for it. And there was fear that, if there was one funding mechanism or one funding source, they could dictate how the service was operated. And 10 was written basically saying, no, the RSOs need to be independent and autonomous regardless. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. No more hands. I've written a note on my paper here regarding #10, and I will have to look into whether we need to rephrase this text or not.

We are running short on time. We are one minute past the hour already. So I think, due to time restrictions, we will have to quit here. We have a couple of things assigned to people to modify the text and continue to work. We will do our best and we will generate a new version of this document for your review.

So I would like to say thank you to all of you who have participated—

PAUL HOFFMAN: Lima, excuse me. Just very briefly, it seems like a lot of people are interested in this document and there's no work party for it. Can we schedule another call?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'm happy to do that. I would have to look at Ozan to help us do that, but I would welcome that, really. So I will propose to ICANN that we schedule a call. It will probably have to be something like one or to weeks down the line because we need the time to sit down and think and write about this. And you will have to have time to read what we wrote. But, yes, definitely. Another call is a good idea. Let's do that.

FRED BAKER:	I was just about to follow up on that, and, in the chat, Ozan says he will work with you, Liman, to make that happen.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Excellent. Perfect.

FRED BAKER:	Sounds good.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	So, with that, I again thank you all for participating and contributing to this document. I will then return to … Who's running the meeting? That's Ozan, right? Ozan, please, do you have any final words?

OZAN SAHIN:	Thank you, Liman. I don't, other than thanking everyone else for joining this session. So, tech support colleagues, please stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]