KOBE - Joint Meeting - ICANN Board and RSSAC

Wednesday, March 13, 2019 - 00:00 to 00:00 JST

ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

KAVEH RANJAR:    So, first of all, let me apologize for the unusual seating. Normally, I expect all members of RSSAC and the board at the same table. But in this big room, the big room in this venue doesn't allow that. But we have some of the board members and RSSAC members in the front row. But we will pass the mic when there are questions or comments.

So with that, can we have a roll call before we start.

Please.

KEN RENARD:    Ken Renard, Army Research Lab, RSSAC.

WES HARDAKER:    Wes Hardaker, USC ISI, RSSAC.

TERRY MANDERSON:     Terry Manderson, ICANN managed root server, RSSAC.


DANIEL MIGAULT:      Daniel Migault, IAB liaison with RSSAC.


TRIPTI SINHA:        Tripti Sinha, ICANN board.


BRAD VERD:           Brad Verd, RSSAC co-chair.


FRED BAKER:          Fred Baker, RSSAC co-chair.


AKINORI MAEMURA:     Akinori Maemura, ICANN Board, BTC.


KAVEH RANJBAR:       Kaveh Ranjbar, RSSAC liaison to the board.


MERIKE KAEO:         Merike Kaeo, SSAC liaison to the board.


SUZANNE WOOLF:       Suzanne Woolf, USC ISI, RSSAC.

HARALD ALVESTRAND:     Harald Alvestrand, IETF liaison to the ICANN board.

JEFF OSBORN:     Jeff Osborn, ISC, RSSAC.

KARL REUSS:     Karl Reuss, University of Maryland, RSSAC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:     And Lars-Johan Liman, (indiscernible) RSSAC.

KAVEH RANJBAR:     And can I have a microphone for RSSAC and Board members sitting in the front row.

If it is coming.

Thank you.

Sorry.

LEON SANCHEZ:     Leon Sanchez, sorry, ICANN board.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:     Maarten Botterman, ICANN board.

BECKY BURR:            Becky Burr, ICANN board.

NIGEL ROBERTS:         Nigel Roberts, ICANN board.

HIRO HOTTA:            Hiro Hotta, JPRS, RSSAC.

LITO IBARRA:           Lito Ibarra, ICANN board.

DUANE WESSELS:         Duane Wessels, root zone maintainer, liaison to RSSAC.

RYAN STEPHENSON:       Ryan Stephenson, Department of Defense, G root.

KAVEH RANJBAR:         And I see Goran also joined us.

                       So Chris Disspain, vice chair of the board, sent his apologies because he's busy otherwise and cannot join,, at least for the first part of the meeting.  Maybe he'll join later.

Today we have one agenda item which we want to focus on, and it's RSSAC37 and the concept paper. There are two goals from the session today. One, everybody is aligned on the process, so we want to make sure both board members and RSSAC members are actually up to speed with the process. And if there are any questions or any changes or proposed, we discuss them.

And second, setting the expectations and limiting possible surprises when the work actually starts.

I will run the meeting in two sections. First we go through the proposed process, and after that, we will discuss the content and feedback from RSSAC.

Before I start with the process, I'd like to ask Akinori Maemura, as chair of Board Technical Committee, to let us know if he has any comments.

AKINORI MAEMURA:     Thank you very much, Kaveh. Yes, thank you very much for joining us. This is the RSSAC board meeting.

And then as Kaveh said, this general session is specialized or focused on RSSAC37, which is proposing the new governance model of the root server system.

And then right now, it is -- the RSSAC come to us with the proposed scheme, which is written in 37. And then still the ICANN board is at the phase of consideration.

But in this early stage, we've already engaged RSSAC for their own input, for the so-called concept paper, which is the -- the interpretation of the RSSAC37, and then with some addition from ICANN's point of view. So this concept paper is discussed throughout this week with the BTC and RSSAC, and this time, entire board and RSSAC, for our own consideration to polish -- polish our own concept paper and then to be officially passed to the RSSAC.

So this is the -- this is for the streamlining discussion in the board to avoid, you know, go back and forth kind of, you know -- not really streamlined situation. We do want to have that smooth discussion with this.

So I'm really happy to have -- if we have a good discussion with RSSAC and the entire board at this time. And then that's -- let's have a lot of things discussed on this stage.

Thank you very much, Kaveh.


KAVEH RANJBAR:            Thank you very much, Akinori.

So I'm not going to go through the RSSAC37. That was presented in detail in the last meeting. And in the meantime, the slide deck, if you download it, the first few slides actually go through that. So I'm not going to dive deep into the 37.

But the process that we are following, at a high level, basically -- so ICANN org -- at a high level, RSSAC has prepared this -- the 37 as a proposed model for governance of root server system. So that would be fundamental change.

This is also -- I have to say, this is uncharted water, so we have never been through such a process. One of the key things in RSSAC37 is RSSAC identifies three main stakeholders, and ICANN is only one of them. The other one is root server operators. And the third one, IETF IAB.

So this means this process is larger than ICANN, but ICANN is facilitating and running it.

The envisioned process at a very high level is -- you see on this slide. First we want to identify who and what should be involved in finalizing the model. Because in RSSAC37, RSSAC only proposed the model from their point of view. But, of course, we want inputs from others to prepare the final model.

Second, we want, actually, those people to basically prepare a final model. And I have to note -- sure, Cherine has joined us.

And, finally, we want to implement a model.

If we can have the next slide, please.

Next slide, please.

Yes.

So, of course, each step has decision-making points and opportunity for public comment. One other thing I have to add, we want maximum meaningful inclusion so we can show we have been as open and inclusive as possible in the future and we can also defend this process. This is not just something that happens now, because it is installing basically a governance model which is going to be used for the root server system in coming years. So we want to make sure that it is as inclusive and defendable as possible.

And now we are in the very first phase of the process. For that, we have more details. The slide you see actually shows the details of the phase 1.

And, basically, after we -- after the board received that advice, RSSAC37 and RSSAC38, from RSSAC, they have -- the board has asked the BTC to look into the proposal, because it's mostly a technical proposal, and provide their input to the board for next step.

Doing that, BTC has asked org, basically, to propose a -- to draft a concept paper, which BTC should discuss.

At the moment, we are at that -- that step. Org has drafted a concept paper. We at RSSAC have agreed to also provide input to that concept paper. But to be very clear, the concept paper was independently designed by the org to be proposed to the BTC. RSSAC advice will go next to it. This is informal advice, so this is not -- no commitment from RSSAC to approve the outcome if everything that RSSAC is proposing is included, or it doesn't mean that BTC will accept everything that's coming from RSSAC.

But we have mutual agreement. Generally, we have discussed this in detail. Also, we had a session two days ago, which we went through all the changes. I understand there is general consensus within both groups on what's inside. But I have to emphasize, formally, at the moment, the owner of the document is BTC. After BTC makes its decision and provides a formal version, RSSAC will have its chance to give its comments, and I assume in the form of statement, which will be voted on, sends that back to BTC, and then we expect the next step in the process, which that -- the concept paper with rest of documents will go to the board for resolution, and hopefully we will continue to the public comment process.

These time lines you see here are indicative.  I have to repeat, which is uncharted waters.  Goran provided very useful input at the beginning of the process to make sure that we actually run the policy in a way that's sustainable and that the process has enough diligence so that we can basically defend it, as I said, in the future as well.

So we are aiming for a clear, documented, open, and rational process to move forward.  The process here is also very important, although the contents has the same importance.

And finally, we are working -- this is a separate work stream in RSSAC, but indirectly related.  We are working on RSSAC statement on the independence of the root servers and what it means and why the root server operators are independent.  This is expected to be ready before the start of step number 2.  Of course, they're not directly related, but we expect that's very valuable -- that would be valuable input for the board before the board can actually make a final decision and a resolution on the subject.

And, yeah, with that, basically, I'm done with explaining the process.  I will go to the questions and comments for the process, and then at the next step, we go to the actual contents of the concept paper.

So Fred.

FRED BAKER:    I just wanted to point out that the paper on independence was actually requested by Goran.

KAVEH RANJBAR:    Yes.  Thank you for pointing that out.

GORAN MARBY:    And thank you for answering me.

KAVEH RANJBAR:    Now, I have to say, yes, Goran pointed this out, but discussing in RSSAC, basically, everybody agreed that would be an important document.   Even  without  37,  that  would  be  a  very  useful statement to have.  So -- and it would be essential for moving forward with this process.  So you will have that.

Goran.

GORAN MARBY:    We haven't spoken about this in this (indiscernible), but one of the  reasons  I  think  it's  so  important  is  because  it's  also  a clarification document for the ICANN community engaging in this and  going  into  the  process.    Remember  that  the  ICANN community  has  not  had  that  level  of  understanding  or  input

about the root server operations, and therefore, to clarify where the limits go, because of your independence, I think that's essentially important. Otherwise, there is a risk that we always end up talking more about things that we shouldn't have a say about.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much.

GORAN MARBY: This is my Swedish treat. I'd rather speak about the things that we have to say and think about.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Goran.

So on the process, any comments? As I've mentioned, this is a bit out of usual for us, because normally, we would receive something formally from, let's say, board, and discuss that and maybe issue a statement and vote.

But this time, we said even before getting to that stage, let us interact on an informal basis with BTC and provide our input.

And I have to say, it worked -- it worked -- so far, it has worked fantastically. We had a very productive session on Monday with the BTC. Yeah, proves to be very efficient. Hopefully, when we

have the final concept paper from the BTC, that will already include all or most of our concerns, and that will make the job of RSSAC also much easier to endorse the statement to move forward with the next steps.

Any comments on the process, on how we are moving forward on the steps?

Board members?

Okay. If that's the case, I will go to the meat of the discussion, which is the content of the concept paper.

So when we received the concept paper -- and I'm not going to dive into the details, because at the moment, it's a draft document. Org is a pen-holder. But there were three high-level subjects that we had comments for. The first one was accountability.

I think it's best if I ask Brad to basically summarize our concerns based on what we received, and then we can discuss that further.

BRAD VERD:          A couple things. First, again, I want to thank the BTC for working with RSSAC. You know, when we submitted 37, we asked for an open dialogue back and forth so that as we moved the ball

forward on this, we were in the same trajectory.  So appreciate the opportunity to review this and give feedback.

As we did this, I will point out that RSSAC itself had some very contentious conversations around this, contentious enough that we had to change our schedule to continue to talk about it.

But as we worked through it, as we worked to consensus, we kind of boiled it down to these three topics that came out of the concept paper.  I'll touch on accountability.  Fred will touch on finance.

So some of these things might seem very, I don't know what you'd say, obvious, but we just wanted to kind of go above and beyond and call them out.  So first bullet, periodic reviews.  We thought that -- we didn't want whatever came out of the concept paper or the governance working group as a result of the concept paper to be done.  We didn't consider it done.  We considered that this was going to constantly evolve as the Internet evolved.  As things changed, this needed to evolve also.  So we just called out that the typical review process that -- here that we have within ICANN should be -- should be noted and included.

We spent a lot of time talking about separation of functions.  The concept paper called out -- So we spent a lot of time doing 37 separating functions to make sure that there was no conflicts. And we identified, you know, all the different functions, called

them out, described them, and then even ran through a bunch of scenarios with them.

In the concept paper, some of those functions are -- "shared" is the wrong word, but they are commingled within potentially the same organization. And this raised a lot of concern and a lot of discussion. So we added -- we shared our thoughts on that and added some potential verbiage that kind of said that the right checks and balances need to be -- needed to be put in place to ensure there was no conflicts of interest and so forth.

Again, I don't think this is ground-breaking, but it was very important and, again, led to some contentious talks on our side.

Lastly, around accountability, the group kind of -- the group was very -- felt very strongly at the end of the process -- actually, throughout the process, wherever anything was being approved or kind of like, you know, there was a milestone to move forward, but specifically at the end of the process, that the stakeholders that were identified in 37 should all have a say in approving it. And so -- so that was -- there was some verbiage change in there.

RSSAC was included, because this is your -- your -- there's a lot of expertise here around the root server system, and so we thought that RSSAC could -- should be in that group also.

So, yeah, that's all I have around the accountability. Questions or concerns?

GORAN MARBY: Can I ask a question? This is more technical. And as you said, I did construct some of the things in the proposal.

Other stakeholders engaged, is that outside ICANN as well?

Is that outside the ICANN institution as well?

BRAD VERD: You mean the stakeholders, the other stakeholders? This came up in our meetings this week. This came up in our discussion with the PTC. And I think the way the group thought about this was that there is currently engagement with ICANN in -- with those stakeholders, I should say, within ICANN. But what should be given to those stakeholders is an opportunity to say, how do you want to engage here? How would you like to be approved. And maybe the answer from the stakeholders is, we're good with what's there. But we don't know.

GORAN MARBY: The reason is, you and me sort of discussed this before, is ICANN is a -- to some extent, a contained ecosystem as itself. The bylaws is only providing for ICANN, the institution.

And one of them is, to the most extent, you have to be inside the ecosystem in the institution to have a saying.

And then we have cooperation with others. For example, Harald here is a liaison from IETF with no voting power within the board.

Great guy, by the way.

So, this is more of a way -- if that is the request, we have to figure out a way and think about it so we don't break anything that doesn't need to be broken.

So it's not me saying -- trying to be -- we just explain that we -- to make two, we have to add one plus one.

So I'm going to take that back and think about it, how that can be worked out in the institution.

(indiscernible). I would like to see the transcript of that, please.

KAVEH RANJBAR:          Liman, and then Brad.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:       Yes, Lars Liman from Netnod. Yes, just precisely because ICANN is a self-contained ecosystem, there is an inside and an outside. And we want to include also the outside. And, yes, we probably need to think about --

GORAN MARBY: Yeah, because this is really uncharted territory. I -- We probably have to think really hard about that. Because ICANN, as an institution, cannot tell anyone what to do. Actually, sometimes we have problems telling people anything. But that's -- but we worked it out -- I mean, in the committees that we were talking about here, we can -- we can have places for people to be -- to have involvement. But then we have to work on voting rights and all of that. That could be --

But we -- now I understand what you want, it's easier for me to see what we can do.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. Is this something direct?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Lars Liman again. There are bits and pieces that we have tested before. The IANA transition have some commonalities with this. But there's still a lot that is unchartered. So, yes, let's explore that together.

GORAN MARBY: So the big difference is that IANA is controlled by us. IANA is in this. The money, the funding, the people, everything comes within ICANN. It's a part of the institution.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: It is so because that was what the outside decided.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Okay. Brad.

GORAN MARBY: Because that's what the inside decided, actually.

BRAD VERD: So I kind of echo what you guys said, which is, this is – and, again, we talked about this with the BTC this week, is that this is – this is really green field policy and it doesn't necessarily fit into a lot of the normal policy development that goes on here. So we're going to have bumps along the way. We're going to have to figure them out. And I like to think that this might be rocket science, but we're all rocket scientists.

GORAN MARBY: I'm not a rocket scientist.

It's like Becky said during – while we were starting to introduce this proposal. Nothing we are doing here is anywhere in anything in our bylaws. So we're going to have bylaws changes, we're going to have a lot of those things. So we better get it right, because we also – all of this has to go back to our community so they agree upon it. There have – really have to be part of this.

KAVEH RANJBAR: I have Suzanne, Akinori, and Wes.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you, Kaveh. Suzanne Woolf.

I think, Goran, that -- I understand your concern about the institutional factor here and the authorities and structures and so on. But I actually do want -- but I think the process we're following here is a more -- is a very constructive way to think about avoiding issues of authority and inside and outside and all of those things. So, actually, I want to say that I think as painful as it has been in some ways -- and Brad is completely correct that there are some real challenges here -- I think this kind of process is exactly how we have to go.

GORAN MARBY: I don't disagree. If -- You know, I've been -- I've been -- me and my team, I know, has been very supportive of the whole process and very grateful for it. So there's no doubt. It's just that for us to understand -- we have a round ball, and we're trying to put that into a squarish hole.

And the reason why we have a round ball in a squarish hole is because the community has given us a specific set of tools, for transparency and accountability. And I'm really respectful of that. So now I think everybody wants to do good, but we also have to do good without breaking so we don't end up something that seems to be nice on paper but doesn't work to implement.

So my comment is -- Now I understand what you want. And my comment back was that, okay, let's try to figure it out and have a conversation about it. Then I try to explain why it's not easy to say, it's because we have limitations with what we do.

But in the first suggestion we came up with, we said it's going to be bylaw changes, we need the community interaction, we have the empowered community, we have all those layers of this onion that we have created. And as I think I've said a couple of times, every time you cut up an onion, you also cry. I also learned that if you put into a freezer first, you don't cry. But I don't want to put this into a freezer.

KAVEH RANJBAR:             Akinori.


AKINORI MAEMURA:          Thank you very much.  Akinori Maemura speaking.

Yes, this kind of discussion, RSSAC had a discussion and put up this proposal 37.  And the BTC and RSSAC discussed this.  And then all a quite similar discussion we had and now we have the discussion between the entire board and the RSSAC.  And then we need to -- definitely need to consult the community at large.

So it is really interesting, an observation from my side, because, you know, ICANN -- ICANN was needed for the (indiscernible) some functionality of the Internet.  And then when ICANN is created, the bylaws were carefully crafted to limit its responsibility in the narrow scoped.  So for -- that was in order for the ICANN to -- for its own role as the business.  So that was needed.

But what we need to -- need for, you know, advancing this kind of -- the new scheme, we definitely need the really based consensus of the Internet stakeholders.  And then it is not limited within or without or inside or outside of ICANN, but community at large.

That's a really difficult point to discuss, in whatever scale.  So we maybe continuously and continually need to do this kind of

discussion in various scale with the community to make that good consensus. So let's try. That's really, as Kaveh said, uncharted process to make. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much.

Wes.

WES HARDAKER: Thank you, Kaveh. I just want to remind people who the three stakeholders are. We sort of dived into this, and I'm not sure everybody has it fresh in their heads. But the three stakeholders that are identified by 37 are the ICANN community as one, as represented by the ICANN board. So that's easy in terms of communication; right? We already have it in place.

The other one is the IETF and IAB, which oversees the DNS protocol and how it works. We have liaisons to both of those.

And then the third one is the root server operators that actually run and administrate the infrastructure. Again, we have communication paths for all of those.

And in terms of maybe this is new and is a green field, but there's a lot that we can build upon. Even though it's green, there's a

large amount of communication infrastructure we already have in place.

And most importantly, you know, even if things may be difficult, you have to ask what is correct, what is right. And I think that making sure that all of these three stakeholders have a say in this is correct and right, even if that makes it slightly more difficult.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Wes.

Building on top of what you said, I have to add, root server operators, basically, which are one of the three stakeholders, have clearly indicated by reading the framework and language of 37, they are committed to this evolution process.

So we have said, as long as within that framework we are committed to that evolution. So I think that solves that one-third of the problem. ICANN communities have been very receptive. And IETF, we have enough IETF people here to, in my personal opinion, be sure that it's not a huge surprise to them. I'm sure we need to still start communicating and get back and hear from them. But I don't think it will come as a super big surprise and we have never heard about it.

So, yes, as Goran said, we all have to work towards consensus in the larger framework. But I wanted to point out that RSOs have

basically commented within 37 to evolution and they have selected ICANN to facilitate this.

So one more comment, RSSAC and board members sitting in the audience, if you have any comments, please, we have a microphone. Don't shy away from joining the conversation.

Anything else on the accountability side?

Okay.

Another -- another high level of -- areas of concerns or comments we had with the concept paper was regarding finance and money matters. And I will ask Fred, our co-chair, to maybe elaborate a bit on those.

FRED BAKER:     So RSSAC37 doesn't particularly comment on financial implications or so on and so forth. We're a bunch of technologists. We commented primarily on technology and the organizations that surrounded that technology. That's not to say that money is unimportant. And so in our conversation over last weekend, we had a fairly rollicking discussion of money and where that comes in.

One of the important aspects of this is that the different RSOs are materially different in a variety of ways. Some have mechanisms

for accepting money; some don't.  Some are for-profit, commercial entities; some are not-for-profit.  Some are agencies of government.  We have a variety of things going on.  Actually, wearing a different hat, one of the RSOs is the local host for this meeting.  You know, we're doing all sorts of things.

But we wanted to look at, so what were the service requirements and would there be different service requirements?  How would we measure that service?  And what would be the implications for each of the RSOs in their different modes of operation.  And something that we thought was strong -- or important to emphasize was that each of the RSOs has the same service requirements.  We need to work out the money and whatever aspects that following from that.  But we're making the same statements, we're performing the same service, and we want to be measured in essentially the same way.

Now, one of the things that has been going on now for -- what is it? -- 40 years is that the RSOs are essentially self-funding.  And, you know, that isn't always easy, depending on the RSO.

With this change in model, things are -- you know, the different assets are moving around a bit, and there's fairly strong feeling, especially on the part of some, that money needed to follow.  And, you know, so there will be discussion of policies and of -- of the management of funding for capital assets.  If we need to deploy a

new service, we need to change aspects of the service, we need to -- you know, whatever, capital changes might be needed, we might have a legitimate request coming back to ICANN, saying, "Please send money."  And then the cost of operations, there might be a place for a policy that would support ongoing operations.

So financially, we wanted to have ICANN as a partner and be able, therefore, to talk about money in that context.


KAVEH RANJBAR:              Thank you very much.

Any comments from RSSAC or board members?

Goran?  I saw your hand move.


GORAN MARBY:               I was not thinking of saying anything.  You and I have spoken on this.  So, yeah, noted.

We are looking forward to future discussions between the sort of -- what you do today, what we're going to do tomorrow, how the interactions from the community are going to look like in the future.  We are in the beginning of a conversation.  But your comment is noted -- this is me "giving no commitments at all" face.

KAVEH RANJBAR:            Thank you very much.


FRED BAKER:              Actually, Goran, you brought it up at one point. So, yeah, that's part of it.


KAVEH RANJBAR:            And we have to add, we saw the breakdown of steps for phase 1. But we think -- and we discussed that internally. We think most of the discussions about finances from both parties will come in phase 2, which is basically drafting the final model.

So we expect that's an integral part -- will be an integral part of the final model. We cannot go to the implementation without clearly identifying all (indiscernible) of funding, starting from sourcing to all of the accounting and liabilities and all of that.

Any other comments regarding -- no? Okay.

And we had one last high-level comment for the concept paper, which was evolution of RSSAC and RSSAC caucus. To open the discussion, basically there was language in the original concept paper. Again, the SSAC hasn't yet even reviewed in detail by BTC. So this was in the proposal of the concept paper. Were suggested

that after this evolution, RSSAC in some -- some words, so I'm just paraphrasing -- will cease to exist.

That was a comment. When this was presented to BTC, we got a comment that says "who says." I mean, why. We are assessing that right now. And also BTC -- sorry, RSSAC had the same input, that we know that RSSAC will evolve and RSSAC caucus will evolve as a result of this process, but we don't know how. And there is no need to comment to kill anything at this time. We just want to point out in a document that it might change and in any form. So now in the concept paper that's more clear.

I don't know if there's any other comments on that point. Please, Brad.

BRAD VERD: Just maybe to add some clarity. I don't think anybody thought that the verbiage that was read in the concept paper actually meant to get rid of RSSAC. I think it was more of if other people were to read it, maybe it would be interpreted like that. So we wanted to bring some clarity to that.

I think throughout all of this, through 37 and working with the Board on -- via the concept paper here, I think there's always been an expectation within RSSAC that things might change as a result of this.

GORAN MARBY:    Did you actually catch on to my devilish plan to get rid of you?

BRAD VERD:    As I stated, no, I did not think that.  Or we did not think that.  But the way it was kind of written, one could read that; and so we wanted to kind of avoid the challenge.

GORAN MARBY:    I have to say, I love you guys.  No, our intention is not to get rid of RSSAC.

KAVEH RANJBAR:    Thank you very much.

Any other comments?  So basically we opened this session with two high-level goals.  One, everybody's aligned in the process.  I hope it's much more clear now for everyone from the Board as well because RSSAC, we have went through this multiple times also with BTC.

But if there's any questions or comments of the process, I think that's the best time to bring it up.

And the second one was basically setting the expectations which I think now would basically -- at least there's some general

understanding of where RSSAC is coming from regarding our comments to the concept paper.

And just to repeat, the next steps, we hope that BTC reviews the concept paper and our comments and considers them and provides a final version to RSSAC so we can start working with that.

Okay. Akinori, do you have anything further?

CHERINE CHALABY: I'm really very supportive. I have spoken to Goran about this. Spoken also to Brad and Fred about this. So I'm very familiar with what's going on and totally supportive of the direction. And I'm also pleased that we've made progress on RSSAC 37 and 38. That was quite important, that we move in that direction.

So I'm very grateful also for David Olive. Is David Olive around somewhere because he's been quite instrumental in working with us on this. So thank you, David, and thank you, everyone involved in that. So, much appreciated.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Cherine. Akinori, closing?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much, Cherine. Thank you very much, everyone.

So it's very good to share with everyone, that this is a very new work item. It's, like, as big as ICANN's stewardship transition. We are changing the scheme. And then it needs to have really good involvement of all corners of the Internet stakeholders.

Now, we finally started this process and then it is tasked to the -- BTC was tasked to deal with that. But what we found, it is really, really much of the procedure and the policy team. And I appreciate the involvement of the policy team headed by David Olive and then we finally start this discussion. So I do hope that there is progress step by step.

And, Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Yes, just a final comment regarding Tripti who has been instrumental in bringing this. It seems once she's come to the Board, we have forgotten about the role she place.

So, Tripti, we're also -- I remember from day one, you and Brad have been working very hard at this. And we recognize truly that this was a big effort and a successful one to have brought everybody into a consensus. So we haven't forgotten about your contribution, although you've been very modest about it. So thank you very much.

KAVEH RANJBAR:     Thank you.

Any closing comments from the co-chairs or Goran?

BRAD VERD:     On this topic or altogether?

KAVEH RANJBAR:     Closing the session

BRAD VERD:     Before we close the session, maybe if we got a couple minutes, just to inform the Board that, you know, we're in the final process of our review.  We've given -- we've turned back things to the OEC and we're working on -- we're looking forward to hearing what the final recommendations are.

But I only share that because the group has worked on a couple of the recommendations -- we were already working on things prior to the recommendations coming out.  And two things that are hopefully being finalized later today in the official monthly RSSAC meeting is we'll be voting on new operational procedures which address a couple things that were brought up in the review. And we were also approving our work plan for the year.  So that should come out later today.

KAVEH RANJBAR:    Thank you very much.

And with that, if there's no other comment -- I just want to mention, as liaison to the Board, I see there is a lot of collaboration between both RSSAC and Board and BTC. And I see a lot of support from both groups. There is a lot of motivation to make this happen. O.

Of course, there are differences of opinion, but so far we have been able to resolve them with cooperation from both sides. So I'm very happy.

And to build on what Cherine said, basically from RSSAC we started, which is a few years ago, rechartered basically, we have -- with the leadership we have been able to make a lot of changes. So thanks to the -- first to the RSSAC members and, second, to the leadership who has made this happen. So thank you very much. And if there's nothing else, I'll close the session.

Thank you.

[ Applause ]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]