
ICANN84 | AGM – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and RSSAC
Tuesday, October 28, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

WENDY PROFFITT

This session will now begin. Please start the recording. Hello, and welcome to the joint meeting of the ICANN Board and the RSSAC. My name is Wendy Proffitt, and I'm a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I'll also post this in the chat for your reference. This is a meeting between the RSSAC and the Board. And so, we won't be taking questions from the audience during this session unless we have time at the end.

For remote participant members of RSSAC, if you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, you'll be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants can use the physical microphone here at the desk to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak clearly at a moderate pace.

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.

I will now hand the floor over to ICANN Board Chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Wendy. Welcome, everyone, to the Board's fourth bilateral meeting with the RSSAC and the Board. Let's start with introductions. Jeff, if you could start, and we go around the table.

JEFF OSBORN

Hi, Jeff Osborn, RSSAC Chair.

BRAD VERD

Brad Verd, Verisign.

MATT LARSON

Matt Larson, ICANN on behalf of L-Root Operations, RSSAC member.

KEVIN HILDEBRAND

Kevin Hildebrand, University of Maryland.

JAMES GALVIN

James Galvin, SSAC liaison to the ICANN Board.

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN

Christian Kaufmann, ICANN Board member.

CHRIS CHAPMAN	Chris Chapman, ICANN Vice-Chair.
TRIPTI SINHA	Tripti Sinha, ICANN Board.
KURTIS LINDQVIST	Kurtis Lindqvist, ICANN President here.
WES HARDAKER	Wes Hardaker, RSSAC liaison to the ICANN Board.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN	Lars-Johan Liman, Netnod, RSSAC member, Root Server Operator.
DAVID LAWRENCE	David Lawrence, IETF liaison to the ICANN Board.
FREDRIK LINDEBERG	Fredrik Lindeberg, Netnod, RSSAC alternate member, Root Server Operator.
KENNETH RENARD	Ken Renard, US Army Research Lab and RSSAC Vice-Chair for another two and a half days.
HIRO HOTTA	Hiro Hotta, WIDE and JPRS from RSSAC.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Rob Carolina, member of RSSAC from ISC, Root Server Operator.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Hans Petter Holen CEO of RIPE NCC, K-Root and then Vice-Chair of RSSAC in two and a half days.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, everyone for attending. So, on behalf of the Board, Wes will be facilitating and chairing this meeting. Wes, over to you.

WES HARDAKER

All right. Thank you very much, everybody. This is always one of my favorite sessions, as I've said. It's the only one I never have conflicts for. So, we're going to go through welcome and agendas first. We just did introductions. Thank you, Tripti. And we're going to start with the ICANN Board questions to RSSAC, and then we have three questions from RSSAC to the Board that we will get to next.

But first off, the question from the Board to RSSAC is, what does RSSAC believe should be the Board's and ICANN's organization priorities in 2026, taking into consideration the new five-year strategic plan, the WSIS+20's review, and the recently launched cross-community group on the review of reviews. Answering this on behalf of RSSAC is going to be Jeff.

JEFF OSBORN

Thank you, Wes. It's a long sentence, and being the organization we are, we spent 15 minutes parsing it, diagramming it, and putting it into jars. And what we realized is, it's a question with three samples after it. So, I'm going to answer the question in a simpler way than it might have originally looked like it needed.

Basically, what RSSAC would like from the Board is your continued support as we are involved with the development and evolution of governance systems for the names and numbers communities, just to tie in all of the folks doing that. That really is the key for us, and that's all in process.

WES HARDAKER

All right, thank you. Are there other RSSAC members that wanted to add? Brad?

BRAD VERD

If I just distill it down, it's like ICANN is names and numbers. And I think, for us, the things that should be put on the priority list are further development of the governance with the RIRs, and specifically with the GWG. We believe that the anecdote for all the items listed there is stronger governance. And that's where we ended up.

WES HARDAKER

Thank you, Brad. Ken did you want to add something? No, okay. Is there anybody else with—do you have a follow-on, Tripti? Please. Absolutely.

TRIPTI SINHA

Well, thank you for that input. I'm very confident the Board is fully supportive of that. The resilience and strength and security of the internet depends on strong governance structures both in the names and the numbers community, so thank you very much.

WES HARDAKER

And I think RSSAC would also like to thank the Board for putting in the strategic plan section 4.2 is strengthening the DNS Root Server System, and we greatly appreciate the recognition that the Root Server System is a key underpinning to the internet at large in the first place. Is there anybody else that has questions or comments on this topic? That's going to be fast. Okay, and that's fine. I think the next ones might spur a little more conversation; we'll see.

So, RSSAC has questions related to ICANN's strategic goal, which is to, as I said, to strengthen the DNS Root Server System. Is there any information that RSSAC can produce to assist ICANN in achieving this goal? So, we firmly believe in it, of course. What can we do as RSSAC to help in this mechanism? Jim?

JAMES GALVIN

So, thanks, Wes, and thanks to the RSSAC for the question. Do want to acknowledge that the Board very much appreciates that the

RSSAC is very much on top of this issue itself, that your commitment to keeping the Root Server System running and in such an efficient and thorough way. No downtime in something like 40 years, something like that. Always worth pointing out to people. So, all of that's a good thing.

You have produced, of course, two advice documents, which we have found very helpful and very important to us in understanding the work that you're doing. And that's RSSAC061 and RSSAC062, in terms of changing IP addresses, security incident reporting. So, you're clearly paying attention to ordinary operational issues and ensuring that things continue in a secure and stable way.

We actually don't have any particular requests of you at this time and desire for information, but we are grateful that you are acknowledging that you're open to any particular request if something should come up. And we appreciate that opportunity, and we'll certainly seek to convey that to you through Wes, of course, as the RSSAC board liaison to you. But thank you, I think, for the good service that you've been providing.

WES HARDAKER

Happy to do so, and I will state that for 40 years, it's been great. I will actually say that I think it's never been interrupted. But actually the early days of the internet, of course, have a little bit less history recorded, but to the best of our knowledge, the Root Server System

has always been available. Does anybody have follow-on comments or additions? Hans?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah. Since you've mentioned ordinary operational issues, I want to put the incident reporting in a slightly different framework because there are a lot of governments that are looking into regulations of internet in various forms, and incident reporting is very important to them. In many of these frameworks, the governance of the root server system is an exception and a special case, but therefore it's particularly important that we have put in place the incident reporting, which is something that they require from everything they regulate.

So, we've kind of taken a step here to make sure that we produce on the level that is needed for society, governments, anyone else interested to understand what's going on here. So, while it may seem like a very trivial operational thing, and especially since we haven't had any incidents, I think it's a very crucial element to show that we take this seriously.

JAMES GALVIN

I think the proper response to that is to say, thank you. Certainly, do appreciate you calling out that nuance and making sure that we're all aware of it. And it's good that you pay attention to those things, and we trust and depend on the fact that RSSAC has done that and will continue to do it. So, thank you.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, let me add that one of the hard things that we had in that working group was teasing apart what a global RSS security incident was versus a security incident with an individual operator, and the document very carefully tries to define where that line is the best that we can. But there's a big difference between the security incident with the entire system versus the security incident that one of us could experience and would need to publish independently rather than as a joint exercise.

Is there any other comments on this topic? All right, hearing none. Before we go on, let me reiterate that of course the Board has the right—we would love to hear more feedback. If they don't want to answer now that you want particular help on this particular guidance. If you ever—you, the board, which I'm on, and it's a little weird. If you ever have the need of needing more information to help put emphasis into the strategic goal we're at your willing beck and call.

So, let me read the next question next, which is the functional model for the Root Server System Governance Model calls out two aspects of needed funding. A, the funding for the RSS Governance System itself, and B, funding for Root Server Operations, which has been heavily discussed in the GWG again this week in fact. What are the potential sources of funding that the board thinks can be used to meet these needs and what is a potential timeline for those

sources of funding to become available? For this, Tripti, I will turn it to you.

TRIPTI SINHA

All right, these are very direct questions. First, let me say that I just met with Brad in his role as chair of the GWG, and we were reminiscing, much of this work started right here in Dublin 10 years ago, and here we are 10 years later, and the work is still ongoing. Ten years ago, I was at the University of Maryland representing a Root Server Operator. Ten years later, I have a completely different role with a different organization, and I am a former root operator. Anyway, just wanted to put that in context.

First, we really appreciate all the work that's gone into building this governance model. It's gone through iterations. It is where it is, and I know a lot of hard work has gone into this, so the Board really appreciates the engagement of all committee members in getting to where you are. The Board is fully committed to supporting a governance model, and in terms of funding, do we believe that this needs sustainable funding? Yes, we do. And as you know, ICANN has processes that we must observe and go through to seek the funding.

So, when the model is delivered to the board, we will then move on to next steps. Implementation steps, depending on what the outcome of the governance model is. We will put together a set of

steps, and one of those steps, we'll look into how do we fund this and put in the appropriate steps to look into funding.

So, your question says, what are the sources of funding? Today, I cannot answer that question. I don't know what the sources would be. Do we have processes in place to get to the sources? Yes, we do have processes in place. And you say, what is the potential timeline? Well, it took us 10 years to get us to where we are today, so I really can't. I don't have an answer to that either. So, I don't know if this is what you were looking for, but I'm being painfully honest with you.

WES HARDAKER

We certainly appreciate the painful honesty, and this has been a long-standing, challenging topic, and we recognize that the Board has a hard time thinking about a document we have yet to receive and a model that we have yet to receive. It's hard to cost and put that into actually operational thinking until we know what it actually is in its final form. But does anybody else have comments that they would like—Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah, thank you for that answer, and I will also say it was kind of expected, but I think our purpose here is to put it openly out on the table because it is important. And if we'd waited a year or two to ask the question, then it would still have taken you a year or two to come up with the answer, so starting now is better than later. So, I

think it needs reflection. It needs thinking. In the document, we are now assessing the public comments. Of course, it addresses different forms of funding, but you know, ICANN is a very likely source of funding for the governance structure and even root server operations.

So, I think actually putting that out there and starting the thinking process is an important step. And this is spoken as RSSAC giving you advice rather than RSS GWG developing the model, so this is a subtle difference.

TRIPTI SINHA

You realize you wear three hats now, RSO, RSS GWG, and RSSAC.

WES HARDAKER

Don't forget [inaudible]. And NRI over here.

TRIPTI SINHA

Well, I'm done with the root server part, yeah. Putting on your root server hat. You've got three potential facades.

WES HARDAKER

That has certainly complicated our personalities.

HANS PETTER HOLEN At least, but when it comes to funding, I'm happily funded by 20,000 members and my board has committed to continue funding K-Root, so I'm personally not seeking funding right now. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER Excellent. CK?

CHRISTIAN KAUFMANN Just adding to one point Tripti said. The whole funding topic, as much as we don't have a solution right now, the Board is aware of it, right? So, it comes up in conversations and we are cognizant of it. So we will certainly not be blindsided or have ignored it. Thanks.

WES HARDAKER All right. Thank you very much. I know I, for one, this is a topic that I think we need to discuss in public and it's been circulated in hallways a lot, but it's actually good to have it brought out on the table. Does anybody else have comments on this particular topic? Brad?

BRAD VERD I'm going to put my GWG hat on for a second, and just thank Tripti for the statement. It has come up in the GWG numerous times that we have to identify a source. And as the GWG, we can't, so it's nice to hear that answer, so I can parrot that answer to the GWG members that are insisting on having a source before a model is given to you, so thank you.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, thank you. Yeah, actually, one of the challenging questions of this is who can answer the question and that alone is hard. I think it's the Board. It's the only really place for that to start. Any other comments on this subject? Now, while we're here, I think we'd like to thank Brad for chairing the GWG for an incredibly long period of time. We certainly recognize it's been a long rough haul, so it's not an easy group. All right, with that, why don't we go on to the next question. Yes, there's one more question.

Since ICANN82, the RSSAC has published both RSSAC061 entitled, Guidelines for Changing an IP Address and RSSAC062 entitled, Security Incident Reporting, which we alluded to earlier. Does the board have any questions related to either of these documents that the RSSAC can help clarify? And are there any topics of interest that the Board would appreciate if RSSAC created in the future publications about?

In other words, is there any other information that the Board would love to hear about from RSSAC that we haven't yet published? Jim, I'm going to turn it to you first.

JAMES GALVIN

So, thank you. And I think building on the answer to your first question that you brought to us, the first question was focused on the strategic plan and whether or not we had any specific thoughts for you. And I've referenced 61 and 62 in my answer to that

question. And so, coming back here, I think I'd like to turn this around a little bit and ask the RSSAC for two things. We'll take them one at a time here.

Again, the Board doesn't have any particular questions and requests of RSSAC, but very much appreciate with gratitude the opportunity to bring questions to you if we have them. So, here's just the first of those opportunities. With respect to RSSAC061 and 62, right? So, what does the RSSAC do? Can you say a little bit? Can you expand on how you operationalize your own advice to yourselves and how you implement that and what that looks like?

And in particular, have you shared this advice with policymakers? Maybe just the GAC, but any policymaker. And what's been the response? I mean, what have you gotten out of all of that.

WES HARDAKER

Excellent questions. Thank you, Jim. Would somebody in RSSAC like to answer those questions. Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

I don't want to answer it in full, but it's interesting that the last part of your question that the reason I mentioned that, the incident reporting, is important is that it actually came up in a discussion with a particular government and we will share it. We have not yet. But I think that's a very good point. This should be shared appropriately in those interactions and brought to their awareness

because I think the initial reaction was, this is something we've been looking for. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER

That's a good point. It's always nice to be able to point at something when we have the answer already worked out for them. That being said, I think, Jim, your point is valid, that we could do a better job of ensuring that people are aware of it. It just enhances the perception of stability and resiliency of the root as a whole in the first place. Anybody else want to? Ken?

KENNETH RENARD

Yeah. Ken Renard, ARL. To your comment about how do we operationalize these documents, sometimes it's actually reversed. These are operational norms or things that we do that we are codifying in a report, so that the community knows. So, specifically the guidelines for changing IP addresses. A little bit of both, but where we have done these things before historically, we're writing them down. We're putting sort of parameters in there, so that the community can understand what happens when we have to do this.

We already know, we already do these things and engineer them accordingly, but now we've put it out, so that other people can know what to expect.

WES HARDAKER

That's a very excellent point, Ken. We should go back and figure out which ones are actually codifying existing practice. That's actually a fascinating question. I will say that our Root Server Operator was the one that triggered the need for changing the IP address guidelines because we were the last one that did so. But I think if we got a good document out of it, then that was worth it alone, right? Rob, please.

ROBERT CAROLINA

Rob Carolina, ISC. I just wanted to highlight for anyone who's perhaps a little newer to the environment because we keep bumping into them all week this week and I'm very grateful for them. The sort of synergistic relationship between RSSAC and the Root Server Operators as individuals. So, in terms of operationalization of things that come out of RSSAC, they might be a statement of having talked to each other what we believe we do. At the same time, those statements from RSSAC influenced the behavior of the RSOs and things that RSOs encounter influence the development of documents in RSSAC and we have other ways of influencing one another in an effort to try to work collaboratively and on a consensus basis.

So, the term operationalization in this sense, I just wanted to highlight that RSSAC doesn't operationalize anything. It's the Root Server Operators individually, who will take on Board what has been said and then implement it. I think in the discussion—part of what we're getting in the discussion of things like security incident

reporting is that those conversations, to the extent that they're taking place, are probably taking place behind some set of doors that are closed because of the rules of engagement with the organizations who are asking questions.

But I think what we're learning from this is that the document certainly is helpful and other documents in this set are helpful when having those discussions.

WES HARDAKER

Jim, please.

JAMES GALVIN

So, thank you for that nuanced distinction between documenting what you're already doing versus trying to suggest things that you might move forward to. I think what that highlights for me is in the question of, what is operationalization, love that word. It's not necessarily about—well, no, I'll frame it this way, it's the uptake of the document, right? Which might be that it's just informing something but it doesn't mean that RSSAC itself is taking action or that Root Server Operators themselves are taking action but you're producing documents, you're producing advice, which has a purpose and you've got a goal in mind, but how do you notice the uptake of it?

How do you notice whether you've been effective? Has it been useful? Is it important? And you may not have an answer for that. I will point out even from SSACs point of view, we often have

discussions for ourselves. We produce a lot of advisories and a lot of advice. Well, so what, kind of thing. How do we know that we're accomplishing something? Maybe I leave that question with you as something to think about, and we'll bring it back next time and ask again. When you're ready, Wes, I do have another question to get to.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, I think, we're nearly there. Let me state that, interestingly enough, the guidelines for changing the IP addresses document came about from questions in the public, on public mailing lists about when we changed our address of, how far in advance are you guys generally going to tell us that you're changing an address and that prompted RSSAC to think more deeply about that and produce this document along with, what are the other parameters that we think are important.

So, we do, we listen to the community, not just through the ICANN processes, but I think the original question was on the NANOG mailing list and things like that. So, it's amazing how deep questions, deep in the technical environment can slowly percolate all the way back up to an ICANN document to clarify it better. Yeah, Liman, please.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Lars-Johan Liman, Netnod. I would also like to point out that this work ties into the ongoing Governance Working Group because the

model that we are designing there is still very much a theoretical thing on the drawing board. But we have identified a few things that will be needed regardless of the shape of the organization, the processes in the organization.

For instance, there will have to be documents that describe how to change IP addresses and there will be documents needed that describe security incident reporting and we can work with them already in parallel to the Governance Working Group. So, when the Governance Working Group result eventually becomes operational, then it can draw from existing documents and already designed procedures in order to quicken the deployment of a new governance structure in the future. Thanks.

WES HARDAKER

Yeah, thank you. And you highlighted, I think, one of the things that, especially the technical folks in the world, take a little while to figure out how ICANN speaks. The word operational and implement in ICANN are very different than what we might do at a keyboard where we think that's writing code because that's our basis and implement really means standing up a new group in ICANN, and it's a very different usage of the terminology than I think that technical geeks like us are used to. Ken, please.

KENNETH RENARD

Yeah, just one thing just for maybe the general audience. When RSSAC produces these documents, both of these specifically here,

these are not just the RSOs. This is the RSSAC caucus which includes DNS experts from the entire ICANN community and that's extremely valuable having the perspective beyond just RSOs and that's another value that comes into this process.

WES HARDAKER

Thank you, Ken. That's incredibly important. It would be a really hard job to do a good job on these documents without the caucus. It's their expertise we need. Dave, please.

DAVID LAWRENCE

Just a quick two-finger for anybody following the transcript. It is the RSSAC caucus, not our sick caucus. We're healthy.

WES HARDAKER

Thank you for that live correction. Any other comments? All right, Jim, why don't I turn to your second question, please.

JAMES GALVIN

So, here's another open-ended question, kind of a curiosity question which has gone on amongst a few of us on the Board, but we'll represent it as a Board question to you. Given the proposed policy development suggestion for this new RSS council, an interesting question is, have you—presumably you've been tracking all of this work, but how do you view your role, the RSSAC's role and the RSSAC caucus, given an evolution towards this kind of

thing? What is the relationship? How do you see all of that sort of playing out?

WES HARDAKER

Anybody want to take this? I'm going to stare one person down until he looks up. Liman has offered to take Brad's place. Go ahead, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN

Thank you. Lars Liman from Netnod, member both of RSSAC and the Governance Working Group. This is, of course, an issue that we have identified, so we are not quite sure what RSSAC, the role of RSSAC will be in this new design. The thing we are aware or foresee is that there are going to be changes, but RSSAC has a role inside ICANN with advising the Board and the general community on things that relate to the Root Service System, and that need, the need for that service, of that function is not going to go away. So, something will have to fill that role.

On the other hand, the new design has a group, a strategic group that could fill at least parts of that role, so I think it's something that we will have to see in the next steps in the future. The plan for the outcome of the Governance Working Group is to step by step implement a new organization that will ride on the documents that we are producing, but also shape its own place in the ecosystem a bit, and how to find the right procedures and how to operate is a little in the future right now. So, we don't have a direct answer at

this point, but hopefully, it will shape itself in the future as things evolve.

WES HARDAKER

Thank you. Excellent description. Brad, please.

BRAD VERD

Brad Verd, RSSAC and GWG Chair. So, let me answer your question directly. Nothing is going to change in RSSAC immediately or in the near future, nothing. RSSAC continues, RSSAC is an advisory council to the ICANN Board. None of that will change. Down the road, will it? Maybe. There are a number of milestones that we've documented in a potential implementation plan that asks these very specific questions, and they basically identify this that it needs to be addressed, and the governance structure at the time, the bodies that are governing themselves, and the community clearly at the time will have to make that call. But right now, it's too early.

WES HARDAKER

All right, any other? Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA

I'm looking specifically at B. Are there any topics of interest that the Board would appreciate if RSSAC created future publications about—something about that sentence doesn't parse well. But anyway, I know what you're asking. And I haven't consulted with the board on this. I'm just thinking aloud. Would the RSSAC

consider a publication in the future looking at the constellation of services today, a highly replicated service, very, very resilient. Thanks to AnyCast, which was a game changer, right? With 12 identifiers, V4 and V6, AnyCast it around the world.

Would you be willing to look at doing studies on—do we really need that many identifiers? And if we were to redesign the system, and it would—you need to take yourselves, sort of decouple yourselves from your operator roles, which can sometimes be hard. And if you had to redesign the system, knowing one of the technical capabilities available to all of you today is AnyCast, how would you design it?

So, would you be willing to consider that? Sorry. I see a lot of smiles. I knew it was a dangerous place to go.

WES HARDAKER

So, how much time do we have left? No, that's an excellent question, Tripti. I'm going to be a little mean and throw it right back because I know when you were helping us work through RSSAC037, this question came up repeatedly. But that's an interesting one, right? If we took it back to the caucus and said whiteboard it, you know it's not going to be one. We know that doesn't work, but what is the right number? That's a fair question. Anybody have comments? Hans Petter?

HANS PETTER HOLEN

Yeah, I have kind of a meta-comment here, because RSSAC actually have decision-making processes and forcing us on stage to discard all our decision-making processes and answer that question is a bit unfair. But I think, as input to or discussion, yes, brilliant. I would love to take that back and see that discussion, but answer would we consider? No, we can't really answer that without having discussed it.

TRIPTI SINHA

Hans-Petter, I wasn't asking for a decision. I asked you to do a technical analysis.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

I hear you, but you asked, would we consider? And how can we ask as a [inaudible]? I would personally consider it, sure, but I'm not sure everybody else would agree.

TRIPTI SINHA

Take it back to RSSAC, ask the RSSAC if they're willing to produce this advisory, then put on your RSO hats, think whether you would like to participate in that.

HANS PETTER HOLEN

I don't think you're hearing my argument.

TRIPTI SINHA

What is your argument?

HANS PETTER HOLEN It's excellent input from the work. So, if you'd phrase this at, could the RSSAC please, then, it's action to take.

TRIPTI SINHA Oh, please. Was I missing a word?

HANS PETTER HOLEN No, but if it's a request to us to do that, that's fine. But if you're asking us no, would we consider it? I'm saying we can't answer that because we don't speak with one voice here in this meeting.

TRIPTI SINHA Yeah, and as I also said—

HANS PETTER HOLEN I'm happy to entertain your suggestion and bring it on the agenda. No problem with that.

TRIPTI SINHA And as I said, I haven't consulted with the Board either. And your question says, would the Board appreciate? So, I want to put that out there as well. This is just me thinking on the spot but...

WES HARDAKER Okay. So, if I may, I think the RSSAC admin team has been discussing when are we going to think about the next documents

we might want to work on and we will take this suggestion as something to consider when we talk about it. And then we'll bring those ideas to the RSSAC like we always do and to the caucus for deciding what the next things we want to work on. The RSSAC does have a limited bandwidth, so we don't take on endless work all at once. We do try and limit ourselves, especially while the GWG is going on and taking a lot of effort. Brad?

BRAD VERD

I was just going to add that this topic that you raised here is not a new topic. It's not a secret at all. This is something that when RSSAC is asked about new roots, old roots, all of that, the question is always, well, what is that number? And the number is probably less than it is today. That's been a statement that we've made many, many times.

WES HARDAKER

All right. Anybody else have comments? All right. So, we did not actually, I think, get to B. So, Jim, let me turn it back to you first. Is there any more in this question to our question to the board that you would like to continue with or are we going to consider this topic done.

JAMES GALVIN

No, thank you. I think we established we've got an interesting dialogue going on here. We'll do that again next time, too.

WES HARDAKER

All right. It's okay. No, no, no, we appreciate it. So, with that, I think we will turn to, is there any other business or any other questions that anybody would like to pose from the Board or from RSSAC to this discussion before we close? All right. Hearing none, a couple of really quick thank yous.

So, first off, Tripti, you have been with the University of Maryland and the Root Server System there for a long time and has recently stepped away from the University of Maryland. I'd like to thank you for your service to Root Ops, to the University of Maryland, to RSSAC, to chairing RSSAC, to helping start the GWG. A lot of that comes from you, so thank you very much.

TRIPTI SINHA

Oh, thank you. I wasn't expecting that. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER

I know. I could thank Kurtis for being a Root Server Operator too actually, but I think we've done that before. And then finally, we have three board members that are leaving the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board is a very unique place. I consider them my friends and I've had a wonderful time to interact with all of them. So, thank you to Chris Chapman to my left. Thank you to Maarten Botterman, who is in the audience.

And I don't believe Becky Burr is here this morning. I think this afternoon she's conflicted. But thank you to all three board

members. You've done an invaluable service in helping us think about the Root Server System and the GWG. And Maarten, in particular, let me put in 4.2 and the Root Server System is an important strategic element of the strategic planning. So, thank you all.

All right. With that, Tripti, I think I'll turn it back to you to close us out.

TRIPTI SINHA

Well, thank you. This was a good discussion. It went in interesting directions. And Hans, next time, be careful. If you ask me a question, I will answer it. All right. With that—

HANS PETTER HOLEN

But don't answer it with a question.

TRIPTI SINHA

With that, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

WES HARDAKER

If it's not aware, they've known each other for a long time.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]