

---

ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions - Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and RSSAC with RSS GWG  
Wednesday, October 14, 2020 - 14:00 to 15:00 CEST

FRANCO CARRASCO: This session will now begin. I.T., please start the recording.

**[ This meeting is being recorded ]**

FRANCO CARRASCO: Hello, and welcome everybody to the joint meeting between the ICANN Board and RSSAC with the Root Server System Governance Working Group on Wednesday, October 14th of 2020. My name is Franco Carrasco from the ICANN staff, and I will be the remote participation manager for this meeting.

Before we get started, I would like to provide some brief information. Please note that we are holding this meeting as a Zoom webinar. Be advised that the floor on this session is reserved exclusively for interaction between the ICANN Board, RSSAC, and the RSS GWG members. We, therefore, have the members of the three groups promoted to panelists today and are the only ones able to speak.

---

*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.*

---

For a panelist, please raise your hand in Zoom in order to join the queue to participate. All panelists are muted by default, so you may proceed to unmute yourself when you are given the floor. Before speaking, please make sure that you have all your other app notifications muted and to clearly state your name and affiliation for the record.

Bear in mind that the Board will only take questions from these two groups with whom they are in session today. Consequently, the Q&A pod is disabled on this webinar.

This session includes real-time transcription which you can view by clicking on the "closed caption" button on the webinar toolbar. You also have available interpretation services in English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Arabic and Russian. Please see the information posted in the chat in order to learn how to access them.

For all participants in this meeting, you may post comments in the chat. To do so, please use the drop-down menu in the chat pod below and select "respond to all panelists and attendees." This will allow everyone to see your comments. Note that private chats are only possible in Zoom webinars amongst panelists; therefore, any sent by a panelist or standard attendee will also be seen by all other hosts, co-hosts and panelists.

---

Please note that this meeting is being recorded and chat sessions being archived.

Finally we kindly ask everyone in this meeting to abide by the expected ICANN Standards of Behavior. You may view this on the link provided in the Zoom chat.

Having said this, I will now give the floor to Maarten Botterman, chair of the ICANN Board.

Maarten, the floors is yours.

**MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:** Thanks, Franco. Welcome, Fred, and everybody from the RSSAC and the root server -- RSS GWG to this call. We look forward to this interaction and who better to lead it than Kaveh.

So we've been briefed on the progress and really see this as part of the core of our work so we really look forward to discussion.

Kaveh, can you take us away?

**KAVEH RANJBAR:** Yes. Thank you very much. Thank you, Franco. And thank you, Maarten. May I have the next slide, Franco? Thank you.

---

Hello, everyone. My name is Kaveh Ranjbar. I am RSSAC's liaison to the ICANN Board. Yes, I will chair and facilitate this session. This meeting is a bit special since usually ICANN Board and RSSAC meet during ICANN meetings to have an update and discussion on the status and ongoing work. This time we also have the Root Server System Governance Working Group with us, so GWG will also present.

As you see in agenda, we will continue this meeting with an update from RSSAC and a brief recap of basically start of the work that has led to the formation of GWG as well as recent RSSAC work and publications which are in anticipation and support of upcoming GWG work.

Then we will have a Q&A between RSSAC and the Board. After that, we will hear from GWG on their process and progress and plans for future work. That will be followed by Q&A between GWG and the Board.

And finally, I will give an update on the work on enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model. And if there are any discussions there, we will follow that.

So with that opening, I will give the floor to Fred. Fred Baker is the chair of RSSAC with Brad Verd who is co-chair of RSSAC.

Fred.

---

FRED BAKER:

Oh, hi there.

So I'm hoping my slides will come up here. Here we go.

So next slide, please.

We went through a series of workshops in preparing for what is now RSSAC37. It started in 2015 and it basically happened because Steve Crocker asked us to go do things and figure out how we were going to recommend that a root server be -- root server operator be added or dropped, however that came out.

A big part of that then was figuring out the architecture of such a system, and so on. We also needed to change RSSAC quite a bit. So we went through a series of six workshops and looked at different topics in each workshop and wrote what became RSSAC37.

Next slide.

When we published 37 and 38, but that was June 2018, and ICANN org responded with what was called a concept paper. We went through a comment period with that, and the Board formed the Governance Working Group.

What the Governance Working Group is intended to do is take this plan that we had written and turn it into something that would be actionable within ICANN. So right now, the

Governance Working Group is in the process of debating and discussing that model with the idea of starting the implementation of that model by 2022. So where we stand in this -- in this series is the -- between the formation of the Governance Working Group and the Governance Working Group developing that model.

Next slide, please.

Now, we gave the Governance Working Group a series of documents. Obviously the first and perhaps most important was RSSAC37, which is our proposal of the governance model.

We went on, then, while they were start -- getting themselves started in working things out, figuring out how we would implement the metrics that are called for in RSSAC37 and figuring out how RSSAC next generation, whatever it's called, should engage with the community, and decided that unlike RSSAC now, it should join the empowered community.

Now, since that period of time, which is last spring, we've been looking at the call-out from RSSAC37 for a contractual relationship between the RSOs and ICANN. ICANN first started to seek such a contractual relationship when ICANN was first formed way back when. And most of the RSOs really felt that that was premature, but we've been working on what such an

---

MOU or letter of intent would look like, and we talked with the GWG about that last week.

Next slide.

FRANCO CARRASCO: This is the last one we have in this deck.

FRED BAKER: This is the last slide. So that's where we stand.

We gave the proposed memo to Ted last week and left that now with them.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much.

FRED BAKER: Do you have questions for me?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, thank you very much, Fred.

So do we have any questions from the Board for RSSAC or -- or actually from RSSAC members to the Board? Now is the time.

---

Hearing no comments -- yeah, and I don't see anything on chat, so I will move forward to the next agenda item. So that's the proposed discussion on enhancing the effective -- sorry. That's - - that's the GWG update.

In the Board, we are working with GWG. Here are our liaisons to that group, who are Tripti and Lito. And the main entry point for GWG-related discussions to the Board is Board Technical Committee. And as usual, (indiscernible) this, if there is a decision needs to be made, the BTC, the Technical Committee, will produce a summary and taking of its members and will present that to the full Board for a decision.

Now I will give the floor to chair of GWT, Ted Hardie. Ted and Geoff Huston are representing Internet Architecture Board in the GWG, and Ted is also chairing the working group.

Ted, please.

TED HARDIE:

Thanks very much, Kaveh, and the board. We appreciate your time today.

Next slide, please.

So this is the basic agenda we'll go through. We'll go through the composition, discuss at the same time the input documents



---

that Fred mentioned. We'll then talk about how the discussion has been going, go through a diagram of the proposal as a whole, and drill down into specific elements of the proposal, and then discuss next steps.

Next slide, please.

As Kaveh mentioned, I was nominated to the GWG by the Internet Architecture Board. But there are a number of other groups which provided membership and a large number of liaisons to the board. We do have two changes coming up to the board. One is Naela Sarras, who has represented IANA. She has taken a new role within ICANN Org. And Kim Davies will be replacing Naela.

We've also been told by Joe Abley that he will be replaced because of other responsibilities he's gotten in his day job.

So SSAC will also be changing.

Before we move off this, I just want to touch for a moment on the input documents. As Fred mentioned, there were source documents which were adopted by the GWG in April of 2020. RSSAC37, RSSAC38, the concept paper on a community (indiscernible) process to develop a (indiscernible) model, RSSAC42, and SSAC106. So the SSAC comments involving the root server system were also accepted as input documents into

---

the GWG, in addition to the ones that Fred mentioned from RSSAC.

Fred also mentioned that we were starting to discuss the MOU and LOI, work that's been done within RSSAC that has not yet been accepted by the GWG, but it's actually on the agenda for this Thursday's meeting, since we received it last week.

Next slide, please.

So -- has the slide updated for everyone else?

There it is.

Enduring a little bit of lag here. It's a little bit early in the morning and I suspect the packets are moving slowly without their coffee.

The GWG has actually taken in the work of the RSSAC, which (indiscernible) up to this a set of different functions -- the measurement function, the financial function, the strategy and architecture function, et cetera -- and thought about how that would be expressed organizationally. And we come at this point to rough consensus that there will be more than one body that will come together to form this new organization, particularly, that there will be a body that will have a community basis, and that will be the strategy, architecture, and policy function, but

---

that there will likely be a different body which implements the financial function, the measurement function, the secretariat function, and the two will then relate. And the entirety of that group will be called the organization -- we'll go into the diagram -- the New Organization. We'll go into that diagram in a moment.

But the discussion has then been, okay, how do these things instantiate the functions that were described in the input documents and in the discussions we've had so far.

Two different writing teams responded to develop papers for each topic. And we're at the point now of having reviewed those initially and working out how the two different relate to each other.

So let's actually go and talk a little bit about the PRS. I think that's next.

Okay. So we have broad agreement that we would like to see the PRS as an affiliate of ICANN, loosely related after the relationship between PTI and ICANN. What that means is we expect it to be a legal entity, possibly something like a limited liability corporation with a single membership. But I want to highlight that this has been a discussion within the GWG at this point and we have not yet consulted ICANN's lawyers to confirm

---

that they agree that this is the best instantiation of this affiliate relationship. So that could change.

But the presumption is that as a legal entity, it would have its own articles, incorporations, bylaws, board of directors, and budget. That the directors would be appointed by ICANN as the single member, though likely nominated by different groups. That is, there would be different constituent groups which would nominate membership to the board. It would be, as a nonprofit corporation itself, dedicated to coordinating and sustaining the entities providing resolution services to the root zones. So this would take the work that needs to be done here and put it into sort of a daughter organization of ICANN that has an operational role. It would hold one end of any agreements that needed to happen with the root server operators, and it would develop no policy, that is, it would implement the measurement functions and the financial functions, but it wouldn't be a policy body itself. That would be the SAPF, which we'll discuss in a minute.

The model that we talk about here doesn't really follow all of the aspects of the PTI model, but the core aspect of being an affiliated organization to ICANN is possibly the most key element of what we're talking about there when we make that parallel.

We also expect that it would relate to PTI itself, and PTI will be one of the bodies you'll see on the eventual slide.

---

In addition to RZM and other parts of the ICANN ecosystem.

Next slide. Thanks.

We've also broadly agreed that the SAPF would be a community-based group that would focus on the management of the strategy and the architecture of the RSS. And that really means that this is the group that would be in charge of coming up with the policies that would be implemented in MOUs, contracts, or letters of intent between the PRS and the root server operators. And so the SAPF is really the core part of the community aspect of this.

It would study any technical aspects of the provision of root services and it would give broad consideration to the architecture of any root server provisions that might change as technology changes.

When we talk about community engagement, we don't anticipate that the SAPF itself would be an open body. We expect it to be of limited number. But that it would engage in community consultation for any aspect of the root service architecture that it was responsible for developing policy around.

We would see the SAPF as chartered by the PRS board, and in terms of the reference for this group, it would be provided by the

---

PRS board. That said, that's mostly a description of how it would evolve over time. We anticipate that the GWG itself will write the initial charter of the SAPF and provide the terms of reference for the initial PRS board.

So the two would come into being at the same time, in other words, after community consultations confirm that this model is acceptable.

Next slide.

I am hoping all of you have very large screens or are very familiar with how in Zoom to magnify things, because this is a bit of an eye chart.

The one thing that's probably key here is to start reading from the right and heading left.

So the ICANN board here would instantiate this by creating the LLC agreement. That would set out the contributions from ICANN's PRS and the obligations of each to each other. So the upshot of this is that the ICANN board uses that little left arrow that you see between the -- the two to create this LLC agreement. Then we move from the LLC agreement to the creation of the PRS. The functions of the PRS we discussed briefly a few moments ago. And then at the same time, the SAPF would come into being from the initial charter created by the

---

GWG. And from that point on, the SAPF and PRS would relate as follows: The SAPF would provide policies to the PRS, which the PRS would then implement. So just as a reminder, it's the operational --

GÖRAN MARBY: Could I make a small comment?

TED HARDIE: Certainly.

GÖRAN MARBY: So when it comes to the ICANN board, anything that has to deal with financial contribution also has to go through the empowered community from ICANN. And maybe just for -- it's good to have that in mind when you do this, because it's not up to the ICANN board only. It's also up to the empowered community, according to the bylaws.

TED HARDIE: Thank you, Göran. I appreciate the intervention.

The other things to note on this are, the relationship between the PRS and root server operators, those would be the relationships instantiated in either MOUs, LOIs, or contracted.

And you'll note also the multistakeholder review panels. As anticipated by the RSSAC input documents, we do not believe those are standing. Those would be called into being as needed. And as the RSSAC input documents note, there's no necessary relationship between one called into being to manage an operator deciding to stand down, and at the same time, there's no necessary relationship between that and one that would be called into being to add a root server operator. So we anticipate that those would be separate functions and potentially separate panels.

So I think the one other thing here is PTI did not actually make it directly onto the -- this slide here, but you can assume that the relationship between PTI and this New Organization would be primarily to SAPF, that it would provide input to the strategy and architecture function. But there might be some small set of occasions where, for operational reasons, it would also talk to the PRS.

Next slide, please.

So in the process, we're running a little bit behind our initial hoped-for timetable. But we are currently at the stage of trying to integrate the SAPF and PRS papers. So those are both (indiscernible) that we're currently working on, the paper that brings them together into describing the sort of enveloping



---

functions that would be New Org as a whole. So we're elaborating that, and we're also elaborating the relationship between New Org and ICANN itself, talking in particular about the financial considerations. And Göran's point would then go into the new elements of the PRS paper that discuss that.

We hope to provide a document for ICANN Org for review. And this would be when we get the legal review I mentioned a few moments ago, by the end of October. And then taking that in, we'll move forward from there.

We're also planning in -- essentially, after this meeting, to review and update our work plan to give a new estimate of when the full set of work will be done.

I believe that might be the last slide, or there might be a questions slide.

It's just a pointer to (indiscernible).

As you all, no doubt, know, the GWG does all of its work in mailing list and in open meetings. This GWG work space includes a pointer to all of past meetings, transcripts, recordings, et cetera, as well as all the input documents, the current state of PR S and SAPF documents, and any other documents we've generated.

---

Thanks very much. Are there any questions?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much.

GÖRAN MARBY: Can I -- just to make sure that Ted knows I've been paying attention, thank you very much for the presentation. I think -- I want to congratulate you. It's sort of -- I feel -- I mean, this is a little bit of a pet project for me, and some of you know that.

Since the interceptions from RSSAC37, 38 into when we designed this setup, which wasn't easy, and there were a lot of you who were involved in setting this up, how we do this. And I'm also happy that we were able to figure out a way of having people outside the sort of formal ICANN structure doing this work, because the relationship with the root servers are important.

I'm really looking forward to how to make this a reality. And I think that you're hitting the right points.

The only thing that I want to make sure of is that we do this reference to PTI, I think it's a little bit sort of unlucky if we do that. Because we have a control system when it comes to IANA functions and IANA services. And it's important for me that the

perception of this is that of ICANN starts controlling the root server operators. So I'm trying to avoid the reference to PTI, the legal entity and all of this. When -- because we actually do control that. And we shouldn't control the root server operators. The root server operators should be independent and make a lot of independent decisions about it. So I'm just thinking about the sort of narrative around this. The independence of the root server operators is an essential part of the structures itself. And I just want to make that -- So it's easy for us to understand that difference. But when we take it out to the ICANN community and other ICANN -- and outside ICANN communities, that it will maybe not be that easy to understand the differences.

So that's a very small point from just a narrative perspective.

TED HARDIE:

It's a point I very much appreciate your making. Thank you very much.

And it is the case that we've tried very hard in describing this to talk about the function as coordination and sustaining the root server operations rather than control.

And I think as we go forward, we'll appreciate further input from you and the rest of the board on how to make sure that narrative

---

is -- is put together in a way that will be best understood by the broader community.

I will say that my own personal mental model for this is actually not PTI. And this is partly because I came to the GWG from the IETF community. The IETF went through a recent exercise where it moved from being an organized activity of ICANN -- of the Internet Society to being a daughter LLC. And in that process, one of the things that took place was the Internet Society board created a set of agreements like the ones that we're talking about here. And the IETF LLC came into being with its separate board and its own ability to hold its own contracts as opposed to always requiring ISOC as a parent organization to create and manage them.

And one aspect of that that has carried forward in my thinking here has been that under no aspect of this did either the original relationship to the ISOC board or in the new LLC did this create the standards process. The standards and the creation of the RFCs that instantiate those were managed outside of the IETF LLC's remit. Those are managed by the Internet Engineering Steering Group or by the Internet Architecture Board, depending on the stream of the Arch C. And that independence, I think, has been kind of at the back of the minds of many of the people in the GWG who also are part of the IETF community.

---

And finding ways to express that, I think, would be very useful. And if you or the board have ways in which we might talk about that relationship without reference to the PTI as a specific other organization, we'd, of course, welcome those.

Thank you very much.

**(Multiple people speaking simultaneously.)**

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes?

GÖRAN MARBY: So it's good to see you, Ted.

I think that we're on the same page when it comes to do this.

When it comes to the legalities, you know, and how to do bookkeeping and all those things, and ICANN as a nonprofit organization, I leave that to the lawyers.

What I think is important is we establish what we said in our -- what we said in RSSAC37/38, this connection with the community to the root servers, complete -- still maintaining the sort of independence of the root servers, but still having a forum for that discussion. How we do that from a legal perspective, I don't know.

So I'm -- what I'm trying to understand more and more about is, what do you want to achieve? Then other people can figure out how to achieve that. Is that from an LLC? Is that something else? Then it's more of a practical work.

So I sort of change -- The important thing is we find the processes, the accountability, and the transparency for it, the mechanism for that. We have people who can figure that out. But the transparency, accountability, and the process work is the thing that I think me and the board, and my (indiscernible). And I'm not saying that you're not looking into that at all. So I'm just saying -- and I know that I speak for probably -- we -- we actually, over the last couple of weeks, added more resources from the board, and from the org as well, to support you in this work, because you have reached a level of -- you are maturing so much in this, things are happening in a positive way. And I'm really happy to have continued conversations about how we look at this.

But the most important, I would say, in all of this is that you achieve what you want, what we want, with this whole process. Then it's just mechanics after that.

---

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much, Göran. And I see Matthew has his hand raised. Before getting that, just to add some context to that. RSSAC37 I also pasted on chat. Basically, the root server operators listed 11 principles that we thought these are the "must haves" in whatever proposal the work, the future work on evolution of root server governance, root server system governance will produce.

And we have, at number ten, is RSO must be autonomous and independent. That's in support of what Göran was saying about comparison with PTI.

And I also want to add, as mentioned, this is ongoing work by GWG. This is also uncharted waters. So this has never been done before, and neither this matches any of the existing processes. So everybody is trying to also to support and build, build the process as we move forward. And I know the RSS proposal of course, the GWG proposal will of course include the organization, but that will need to go, as was mentioned by Göran, multiple input points by the community and legal reviews and organizational reviews and things like that.

So, yes, I think there is a lot to consider. And we will -- we will have an interesting path ahead of us.

So, Matthew.

---

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Kaveh.

Just to echo Göran's words and to say how fantastic it is that this is moving forward and this governance structure has been put in place.

I wanted to come back to the narrative issue. Maybe this is just stating the obvious, but from a broader Internet landscape and geopolitical landscape, the independent of the root servers has always been seen as a critical kind of balancing element between the concerns and the political concerns by various countries.

So I think when it comes to the narrative and this starts to -- when this is announced, it will be critical to put everything very clearly in this context and to really emphasize the independence of governance structure, independence of the RSO, because those issues will -- if that's not made very clear, those kind of issues will set off (indiscernible) countries when it comes to governance discussions.

I just wanted to put that out there. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you very much, Matthew. Fully agreed. And I think this is one of the reasons that, from the start, RSSAC, as you have seen



---

in the previous slide deck, we really, like -- it was hard. I mean, root server operators for more than 30 years, independent organizations, they run -- and with very different stakeholders, they did run the service together, keeping their independence. And in our principles, that has been articulated from different points, directly in point 10. And those principles are very important for us. That's why the process was also so -- took so much efforts, because we wanted to make sure what we put down and what we request and document is basically a view and consensus of all of the current operators. Because, yes, this is an evolution, but it will be also a big change, and we want to make sure that the -- we don't lose those values and those principles in the process.

And I know that I can speak for RSSAC that those principles are key to us, and that's one of the -- the core of the work that we have produced. So thank you for that.

I don't see any more hands, or any additions to the chat. So with that, I think we can move to the third agenda item, which is the -- yeah, the proposed discussion on enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model.

As you know, last year ICANN Board initiated a project aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model, one of the strategic objectives outlined in the ICANN 25 to 25

---

strategic plan. This report is critical to ensure the multistakeholder model is able to evolve and meet the ever-changing needs of ICANN's global community.

So I'm not going to go into much detail and background about that, but as a quick recap, there was a call for community input from the Board, I think this June. And -- I'm sorry. There was first a call. There has been multiple facilitated sessions, actually. And after that, that resulted in identifying six priority topics, such as prioritization of (indiscernible) or efficient use of resources.

June this year, then the Board basically posted the paper enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model next steps, and that was open for public comment until August. And after receiving all of that comment, Board updated the document and incorporated all of that input.

Now ICANN org is moving to the implementation phase by forming of Implementation Operations team with dedicated resources to follow-up on that process. That team will work closely with the community and the Board and will gather input to follow up implementing committee consensus solutions for each of those identified improvement areas.

---

So that's a quick recap of that effort. If there is any comment or discussion. I see Tripti's hand raised, so Tripti, please.

TRIPTI SINHA: Kaveh, my apologies. I'm -- this comment is actually related to the previous topic.

KAVEH RANJBAR: **(Indiscernible.)**

TRIPTI SINHA: Yeah, so I hope Ted is still on the call.

I just wanted to let Ted know that, first, the Board is very appreciative of his leadership. And as Göran just said, he has brought many resources to bear, as recently as a few days ago, because this work has reached critical mass and now needs the full attention of the Board to move this forward.

So we will -- the Board will continue to be a partner, Ted, and of course to all members of the GWG. And the goal is to see this, you know, come to fruition. And it's a delicate balance. This is -- you know, we've never done this work before, and it's critical that it be done and it be done and strike the right balance.

---

So thank you very much. I just wanted to express this on behalf of the Board.

TED HARDIE:

I'm sure I speak on behalf of the GWG when I thank you for all of the resources you've already given us, and we look forward to trying to deliver as close to our original timeline as we can.

Thank you again.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you. Thank you, Tripti. Thank you, Ted.

Any questions, either on that or the previous topics?

I see no hands or no additions to chat.

So, Matthew, I assume it's an old hand or....

MATTHEW SHEARS:

No, it's a new one. New one, Kaveh.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Please. Please go ahead.

---

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Yeah, thanks. I just wanted to perhaps just give an opportunity to see if anybody had any suggestions, because one of the -- the Board question was about enhancing effectiveness of the multistakeholder model, and Kaveh has summarized that very well. But the question really had another part to it, which is what are the key issues? and are there any opportunities for acceleration or any issues that come to mind? And I just wanted to make sure that we had that -- that I put that out there so that people, if they wanted to, could comment on those (indiscernible).

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much, Matthew.

I don't see any additional comments at this point, but I think this is something that we would like to also -- or I will bring back to RSSAC also to discuss. Because I know some of the discussions, like the resource fatigue or -- yeah, it's hard to actually find enough resources to do all the work ahead of us, sometimes also hits us. And so far we have been able to produce all the documents and everything we needed, but I know still it's a pressure. And I think RSSAC is affected by that, so we might have -- we might have contribution.

---

So we will -- But if you have any, of course I can liaise with the Board. And with the Implementation Operations team formation, I assume there will be channels. So -- but that will be formalized.

Göran.

GÖRAN MARBY:

The interesting thing, which is a connection I don't think I sort of made to you guys before, but the RSSAC37/38 was actually one of my sort of starting points when we started talking about the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model. And it was really down to -- and some of you were involved in this, and you, Kaveh, where we -- so when we took RSSAC37 and 38 into ICANN, we did actually literally spend nine months trying to figure out a way how do we take this into the ICANN system with its bylaws and transparencies and all of those things which are there for good reasons. But as many of you (indiscernible), we'd never done this before. So it was like trying to take a round ball and trying to put it into a square-ish hole.

And I remember here in L.A. actually sitting and realizing that the proposed model was no good. We threw it out of the window literally and then spent an afternoon coming up with a model that actually works. And I remember that, sitting in a conference

---

room with Brad, Tripti and you, Kaveh, and other ones and realize it doesn't work. And the missing thing really was how do we get into an ICANN structure other organizations outside. So we can have you, Ted, for instance, in a formal setting.

And that says something about the effectiveness of the model. Because if the model as itself cannot handle new things, things that happens or needs to be done in a different way, then it's not that effective.

So I think that -- First of all, thank you, RSSAC, then for again making sure that we stay on our toes and have to evolve.

But it gets interesting because that's a good example of things that we have to think about from an ICANN perspective. How do we handle things that we didn't think about? And so it's your fault, but it's also thanks to you.

But that's why I think it's interesting, especially now when we look into implementing RSSAC37/38 because it becomes part of effectiveness, how we do things.

When I mention things like, yes, we have to take into account the empowered community, that's not something we should change at all because it's actually the fundamental part of the transition. But there are bits and parts in this that we think about.

---

So this might think, as a -- this exercise seems to be philosophical, but it's actually quite fundamental. And you helped us to prove that.

I just want to put that on that. So please engage on this one. Your thoughts, especially during this process, is important. And I take the opportunity also for non-ICANN, whatever that is, to participate in this one as well, because it might be, you know, today we are doing -- we are talking about the working group and implementing 37 and 38, and tomorrow it's something else that's happening.

I just want to put that on the table. We need you guys.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Thank you very much, Göran.

So any additional comments?

Seeing none, then I will go to closing, but before that, two quick things.

One, as Ted also mentioned, Naela is leaving GWG and RSSAC because she's changing her positions within ICANN so she won't be with IANA PTI in that previous role, but I just wanted to point out, as we also thanked her in our last meeting, our last RSSAC



---

meeting, because she was with us basically during this whole process and was really a good contributor and joy to work with.

So thank you, Naela, and wish you the best for your future endeavors.

With that, I would also like to thank ICANN support team for enabling this session, and also ICANN RSSAC support team for their world-class support of our activities. They really helped us during this whole process, and there has been a lot of work and organization and the arrangements. And, yeah, they have really provided good service. I think I can talk for all of RSSAC that we are really happy with what we get as support service.

And thank you, everyone, for joining this session, and looking forward to the work ahead of us in supporting the evolution of the root server system governance.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks, Kaveh. Thanks, Fred. Thanks, everybody.

**[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]**