
SINGAPORE - ICANN Public Board Meeting
Thursday, February 12, 2015 – 17:00 to 18:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Fadi. This brings to a close the public forum, and we move immediately to our formal board meeting.

Before we move into the formalities of it, a couple of comments.

Quite often, these formal board meetings in public here are a little dry. There's certainly a certain amount of business that we have to take care of that is the standard stuff, but we have two timely statements and actions in addition to our usual business that will add quite a bit of content.

One is a statement that we're going to make addressing some of the confusion or concerns about the coordination and processing of these proposals that are coming out of the community and will find their way to NTIA. And the other is a -- an action, a resolution prepared to deal with the two-letter codes, and we've done this as briskly as we can, quite briskly in this case, in order to be responsive to concerns on the people who are waiting and, at the same time, to move things forward. We'll deal with this in more depth when we get to it.

And finally, we will close -- after we close, you're all invited for cocktails across the way in the S.B. foyer.

Let me go to the statement related to the proposals here.

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.

So we have received several questions regarding -- requesting clarification as to how ICANN will handle receipt of the proposal from the ICG and the work stream one proposal from the CCWG. We hope the following will be helpful.

NTIA is expecting coordinated proposals from both groups. They cannot act on just one.

Further, they expect the ICG proposal will take into account the accountability mechanisms proposed by the CCWG. We are heartened by the close coordination between these groups, including liaisons from the ICG to the CCWG.

ICANN is expecting to receive both proposals at roughly the same time. When ICANN receives these proposals, we will forward them promptly and without modification to NTIA.

As we have previously stated, if we do submit the proposals with an accompanying communication of comments, they will be on points we had already shared with the community during the development of the proposals.

We, therefore, encourage the groups to continue coordinating closely to ensure ICANN received the proposals together and is able to provide them to NTIA in a coordinated manner.

With respect to improvements in our own accountability, we are definitely open to improvements. And the details of that will have to wait until we actually see what the details are in the CCWG's proposal. So I hope that's helpful.



We've tried to listen carefully to the disparate nuances of what otherwise are all intended to aim at the same target.

So with that, let me open the board meeting here. We're in Singapore, and I want to take a roll-call here.

Why don't we start with you, Fadi, and we'll just go down the line.

FADI CHEHADE: Fadi Chehade.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Wolfgang Kleinwachter.

JONNE SOININEN: Jonne Soininen, the IETF liaison.

BRUNO LANVIN: Bruno Lanvin.

RAM MOHAN: Ram Mohan.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Asha Hemrajani.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby.



STEVE CROCKER: Steve Crocker.

BRUCE TONKIN: Bruce Tonkin.

KUO-WEI WU: Kuo-Wei Wu.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Chris Disspain.

RAY PLZAK: Your mother appreciates that, Christopher. Ray Plzak.

ERIKA MANN: Erika Mann.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Suzanne Woolf.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: George Sadowsky.



GONZALO NAVARRO: Gonzalo Navarro.

MARKUS KUMMER: Markus Kummer.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thomas Schneider, GAC liaison to the board.

MIKE SILBER: Mike Silber.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Mr. Secretary, I presume we have a quorum. He indicates that we do. Good.

The agenda for this meeting consists of a consent agenda with I count about nine items on it. We'll read just the summaries of these things. So the first are the approval of board meeting minutes for the minutes of 17 November 2014 and 3 December, 2014.

Item B, please.

This is the delegation of Bel in the Cyrillic script to Reliable Software on behalf of Belarus.

Next one, please. This is the removal -- this is Item 1C, removal of .TP, top-level domain representing Portuguese Timor.

This is a result of changes in the political structure there where Timor-Leste was created some time ago and .TL was put into place.



Next one, please.

Item 1d, GNSO Council policy recommendation on inter-registrar transfer policy Part D.

E is recommendations for the collection of metrics for the new gTLD program to support the future Affirmation of Commitments review on competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice.

Thank you.

F is reappointments to Security and Stability Advisory Committee, that's SSAC, nine members are being reappointed, if I counted correctly in the text.

Back up one if you would. You can see the names there: Greg Aaron, Don Blumenthal, KC Claffy, Lyman Chapin, myself, Mark Kosters, Russ Mundy, Rod Rasmussen, and Mark Seiden.

Next. The Item G is an appointment of a new member, Geoff Huston, to SSAC.

And, H, thank you to the departing community members. I imagine we have a list of those there, in particular, Dr. Jun Murai. I think it is worth noting that Jun was a long-time member of the board. He is a pioneer of -- Internet pioneer and member of the Hall of Fame responsible for founding a lot of the activities in Japan and not incidentally one of his accomplishments while he was on our board was founding the Root Server System Advisory Committee and serving as chair until only a few days ago, I think. Thank you.



And next, thank you to the departing community members, Rodney Joffe, Jason Livingood, Bruce Tonkin leaving SSAC, Stefano Trumpy, and Paul Vixie. We are not losing him as co-chair -- as vice chair, rather, here.

Kristina Rosette, GNSO intellectual property constituency chair.

Tracy Hackshaw and Peter Nettlefold as GAC vice chairs.

And, finally, thank you to the several sponsors of this meeting which you can read there, VeriSign, PIR, Afiliias, CentralNic, Internet Domain Name System Beijing, Engineering Research Center, NeuStar, NCC Group, Trademark ClearingHouse, Uniregistry Corp, Minds+Machines, Iron Mountain, Inc., Ion Magazine, Radix FSZ, ICANNWiki, and InterConnect Communications, and Sedo GmbH .

Thank you.

Also, to the management of the Fairmont Singapore, the Swissotel, The Stamford for providing excellent facilities here.

Okay. So with that, let me ask for approval from the board. All those in favor say aye.

[Chorus of Ayes.]

Any votes against?

[No verbal response.]

Any abstentions?

[No verbal response.]



The consent agenda is passed. Thank you all very much.

And now we move on to Item 2A which is release of two-letter codes in the second level of the gTLDs.

Who is going to speak to this? Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Yes, I'd like to propose the motion, Steve. We've heard a lot on this topic during this week, depends when you define when the week started. For most of the board it started last Wednesday, I think, and we've been hearing about this ever since.

The board met with the Governmental Advisory Committee during the week, and they have released some further advice in their communique that we received today. And we've also heard from numerous speakers in the public forum today. So hopefully this will answer the question.

This resolution, I will just try to summarize rather than read every word here. But we have -- so in the New gTLD Registry Agreement, there are two methods for which to release two-character domain names. One of those is that two-character names can be released to the extent that the registry operator reaches agreement with the related government and country code manager or the registry operator may propose the release of the names based on its implementation of measures to avoid confusion.

At its board meeting in Los Angeles, we as the board directed the staff to come up with a procedure for which registry operators could apply for the release of these names. Subsequently, we received a letter from



the chair of the GAC indicating some areas where that process could be improved. And we received further advice from the GAC following its meeting this week.

So if we can just on the screen perhaps jump to the Resolved clause. So it's Resolved, that the board accepts the advice of the GAC from the 11 February GAC communique regarding the release of two-letter codes at the second level in gTLDs.

The board directs the President and CEO or his designee to revise the authorization process for release of two-character ASCII labels and proceed immediately as follows: Implement improvements to the process to alert relevant governments when requests are initiated and comments from the relevant governments will be fully considered.

For new requests, the comment period will be for 60 days.

For requests with pending or completed comment periods, extend or reopen the comment period so that each request will undergo 60 days of comment period in total.

That is the end of that resolution. I hand it over to you, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. So you moved it. Do we have a second?

CHERINE CHALABY: I'll second. Cherine.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Cherine. Discussion? Ray.

RAY PLZAK: Thank you, Steve. The community always wanted to see how the board really works. Well, you're going to see it right now.

One of our favorite pastimes is editing on the fly. And in a brief discussion that we had this morning, there was an item that we tacitly agreed to should be included. And so Chris has the text of that that he and I have worked out. So I would like to have that inserted.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. So if we could go to the last Whereas clause, please.

This is our amendment to the Whereas clause. It doesn't include -- it is missing one final piece of the GAC advice. So the proposal is to -- the end of the last sentence, "also advise the board to extend the comment period to 60 days" is to insert, "The GAC also advised they will provide a list of GAC members who do not require notification as they will be agreeing to all requests."

So if we pass this resolution, we will be passing this resolution on the basis that amendment -- or that proposed amendment to the Whereas clause, provided everybody's happy with it, is simply a piece out of the GAC's advice that we had not previously put into the Whereas clause. So I think it's not overly complicated to understand. Thank you, Steve.



BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, the specific text from the GAC communique says that a list of GAC members who intended to agree to all requests and do not require notification will be published on the GAC Web site. So we can -- (multiple speakers).

We'll copy those words and put it in the Whereas clause.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No problem.

STEVE CROCKER: So although I'm sometimes a little casual with the precise formalities of this -- in this case, I think we should be quite careful here. Somebody needs to propose the amendment, and we need to vote on the amendment, and then proceed there.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'll let Ray propose it, and I second it.

RAY PLZAK: I propose.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I second.

STEVE CROCKER: All right. And do we have any way of getting the wording of that posted?



BRUCE TONKIN: Let me just reread it into the record and you will see it come up on the screen, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Sounds good.

BRUCE TONKIN: So we are adding to the Whereas clause. It says, "The GAC also advised the board to extend the comment period to 60 days and also the GAC advised that a list of GAC members who intend to agree to all requests and do not require notification will be published on the GAC Web site."

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. And that's been moved by you, Ray, and seconded by you, Chris, I presume?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's right, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay. Any discussion? Any further comment?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Discussion of what?



STEVE CROCKER: On this amendment.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

STEVE CROCKER: All right. So I will call the question on accepting the amendment for this. All those in favor?

[Chorus of Ayes.]

Any opposed?

[No verbal response.]

Any abstentions?

[No verbal response.]

Fine. So now that puts that amendment into the resolution, which we are currently discussing.

Any further discussion of the main resolution?

Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: I'd like just to hear from staff. How long will it take to get these changes done so that the two characters are released, because the whole community is waiting, the registries are waiting, and we did put them on hold, so we need to reach those as soon as possible.

Akram, could you give us an indication, please?

AKRAM ATALLAH:

I trust that the comment periods could be put up very quickly, so I don't think that should delay us.

The communication with the GAC would require us to set a process, but I think that if we do it in an email directly to each GAC member, notifying them, we could do that, you know, probably within the next week, so we give them as much time to participate in the comment period. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

So I have a question.

Do we need to have responses from everybody -- every GAC member at the same time or is it possible that we could proceed with responses from some and then a GAC member could respond later saying, "Oh, add me to the list"?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

We don't need -- there's no --

AKRAM ATALLAH:

So I think we're talking about two different things, Steve, here.

The list that -- for GAC members not to receive emails or notifications would be posted by the GAC on their Web site.

We will use that to exclude notifying GAC members.



So if GAC members do not want to be receiving notifications -- and we have a lot of these requests, so it's not going to be 10 emails, it's going to be in the hundreds of emails to the GAC members. If they don't want to receive these things, then they put their name on that list and we'll exclude them from the email.

If they don't put their names on that list, we will have to send them email.

And we will work with the GAC to see what we can develop for them to be notified in an easier way, if they want, but that will take more time.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah. And I'm asking just the, you know, kind of small question: When we get this process going, will it be possible for a GAC member to subsequently say, "You've been sending me email because I didn't say no but now I want to say no"?

AKRAM ATALLAH:

Yeah. I believe that they could work with the GAC staff to add them to the list later on. Absolutely.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah. Thomas?

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. I just would like to bring to your attention the fact that although the participation, the number of members of the GAC, is



growing rapidly, there is quite a number of governments that are not yet members of the GAC.

So if it's about notifying governments, then please do not forget to notify the ones that are not a member of the GAC. Thank you very much.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Yes. We will endeavor to reach governments affected that are not GAC members as well. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Any other discussion?

I think it's time to call the question.

All in favor say aye.

[Affirmative responses]

Any opposed?

[Silence]

Any abstentions?

[Silence]

The motion passes.

This is a very substantive piece of work that we have tried to do in a very timely way and hope that it will have the positive effect that we intended for it to do.



That brings us to the end of the preset agenda. Is there any other business that any member wishes to introduce?

I hope the drinks are already set up. We're in the uncomfortable position of actually not having consumed all our time. We have a solution to this.

[Laughter]

I had forgotten something. Let me turn things over to Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Thank you, Steve.

One of the things we heard from the community is that sometimes people are not sure whether we're listening to them, and I've also heard from the community that maybe we should have a few new faces on the board, and we do.

So this is just an opportunity for some board members who wish to speak just to give a quick summary of things they've heard during the week and any observations they have on them. And hopefully that won't be the whole board because that could take us some time, but, you know, I'll let Steve manage the speaking order of who would like to speak.

STEVE CROCKER:

This is not -- this will not be part of the formal board meeting, right?



So just as a matter of form, the board meeting is hereby closed, and we'll now move into these statements that Bruce has described. Thank you.

Do you have the order?

BRUCE TONKIN: Do you want me to --

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. You do it.

BRUCE TONKIN: Well, I'll start with someone on my left. Rinalia, would you like to -- just be conscious of time, so try and keep the comments -- yeah, about two minutes, yeah.

RAY PLZAK: Put up the clock.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. On the spot.

Some personal observations and thoughts from ICANN 52. I wrote this down right before the public comment, in case I forgot, because it's been a very long week.



So I -- it's been a hectic week for everyone, and I can see that the ICANN community is putting a lot of effort into the accountability and IANA stewardship transition work.

In terms of capacity, I believe every group has gone into overdrive, and it has an impact on other areas of work, and I've heard calls for work prioritization across all stakeholder groups and I believe staff is currently working on something to help with this.

But amidst the intense activities, the nice thing is I have also seen the emergence of new leaders. Some flowers bloom in times of adversity.

And it is a welcome sight and I hope that there will be more to further enrich the diversity of a globalized ICANN community.

The next comment that I have is on the work of the IANA stewardship transition coordination group, the CWG on naming related functions, and accountability, CCWG.

Essentially -- and I'm commenting more on the CWG and CCWG work.

There are three groups of people who are engaged: those who are actually doing the actual work in the groups; those who are actively monitoring the work; and those who are deeply interested but who are not able to engage or directly do active monitoring.

And it is not an underestimation to say that parts of the community are having difficulty keeping up with the developments and pace of work. And I can see that the practice of providing regular summaries is helpful to the larger community, and that should be continued as the CWG and CCWG continue their work.



In terms of the overall coordination of work, I hear concerns about time lines and the ability to meet set deadlines for deliverables, and there is the worry that the late start of the CCWG on accountability and its area of work is affecting the CWG's work time line and ultimately the ICG submission time line, which isn't fair on the other affected parties, especially the numbers and protocol parameter communities. And this is something that needs to be addressed and whatever that can be done at the community, board, and staff level should be done to speed up the work, including ensuring that the CCWG on accountability gets all the information that it needs, including independent legal as soon as possible.

In terms of time line, Larry Strickling has given his assurances that the community should take the time that it needs to do its work. There is wide recognition of this.

Thank you. I will slow down. I almost forget that I tend to speed up.

Nevertheless, I believe that there is the recognition in the community that -- at this meeting that it also needs to work with urgency and do its best to get the proposal submitted in time.

Linked to the issue of time line is the worry about how the board will treat the proposals from the CCWG and the ICG, and Steve has issued that statement in terms of how we would deal with that, and hopefully that will provide clarity.

And finally, with regard to the substance of the accountability CCWG work, my personal opinion is that they have a good approach. I like that they have been inserted checks and balances and independence to the



traditional components of organizational accountability. The gap that I see personally is on mutual accountability. Whereas the community is empowered to make the board more accountable, community accountability should also be ensured, and that is, to my mind, the missing piece. Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you, Rinalia.

Asha, our newest board member from the nominating committee.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Thank you, Bruce.

Firstly, I want to thank the nominating committee for giving me the chance to participate -- to serve on the ICANN board, and I want to thank many of you that have made me feel welcome and have taken the time to guide and to orient me.

This is my first board -- first ICANN meeting as a board member, and it happens to be in the very city that I have lived in for the past 12 years, so I hope you've enjoyed your stay in my city and I hope you spend a few extra days and, you know, a few extra tourist dollars and contribute to our economy.

As a female board member from Asia, I would be particularly keen to see more geographical and cultural diversity and gender balance in all part -- in all groups of the ICANN community, and that's not only from a membership perspective but, more importantly, from an active participation perspective.



So I would urge all the various groups within ICANN -- you know, the registrars, the registries, the ISPs. I would have loved to have seen Singaporean ISPs here, for instance. I would urge all these groups to, you know, go out there and get out of your comfort zone and reach out and mobilize your counterparts in different countries, as well as your fellow citizens.

So look where you don't normally look. Try to get more fresh blood like me. And, you know, make ICANN a more multicultural place like my beautiful city, Singapore.

I mean, coming back to what I've observed in the last five days and what -- some of my views on going forward, I think all eyes are on us now. It's all up to us, right? The way we work together, the way we synchronize on the transition and the accountability proposals will affect not only the three billion Internet users there are today, but the population of future users. The four billion who are yet to be connected. You know, this includes the hundreds of millions in the villages of India where my parents were born. This includes the hundreds of millions in the villages of Indonesia where my mother formed -- spent her formative years. And the hundreds of millions of people in the villages of China, the country I was born in and the country where I spent my formative years.

So what we do has a long-term impact, not only on the people who are connected on the Internet today but the four billion who are yet to be connected. So it's very important what we do, and it's very important that we do it well.

Talking about China, next year is Chinese New Year as Kuo-Wei mentioned. It marks the start of the year of the goat. This is the year of



the wood goat. So there's a famous Chinese astrologer who comes from my hometown, and I don't think he's ever been to any ICANN meetings but it's real interesting his prediction for 2015. He says, "This year is symbolized by two elements, wood on top of earth, and wood and earth don't get along. So there will be conflicting elements. There will be disharmony. There will be international conflicts and clashes. However, it seems as such conflicts may be easily resolved by compromise and concessions in 2015, even more so than 2014. Because there is an element in the year 2015 of the -- in the yin wood which is a flower, and a flower is meant to be -- is meant to symbolize more flexibility and listening to each other."

So I hope that Mr. Lo is right. I'm heartened by this -- by this prediction. Even though the proposals from the CWG and the CCWG are perceived to have significant overlap, I would like to echo here what Lise Fuhr, chair of the CWG, requested the community to do. She says, "Please give constructive feedback on the models and their implications." And it's really heartening for me to see the various groups working, you know -- and the different tracks are beginning to be coordinated by the five co-chairs from the two groups and trying to get in sync as much as possible, which is a little bit -- which is very much in line with what Steve mentioned earlier. So I hope my astrologer, the astrologer that I mentioned, his predictions come true.

So as we prepare to enter the year of the goat, all eyes are on how we handle the transition. Let's not let down the three billion future compatriots, Internet compatriots. Thank you. (Speaking in non-English language.)



BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you, Asher. Kuo-Wei, would you like to try some words of wisdom in Chinese?

KUO-WEI WU: Well, I'm going to talk for one hour in Chinese.

[Laughter]

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We'll go then and let you get on with it.

KUO-WEI WU: I will start the first part in Chinese and then I like to, you know, talking about SO activity in here in the second part. That part will be in English. The first part will be in Chinese.

First of all, everyone can see that at least there are three Asians been appointed as facilitators. Maybe you can understand the two Australians, they don't really look like Asians. That's why they appointed the three people who actually do have Asian faces as the facilitators. I think this is a very good opportunity for people to know what Asians are like.

First of all, I should tell everyone -- year and to be prosperous and because during the summarization I said be prosperous, Steve Crocker, he did not pick up what I was saying. Therefore, I need to speak in both Chinese and English together so Steve Crocker can pick up what I'm --



My experience particularly for the SO participations. As we know the SO actually is a very long institution participate in the Internet world. But particularly in the ICANN meeting. Most of the time the people ignore where they are and what they are doing. But be careful that because if you are looking for the DNS measurement, actually SO particular RIR, they regard scientists and researcher in doing the measurement. If you want to know the DNS measurement, IPv6 measurement, they do an excellent job. Particularly from this meeting we heard a lot of very positive sign regarding for the IPv6 growth. Very healthy growth, about 5-6% of the total Internet traffic. So I think it's a very important time for the government to recognize that, you know, because although we're talking about IPv6 for so many years, but now the sign is coming. So I wish the government pick up the sign and start to pushing the IPv6. Keep working and keep growing, you know. And I think if there is a chance, you know, maybe you can invite SO and other people to your GAC meeting to share those data. Those data is really positive and really important for the overall Internet growth. And particularly, for example, I am talking about a measurement that, you know, the DNS performance. I think at least in this week I heard Jeff Houston talk, his really excellent talk. He talking about a DNS resolver. You know, I think you -- in our community, actually number and names cannot separate out. And DNS is a part of the thing, the number and name we're working together. So we know most of the measurement and research I think, you know, the Internet cannot go further. So I -- I would very appreciate the RIR, the SO, they're really working hard not only to serve their community, also to all the research, particularly those measurement and what is going on. And at the same time, I also - - I think it was yesterday or day before that we have a meeting with a



technical group. Those talk actually -- actually I think unfortunately we should share those technical, you know, deals -- technical group to, you know, meeting with the Board. Those information can be shared by all the people participating in the ICANN. Because they are talking about the risk, they are talking about the future, they are talking about a very important thing, including the Internet thing.

So personally I like to take this chance to thank you very much for all the number community, your effort and your research and your outcome. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

BRUCE TONKIN:

Thanks Kuo-Wei. I'm conscious of the time with the audience here. Does anyone else have any remarks? George?

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

Thank you, Bruce. Even though I'm not Asian, I'd like to make two comments on what -- well, I'm not -- maybe. I'm not sure. On things that I heard at this meeting that I'm going to be pondering and trying to figure out how to help, and I'd just like to mention them. The first was that we had a -- we had a significant and active interchange of views regarding an issue relating to sensitive strings in the new gTLD program. And there were conflicting points of view. Fairly large ones on both sides. I think it's an important issue and it needs resolution. And my sense is that the issue is a symptom of more general issue which I pose to myself and which I'll be pondering. It's this: To what extent, if any, should ICANN or any of its constituent groups bare any responsibility for



the semantic content or the semantic implications of new gTLD names? And if so, what might that responsibility consist of? And finally, to what extent is this issue going to affect consumer confidence and consumer trust in the enlarged domain name space.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I don't have an opinion on it now. I don't want to talk about that. But it's an issue that may continue to confound us in the future. And I think we need to decide this one way or the other and set community and user expectations publicly and accordingly.

And the second issue has already been spoken to. I'd like to add a little bit. I really appreciated seeing the CWG and the CCWG at work carefully, slowly, methodically, looking at issues and trying to figure out what's best for ICANN.

But I worry about the slipping timeline. I take the point that we have to do this right. I also would suggest the point that we have to do it knowing that time in the long run is not on our side. Because parts of the world are beginning to conflate the lack of ability to get the transition done, quote, unquote, and the failure of the multistakeholder model of which we are the primary instantiation.

The external world is very political, and it's often unpredictable.

And they judge our timeline and our ability to produce according to that timeline by their standards, not by ours.

And there are implications for the continued legitimacy and strength of the ICANN and the multistakeholder model.



We've got to be able to produce acceptable and coherent proposals in a reasonable amount of time. So I think it was Ira Magaziner who pointed out that speed is not necessarily inconsistent with thoroughness. We've got to do both. And I hope we can do it. So those are the things I'm worrying about between now and the next meeting. Thank you very much.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thanks, George. Ram, I believe you had a comment.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Bruce. I wanted to just say a couple works about the growing technical engagement. You know, if you look at it, Michelle Cotton from ICANN is now in the Internet Steering Group, ISG; Suzanne Woolf from the ICANN board is now on the Internet Architecture Board, the IAB; Jonne Soininen is the IETF's liaison to the ICANN board; and, of course, I'm the SSAC's liaison to the Board.

There's a lot of progress being made and a lot of work remaining. And, if you look at the technical community and their engagement inside of ICANN, it's a positive thing. And it's also a good thing because it's important to understand that technical feasibility and security considerations are a required component of any rollout. Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thanks, Ram.

Back to you, Steve.



STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Bruce. And thank you, everybody.

The common message that comes across here is that ICANN board members, not only as a group but individually, are deeply engaged in a wide variety of the substantive matters and care a lot about these things.

As the last thing we do, I want to recognize community members. David Olive, you have -- so let me turn things over to Fadi and to David and recognize the community members who have given so much to us.

DAVID OLIVE: Thank you, Dr. Crocker. At every ICANN public meeting the Board and community express their appreciation to leaders whose terms of office are ending across our supporting organizations and advisory committees. Today we pause after a busy week to thank these leaders for their leadership.

Unfortunately, not everyone could be here today. And some community members are being represented by colleagues. We acknowledge their work nonetheless.

The community leaders are, from the Generic Name Supporting Organization, Kristina Rosette for her service as intellectual property consistency representative.

[Applause]



From the Governmental Advisory Committee, Tracy Hackshaw for her service as GAC vice chair.

[Applause]

And Peter Nettlefold for his service as GAC vice chair.

[Applause]

From the security and stability advisory committee, we have Rodney Joffe. Becky Burr is here to accept the certificate on his behalf.

[Applause]

Jason Livingood for his service as SSAC member.

Bruce Tonkin.

[Applause]

Stefano Trumpy and Paul Vixie, both could not be here today.

And, finally, from the Root Server Advisory Committee, Jun Murai. As Dr. Crocker mentioned earlier, Dr. Jun Murai is ending 15 years of leading the RSSAC. Professor Murai was the first RSSAC chair and subsequently led RSSAC through the growth and development of the root server system. I'd like to invite Lars Johan-Liman, the current cochair of RSSAC, to reflect on Dr. Murai's leadership.

LARS JOHAN-LIMAN:

Thank you. My name is Lars Johan-Liman. I'm one of the two current cochairs of the Root Server System Advisory committee. Very narrow focus. I'm standing here as the 10-year-old school boy with the



impossible assignment to say thank you to one of the Internet superstars.

I've been involved in operating the root zone server that's based in Stockholm, Sweden, for 23 years by now almost to the day. And, when I was an even younger school boy, I was invited to a meeting. Actually, it was here in Singapore. It was back in 1999 and was the first ICANN meeting ever.

A new body was created. It was called the Root Server System Advisory Committee. And it was one of the first places where the root server operators could come together and discuss the issues they wanted to deal with.

So here I am, trying to say thank you to the person who invited me to that meeting, Professor Jun Murai from Keio University in Japan. And it's kind of difficult to say thank you to a person who has received three ministerial rewards, who is a holder of the Jon Postel award, who travels through the World Economic Forum, who is vice president of a university, and who has an enormous track record on the Internet.

I am deeply humbled by having served together with Jun Murai as cochairs on the RSSAC the few last years.

Jun was instrumental in creating RSSAC. And that was a very important step for the root servers. The root server operators go back a long time. It actually predates the he creation of the first RIR. And everything was operated under Jon Postel in the beginning. But, when Jon Postel left us way too early, there had to be new forms for corporation. And Jun Murai was instrumental in creating one of those, namely, the RSSAC.



So I say thank you to Jun for creating RSSAC and also for educating those of us who are members there what it meant to do cooperation and to work with the greater Internet community and also for guiding and leading us in our work, for watching out and protecting us from the world outside so that we could do decent work.

Under Professor Murai's leadership, we passed a couple of very heavy milestones. I'm thinking of IPv6 introduction and also DNSSEC, which has a major technical shift in the DNS technology. And the introduction of this passed without a hitch in the overall system performance.

So RSSAC today is a very stable and working organization. We are producing good work to the benefit of the stability and resiliency and security of the root server system. And that is very much down to Jun Murai's groundbreaking work.

It's been 15 long years. In my personal time scale, that means that my teenage daughter wasn't even born when this all began.

So I think this is a record. I believe it's a record in the ICANN history of a person serving for 15 years as a chair of a working group. And I can only say thank you so much for being the chair for us and for helping us in our work. And I'm bowing in respect.

Thank you.

[Applause]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you. Hiro Hotta is here to accept Dr. Murai's certificate on his behalf. And with that, we're very grateful for the extraordinary

contributions of these community leaders. ICANN's and evolution as a multistakeholder organization depends on the sustained engagement of our stakeholders. Indeed, it is community-driven work that is at the core of ICANN's mission and mandate.

Thank you.

[Applause]

STEVE CROCKER:

Time to stretch. Time to stand up. Time to go across the hall for a drink.

ICANN 52 is hereby closed.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

