
FRED BAKER: Thank you. Okay, thank you for joining. And our first order of business is actually to do a roll call, see who's here. Let me run that down. Cogent, who do we have from Cogent here? DISA?

KEVIN WRIGHT: Kevin Wright.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and I believe Ryan's on the call as well. ICANN?

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson is here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. ISC, I'm here. Jeff are you?

JEFF OSBORN: I'm here, Fred. This is Jeff.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. NASA?

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Barbara Schleckser's 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.

TOM MIGLIN: Tom Miglin's here.

FRED BAKER: Netnod?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Liman is here. I don't think Patrik is.

FRED BAKER: Okay. RIPE NCC?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh is here.

FRED BAKER: University of Maryland?

KARL REUSS: Karl's here.

FRED BAKER: USCI ISI?

WES HARDAKER: Wes is here. I don't think Suzanne is.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Army Research Labs?

KEN RENARD: Ken is here.

HOWARD KASH: Howard's here.

FRED BAKER: Verisign?

BRAD VERD: Brad's here.

FRED BAKER: WIDE?

HIRO HOTTA: Hiro's here.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Kaveh, you already identified yourself, and Liman's here for the
CSC. Daniel, I've seen you on chat.

JEFF OSBORN: He keeps having audio problems.

FRED BAKER: He is? Okay. But I believe he is present. Okay, and Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, Russ is here. Good morning.

FRED BAKER: Good morning. IANA Functions Operator. I believe James will be joining us. And RZM, Duane are you here?

DUANE WESSELS: Duane is here. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I think I saw James in the chat so he's probably trying to get in at least.

FRED BAKER: Okay. We have some observers. Ryan dropped me a note yesterday. Ryan, could you please introduce your observers?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Hello. Can you hear me?

FRED BAKER:

I can hear you.

RYAN STEPHENSON:

Great. I don't see them ... Okay, I do see Andy Kimble on the line. Andy Kimble is with DoD CIO, as well as Vernita Harris. And I do not know if she is on the line. Andy, is she on the line?

ANDY KIMBLE:

I don't believe she's on the line. I think she's going to try to join but she may not be available. But obviously, I called in via audio. Unfortunately, I'm unable to join in via Zoom but thank you for the invite.

RYAN STEPHENSON:

No problem. Andy's with DoD CIO. Miss Vernita Harris, she's also with DoD CIO. They interact with a spectrum internet governance role as well. Andy, if there's anything further you'd like to add, please go ahead and contribute.

ANDY KIMBLE:

Thanks, Ryan. No. We're just obviously interested from DoDs standpoint and welcome the opportunity to listen in to this dialog. So thank you very much for your efforts.

FRED BAKER:

Certainly. I expect we each have stakeholders that will be interested in what's going on. Liman, you have your hand up.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes. For a poor foreigner, could you please spell out DoD CIO? What does it stand for?

ANDY KIMBLE: It's the Department of Defense, office of the Chief Information Officer.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. In a moment I'm going to forward some slides that were shared with us by the Board—that were shared with Brad and myself—and they will be interesting, I think, to your stakeholders. I would encourage you to forward them. They probably shouldn't show up in the New York Times but I believe we have authority to pass them along to stakeholders. Okay. I just sent that and what's next on our agenda? Okay, administration. You've seen draft minutes from last month's meeting. Have I missed some? Ozan, you're showing me something and I'm missing what you're trying to show me.

OZAN SAHIN: I believe you moved on to the agenda draft minutes from 2nd of March meeting so I'm showing the minutes from this meeting.

FRED BAKER: Okay, cool. You've each seen those minutes, had a chance to look at them. Does anybody have any objection to the minutes? We'll go ahead toward accepting them. Does anybody have any proposed changes? Failing that, we'll consider them accepted. And, Jeff, do you want to tell us what's going on with the caucus membership?

JEFF OSBORN: Yes. The previous process where we were working with people who hadn't showed up has been given a grace period of a year. What we're primarily doing is working with new folks and the membership committee is unanimously recommending candidate Malick Alassane. He lives in Benin and is relatively new to the DNS community but he's got a masters degree in IT security and worked as an IT Security Analyst for AfriNIC and other organizations. So we felt he was imminently qualified and we're recommending his membership in the caucus.

FRED BAKER: Okay, and that's a vote item. We're supposed to vote on that, correct?

JEFF OSBORN: I never can remember that. Good question.

OZAN SAHIN: Yes, this is correct.

FRED BAKER: Yes, okay so fine. Let's take a vote. It's pro forma but does anybody object to having him as a member of the caucus? Failing that, then we'll consider him accepted in the caucus.

JEFF OSBORN: Thanks, Fred. That's it.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Cool. Now the next item on the agenda is the discussion that Brad and I had—Brad and Liman and Hiro had—with the Board Governance Group regarding the proposal from the GWG last week. You should all have, in your email, slides that I forwarded a moment ago that they showed us. The GWG is comprised like the RSSAC. It's composed of several standing members and several observers, including two from the Board, one of whom I think you all know, or most of you know, Tripti, and another one whom you may know called Lito. So Tripti and Lito put together these slides and walked through concerns that they had with the GWG proposal. Let's talk about that for a few moments. Ozan, could you show those slides?

Thank you. So they started out with walking through history. We all know the history but to make sure that we're all on the same page—the fact that the ICANN Board convened the GWG and asked the GWG to specifically do some things with respect to RSSAC37 and the evolution of the RSS, which we have spent several years talking about and preparing for in the development of RSSAC37. Next slide.

This slide came directly from RSSAC37 and Tripti walked through and just said so. These are different things that RSSAC37 details. You've all seen this slide, so next slide. Then they talked through, very briefly, the new order proposal from the GWG, which you have the link to. Understanding that the GWG proposal is not final at the moment, they said, "Okay, this is what the current proposal is. The proposal could change but this is the proposal that's there."

Suzanne, I believe that you are also on the GWG coming from SSAC, correct?

SUZANNE WOOLF:

That is correct, Fred.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, so next slide. Now then Tripti went through and identified several differences between the current GWG proposal and RSSAC37 and you see the first of them on the screen in front of you. The current GWG proposal identifies three major functions within an entity which is a wholly-owned subsidiary of ICANN, similar to PRI, and it's called the PRS. So there's that.

And it differs from RSSAC37 a little bit in that ... Okay, so the concern is that an operational entity would not have any role in chartering policy bodies or assessing those policies for implementation, according to the GWG proposal. The RSSAC37 specifically talks about that in the sense of having affinity groups for different activities. Next slide.

There is a question about SLAs and SLEs and MOUs. And the GWG proposal basically says those understandings are to be developed by the PRS as it's constituted and there's no discussion of funding. RSSAC37 has some pretty specific statements about service levels and funding and so there is a disagreement between the GWG proposal and RSSAC37. Next slide.

The current GWG proposal does not mention any evaluation of the data that it develops only says that it will develop data. RSSAC37 talks about evaluating candidate RSOs against service expectations being done in the PMMF. Next slide. The current GWG proposal doesn't actually organize the RSOs, per se. It says that the RSOs will report into PRS but does not specifically provide a collective channel. And RSSAC37 talks about there not being a collective channel so there's some distinction there. Next slide.

The SAPF is called out in RSSAC37, basically as a community group, and is intended to become a member of the ICANN community. The current GWG proposal doesn't make that statement so there's some question about the status of the SAPF and I'm not exactly sure that a body that is constituted outside of ICANN can be made a member of the ICANN technical community. Next slide. In RSSAC37, we thought of the SAPF as asking questions of the different bodies within what RSSAC37 calls out. The current GWG proposal sees that coming from PRS. Next slide.

Okay, so that was the end of the slides that Tripti and Lito shared. And the important thing there is not that the GWG is automatically wrong but their proposal is different from RSSAC37. So we will be asked our

viewpoint on that and I guess we should develop one. Let me throw the discussion open. Anybody have comments on that?

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: I'm just not understanding. How did we get so far away from what the GSW wants or the governance group wants to what we're proposing? Is this the first time we've seen each other?

FRED BAKER: Well, it's not the first time we've seen each other. We've had regular reports from Brad, and from Liman, and from Hiro who are employed by different RSOs and are on the GWG. However, the GWG has been operating without, necessarily, reference to the RSSAC.

So when I asked the chair—which is Ted—asked him to maintain contact with the RSSAC and told them that I thought it would be a really bad thing when the RSSAC comes to review the GWG output which is yet future—that's not this discussion—it would be a bad thing for the RSSAC to be surprised. He said, "Well, so you guys can talk to Brad, and Liman, and Hiro and there's no reason for the GWG to actually directly contact the RSSAC." So they have been operating—in a vacuum is probably too strong word—but without reference to us.

BARBARA SCHLECKSER: Okay. I was just confused. How did we get so far off on the objectives? So yeah. To me, we put a great deal of work into this, and then, yeah. I just wish we were both a little closer to what we were [inaudible]. So

how does this get resolved? What's the process for resolving the differences and who holds the trump card—the pecking order on this?

FRED BAKER:

Well, so there are several hands up and I am going to call through people and assume that at least part of their comments will be responding to yours. So let me come back to you later. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Yes, thank you. I have so much to say on this topic. Yes, I am one of the members, the representatives on the GWG. I was surprised to see Tripti's and Lito's list because I tend to disagree with it, not entirely, but to a large extent. And we obviously came to the table with the different notions of what RSSAC37 represented.

In my view, RSSAC37 was the result of discussions within RSSAC where we did an inventory of the problem space. And we had ideas. We identified various functions that we believed needed to be filled and we said, "Here are some play pieces that we need to play with in order to make this work." Then we took this to the wider group of representatives from other stakeholders.

And from my side it was always with the intent that this will be changed. There will be major changes to what we have on the table because what we have is not a proposal. It's a selection of play pieces. We've had a fair number of discussions and again as Fred noted this is not a final proposal. This is written down as far as we've gotten in the discussion so far and there's a lot of discussion still to be had.

I also have a slightly different angle on the RSSAC thing here. RSSAC was where this was discussed but RSSAC we decided that it was the root server operators that were the stakeholders from our side of the table. So you could argue—and I'm not saying this as a black and white thing—that after having delivered RSSAC37 and fired off GWG, RSSAC could be ejected from the loop because it's the root server operators and root ops on that side of things that is represented on that board, not RSSAC. I don't see myself as a representative from RSSAC there. I am a representative from the root server operators collective. RSSAC is the ICANN body.

I also think that the functions that we mentioned in RSSAC37 are still being carried out in the models that we're trying to build up in GWG. So I don't see the things that are mentioned in this slide deck as major points of disagreements or major steps aside from things, maybe because I didn't see it as a proposal for a final solution.

I'm conflicted here but the fact that I'm conflicted is a very strong argument for having reconciliation discussions with RSSAC. So I would propose that we set aside time, not at this meeting and not at our regular monthly meetings, but that we open a separate meeting series because this will take time. We need to talk a lot, probably, about these things and there are things where we—Brad, Hiro, and I—would benefit greatly from your input so that we get a bit better feeling for where the other root server operators want to go with things.

And I think we can also alleviate some of your concerns by explaining more of the thoughts in the GWG, and the things aren't yet in the

papers, and where things may change. I think I'll stop there for the moment and give some room for others. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Kaveh, your hand's up.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, thank you very much, and hello, everyone. So I think it's important to frame it right. So Fred and Liman both mentioned, I think first, it is really important to remember that it is work in progress in the GWG so it might completely change. But that said, I think we have a problem and the problem is not about the content. It might even be okay. Or with some small changes, we might be able to fix those, or we might have different views on the examples that we have seen. That's basically Tripti and Lito's observations and nothing more than that.

But what I think we should keep in mind is—or the issue that, actually, we have to deal with, especially now at this place—is a communication issue. It is a complex set up and we all know that RSSAC, and root ops, and different groups we have and that the fundamental difference is there. But at the end, I think right now, we face a communication problem.

To touch on Barbara's, basically, concern, actually it is by design because what we have designed is to ask ICANN Board to create GWG from group of people which, yes, RSOs have three representatives but then SSAC has people there. IEB, which is completely outside of ICANN has representatives there, gTLD registries and ccTLD because we really saw

the governance of root server system much larger than just ICANN or a single group. And now that group has their independence, which is fair. It is by design.

On the other hand, I think it is, again, very important to remember. ICANN Board will not approve any outcome that comes from GWG if RSOs—which in this case will be represented by RSSAC but at the end same people—if RSOs don't agree or do not like that proposal. Of course, minor differences, there's always room for discussion or accepting or rejecting some. But generally, if there is no general consensus within root server operators, ICANN Board is not going to implement or accept what comes from GWG, which would be a major failure for all of us. So that's the worst-case scenario that I see and we really don't want to even get close there.

How we can avoid that, my thinking is ... Because in my experience even if GWG goes through their normal process, which they would develop something, of course, we have our representatives there. But at the end, they have 3 out of 10 votes. So something will be accepted as consensus and will be published for public comment. But if that document is really far from what we understand and what we expect as RSOs, even the public comment period, if not impossible, will make it very hard to correct course.

So based on all of this, my suggestion ... And I will shortly ask to share a proposal that I have. My suggestion to solve this is basically to make sure that we solve this communication problem. So we make sure that we ask GWG to meet with us—of course, again, they're an independent group—but meet with us RSO's and talk to us before they publish

something. Again, this is not against their independence. They might choose to publish something that we really do not like or disapprove but we know that will be a failure. And if they choose that path, okay. That's a very different discussion.

In order to execute that, it also might be a bit complex because RSSAC, we, actually by design, we ask not to be part of that, which I still think is a good decision from a governance point of view, in the longer run. On the other hand, what can we do, let's say, right now? My proposal ... And I think Steve has the link, if Steve can share that and maybe even put it on the screen. My suggestion ... And please listen to that because it's a bit of navigating in our governance.

My suggestion is, there is a letter which I'm suggesting RSOs ... Within the process we have in root ops, RSOs basically write that letter and send it to GWG. But I thought the introduction of that letter, it is good if I do it here in RSSAC because we basically have all RSOs, of course, here and then mostly decision-makers which, if there is general consensus in RSSAC, that's such a letter ... Of course, maybe not exact wording. This is my proposal and I got help from staff—thank you—to write it down. But if such a letter, you think, can be useful with this general frame we can send it to the root ops and follow the process there to publish it.

But, of course, if someone really objects to that I won't go through the trouble of sending it to root ops. Because first I wanted to basically make sure that RSOs generally agree with this. And, if yes, then we will take it to root ops. So that's my suggestion. My suggestion is basically writing to GWG as RSOs collective and asking them to basically, A, establish quarterly meetings to discuss with us and also, prior to public

consultation, give us interim documents when they have liaised with us and talked to us about this. That's what I'm suggesting. Thank you.

And please let me know, especially if you have objections against this. Again, right now, this is not to go through phrase by phrase. That we can do in the root ops process. But if the general spirit of this message and the general suggestion you agreed, then I will take it to root ops.

But I don't think this real discussion should happen there. So if you have fundamental disagreement with this or you want to change it at the high level, at the structure, please raise it up now, here. Otherwise, I will follow the process in root ops. Thank you. Jeff, says it says, "Access denied." I think, yeah, we will fix it.

FRED BAKER: Kaveh, you did this in Google Docs, correct?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes. So it is being shared on the chat now.

FRED BAKER: Okay, there we go. Steve Sheng has shared it. So if people have specific concerns they can comment in the document. Wes, your hand is up.

WES HARDAKER: Yeah. One sec while I collect my notes. So I did read the GWG document. It does look like it's coming along nicely. It's interesting that the differences that Tripti found were different than mine. I agree with

Liman, like a thousand billion percent. A, we should set aside some time to talk about this and that we did expect it to change. We expected 37 to be a starting point, not the actual perfect architecture. There are a number of interesting things that I found that were significant enough changes that made me go, "Hmm, that's interesting," that I haven't necessarily made up my mind about.

The two that I'll mention at the moment are, one, that the PRF charters the SAPF, which the SAPF needs to be chartered somewhere. I always figured it would be chartered under ICANN because I worry that the ... Sorry, I said PRF but I meant PRS. Something autocorrected my PRS. But anyway, PRS chartered the SAPF and I worry that there's a conflict of potential interest there, if the charter comes under the PRS but that may be necessary for contractual purposes.

Also, the other thing is that I found it very strange that the PRS was actually going to collect contact information and pass some of it to the PTI. That seemed backwards to me because the PTI is what controls the sources of the root in general. The root contact information. And maybe that's reversing it, and maybe that's a good thing but I did find it interesting that it seemed to reverse what is happening today. But I guess if the PRS is going to take over essentially the functionality of who actually is a root server operator, that maybe that's the direction to go. But I would say it should be called out more cleanly.

But overall, I felt the document's headed in a good direction. I will implore us to ensure that we don't get in the way of getting this done. So I think we do have to think about each potential difference and issue and really bring up concerns that we think is functionally not workable.

It would be very easy for us to stand up and say, "No. Whatever they came up with is just too different than 37 and we refuse to consider it." And I don't think that's the stance we want to take and we need to make sure that this work can get done so our vision set forth in 37 can actually get completed.

FRED BAKER:

Thank you, Wes. Jeff, you've got your hand up.

JEFF OSBORN:

Yeah. Thanks, Fred. It's good to have the input on this now. I'm being very concerned that all of this is going on and we haven't had a really good time to discuss it in a lot of detail. I blame COVID because we haven't been able to get together in a workshop setting, which would be very valuable. But I share Barbara's concern that how the hell did we get here and then what do we do about it?

The longer this goes, I disagree with Wes's idea that we can't just say no. if there's not a whole lot of input from what we put together over the course of three or five years, however long it took, then I feel like I would have a duty to say, "This isn't acceptable. We can't do this." I really feel like it's violating a couple of basic principles we've got. And my cynicism about ICANN is widely known in this group so I won't apologize for it. But the PRS being such a captured organization to ICANN, just the optics alone make it hard for me to even get passed that point.

What I'm definitely very worried about too is if we don't have further discussions with the GWG and the buy-in, then we're going to have—I guess it was what Kaveh called a disaster. If they spend a year or two working on this and we just say no and hell no, nobody will have won. The free and open internet will not have been furthered. It's a bad thing altogether. So more communication. When can we do it? That's all I've got to say. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. Russ, you have your hand up.

RUSS MUNDY:

Yes. Thank you, Fred. I have a—I guess you could call it a mechanical question because one of the tasks that I had as a result of our recent RSSAC/SSAC joint meeting was to try to coordinate a get together of GWG, SSAC, and RSSAC to talk about what's going on in the GWG. Now, I have some personal concerns about what I'm seeing in the slides that's in the report and so forth.

But at this point, I want to just restrict my questions and comments to whether or not the RSSAC feels that this is still something that's needed and needed to be done jointly with SSAC or if RSSAC wants to go forward separate from coordinating something. I don't expect an answer at this point by any means but I'd like folks to keep this in mind so we can figure out what it is that we want to be doing next, especially with respect to joint get-togethers of some sort. That's it, thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, and before I go to Suzanne, let me respond to what's going on in the chat. I would really like our dialog with the GWG and with the ICANN Board to be constructive which is to say, come to an endpoint that benefits the internet. I personally have quite a bit of concern with the GWG operating almost in a vacuum. So that, to me, is not constructive. That said, I would like our comments to the GWG to direct them toward a mutually satisfactory proposal, whatever that may be. If you've gotten a different idea of what I'm thinking about, then please take that as input. Suzanne, your hand is up.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

Yeah, Fred. Thanks. Couple points to reinforce and add. First, I want to reinforce everything that Liman and Kaveh have said about those. In particular, the GWG proposal is very much a work in progress. Personally, my frustration is more that it hasn't proceeded further. It seems to me to be going very slowly and I'm thinking about how we can make it move faster but it's definitely a work in progress. And I'm looking forward to discussion of the issues raised in the slides in the GWG because as far as I can tell, that feedback has not been shared there. And I am happy to carry the flag for considering that input when the GWG has it.

The other thing, there's a number of factors as far as where the points of divergence might've come from. I agree with everything that has already been said about that. And I also want to point out because that there are other stakeholders involved and the GWG is trying to navigate some implementation issues around what RSSAC37 said and some practical means for implementation—the organizational stuff about how PRS is

structured and things like that ... So the thing to keep in mind is that there are both real constraints on what can be done, as far as implementation, and some speculation or some concern on the part of GWG members that just has to be untangled, as far as what, certainly, some of the legal and financial constraints look like.

So I would urge people to consider this is definitely a work in progress. This input is definitely extremely important for the GWG to have and we should proceed on that assumption and bring in ... I haven't had a chance to look over the letter yet but definitely bring in whatever feedback RSSAC—and, wearing my other hat, SSAC—feel needs to be brought in because the idea is that it should be relatively easy to provide that kind of input.

FRED BAKER: Suzanne, question for you. Do you want me to forward these slides and the letter to Ted?

SUZANNE WOOLF: I'm a little bit surprised if this hasn't been shared with Ted and don't want to speculate on the whys and wherefores on that. I would like to see it shared with the GWG just as a basis for those of us who were familiar with RSSAC37 before this part of the process started to ...

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry, may I interject on that?

FRED BAKER: Certainly, certainly.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you. Because the slides were basically ... As I said, Tripti and Lito are Board liaisons to GWG. This is own ideas, how they report back to the Board, correct? So this is, again, between them and Board. I did ask to share them with RSSAC, basically on the agreement that if you remember like last year ... So I've got an agreement with the Board that any document related to RSSAC37 – 38 I would share back with RSSAC, or I have the permission to share back.

My assumption is this is for RSOs, not for GWG consumption or anyone outside of RSO organizations because, basically, this is an internal report from Board liaisons to the Board and they have ... Because we have the agreement, we also shared it with RSSAC. But at least with permission, if we want to share it further, we have to ask because it is prepared by those people for a certain reason and of course informing the GWG, at least, it wasn't a communicated purpose.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah, just to address that and then I will go back on mute. I think this is important input for the GWG to have. I have no opinion and no charter, if you will, to determine how that should happen. Frankly, I also owe SSAC something of an update and would like to be able to at least consider this input when I report back to them. But, again, that's a matter of receiving permission and I understand what Kaveh is saying about restricted distribution and so on. So I will try to work on that for

SSAC offline but I do think this is important input for GWG to have and I'll leave it at that.

FRED BAKER: Well, and I would agree with you Suzanne. In the spirit of trying to achieve mutually satisfactory endpoint, it seems like the GWG needs to be aware of the views. So, Kaveh, could you follow up on getting the necessary permissions?

KAVEH RANJBAR: I can ask, but let's go through the hands because I also have some comments related to that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thanks. I have a gut feeling that this is derailing at high speed and one of the reasons is that we're derailing from process. I don't want RSSAC to have a direct dialog with the GWG because that's breaking the process. The process is that the root server operators has representatives on the GWG and they are supposed to carry forward opinions, and look at the root server operator picture, and carry that forward in the discussions.

So I think the right way forward is for RSSAC to inform the root server operator representatives, being Brad, Hiro, and myself, about what have we done wrong? Where do we need to be stronger in the things we

express? Because I think that's the channel that we want to have into the GWG because if we start to throw the entire RSSAC at the GWG, the other stakeholders will do the same and we have a major—too many people, too many voices speaking at the same time and it will not be fruitful.

Also, if RSSAC starts to talk directly to the GWG, it will be disapproving on our work as representatives, which you are ... Of course, it's open for you to do so but knowing that means that ... Do so knowingly, if you want to do that because you will step away from process.

I have one disagreement with Suzanne, actually, which is the speed of things. I think slow is good. This should take time. I am not worried about the speed. If it takes another year, fine. I am also surprised that this is carried to us from people who are Board representatives. Why does the Board care so much about the level of detail to which RSSAC37 is followed? What I can see is Tripti as the root server operator and that's fine. But in that case, the concern should be brought to RSSAC from the root, not from the Board. I'm happy to look at the content of it but the channel strikes me as odd.

I still think that we should hash things out between the people who have concerns—people who rightfully have concerns; I don't disagree with that—but with people who have concerns and those of us who represent the GWG and try to understand each other, both what are we discussing and proposing from the GWG and where are the various root server operators feeling uncomfortable? Because these are the things that need to be reconciled and we can only do so if we talk and communicate properly. That's the thing we need to put up first. We

need to identify these various issues where there is concern and we need to hash them out.

And we, as representatives, we also work in a vacuum because we don't know which concerns the root server operators have. This is from a lack of communication going both ways. So first let's talk. Then let's find a way to carry that forward to the GWG. And that might be a slightly more time-pressing issue. So I would ask Fred to try to make it possible for us to discuss that in other meetings than only these monthly meetings because I think that we need to guess further on that. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you. Brad, you've got your hand up.

BRAD VERD:

Yeah. I'm trying to figure out the words to use here. I feel like what I'm hearing is that we're in agreement that more communication is good. I feel like we're in agreement that it's the RSOs that should be having that discussion, though we coming back and saying RSSAC, RSSAC, RSSAC and I think what people mean are the RSOs. So I wish we could solve that and put that to bed.

I feel, regardless of how you feel, what channel the issues were raised and/or whether or not you think the issues that were raised are valuable or not. I'm not so concerned by the issues that were raised. I'm more concerned by what I see as the systemic challenge that isn't being addressed. What I mean by this ... And I continue to raise this and I've said this in here. I've said this in the RSO meeting. I've said this in the

GWG meeting. I'll just go back in time really quickly and that is Tripti and I traveled around the world, went to every executive team for all the RSOs, explaining what was going on, why we were doing it, why it was the time to do it and getting buy-in.

I feel that that was a huge cog in the wheel that allowed us to get 37 done, specifically in a way that it got a unanimous vote and support of all the RSOs, which I believe everybody said was going to be impossible. I believe that the RSOs, the intent was good and we all agreed it was time for accountability.

What I feel is missing from this effort is that same effort. I'm not sure the RSOs, the executive teams, the people that are going to have to sign these contracts, and MOUs and whatever you want to call it—the decision-makers—understand what is in that document that the GWG is writing, understand the model, and understand the different pieces of it. So when we wrote 37, we wrote it from a very unique point of view. We were the RSOs and we were essentially writing a governance model for us. And I understand that that's odd and weird and I get it, but at the time we were the subject matter experts.

The work that I feel is being done now ... Well, when we wrote 37, there was a lot of—call it negotiation, call it what you want. But if the RSOs are going to give up X what do I get in return? And there's this back and forth and we were going to sign up for accountability. We were going to sign a contract, potentially, with SLEs or SLAs. That was to be determined. But we were going to have more of a say. We were going to have a seat at the table for the people who could hire or fire us.

I'm not sure that holistic view is being taken into account with the GWG work right now and I feel that key aspects of it are being kicked down the road that won't be addressed until later. And I feel that that is a risk that, in my role as an RSO, I need to point out and make sure everybody is aware of. That is what I feel is the systemic challenge. Not the slides, not the content of the slides. I think those are differences that we can work out and as everybody's said this is a work in progress, which is great because we can still work on it and have meetings and talk to work through that.

But there are key pieces to this that are just not being addressed and being kicked down the road to be addressed by PRS when it gets formed in this model type of thing, that I feel a number of the RSOs would have a huge challenge with and out of the gate would say no to. And as everybody has pointed out, that would be a disaster. So, I'll leave it at that. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you. Kaveh, your hand is up.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Yes, thank you very much. So basically I wanted to ... I agree with what Brad said and also agree with Liman's point that we have to be careful, correct, because we also might demotivate the GWG or cause unnecessary trouble where things can't be fixed.

Let me first speak to the channel since Liman brought it up. It's really wasn't ... The communication we got was basically that the Board has

internal caucuses which basically get the input from the liaison for each subject—in this case, GWG. And they discuss basically how we deal with next steps. When they saw this report, the main thing that came up was the agreement that we have with the Board and documented—basically a part of the process—that the Board will not move on, on any input except if there is clear consensus within RSOs, which the Board would receive via RSSAC.

But then they already saw basically one RSO at least is not happy with the process at all. So that immediately means there might be an outcome that RSOs might not accept it. Just wanted to let us know. And I find as an early warning which I welcome. It is not a formal Board action. Board did not have any request from us. They just reinforced the fact that we have basically the control at the end of this line. And I think this is very important to keep in mind because the GWG is independent by design and that's good. They're doing their work and I think that's also very good. And they will have to deliver something that they find consensus on. And actually, they have defined how they get to consensus. That's also very clear.

The thing is—and what GWG actually is not even responsible for—is if whatever that is produced is not consensus by the RSOs, the ICANN Board will not execute to make it happen, make it reality, which will be a big failure. For GWG, it will be, I assume, a disappointment and for us, it will be a failure of what we have worked for so many years on.

I think we have to get it at a right level, which is I think there is a concern about will RSOs accept to this or some form of what will come out of the GWG or not? I really don't think it is about the content—about, for

example, those six examples we saw. We might have no issue with any of those as individual RSOs, or might have issues with one or two, or different issues on the proposal. I think that was just an example.

What we have to show or resolve is send a clear message to GWG and then make sure to at least rate and have our input, RSOs, into their process. And, again, to agree with Liman, I think we have our representatives, there and that's really good, and I want to thank them. I know it takes a lot of time and effort to join all of those calls, and there is a lot of writing and it's a big effort. But on the other hand, we don't have a system between us RSOs to regularly sit and talk with also our liaisons, let alone GWG.

With that, I come back to my proposal which is still on the screen. If there is no objection to some form of this communication, then we can also ask our liaisons to actually bring it there. But still, this should be discussed in root ops, I assume, as RSOs, either way as a publication or as something we would ask our representatives to take to GWG. I think this will solve a lot of those issues. Again, we are not forcing GWG to accept what we say but I think they have to understand getting input from us at an earlier stage before going public is very important. I really cannot see this being solved in, really, public comments and things like that.

For me, the fact that I heard at least three-year operators including ourselves having issues with this current draft, which I would say I cannot agree to those if they become part of proposal. I think that already warrants more communication. So I also repeat ... Based on

this, I repeat my suggestion to, if there is no issue here, let's take it to root ops such a letter and discuss it there. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Ryan, you had your hand up and took it down. Did you want to say something?

RYAN STEPHENSON: No, I'm good.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, we've had a number of people speak and various perspectives shared. Let me ask. Does anybody else have something that they would like to talk about? Seeing no hands and hearing no voices, I'm going to assume that we've basically talked that part out. And let me come back to Kaveh's proposal which I think is actually ... Brad also had this comment and others. Do we want to send this letter to the RSOs?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I have no objections to having communication between RSSAC and the RSOs. That's perfectly fine. I haven't read the letter yet so I don't have a detailed opinion on the content. But making the root server operators more aware and more involved is a good thing so having it sent in that direction is fine by me. Thanks.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Liman, sorry. The letter is from RSOs to GWG. And basically RSOs are asking GWG to do two things. One is establish quarterly meetings to discuss elements of the GWG proposal with all RSOs and second, prior to public consultation, and when they have a stable interim documents, either one or two milestones, to work in [inaudible] with us and get our input as a collective. These are the two asks from GWG, coming from RSOs.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That's not what Fred said. He said about sending something to the RSOs, which is fine. I definitely am strongly opposed to sending something from RSSAC to the GWG that asks for recurring meetings.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Sorry. So let me again repeat. This is not from RSSAC to GWG at all. We are just putting it here, because in RSO group, we don't have a modality of basically starting something. That would be really hard, right?

So, the question is this is a letter which will go from RSOs, the suggestion and the request—the two requests that I mentioned, the quarterly meetings and the meetings before the major milestones and public comment. This is a proposal, which if generally RSOs presenting in this RSSAC call agree with, I would submit to Root Ops and say, root Ops, this is a letter we are suggesting to send to GWG either via whatever the preference and the most effective it is, either via our three liaisons through GWG or as an RSO statement. That [inaudible] Root Ops.

But now we have a chance to see it here, and if someone has objections, I thought this forum might be easier before sending that ... Basically, I send this letter to Root Ops and ask them to send it to GWG.

LARS LOHAN LIMAN: I still think this is the wrong way.

KAVEH RANJBAR: How should we do it? Should I just send it to Root Ops and take it from there?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: You're requesting the wrong thing. Why am Brad and Hiro and I not fulfilling this service? You [have represent this]. We are supposed to be liaisons. We are supposed to be able to carry information back to you. If we don't do that properly, tell us what we can do better.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Fair enough. We don't have any forum to discuss that either within us or basically with GWG, correct?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yeah.

KAVEH RANJBAR: So, the liaisons, we get ... Actually, formally we don't even get updates from that group in the Root Ops [inaudible], correct? So we don't have

our governance. This is basically a step at solving an issue that we have in Root Ops, which is of course not a group and is a group at the same time. So, we don't have any mechanism there, correct?

And if we follow that path, what I think we will end up with is there will be some publication and then we will need to interject at public comment, which I think is already a path to failure.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I agree with that last part, totally. But my way to fix it is to establish communication between us as representatives and the root server operator collectively. You say that we don't have any such mechanism today, so let's make one.

I'm happy to use RSSAC time to have those discussions. If the RSO members that sit on RSSAC are the right people, doing it in the framework of RSSAC is fine. But I disagree with the direct communication from all the root server operators and the entire GWG. That is what you have the liaisons for.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Fair enough. If I may suggest something, as an RSO, I think ... Yes, I agree with you that we really need more alignment with our liaisons, hence with GWG, because as an RSO what I see right now is not acceptable. Understanding it is work under progress, but still, I think it is going in the wrong direction.

If I may, I would actually ask ... And I should do that in Root Ops but please take it in that sense. I would ask you, Brad, and Hiro to solve that

issue somehow, in whatever form you see, either adding time in RSSAC or having Root Ops extra meetings—whatever you think that works. But basically my ask is that. So I will leave this letter or any other suggestion to the group of you three liaisons if that's acceptable. The problem to solve is to have regular meetings to make sure we are aligned or have at least similar understanding on where GWG is going and can provide our input if we disagree. Does that work for you, Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Regular meetings is fine. I suggest this part forward. We try to start with regular meetings, with the root server operators and the representatives, where we as representatives can explain what's going on and we can take input from the root server operators and bring that to the table of the GWG.

I welcome you all to look at these documents because they are totally open. The documents that we added, you can see [as added them], mostly Duane. Thank you, Duane, for doing that.

So, you can look at this almost in real-time and then talk to us as representatives to make us understand your concerns and how we can alleviate them, what we need to bring into the document to make things better, because if we start as a group to address the GWG as a group, then other groups will do the same. So we will suddenly have the IAB want to talk to the entire GWG and we will have the GNSO want to talk ... Suddenly, we have this everyone is talking to everyone problem with the GWG and that's not how it was designed.

But, regular meetings, more information, absolutely yes. But please we should use the channels that we have in place.

KAVEH RANJBAR:

Sorry, Liman, to jump in—and that will be my last comment, I promise—but one question, which is who will initiate this work, these regular meetings? Who would start that? Because as you said, yes, we follow the documents, and of course I know I can talk to you, Brad, or Hiro if I as this one operator have some concerns. But to be honest, a lot of those will be much more visible, and when we discuss it as a group, because then there are different angles coming in and I can immediately see, oh, I have a bigger issue or actually I don't have an issue with this. So it's not just I read the document and I tell you that I have these comments or these concerns. I really think we need to have those collective thinking about those and meetings on that.

So, I agree we need to talk more, but my question is who will take the first step to set them up?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thank you. Yes. And I agree. So this is a question for Fred and Ozan. Would it be possible to use ICANN's resources for holding such meetings? And no is a perfectly good answer because then we will turn to the other direction and look for root server operator collaboration as we do with other issues. So, Ozan and Fred, do you think we can do this within the framework of RSSAC just to—

FRED BAKER: I don't see any reason why not.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Because then I suggest that the three representatives and Fred, I would say the vice chair but that's Brad who is on both sides here, we sit together in a brief meeting and design a time schedule and roll out a few meetings in the semi-near time over the next month, maybe once a week, maybe every other week, so that we can sit down and talk about this. How about that?

FRED BAKER: That sounds good. Now, we have an administrative meeting tomorrow morning—or morning my time. Brad and Kaveh are both on that call. Would you be willing to come and have this conversation then?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I'd be happy to unless it clashes with—at which time is this meeting precisely?

FRED BAKER: I'm pulling up my calendar.

KAVEH RANJBAR: It is 5:00 our time, Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Rats. I have a preparatory meeting with the Customer Standing Committee at that time. But this is important. It is very difficult for me to dodge that meeting.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Well, what are your parameters on that? Could we make it be an hour earlier or an hour later?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: How long are your admin meetings usually, give or take?

FRED BAKER: Well, we schedule an hour, when in fact it's quite a bit less than that.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay, because the prep meeting is scheduled for half-an-hour. So if I can join at 5:30, I'd be happy to. I could possibly join earlier than that if I can cut the prep meeting short. I don't think it's too complicated this time.

FRED BAKER: Well, okay.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: So if you put it late in the agenda, so to speak, for the admin meeting, I'd be most happy to join.

FRED BAKER: Let's do that. Okay. And meanwhile, Russ had his hand up or Ryan has had his hand up approximately forever and Brad is in the queue. So, Ryan, did you have a comment?

RYAN STEPHENSON: Yeah. So, where it says we kindly request on the milestone deliverables for the Root Server System Governance Working Group quarterly meetings, I wonder if we just change that to maybe just say regular meetings because being the importance of this type of discussion, we may want to have it more frequently than quarterly, meaning once every two months or even once every month.

So just some food for thought for that, if anybody thinks this is a good idea. Thank you.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Thank you, Ryan. Quick comment. So, basically, the idea is we are not pursuing this letter anymore, at least at the moment. So we will have the call tomorrow and hopefully we will have some regular calls facilitated by ICANN so RSOs can basically have a place and discuss this for a few sessions. So I don't think we will act on this letter any further. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: I think something like the letter might come out of that.

KAVEH RANJBAR: Yes, definitely. Yeah.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Brad?

BRAD VERD: Yeah. I feel ... I don't know. Listening to Liman and Kaveh go back and forth, I feel like, again, we're wrapped around the axle around this different hats between RSSAC and Root Ops. Root Ops basically is an operational body. Very rarely does it talk about policy. So I think the proposal here with good intent was trying to address the policy piece. If we just separate those labels, we can do that.

So, if we just need to schedule a meeting with the Root Ops people but have the policy people from the Root Ops people present, I think that's pretty simple to do.

I will say it's ironic that we then turn around and ask ICANN to use those resources. That's just in the back of my head. Funny.

Again, I feel like we're spending a lot of time here on the labels, when really the intent here was policy people at Root Ops need to talk since this is a policy matter and that is I feel what the crux of the issue has been and we're trying to get at.

So, hopefully, this meeting tomorrow we can facilitate that and get that going. And I think, Ryan, going to what you said, I think maybe these meetings are even more frequent in the beginning weekly, and as we work through it, they get less and less. I'm not sure but we'll see.

FRED BAKER: Well, yeah. And I would agree with that. From my perspective ... Somebody asked and maybe it was Ryan that asked. No, it was Liman that asked whether we could use RSSAC resources to host that. And from my perspective, this needs to happen if I have resources available to do something, then from my perspective using those resources is justified. I'll absolutely work with Root Ops on them.

BRAD VERD: We just need to make sure not to call it RSSAC. That's all I'm trying to get at. I think that will alleviate some of the confusion and getting wrapped around the axle on things.

FRED BAKER: Well, agreed.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Fair enough.

FRED BAKER: Frankly, I think—

BRAD VERD: It is essentially this body of people right here on a separate call and call it Root Ops. Like 30 minutes of the last hour would go away.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Good. So, what we have as outcomes from this is that tomorrow on the admin call we'll nail down at least opening steps on that conversation. Andrew in the chat comments that, from an ICANN policy perspective, they're willing to support the conversation. Kaveh proposes that this be facilitated by RSSAC. It's fine.

What other outcomes do we have from this conversation that we've just had besides initiating this conversation? What am I missing?

RUSS MUNDY: I will wait for guidance with respect to the RSSAC-SSAC-GWG gathering until this progresses a little further, if that is satisfactory with RSSAC/RSO.

BRAD VERD: I think it's too early [on the SSAC though].

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, I agree.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Thank you. So, with that, I think this conversation has pretty well blown itself out. Let's move on down the agenda. Okay. So, we have some work items. Ken, would you like to comment on your couple of work parties?

KEN RENARD: Sure. Thanks, Fred. The rogue work party, some final edits are going to be discussed next week by the core writing group, but pretty much that document is ready for review by the caucus and anticipate that ... Well, I'm kind of thinking the document could be ready at the next RSSAC meeting or the one after to vote on.

The local perspective work party has a few more content edits that are happening again next week at the core writer's group and are probably a month behind the rogue. But things are wrapping up and hopefully get these to RSSAC for voting and review soon. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, what I think I just heard you say is that reviewing in April, perhaps May, and then a vote probably in June.

BRAD VERD: Yeah, by June.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Small chance for May.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Sounds good. Liman, did you want to talk about your document?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Sure. We had an editing session. This is the principles guiding operation of the public root server system, which we took out of RSSAC37 with the

intent of doing a version with short annotations regarding the various principles.

We've had an editing session that was quite useful. A lot came out of that. There's still work to do, homework to do after that session if I remember correctly, where we need to actually shrink several of the annotations and rip out a lot of the text that isn't really useful and doesn't really help.

So that [inaudible] that sits on my shoulders to do that homework and I envisage another editing session where we can iron out the remaining details of that. I'm not going to hope for a timeline to have this ready to vote at the next meeting but maybe the one after that. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you. So, the following meeting, I'm looking at Ozan's comment in the chat. He says there's a follow-up meeting on the guiding principles that will be on 13 April.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Thanks, Ozan.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. So, let's go back to the agenda. Okay. So, now we have some reports and, Brad, maybe you want to chime in here. You and I have reports due to the committee, and frankly I think our big report right now is the conversation that we just had.

BRAD VERD: Yeah. Our update would have been the meeting that we had around the GWG stuff which I think we just spent most of the meeting on.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So I don't know that I've got anything to add at this point, so Kaveh, do you have comments from the Board?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Basically, the two documents that I have mentioned in the last call as well, they were passed in RSSAC47 that was around metrics and RSSAC28. In the public Board meeting, they were part of consent agenda, so basically no discussion, as our documents were basically accepted by the Board and the outcome and what we recommended will be tracked one by one under tracking system for the Board so we will get reports, as actually [Matt] kindly did provide already provide a high-level report to RSSAC. But we will get those reports from ICANN Org on how they progress with finalizing some of those items, or if they have done already ticked off some of them. But they are basically approved by the Board [inaudible]. Thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Yes. The CSC. Nothing special going on with the PTI. Everything is working fine. We are looking at ... We are reviewing some of the thresholds as you know and that process is continuing. I reported on that last time, I think. There are some thresholds that are ill-designed when it comes to business days versus calendar days and we are looking at how to address that. So there's a proposal that if it's an intermediate number, it's not counted in hours and it's not counted in weeks, then you go for business days. If it's counted in weeks, it's easy to do it in calendar days so that's the general thought of it.

We do have a meeting scheduled in April where we will meet with the Board Technical Committee. The exact time of that will shift off from our usual meetings but that's not a big problem.

And as a final note, we've had the chair election and I am proud and humbled to report that I have been elected chair for another year, as chair of the CSC and Brett Carr from the ccNSO remains as my vice chair. I think that's it. Thanks.

FRED BAKER:

Okay, thank you. Daniel had to drop off. He forwarded some notes from the IAB to the RSSAC list an hour ago, so you can review his thoughts there. Russ, do you have words from the SSAC?

RUSS MUNDY:

I don't have anything further from the SSAC but I do have a question with respect to the coordination and flow between RSOs and RSO reps to the GWG, and that is since I am technically the RSSAC liaison I don't

know whether or not I am or should be included in the RSO GWG rep discussions. I am happy to participate if that is desired but I'll wait for the decision to come from the admin committee on that. That's all I have and thank you.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. I'll include that in the admin discussion tomorrow. So I'll get back to you then with whatever is going on. James, are you here? James Mitchell.

JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. No update from IANA.

FRED BAKER: Okay, thank you. Duane?

DUANE WESSELS: Hi, Fred. Nothing to report this time. Thanks.

FRED BAKER: Okay. And Brad, can I get you to speak for the GWG room?

BRAD VERD: Well, I'd love to hear from Liman and others. The GWG only met once since we last talked I think and it was only a half hour meeting because it was on the same week as the ICANN meeting and there was a brief discussion. Some major topics, though, were brought up. I can't

remember—Liman, maybe you can help me—there was the issue that I raised here about the systemic challenge and the RSO point of view. I don't know. There were a couple of other things that were brought up. I don't remember. They were being documented and sent to the mailing list. But it was ... These are items that are longstanding items that are going to take some time to work on, so it's nothing that needs a decision right away. Liman, can you add some color to that?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Are you talking to my memory? I'm trying to separate the meeting we had with Tripti and the Board from the actual GWG meeting. As you said, it was short.

BRAD VERD: It was super short. There was some homework assigned to people and I just don't ... Sorry. Like I said, the focus for this meeting was the other GWG stuff, not the ongoing work that I think we all know is going to take a while. Suzanne, maybe you can help [inaudible].

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Duane is the document editor for the main document, isn't he?

DUANE WESSELS: Yeah. So the homework was a couple of things, but one thing that I think is worth bringing up here is if you read through the draft GWG document right now, it doesn't really talk a lot about RSSAC. It doesn't say where RSSAC fits in the model.

So I think it would be good for RSSAC to think about how it sees its future in the new governance model. Is RSSAC absorbed into something else or does it keep standing on its own or what? So that would be good feedback to have.

BRAD VERD:

I think there was ... Just to add to that. Thanks for reminding me on that. There have been discussions about RSSAC. So 37 was written, again, in the context of the ICANN box, so to speak, and the GWG is outside of that box. So when we have a document out there saying that we believe that RSSAC would become a member of the empowered community through the implementation of the work being done by the GWG, that kind of ties the two together in some people's minds.

I believe, in the GWG's mind, they're not thinking about RSSAC. RSSAC is not a thing for them because they're outside of the ICANN box. We, when we wrote 37, we all had the thought process—and I don't mean to speak for everybody else, I'll speak for myself. I believe the thought process was that the SAPF would evolve into the next version of RSSAC.

In this GWG proposal, the SAPF is a community outside of ICANN and not RSSAC, so there is this ... There were comments that RSSAC doesn't exist anymore and I think those were misspoken. But that's why some of the discussion around, "Well, what about RSSAC in all of this?" has come up.

FRED BAKER:

Well, and that's consistent with what [Goran] said in the call last week, that the ICANN Board would need someone to talk with concerning the Root Ops, concerning the root and whatever, so there would continue to be something called RSSAC. The question was really what it was. So I think that is an open question at this point.

Okay. So I believe that concludes our reports. The next instance of this meeting is in May on the 4th and we can plan for that. As an AOB item, Ozan, could you please list any action items that have come out of this meeting?

OZAN SAHIN:

Hi, Fred. Thanks. Hi, everyone. One action item for staff was to extend the invitation to RSSAC admin meeting happening tomorrow to Lars-Johan Liman so that he could join and add him to the agenda later in the agenda so that he could join after the first 30 minutes.

Liman also agreed to work on the action items regarding the principles guiding operation of public RSS documents and this follow discussion would take place next week, next Tuesday.

Of course staff will go ahead and work with [Malik] to onboard him and add him to the RSSAC caucus list. And publish the draft minutes from 2nd of March meeting and share it on the RSSAC caucus mailing list. Thank you.

FRED BAKER:

Okay. And in addition to inviting Liman to the admin call tomorrow, you'll be inviting Hiro. Correct?

OZAN SAHIN: Oh yes, sorry for missing that.

FRED BAKER: Okay. So, anybody else have any comments before we bring the meeting to a close?

Oh, Kaveh put something in the chat regarding Board resolutions. There are a couple of Board resolutions pending related to the RSSAC. FYI.

But are there any voices I haven't heard yet?

Failing that, I believe we've come to the end of this meeting and I thank you for attending. We'll get these issues sorted out. So, meeting—

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]