
MONTREAL – BTC Open Meeting
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:30 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

AKINORI MAEMURA: As you see, we have a lot of available seats in the front, so please don't hesitate to come up to the front and join us. Once they come up, then we can start. So please bring it up, yes? Okay, let's go. Thank you very much. Let's start the meeting.

The naming is a little bit also confused. In my kind, it has the joint TEG and the BTC meeting. And then the slide says BTC Open Meeting with the TEG. Then in the publicly available schedule that is called BTC Open Meeting. So it's a bit such kind of meeting we are having it here.

All right, my name is Akinori Maemura, the chair of the Board Technical Committee. Thank you very much for joining us. So let's start. Today's agenda, we have this agenda. What is new in the IETF? The recent developments will be introduced here. And then I'd like to introduce a brief overview of the BTC and the recent activities. And we'd like to talk about the interactions with the TEG and the TLG. So that's pretty much making this session. So is it now for us to get [through]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No [inaudible].

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.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Okay, so I would like to pass the floor to Warren who is now kindly introducing the IETF recent developments.

WARREN KUMARI: Excellent. Thank you. I'm Warren Kumari, and this is Tim Wicinski. We are the IAB appointed reps to the Technical Liaison Group. Let's see if we have a set of slides. [inaudible] getting those set up. While those are coming up – okay, yep, that's what we said. That's us. Next slide.

This is going to be a short introduction on some new stuff that's happening in the IETF. Next slide. Going to be a quick update on some DNSSEC improvements for multi-signer models. Possibly some stuff on DMARC. And then a quick update on application behavior considering the DNS.

With that said, I will hand it over to Tim.

TIM WICINSKI: Thank you, Warren. Next slide. These are some improvements we're doing in IETF on DNSSEC. As you know, large organizations now will definitely employ multiple providers and multiple services for resiliency of their DNS. That seems to be the way the world is now, and I think that's a good thing.

Now having multiple DNS providers or services or even DNS vendors of software creates these technical challenges which slow the pace of DNSSEC adoption. So one of the things we've worked on inside of

DNSOP is mostly around sharing the DNSSEC keys across providers, how the services interact, things of that nature.

If we go to the next slide, what we've put together is the multi-signer DNSSEC models which is a draft that's actually going through last call right now. It's formalizing these techniques. The authors of the draft and the working groups have been working with software vendors and the service providers to implement these features, and we've had very good success with this.

And so we've had large enterprise organizations basically deploying DNSSEC in this multiple provider fashion today. That allows these organizations which may not be as technically competent or capable or have the technical group to manage that to deploy DNSSEC much more easily and much more reliably.

We do not anticipate risk of this to ICANN though it may change how some of the DNS providers do business models. And we've seen more of the DNS service vendors being much more supportive of the latest DNSSEC algorithms, methods, etc., and that's been a good thing to us.

So we'll jump to the next one which is literally the applications behavior considering DNS which is a lot of discussion that I've heard in the hallways. I'm going to send that over to Warren.

WARREN KUMARI:

Thanks, Tim. Over the past couple of years, the IETF has been increasingly moving to an encrypted by default stance. A fair bit of this is because users want their privacy, but there's also—back in 2014 or

so—the IETF published RFC 7258 which says that pervasive monitoring is a technical attack on the Internet and that we should try and mitigate it in the design of IETF protocols.

One of the primary protocols which leaks user private information is the DNS. It doesn't really help if the content on www.AlcoholicsAnonymous.org is encrypted if the very fact that I'm going there is visible. It's fairly clear or people can make an educated guess why I'm going there. There are a lot of other similar sites like GayRights.org, Human Rights Watch. The very fact that one is looking up a name leaks, often, a lot of information.

So the IETF has been working to try and mitigate some of these privacy issues. One of the first ways that we did that was a protocol called DNS over TLS. And then more recently a newer protocol which is DNS over HTTPS. HTTPS is the same protocol which encrypts web pages. If you go to <https://www.example.com>, you get that little lock icon in your browser.

One of the interesting implications of running DNS over HTTPS is that a lot of applications already know how to speak HTTPS. They already have it built into the application. There are easy libraries available to do this, etc. So one of the possible implications of this is that applications themselves will increasingly start doing the DNS resolution.

In the current model, an application that wants to resolve a name asks the operating system. In a new model with DNS over HTTPS, it becomes increasingly likely that the application would do the DNS itself and just bypass the operating system.

In the upcoming IETF meeting—which is I believe 106, it's going to be in Singapore the week after next—we're going to be holding a BOF which is IETF-speak for an initial meeting to investigate what the implications of applications doing their own DNS might be.

This is actually lifted from the proposed charter. As I say proposed charter, it's like to change. But some of the initial areas that we're going to be focusing on is things like resolver discovery but also a large amount of discussion about the best practices. Things on how exactly the protocol should be used. If you're deploying this, what you might want to do. If you're running a DNS server that implements DNS over HTTPS, how you should best do that. And then also a bunch of discussion on deployment models that minimize issues with pervasive monitoring and the other things that are stated there.

At the moment, we don't really see a huge amount of risk for ICANN because this is new work. It's still very much evolving. But it does seem that it's something that ICANN might want to be aware of, and the Board in particular. So hopefully there will be more updates after this meeting and potentially after the working group's formed. But figured it might be worth you knowing about.

You saw the summary. And questions? If any.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you, Warren and Tim. Any questions? Harald?

HARALD ALVESTRAND: Just to check the scope of the BOF/working group, there's nothing here about changing the model of resolution like [inaudible] DNS thing. It's just operational [modes] for encrypted transport, right?

WARREN KUMARI: The scope hasn't completely been figured out yet, but it's also somewhat as likely to touch on what the implications are if the applications themselves do it. How does this change the resolution model? But as I say, unclear at the moment. We have a discussed and proposed charter, but we're not sure how that might change over time, how exactly the scope of the working group might change.

I'm not sure if Barry Leiba is in the room. He is actually the person running the BOF or organizing it. No, he is not. So at the moment, that looks correct, but we'll find out more as this happens.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Any other questions or comments? Okay, thank you very much. My next one, next agenda maybe being back to the previous slides. Right, let's go to the next part of the briefing of the BTC. This is first time to have the opportunity to introduce what is the BTC all about. So here is the summary to introduce the BTC's activity.

The BTC is now two years old, created in 2017. Then at the time the 2017 AGM was when Steve Crocker stepped down from the chair and Board seat and then we needed a more institutionalized way to have the technical excellence on the ICANN Board. So that is the motivation to have the Board Technical Committee.

And then the scope of the work [of the BTC], we have basically three areas. One is the ICANN organization's activity to be overseen by the BTC. So it is basically have the update from the CIO for their own technical activity, and then IT support to the Board, and other technical issues that are needed for the Board's attention.

Another thing is the committee engagement and the external relationships. The relationship with the TEG is one of them. And then we have ICANN multiple advisory committees who take care of technical things. We at the BTC are the first window to interact with such ACs and other external groups. So that is the second point.

The third point is making a strategy for the technical [part] based on input from the [office of the] CTO and then to have a better understanding of the trends and upcoming issues. So that's the BTC. Next, please.

We have quite a number of priorities these days. These are lined up here. L-root strategy to develop a complete strategy to promote the existence and the secure operation of the [multiple] instances of the L-root. It is done by the OCTO and L-root team. We now refer to the ICANN managed root servers (IMRS).

Second one is root server crisis communication plan. It is by the great help of Kaveh Ranjbar who is the RSSAC liaison to the Board and has been involving the RSO people to set up the communication plan.

The third thing is the DNS ecosystem security. We are now sorting out the security situation with quite an exhaustive look [inaudible]

supported by Harald. And then we are now having an initial set of such inventory of security issues and concerns on the DNS. And then that is our thought to maintain this listing as up to date and then for us to consider the next steps and needed measures for this regard.

The fourth thing, evolution of the root server system governance. We are now taking a step based on our RSSAC037 and RSSAC038 which were advice to the Board in 2018. We've had the consideration at the ICANN Board and the ICANN organization of how to move these ahead for the consideration of revising the root server system's governance.

The ICANN Board is now ratifying the acceptance of the public comment and the revision of the working plan, so the [concept paper] which is the interpretation of the RSSAC037 and then have some concrete way to implement that. And then at tomorrow's Board meeting, we will ratify convening the root server system governance working group which is the moderator function of the committee discussion of the revised REASONS governance scheme.

Last but not least, name collision analysis project which is the work with the SSAC [inaudible] committee and then we commissioned SSAC for this project to analyze name collision. And [then they just now] work in progress.

So these are all which we are now taking care of within the BTC. Next, please.

Then we have the TEG. The Technical Liaison Group is the central part of the Technical Experts Group which is defined in the ICANN bylaws.

ICANN bylaws at Section 13.2 stipulates that a formal group created to channel technical information and guidance to the Board and to other ICANN entities. This role has both a responsive component and an active watchdog component. That's what the ICANN bylaws say.

Then TEG consists of two representatives from the following organizations of ETSI, ITU-T, W3C, and the Internet Architecture Board (IAB). Next?

With the TEG as the central part, the Technical Experts Group a little bit [inaudible] in the group was formed in—when was that TEG was? Maybe a little bit before 2017. But anyway, that's a recent happening to have the TEG but before my tenure at the Board. It's an informal group focused on [inaudible] technical and technological issues.

The Technical Experts Group is for the Board to consult the recent happenings, the technical movement for the Board to consider, take into account for our own job for ICANN's business. The TEG meets with the Board and the BTC at ICANN meetings. That is how we meet in this AGM opportunity.

Then that last line says that the TEG participants are also members of the ICANN's Technical Experts Group. So this is how the TEG is defined and works with the ICANN Board. Next slide, please.

We are now looking to the future because the Board Technical Committee is now—two years ago—so we do as a BTC two years' timeframe, and then the second year we had a lot of institutionalization. For example, we have the monthly call. We have

the much facilitated keeping track of the action items. And then we introduced, facilitated keeping track of the advice which we received from advisory committees.

So the BTC is now functioning in regular cadence to do the technical discussion and consideration for the ICANN Board. So we have been doing the BTC for two years with one year of the [inaudible] way. We are now thinking how we can do for the future.

So the BTC as a part of the ICANN Board and the core of the technical expertise of the ICANN Board, we definitely need to have a lot of discussion with the other parts of the community. And then the activities need to be working for advancing ICANN's mission for a global Internet infrastructure.

So for here what I did now is to introduce the BTC and then how it is working and then [inaudible] TEG and TLG, how these two groups are defined in our documentations. And I'd like to have a discussion how we can move them forward for the future to the better activity around this.

I think I did all I should say. Do we have the next slides?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's it.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Okay, that's it. So I'd like to have questions and comments or a discussion. Please, Dan.

DAN YORK: Just for your point of knowledge or info, I guess. The first TEG meeting, Steve Crocker called in at ICANN 49 in Singapore in the early part of 2014. And that was when that informal group that [kind of] continued. I agree with you, it's confusing. So I think you're asking the right questions.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you. Warren?

WARREN KUMARI: Thank you. From the ICANN page on the TLG—[and I realize] this is the TLG, not the TEG—it says: “The purpose of the TLG is to connect the ICANN Board with appropriate sources of technical advice on specific matters pertinent to ICANN's activities.”

There is now the BTC which seems to cover a fair amount of that, and also the wording in it sort of makes it sound as though the Board can ask the TLG members for advice or information if and when they need it.

I don't know if that means that we really need to be meeting at every meeting. We've been doing this for many years, and it hasn't always seemed like it's been a hugely good use of the Board's time. Not [necessarily] from the meeting but from previous ones, we've sort of at the end of it had a discussion on whether the Board has got everything that they want out of it and if this is a useful use of your time.

So I think it might be worth us considering if it makes sense for the TEG and the TLG to actually meet with the Board each time, or only if there is specific information that's useful to communicate or maybe once every couple of meetings. But Wendy I think has a comment.

WENDY SELTZER:

Yes, thank you. Wendy Seltzer speaking from W3C. I think probably the cycle of issues coming up for discussion ebbs and flows. Sometimes there may be issues on which urgent advice is needed, and it's helpful to have a network of folks to talk to. And for that, it may be worth maintaining the network even in times when there doesn't seem to be any pressing challenge.

I think it's valuable for the technical groups at different layers of the Internet's infrastructure to be speaking with one another and to know names and faces of those to give a heads up or ask a quick question without concern for seeming stupid or worrying that you'll be annoying somebody sending something onward.

I also agree with Warren that for that we probably don't need to meet at every meeting or certainly to schedule formal meetings in front of large rooms with more monitors than people almost. But I do think that there are valuable interactions among us.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you very much.

HOWARD BENN:

Howard Benn, representing the European Telecommunications Standards Institute. I agree with what Wendy says. This to me is always a little bit like an insurance policy. When something goes wrong, we can react very quickly because we've all been sat around and at least know each other's faces and email addresses.

I again, have often questioned the usefulness of some of the meetings that we've sat in, so it would be very good to optimize. I've also found this week quite interesting because the two technical working days that I've been to have been extremely interesting.

With a lot of overlap of work that's going on within ETSI, unfortunately I missed one of the sessions on the tech day on yesterday. Because there are lots of interesting stuff going on in the world. The quantum computing at the moment and the ability to hack stuff that you can't hack today. And ETSI is doing an awful lot of work on quantum safe computing.

So I think there are areas where we can contribute. It may be easier if we somehow figure out what the best method of doing that is though.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you. Tim?

TIM WICINSKI:

Tim Wicinski, another one of the IETF/IAB representatives. We've been doing two a year. I think this year, maybe last year as well. Why don't we cycle back to one a year with an ad hoc if the Board needs us, they

can call on us kind of thing. I think that's very [inaudible]. And then reevaluate in a year or two and see if that's useful as well.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you. Warren?

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah, thank you. Following on from that, yeah, we have a mailing list. I think it would be good if the TLG members and TEG members used it a little bit more to communicate amongst ourselves. But also if the ICANN Board has a question, it can be sent to that list. For IETF stuff, there's also Harald and liaisons and things like that. So, yeah, possibly a different cadence of these would be a useful thing to discuss and also just a different way of interacting. The Board's time is valuable. I don't know if it's worth you sitting in this meeting.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much for that kind of concern. Yes, I'd like to have a lot of opinion like a round of microphone. And then before that, please make sure to state your name and affiliation for the record. Who's next? [inaudible], please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]. In ICANN committee, the term DNS abuse is widely used, but I feel it is very inappropriate and misleading term. I am not a native English speaker, so it is difficult to [inaudible]. But this Technical Experts Group or BTC, I want this group to [replace] the word in more

technically correct. Not to confuse the people or state the issues including in the word.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Does anyone have a response? Okay, Warren.

WARREN KUMARI: Just a clarification. Do you think it's more that the term is more being used to mean Internet abuse and not specifically DNS abuse, or how are you interpreting it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, so Internet is too wide, but domain name abuse or such is a more appropriate to state the issue and more clear to find the solution.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Actually, we had a lot of time here about DNS abuse this week. And DNS abuse is not only technical. That involves compliance issues as such. And, yes, we definitely need some much clearer view and coherent the wording of which can be widely shared with the ICANN community which involves technical experts to the other non-tech but lawyers and something like that. So that's really a big issue for ICANN, I think, and the Board needs to take care of that. Thank you. Lito?

LITO IBARRA: Thank you. On the suggestions that we were receiving about our interrelationship, I would like also to second the proposal of having one meeting per year. But I would also like to propose to the BTC that we make a practice of consulting more often to the TEG, TLG [inaudible] mailing list on different topics that we are currently discussing. So in that sense, I think we are—I don't want to use the word forced—but inclined to do a better use of this experts group and liaisons group. Thank you.

TIM WICINSKI: I think Warren and I always feel we have something interesting to share, but that's probably more because we think everything we do is interesting. But we can even see doing just random preparations for the Board and just send them before one of the meetings that we don't attend just to give them a heads up on things. I think that's a pretty reasonable workflow.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah, we could send slides or a really short summary if it's of interest. Although I'm sure you have a lot to read before meetings anyway and yet another email might not be something you desperately want to see.

TIM WICINSKI: But we tend to keep it very short and very focused.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Merike?

MERIKE KAE0: I very much like that idea. I know that from the NCAP project when it started to really take off, the SSAC has been giving monthly updates because the BTC does meet on a monthly basis. So if there's any kind of timely new issue that come up, then it would be nice to have a cross functional discussion with ETSI, with W3C, with what's happening in the IETF so that the Board gets updated and just see whether or not there's any relevance to the ICANN community and whether any action needs to be taken.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Questions or comments? Of course, from the floor. Welcome. Wendy?

WENDY SELTZER: I should have done this at the beginning but since this is his first TEG and BTC meeting, I wanted to take the opportunity to introduce my colleague Shadi Abou-Zahra who works with me at W3C. He is one of the forces behind W3C way accessibility initiative, and he has done tremendous work on making the web and web standards more accessible globally.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thanks. Could you introduce yourself?

SHADI ABOU-ZAHRA: Very glad to be here.

ALISSA COOPER: Alissa Cooper. I'm the IETF chair. I was just wondering, do you feel like you answered the first question here? What do we do with the TEG? Is it just—I understand the meeting frequency has been discussed, but the group itself, is it going to continue to exist?

AKINORI MAEMURA: My problem is that the floor microphone is really, really hard to hear from here. So could you say that again in another microphone?

ALISSA COOPER: Do you want to just repeat?

WARREN KUMARI: Sure, I think can just relay what—I think, please correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe what Alissa was asking is do you understand or have we figured out for the first question, what do we want to do with the TEG? Should the group continue to exist? Should the TEG maybe close and the TLG continue? I do realize it's very hard once a group is created to close it down [as well].

AKINORI MAEMURA: Yes, that's actually an open question, and we—okay, before I say we—I don't have any answer for this. Because this kind of thought would

come up after the round of the opinion and discussion. That is the reason why we are doing this kind of format. Harald?

HARALD ALVSTRAND: The most specific proposal I've heard in the discussion so far is to scale back the amount of meetings, keep it as a mailing list. I do think it would improve communication between the BTC and the TEG if the BTC actually joined the mailing list.

WARREN KUMARI: I must admit that I hadn't realized the BTC wasn't actually on the mailing list. Although to be honest, there has been no traffic on the mailing list for the past six months or so. So we [inaudible] forgotten that it exists.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We can fix that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just to add something, I think the whole confusion about the three groups. We have three groups that seem to have similar missions, and two existed before the BTC. The BTC is now formal. Do we still need the three? I think that is the question. And I think if we start looking deeply, we may realize that maybe we don't need the three of them. We could either merge or something. But the TLG is in the bylaws. That's more difficult to touch. So we are left with the TEG.

WARREN KUMARI: Yep, the TLG is in the bylaws but I don't think it says that the TLG actually has to meet very often or anything like that. So it could continue to exist and simply not do a huge amount, which wouldn't actually be a big change. But Merike has her....

MERIKE KAE0: I have a question in terms of the TEG consists of the BTC, the TLG, and is there anyone else?

DAN YORK: Yes. There's a wide number of folks, myself included and others, who were added to that. When Steve first convened this back in 2014, the TEG, it was really as to—I think Warren or Tim, somebody made the point—of trying to have a pool of experts that the Board could draw upon and work on in different ways. And it was created in an informal basis with who Steve and other members of the different entity invited to become part of that group. And so it was a very ad hoc, very informal process, and it had a variety of people.

From the beginning, there was always a bit of a confusion because there was this TEG that was this loose, ad hoc, informal group, and then there was the TLG that had formal liaison appointments from other entities, and what was the difference between them? I think over the years, the TLG did not meet separately from the TEG. They all kind of met together.

And so some people sitting around the table were people appointed by other entities, and some people were just people who were asked to join by various people. So it has always been this amorphous thing.

I think Alissa is asking a good question. I think you're asking a good question here. What do we want to get out of this? Is there a value in continuing to formally have a TEG? It has had a good ride. It has been here for a while. Should it continue perhaps as a mailing list to which various people are out there and are added as a community of people that are there?

But I think you now have two entities that have been created, the BTC and the TLG, that do have some kind of formal standing within the entity. I don't know that the TEG needs to formally continue in its informal way.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you very much. Okay, so that's actually maybe the intention of the BTC open meeting was [inaudible] named for the public agenda. It's like the BTC to engage the community [who is] the technical around ICANN to have something discussed throughout such an open process. Then that will be the input to the BTC and the TLG's discussion. So is that your idea, Dan?

DAN YORK:

Well, I guess my point is really what does the Board want? Does the Board want to have a mechanism whereby they can solicit opinions around different new technologies or new things? Do they want a

sounding board where people can do that? How will this help further the work of the Board if the Board sees value in having a group of people that can do this?

Because to be clear, the TLG members who are here can also provide that. They are also representatives of other entities and other organizations, and so there's a very clear liaison function that is useful. So as Warren just brought work from IETF and talked about that. I've heard work from ETSI being brought in before. Wendy has talked about W3C. So there's a useful purpose I think from the TLG side in terms of informing the ICANN Board of things that are happening in those other entities. So I think there's value in that.

As to meeting frequency, whatever. That's a separate thing. But there's a question to the Board of, does the Board want value in having a larger consultative body to which they can receive information? Granted, there's also SSAC, RSSAC, all the other different pieces. I think that's the question that has to be answered. If the Board says we've got enough through the various advisory councils, the TLG, and other things, then I think there's a good question to say the TEG served its purpose. It brought people together. It did this. It worked with this. And now it's time to perhaps keep a mailing list open but not formally have this as part of that.

But again, what does the Board want, and does the Board believe there is value in having this kind of thing?

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Your input is all reasonable, and that's a really core question for us.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that one of the main advantages of the TEG is its flexibility. So you can include anyone, and you don't have to go through a formal process or argue this or that. You just [inaudible], just say whatever you want, and we can contact you easily. So I think it's a good thing.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. [Merike]?

[MERIKE KAE0]: Yes, I think it's a really good discussion to have because I think we need to think about this a little bit. I heard Warren say that there wasn't any email discussions in the last six months. But that could also be because there isn't hot topic at hand. And so me as a Board member, what I want is to have discussions that are timely, that are useful, and that don't waste my time, basically. So it's a matter of do we have the input that we need if we just have the BTC and the TLG, or do we actually want to expand it? And I don't have enough knowledge yet to be able to answer that today.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you. [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I heard that the emergency identifier technology [inaudible] was very unique and useful for the Internet community. Such kind of discussion has rarely happened in the standardization organizations and business communities. But we should know that kind of new technologies that can be the next generation of the Internet. So that kind of not standardized but useful information. Technical information sharing is a very good [thinking] target of the TEG.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Thank you very much. So I think it's a really good discussion. Thank you very much. And then, yes, Dan is reasonable to say that that's how we at the Board need the external input. And then with the environment that we have the TLG as the official channel and then quite useful for us to keep us up to date on what is happening in the external of ICANN, then we definitely need a quite good input from the recent developments and the frontend technology which is happening in the industry and the community. So we definitely need the input from the outside world.

And then I think that all people here agree that the open discussion, open mailing list, not necessarily we need to meet in person, but a mailing list discussion would be quite helpful for that regard. That's my basic take for this discussion. But if you find anything missing and if you had something that you haven't told to us, please take a microphone to say something. No? Pretty much done?

Then I think that the Board and the BTC need to think and then construct based on your opinion to have a better setup of this valuable forum. Does anyone have any—please?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I just have a newbie question. I'm interested in the idea of if there was an urgency that were to come up and the Board would want to have more input than just the TLG—so having this ad hoc-ness that was raise a little bit earlier—are there other mechanisms through other groups under the Board in which other constituents or other people could provide their input, provide their thoughts? This is the question.

AKINORI MAEMURA:

Who has a clear answer for this? Warren?

WARREN KUMARI:

The Board could still email the TLG or TEG email list if it stays around. But also I should want to mention that there is the OCTO group, and David Conrad's group has a lot of technical people who know a lot of people. And so I'm assuming that if there was an urgent need coming up, the Board would be more than capable of finding experts in whichever standards bodies or groups or technical areas that they need to.

So I don't really think it's—I cannot envision a case where you wouldn't be able to find technical people to talk to if there was an urgent need.

And the technical folk know how to reach the ICANN organization. It's well publicized.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, just another thing. Depending on the matter and the urgency, we at the RSSAC, we have a caucus also. So it's quite a huge group. But again, that depends on the topic and the deadlines.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Caucus is one of the valuable [ideas for that]. Thank you. Anything? Okay, thank you very much for the great input. It's really valuable. We need to think about that and then construct something very good for our own business.

I think that's it for this meeting. Okay? All right, thank you very much for your time. Thank you very much for joining us. And thank you very much for your great input. The meeting is closed. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]