
BUENOS AIRES – Board with the ASO
Monday, November 15, 2013 – 10:00 to 11:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

UNIDENTIFIED: Since Steve is not here yet, I would like to share good news for you. Ray just the [?] the second times.

UNIDENTIFIED: Okay, it looks like we're still waiting for Steve and Paul to join us. Why don't we give it just a couple of more minutes? I've sent off an email to the relevant people, and see if we can get them up here.

BRUCE TONKIN: Okay. Hello all. My name is Bruce Tonkin, I'm Vice Chair of the Board. The Chair, Steve Crocker, will be joining us shortly. He is just walking down the corridor. But in the interest of keeping the day on time, I'll kick things off. That's that. And I think we'll start with your agenda.

LOUIE LEE: Hi. I'm Louie Lee, Chair of the ASO Address Counsel. Would you like to put the agenda up at this point? All right. We have some discussion topics, including the Montevideo statement, meeting in Brazil and the one at the initiative. I'm not sure anybody has any other topics they want to cover that we didn't capture here.

But I think these three topics will be plenty for the hour that we have.
Ray?

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.

RAY: Louie, I would like you to at least give a report on the session that we had Monday afternoon, regarding communications between the ASO and the rest of the ICANN community. I think support and everybody understand what we did, and we intend to do. I think it would be, if you can give a short report, that would be great.

LOUIE LEE: Okay. We can definitely cover that. We'll make sure we allow time for that. Is there, we all know each other here, right? Yeah. All right. Please do introduce yourself as you speak. Do we have any remote participants? Not at the moment, okay. Just to make sure that you are heard and understood. All right. And also, Paul Wilson, Chair of the ASO should be along in a moment.

So, in light of the recent events, Montevideo statement, the statement itself is non-contentious. The reasons for it, I believe everybody understands at this point. Do we, I hate to just open this up completely for topics, but lacking specific focus on this, I think Ray has a comment for that.

RAY: Actually, I would like to hear Raoul talk about it, because I know it's something that the ISTAR's have been talking about for some time and so, the – was pretty much instrumental in helping move these topics along as well, so I would, if you could Raoul, I would appreciate hearing something.

LOUIE LEE: And also, I think Raoul should touch on it as well. Raoul?

RAOUL: Sorry, I didn't hear Ray very well.

RAY: I'm saying the Montevideo statement, if you could give a report about how it came about and the fact that this wasn't something new, that this is something that has been talked about for some time amongst the CEO's and also, to a certain extent, with the rest of the ISTARs. So, I think if you could give that kind of a little bit of a background report, that would be good.

BARBARA: This is Barbara. I'm just going to interrupt for one moment. We do have some online participants now, and they have asked that everyone remember to speak into the microphone clearly please so that they can hear what's going on.

RAOUL: Thank you, Barbara, for the reminder. This is Raoul from LACNIC. Are you referring to the preparation of the previous work that brought us to that statement?

RAY: Yes, because some people think that it just happened. That this was a surprise moment, and the fact is, as you know, it's been going on for some time.

RAOUL: Okay. I think, some things are very short because I think that's most of the people were informed about the Montevideo statement. But I think, I said yesterday in the ccNSO meeting, when all of the organizations arrive in the Montevideo meeting, I think that's really [very hard] in mind that we needed to say something with regard to the last revelations, developments related to the NSA activities, and [Lima speaking], UN.

And the fact that this discussion have had in the – undermining the confidence of the Internet. So, it was really easy to get consensus on that. Okay, it took some work toward the statement because we were [living] organizations put in the [pane] at the same time, on the paper.

But, I think we were efficient anyway doing that. Probably [?] could have change a few words, but I think that's the [?] it was very good, satisfied all of the parties. But, I think it's not, as you say, Ray, it's not surprising the things that we say there because if it's very consistent with previous declarations and statements made by the different Internet organizations in the past, in different occupations.

For example, [?] made clear statements with regard to the IANA financials and even the last time that we had made comments to the open consultation, the United States government consultation. In fact, we had also made [?] proposal during the ICANN meeting in San

Francisco when we proposed to remove the IANA contract, and change it by some kind of cooperation agreement.

So I think that's nothing that was included in the document, in the Montevideo statement, could be surprising. Our organizations had been [?] for a long time in the Internet governance discussion, trying to be proactive. The RIRs have always had representation in all the groups that have been [formed] in multi-stakeholder fashion, everywhere, under the UN umbrella, and regional organizations, intergovernmental forums.

We have been proactive in engaging with ITU in discussion about IPv6. I think that's, so it could not be surprising to see us trying to get a proactive attitude in engaging in discussion toward the evolution of the Internet governance framework. I don't know if this is what you expected.

RAY:

Yes, thank you very much. And this has been going on for a long time. If you recall, in 2006, when ICANN was, relationship with the US government, was a MOU, the NRL was the only organization at the time that said that the ICANN should be independent from the US government. So this is a consistent message that we've been saying in the NRL community for years.

RAOUL:

You are right. Thank you for your comment.

LOUIE LEE: Thank you for that. And I'll note, for everyone, that Steve Crocker has joined us.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you Louie, apologies for coming in late, and thank you for kicking things off. I note that you escaped back into, it would have been five, keep going here. Let's just keep moving.

LOUIE LEE: Okay. In front of us, showing, what to look at ICANN Board's view in view of recent events. Do we have ICANN Board comments to the SO about this? Please.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you. Wolfgang Kleinwachter, Board member. What Ray just said, is well known at the community. So that it was an ongoing development of positions since 2005, six, about what is called now the globalization of the IANA function. But outside this community, this is rather unknown, and with the Montevideo statement, this issue of globalization of IANA is now in the spotlight.

And a lot of people outside this community have started to discuss what this could be, the globalization of IANA, with sometimes totally unrealistic or not workable ideas and solutions. So what I see, there is a special need is to handle this discussion, to bring this proposals and statements which have been made by the NOO and various IRRs in the past, went to the spotlight so that people have a guideline for further discussion.

I think this is really important to avoid that we move to a discussion which goes out of control. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: I see [?] and [?].

BERTRAND DE LE CHAPELLE: Thank you. Bertrand de le Chapelle, Board member. Not speaking on behalf of the Board in general, but a contribution. As Ray said, the fact that it was highlighted in one sentence in the Montevideo statement, gave great visibility to something that had been said before. So it is valuable to have this message.

What it does is it actually breaks a taboo. It breaks a taboo in terms of, this is a very valid question, doesn't mean that people have a solution for it. But the benefit of making this a very valid topic of discussion is that people will be able to begin to think about how it can evolve in time. I believe that the starting point for any good discussion is the current framing of the topic.

And in most cases, the framing of this question has been wrong because it has been basically put in terms of a political question rather than an operational question. I believe one way to frame the question is the following, all actors, including all governments, all civil society groups, all technical operators, all business, everybody who uses the Internet has one common interest in that regard, which is to ensure the integrity of the root zone file, which means making sure that nobody voluntarily or un-voluntarily can tamper with the root.

That's what the function of the final validation in the IANA process is. It's a trust mechanism so that all actors know that there are proper procedures for any change that is integrated in this very important common element. Of course, the IANA function covers other aspects, but this is the most important.

The fundamental situation is that the current mechanism is providing the United States does guarantee. It is providing this guarantee for a certain number of actors who know the procedures very well, who trust the United States, or who consider that basically this thing has functioned well until now, and that there is no particular need to change it.

There is another group of actors who either do not know the procedures exactly, or who have a feeling that it is a very useful, political wedge in the international discussions. Or, we consider just on a political basis it is a situation that is unbalanced and should evolve. Once we have agreed on a common objective, the conditions for moving forward in this discussion, and this will take time, this will be discussed in the IGF, it will be discussed in other spaces, is two conditions.

The goal is to make sure that everybody in the world has the same level of trust and guarantee than the ones who are currently trusting the system or the United States. The second condition, which is the most important, is that whatever evolution is [?] it maintains for the United States government, the same level of trust that it has in the current system.

That's my personal contribution, but I think in framing the debate, in terms of the common interests, which I think exists, is a starting point that will help this discussion move away from pure political to [?] to something that is on a search for balance and global system.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much Bertrand. [?] Gonzalo and Ray in the queue. But I want to take the privilege of taking your point and putting it on the table for consideration after we hear from others. A question for the NRO, for the assembled RIRs here. To what extent do the relationships, and documents, and agreements that are in place, to what extent are they from your perspective, sufficient if there were no involvement of the US government at all?

Supposed one magically ripped the IANA contract up, but wanted life to continue on a regular bases, to what extent would you feel that you have the appropriate mechanisms? I'll just leave that hanging, I'd like to come back to it. And we'll continue with the queue.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Yeah, I think basically respond for the statement, what else we can do, you know, is there other people discussing in wrong direction, just to remind them this is actually kind of restatement what we did in 2006. You know, because the people thought about this is kind of revolution [?], you know, I think this is just like the clarification from the Raoul and also Ray.

This establishes – this is the same statement and same position in 2006, I think. We should mention the community, or outside world, there is, just not happen today, we did in 2006 already.

STEVE CROCKER: Gonzalo?

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you. I think, well this is the first time that we are meeting in an official manner. So, for me, it's important to understand the position of the NRO, and you guys, in relation with these issues that we have on the screen. So, from that perspective, I will not go further of what Steve is asking because I think he framed the question that I have in mind. I would like to know your opinion about, thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Sebastien and then [?]. I'm sorry. Ray and then [?].

UNIDENTIFIED: That's kind of [?]. Ray, you are Sebastien now, everything goes wrong here.

UNIDENTIFIED: No, it's Harold.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm struggling today, I apologize.

UNIDENTIFIED: So, who is first?

UNIDENTIFIED: Oh, okay, I want to extend the remarks made by Wolfgang and [?] in particular, and also add a few other things. First of all, while I cited a 2006 public statement, the position of the NRO in this regard actually goes back much further. We were saying... I use we because at the time I was part of the NRO, said the same thing during the [?] prep coms, we said it in the [?] statements what is [?] as well.

We didn't make formal statements per se but, it was a sentiment that has always been put forward. Going forward, I think while it's all well and good to look at how the regional registries would interact with an IANA that had a different final authority than the US government, I think it's much more important that it has to be looked at as the actual structure of ICANN.

It almost begs the issue that the IANA function can't be, what amounts to a department inside of ICANN, as part of a total staff compartment. You may have to look at, somehow or another, pulling IANA in some of the functions somewhere away from the ICANN. Particularly in light of the fact that the Board of ICANN is actually the policy decider for [?] policies and so forth.

So, I really don't, and I have never foreseen any difficulty from the perspective of the regional registries being able to interface with IANA wherever it is, as long as the current arrangements and policies are carried forward. I think it's a bigger discussion as far as how is ICANN

going to interact with the IANA function? And how it performs it. It may have to change the way it looks at IANA, and there may have to be some sort of a different relationship defined.

And then lastly, there has to be an accountability mechanism overall. Right now, that is the US government. And so when you take away the accountability mechanism, there has to be something else put in its place, and that is probably a much larger question that needs to be debated. And I think that gets to the heart of what Wolfgang was saying with regards to expectations and so forth.

STEVE CROCKER: [?], Sebastien, and John Currant.

UNIDENTIFIED: I would like to add one more angle to this discussion, and that is the strategic panel we're doing. This is the first time we, ICANN, I believe, has written a proper vision statement about what where does it want to be in the next few years. And the vision statement reads, to be an independent, I think someone added accountable, global organization, trusted worldwide to coordinate the global Internet system of blah, blah, blah, blah.

The word independent, accountable, and global and trusted. This is a sign that this is an organization that is no longer a startup. And if you look at the life cycle of companies, they go from startup for a number of years, then they mature. Now we're into the next stage. We are 15 years old, we need to play a different outlook on the world in terms of our characteristics.

And the question then is, is the relationship with the US government in terms of IANA and, quote, big brother, consistent with that vision statement? To me, it isn't consistent. So, we need to make that consistency happen. It isn't just about service, it is about also the vision of where we want to go.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay. And Sebastien, John, and then [?].

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I wanted to come back to what's happening in Montevideo because really I would like to comment on the roles that, what, at this time, what we heard about the story. The role you play in helping the ISTAR organization to go in, what I think, is the right direction.

And that's very important that we can – ICANN and the five original registry work together and going in the same direction. And I, it's also very important for me who came from ALAC that you are establishing relationship with original At Large organization, and there you are working with them closely. That's also very important point to help the [?] to go to an Internet will stay up, and stronger, as they say now. Thank you very much.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. John?

JOHN CARRON:

Briefly, John Carron, president and CEO. The IANA does its job today under two relationships. One is the IANA functions contract and the other one is MOU with the Internet engineering taskforce. And so, both of those are applicable to IANA source authority. Subsequent to the Montevideo statement, the ISTAR CEOs asked a group of folks in the organizations to get together and talk about globalization of ICANN and try to figure out what that would mean.

And there has been some meetings, design team to use lack of a better term, sort of penciling that out, and it means looking at the relationships we have in trying to figure out where they're informal, and where they need to be more formalized, and the existing MOUs between all of the folks. I think that's an important part, so that the system functions very well right now. And I'm told from a practical basis, there is not a lot of actual NTA involvement in it.

So I imagine if there was less, it would keep working just fine, but there is a group trying to figure out what relations and paperwork should be behind the scenes. That doesn't address the more global oversight and accountability questions raised, which are more of a political layer nine and ten kind of thing. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. [?] and then Paul and then [Axel].

UNIDENTIFIED:

[?]. In my opinion, when there were any concerns gets overstated, it takes the form of language like, future of Internet, savior of Internet, Internet initiative first time. Again, in my opinion, this overstated

concern may not last for long, as positions keep changing. Unfortunately, our stands are where we sit. What has been initiated by Fadi last few months, may turn around and really bring down this entire environment back to its normal 99 degree centigrade temperature.

Having said that, it's an opportunity to bring some kind of order of management in world body, but let me remind, even world body like United Nations has got – has [?] comprising of few countries managing little situations. If we are moving in that direction, then let's not put across a communication that we are taking out in the next realm, US control. We are moving from one control to a few high equally related countries control. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Paul, then Axel, then Louie has a topic to introduced. I see, it's me who is behind. Okay. Thank you. Paul?

PAUL:

Just some comments on IANA. The RIRs, the NRO, has responded a few times to the US government's inquiries cause for community input, and so forth, on the IANA contract. And the RIRs have always supported the continuation of the arrangement with ICANN. We haven't called for IANA functions to be split. I think, at an operational level, we've had some concerns in the past about the relative importance of numbers versus names as I've mentioned during the social event last night.

But it's sort of 99% names and 1% numbers. The focus of ICANN has been a concern, but I think – personally I think the recent changes with the division under acronym to deal with one whole swagger of ICANN's

distractions will help us. And I think other things going on at ICANN seem to give us increasing confidence.

We responded recently to IANA's service, customer service surveys, positively, because, again, we are getting what we want out of the IANA... There is one bit of unfinished business from quite a few years ago, which was we were in discussions about IANA's service level agreement, which didn't result in the type of contract that either side, I think, was looking for.

Those discussions were shelved in favor for an exchange of letters, which indicated our intention to get back to the contract of the agreement in the future. So that's over due at this time. I think that's all for now, thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Let me just insert a personal observation that there are a number of references to things that happen several years ago makes me conscious of how stable and long lasting this community is. The leadership, particularly in the NRL, in the address community, is rock solid. I think there has been a high degree of continuity, as well as continuity in the Board.

I think this speaks very well for the situation.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thanks. Bruce, did you want to just chime in on that?

BRUCE: Yeah. I just wanted to pick up on a comment, Paul, you made about the service that the RIRs kept from IANA, and you talked about forming some sort of an agreement. Probably the important thing before that agreement is really stating what are the metrics and performance requirements that we have in tracking those. I think that would be just helpful for the operating plan and other things that we're doing anyway, irrespective of requiring the legal affirmations of those.

I think just being clear on the metrics and how the performance is going, and we can fit that into the operating plan.

STEVE CROCKER: All right. Axel?

AXEL: Thank you. Maybe going back to operational aspects of IANA locality and contractual arrangements, you asked about that a bit earlier. If you ask me, half a year ago, whether that would have any influence on our community's thinking, I would of said, "No, our operations with IANA are brilliant operationally and everybody is very happy."

And there is some understanding that internationalization would be a good thing, but it's not that urgent. Since the summer, actually at the tail end of summer, I have been sitting with my Board members, and as you know, the RIRs are a couple of years implementing the [aplic-a-i] system, the question of global trust comes us again, and again, and again, more frequently.

And we've started to carefully works towards a [sandbox] to test [?] probability and the like. And of course, there are real operational operations and standards issues actually there, before we can implement such a thing. But I've been told at the tail end of summer to stop as [ripe NCC] to work towards a global trust angle. And I would not be able to say it's the community's opinion that we should stop until the IANA moves out of the US, but I think there is a bit of undercurrent there, and I actually heard it once, it's actually not really quotable, I heard it once, IANA should move out and then start again.

So, there is actually an operational complication, yeah, for the time being.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. I have [?], Bruce, and Raoul, but I have a feeling Raoul wants to respond on this point in particular.

RAOUL:

I want to add something to what Axel said because in LACNIC, we're in a quite similar situation. We don't have any formal request from our community to stop doing this work [?]. We are convinced that it is very inconvenient now, and it would be very difficult to explain to our community if we move forward in the implementation of [?].

We don't have the restriction that Axel has, and we can continue onboard [?] and continue working together in the evolution of the solution, and the architecture. But it doesn't pass, in my mind, that we could deploy the global [?] soon, before moving forward on the debate of the future of IANA [?].

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. [?]

BARBARA: I'm sorry, I'm going to interrupt one more time. The complaint online is that everyone is very faint with their mic, and the techs have done their best to raise the volume. Please remember to speak directly into the microphone, and be aware that there is an audience outside of the room. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you Barbara.

UNIDENTIFIED: I would like to say what is Raoul told me one or two days ago, and if I'm saying wrong, Raoul, you can correct me. Raoul said Internet for somebody is a project, but for us, it's a whole. They say everything for us, you know? We are living in the Internet, but for somebody, it's just a project. And so, you know, when people are talking about – things we are talking about, line offices, the possibility or the [?] going, you know, take it over from the US government, and we're talking about internationalization for the IANA.

And I think before we're doing point today and point in the future. I think we have better begin to think about what is the process, what is process when the US government say [I want to hand now?]. I think everybody likes to say internationalization, but we never thinking about, what is the process from US government to the internationalization?

And furthermore, we think this is a process, where would be anchor? Who will operate it? And how is it managed? You know, in the ICANN Board, you know, I'm not going to [?] all about – come to me. You know, thinking about the process first. I think when we are talking about IANA, don't – from this point to that point without any past, without any process, this process can be very dramatic, because [?], that would not be necessarily decided by ICANN community or in our community, RIR community.

Many communities [?] and say we want to talk about it. And I think we have to be thinking about the process, not right now.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. Bruce, are you – you said... And so Bertrand?

BERTRAND DE LE CHAPELLE:

One thing I would like to bring in is, there is a complete lack of understanding outside of the community, and even within the ICANN community about what exactly the role of NTIA and the workflow is. There is a lot of [?] about the importance of this function, and the first step is to document exactly what it is. There are many analogies that can be used, but it needs to be toned down in terms of what exactly it is.

The second thing is, to answer to a comment that was made before, I don't think anybody around this table sees the evolution as being towards anything that would look like digital security council, in place of government. I mean, this is out of the picture. One of the words that I think resonates, or at least resonates with me, is connecting to what

Axel is saying, given the fact that this is about trust, there is a beautiful word, which is trustees.

I don't know how to use this word in this environment. But I would like, as an user of the Internet and as a member of this ICANN Board, in general, is to know that this function is exercised by people that are trusted to do this. That's the core element, period. Who they are, how they are nominated, whatever, is another issue.

But this is the key word for me.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. [?]

UNIDENTIFIED: Well, I must clarify when I said security council, it is something saying like a trust. So when we are talking about process, I would like to really understand whether we have arrived, whether we have concluded, that moving from US to somewhere else, if that's not the case then process is little [understated] communication about the discussion.

But if we have arrived, and it already concluded situation, before even kind of a report or any kind of a discussion, or any kind of a deliberation, then I think we are really overstating many of our [?] again and again. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. There is another topic to discuss, and this is probably the time, if not past time, to move to that which is the – let me get this

right, the relationship between this group and other parts of ICANN. I wasn't here when it was articulated...

LOUIE LEE:

Sure. Thank you Steve. I had brought this up with Michelle, and Ray had mentioned earlier in the room, on Monday we began some initial work on the ASO strategy for engagement with other ICANN communities. Basically just for the members of the ASO address council, some of the RIR staff and Board members [?].

We got together on Monday afternoon to have a fresh look at our strategy in engaging the different parts of the ICANN communities. Several ideas came out of it. The ideas include at every engagement opportunity to provide handouts on who the ASO is, and how to participate. This way we don't have to start every presentation with that piece of information, and that folks can bring it back to their homes to write their reports and to actually have something in front of them rather than relying on their memory or notes.

Each person should be educating himself or herself on a different culture, on the different parts of the ICANN community, and learn what are the important topics and issues for each of them. What that will do is that it will help us tailor our communication to their wants, their needs. And there are several other ideas, I don't want to go too deep into them at this point, because we also formed a smaller group.

We also formed a smaller group to get some actual action items, actionable items out of these ideas. So if there are other ideas that the Board members have, that would be interesting.

STEVE CROCKER: Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you. I guess that your thinking will also go throughout, to interact during an ICANN meeting, or during ICANN meetings, and it will be very useful if you can bring that in the meeting strategy working group, currently multi-stakeholder working group, you have at least one member of your community participating through this working group, is Dimitri.

And he could be your conveyor to this [?]. It's very important that we really embrace all the needs of all the stakeholders, and [?] it's a very important one. We really are keen to have your inputs. Thank you.

LOUIE LEE: Anybody else? I do want to add that one of the things is to actively participate in the pre-ICANN meeting phone call for a policy update, where I gave an ASO update during that session, that's normally hosted and conducted by staff. And we received some feedback on the chat, and perhaps we can expand that to include things like regional policies and touch on some of the more important regional policies that we think are important to this community.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. [?]

UNIDENTIFIED: I remember [?] September, in the [strategic] meetings, and the Board, we also talked about strategic meetings. Eventually we tried to form, is it possible to ask in the RIR, your regional meeting, the APNIC, ccNSO, RIR meeting, allows us, the ICANN to participate one day, and you know, [?].

And so we can bring the ICANN, for example, registrar, registry, those are the main industry people, to come in. And I think it's not only when the ICANN show actually some [?] community is [?] with the RIR peoples. And I think this is one of the, another, the possible communication would be happening. And so, in here, I would just like to kind of – kindly to ask all RIR, once you have the regional meeting, to allow for example the [?], the crack [?] in Istanbul or somebody to know your schedule, and so we can fill it in as soon as we could. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: I have [?] and Ray. Something else just came to my mind. There is an elephant, a herd of elephants flying around, called IPv6. It is, from a certain point of view, pretty amazing to have zero discussion about that. Just trying to bring the temperature back up a little bit. [?]

UNIDENTIFIED: I just want to share an experience from an AfriNIC perspective on what [?] just said. In our last meeting, AfriNIC meeting, we had something like that where we provide a place for different ICANN stakeholder. AFRALO, the gTLD community from Africa, we give them a space to meet and discuss issues, specifically related to their operation in Africa.

And it was interesting, and something that can be repeated with more close collaboration with ICANN globally. And the originally road to see how this can work. But, I think the advantage of such a meeting as well is for those constituencies to focus on a thing that are more original than the whole global thing, because they face a different challenge regionally than they want to discuss.

And that gives them that opportunity.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. I have Ray and Paul.

RAY:

Thank you Steve. Two things. First of all, it's all well and good for us to talk about having meetings backwards, and forwards, and so forth. The biggest problem that exists, and this is something that we spent some time talking about on Monday, is the use of language. And I'm not talking about English, and French, and German; I'm talking about names and numbers.

And quite often, the names people approach the numbers people speaking in their culture, and in their terminology, and the numbers people conversely do the same thing. So when a numbers person goes up to someone and starts talking about slash 64s, and slash 32s, etc. The guy on the other side eyes just roll up because he has no idea what's going on here.

He doesn't realize the significance of what is being said. And so one of the things we talked about that, from the perspective of the numbers

people, is learning how to frame what is going to be presented in the language, and in the cultural understanding, of the audience that it is going to.

And we specifically, in the meeting Monday, looked at that it can't be a general message. Actually, if you look at the GNSO, you actually have to target it for the different constituencies and stakeholder groups because they talk in different terms, even amongst themselves. So, that's probably one of the bigger hurdles.

Speaking to what [Adele] just spoke about, is very significant. If you sit back and totally look at an ICANN meetings week, and I use that term, meetings week, because that's what it is, it's actually the only place that the other stakeholder groups have their real face to face meetings. They don't have what the people in the numbers community are used to having, the regional registry meetings two or three times a year.

And so, for the regional registries to do such as what [Adele] spoken about, I know LACNIC does some similar types of things, and APNIC has done some similar types of things in the past, is that you open up and you allow the other parts of the ICANN community the opportunity to meet face to face, other than having to travel to an ICANN meeting to do so.

And it's probably more important because it allows them to discuss things on a reasonable basis, things that are more common to them than it is common to the rest of the world. So I think there is a lot of merit in that type of activity and it should be considered. Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER: Thanks. Paul and then we're out of time.

PAUL: Yeah on that meeting topic. I've had some fruitful, interesting discussions with [?] who is the IP VP at ICANN about bringing our meetings together in some sort of regional configuration where the APNIC meeting, like other RIR meetings, are actually assembly points for numerous other regional activities, which come together no place else.

It would be very nice for us, as I've discussed with [Quick] and this is speaking for APNIC, to have regional ICANN activities kind of represented in some way within our meeting. And I think one of the real goals that I have, and one of the success conditions would be if we were able to bring together a respectable collection of ICANN GAC members into that regional meeting, because the ICANN GAC members, it's very difficult to get them to travel.

We've tried but have not succeeded in really bringing GAC members into the APNIC meetings without ICANN being there in some capacity, in some sense, because they simply just can't afford it, but it really would in our benefit and particularly these days, that the ICANN GAC have a better exposure to our communities in action, because they don't see it here.

They'll only see it if they come [?] APNIC, and I'm sure this goes for everyone else, if the come to the regional meetings and really see it. So I'd very much like to see that happen in some way. Hopefully will be trying something like this in a future APNIC meeting. On IPv6, I sort of

hesitate to bring it as news because I don't want to go off anyone's agenda.

IPv6 has still got a long way to go. At the IGF meeting in Bali just a couple of weeks ago, there was the usual access infrastructure provided – APNIC staff were involved with helping with that, as actually was [?] Electric, and particularly on the IPv6 side. At the end of the week, the stats showed that we had an average bandwidth on that network, an external bandwidth of 150 megabytes per second and an average of 30 megabytes per second IPv6.

So we hit 20% of the traffic going out, in and out of the IGF meeting, network was IPv6. And that was the highest ticket that I have seen for a general purpose kind of environment like that, it was a very good sign. But as I say, there is still plenty of work to do. We are actually seeing some growth that's starting to look significant and exponential and ongoing, which I'm glad be able to mention here. Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER:

That's great. That's really good. Any last words that we need? This has been a pretty content full exchange, and which I'm actually very pleased about. I like getting into substantive issues here. It's occurred to me with the concern about addresses not getting the same level of attention as names, that all of that attention is usually related to the level of problems. And you should take comfort.

I remember the transition as I grew from childhood to teenage years to adult and then had children, that not everything was about me anymore and it was about the children. That's part of learning to be a grownup is

to be comfortable with the idea that it's the youngsters that got the problem that get all of the attention, and us adults take comfort in that.

Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]