DUBLIN – IANA Stewardship Transition Engagement Session
Monday, October 19, 2015 – 12:00 to 13:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:　　　　Milton Mueller, can you please come to the stage.

ALISSA COOPER:　　　　I need the slide projection, please.

This is beautiful. But -- this is also beautiful.

There we go. Okay. Thank you.

So welcome, everyone, to the engagement session on the IANA stewardship transition. I am Alissa Cooper. I'm the chair of the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group, otherwise known as the ICG. And we're here today to provide you with a status update on the stewardship transition and the proposal that we have been working on in the ICG and in the communities. Hopefully, that piece will be short, the status update. And then we will field questions and comments from all of you. The goal here is to get your feedback and input and answer any questions that you may have.

I'm joined up here with a selection of ICG members -- one of our cochairs, Patrik Faltstrom, who represents the SSAC; Jean-

Jacques Subrenat, who is from ALAC; Milton Mueller from the GNSO; next Martin Boyle from the ccNSO; Wolf-Ulrich Knoben from the GNSO; and Lynn St. Amour from the Internet Architecture Board.

These folks were our key leaders in reviewing the public comments received about the proposal. So they have the most depth of knowledge about those comments. But we have other ICG members in the room as well who may be called on to answer questions as they come up from the audience. One thing I will say is that I was thinking about the our group and the process we've gone through. And it reminded me of a team that I work with back in my day job at work. And it's a team that runs kind of operational infrastructure for one of the products that my company sells. And they have an initiative called "The Quest for Boring." So, as an operational team, when you first set something up at the beginning, nothing works. The service is coming up and down all the time. There's constantly these fire alarms that are going off. But over time, as you get better and better at the process and you learn more about everything that you're trying to do, you can go on this quest for boring. And that's what they've done. They've gone on a quest for their jobs to be boring, to not have these fire alarms going off, for everything to kind of go along at its normal pace and to not have any surprises.

I think, as the ICG, we're nearing the end of our quest for boring. As compared to some of the other processes that people may have been involved in, we are pretty much there. So, hopefully, that's reflected in what we have to talk about today.

Just a quick review of the process that we've gone through from the beginning when the NTIA made the announcement about the IANA stewardship transition. A few months later we as the ICG were constituted. And then we issued a request for proposals that went out to the three operational communities dealing with names, numbers, and protocol parameters.

Over the months that followed, we received proposals from those communities. From the protocol parameters and numbers we received proposals in January of this year and then from names in June. We assessed those proposals both individually and in combination. And that took us up to July of this year.

And then we issued a call for public comments in July, 40-day public comment period. And we've now assessed and analyzed and incorporated feedback from those public comments.

So we received 157 comments in the public comment period from individuals, from organizations of every kind and shape, all of the different constituencies of ICANN and broader organizations interested in the transition. We received

comments in four different languages. We had had the transition proposal translated. And we also had the comments translated back into English for our review.

And, as you can see, we received comments from all over the world and from global organizations that don't have a specific jurisdictional home. So a lot of variety in terms of the comments and the commenters that we received.

I wanted to just give kind of a summary of what we heard in the public comments. First of all, as with respect to support for the proposal, the majority of the comments that we received were supportive of the transition proposal that we put out.

Some of these were qualified based on outstanding questions about a variety of different aspects -- about ICANN accountability, about the root zone maintainer, about intellectual property related to IANA functions and about other issues. So, while they were qualified, they still received support. That's about 65% of the comments we received.

Those came, again, from a wide variety of individuals and organizations -- from the operational communities themselves, from SOs and ACs, businesses, civil society groups, governments, you know, every flavor of group we received some supportive comments from.

We also received some comments that were strictly not supportive of the proposal at all. That was a much smaller fraction. I can see that I've lost part of my legend here. That was a smaller fraction. Again, a small fraction of folks who were just opposed to the transition itself. And for those comments we acknowledged them and then sort of put them to the side as the ICG's mandate is to deliver a transition proposal. So we understand that some people don't want the transition to take place, but that's not really something that's actionable for us because we are working to have the transition take place.

And then the pink slice that you can see there where we lost the legend is for -- there were some comments where support or opposition for the proposal was not specified, was not clear, or the comment was not really specific to the proposal itself. So we couldn't really classify them as supporting or opposing.

There were a number of key themes that emerged from the public comment period. The first is the dependency on the outcomes of the CCWG accountability work, which, if you were in this room for the previous session you heard all about.

So this was highlighted across many, many, many of the comments. Everyone has acknowledged that there is outstanding work to be done in the CCWG and that there is a

dependency between the names community proposal and the completion of that work.

We also got a lot of comments about the post-transition IANA, the PTI. And in part, I think many of these comments are reflective of the fact that, again, we received the proposals from the three communities at different points in time. The PTI is a construct that was created and documented after we received the proposals from the numbers and protocol parameters communities. As a result, because the PTI does affect the three communities, potentially, there were many questions about the relationships between various of the entities that will engage with the PTI and lots of questions about how that would all work when combined for all three of the communities. Also questions about the remit of the PTI board and the membership and how it would be structured and questions about -- and comments about what would happen if one or more of the operational communities decided to choose a different operator for its IANA function, how the coordination would work in that case.

We received lots of comments about the root zone maintainer role. So, as we know, there are multiple roles involved in the administration of the root zone. They include the IANA functions operator; the root zone maintainer, which is currently VeriSign; and the root zone administrator, which is currently the NTIA. And those relationships, because NTIA intends to exit from its

EN

role, will need to be revised from what they are today where VeriSign has a cooperative agreement with NTIA. But the details of those revisions are not strictly included in the CWG component of the transition proposal. So we received a lot of feedback about the need for that process to go forward, its transparency, its potential outcomes.

The next one that we have highlighted as a theme was the jurisdiction of ICANN. This was touched on in the previous session as well. And we had some commenters who had opinions about what the jurisdiction of ICANN should be, whether it's a topic that should have been taken up differently or should be taken up in the future. And, as we know, in the transition proposal itself, there's no indication of change in the jurisdiction of ICANN, although it has been selected as a topic for workstream 2 of the CCWG accountability.

And then, finally, the last major theme was that we got several comments about some of the references included in the text about ccTLDs. There was some changes that happened in between when the names community submitted its proposal to us and when the proposal went out for public comment. And so those references regarding ccTLD documentation needed to be updated. There were lots of other comments, but these were the major themes.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

Just to explain the process that we went through for all of these topics and a few of the others, in some cases we just made edits to the portion of the proposal that the ICG had written which is, if you look in the proposal, it's part zero. So we clarified things. We did this very much -- for the PTI, for example, we have added a whole section to just explain the PTI and relationships between the communities. So places where we felt that the comments pointed to lack of clarity, we attempted to clarify that using our own section of text.

But, for many of these other topics, we actually asked questions back to the operational communities where we felt that we needed clarity or something needed to be changed. For example, the ccTLD references. So we posed 13 questions to the CWG, I think two questions to the CRISP team, and one to the IANA plan working group and the IETF. And we have incorporated that feedback back into the proposal that we've been working on up until now.

Lastly, in terms of the feedback we received from the public comments, we had asked the public specific questions about whether they felt that the proposal supports the criteria that NTIA established at the beginning of this transition. And the majority of commenters who spoke to this at all, who spoke to the criteria at all, felt they are either met by the proposal or, again, conditionally met assuming that some of the outstanding

issues that they had pointed out in their comments would be resolved. In our assessment, having gone through all the comments and having had the back and forth again with the communities, the ICG believes that the criteria have been met by the transition proposal. Just one item to flag on that as you're kind of looking at the criteria themselves, one of the key criteria concerns maintaining the security and stability of the DNS. And that's an area where, as the ICG, we have highlighted the need for outstanding resolution and revision of the role of the RZM in relation to the IANA functions operator. That needs to be worked out in order to maintain the security and stability of the DNS going forward.

So status update: The ICG had working meetings on Saturday and Sunday earlier this week and have been making some further refinements to the proposal. We have a set of remaining refinements that we will make in our next set of working meetings which will happen on Thursday and Friday of this week. At that point our expectation is that we will have, essentially, one outstanding item in the proposal and that will be the dependency that exists between the ICG proposal and the CCWG accountability's output. So, shortly after ICANN54 ends, we expect that to be the only remaining outstanding issue.

As far as the ICG status, once we get to that point, we intend to provide a status update to the community to let everyone know

that that's the point that we've reached and to have available for review the current proposal document with all of those refinements incorporated.

Then we will be awaiting confirmation from the CCWG that its requirements are met by the output of the CCWG work. So once the CCWG work has concluded and the CWG has certified that its requirements have been met, that's the point at which the transition proposal will be done and we'll be able to forward it on to the ICANN board for submission to NTIA.

In our meetings this weekend, we agreed that the ICG should remain constituted as a body at least until the 30th of September 2016, which is the current date of expiry of the contract. By staying constituted what we mean is that we will maintain our mailing list so that we can have discussion amongst ourselves. We will ensure that we have mechanisms such that, if anybody needs to get in touch with us or has a question or an issue that they think requires coordination or requires us to resolve or provide an answer and that they know how to do that, we will not schedule a priori standing meetings. But we'll meet or have a conference call if issues arise. That's the mode we intend to go into.

And we're also presently discussing the need for the ICG to play or to have any work related to implementation. There's a

diversity of views within the ICG about whether that is necessary and what form it might take or how we should come to a conclusion about that. And that's something we will continue to discuss in our working meetings at the end of this week.

And now we're ready for Q&A. So, please, if you will, use the microphones at the front of the room if you have questions for us. And we also have remote participation and will be taking questions remotely as well.

All set for the Q&A. So -- quest for boring, people. This is what it is. This is what a quest for boring looks like. Do we have remote? No. We're also boring remotely.

All right. Going once, going twice, mission accomplished!

[Applause]

No, okay.

All right. I think we're done. Thanks, everyone.

40 minutes back.

NANCY LUPIANO: Thank you, all. The next session in this room will begin at 3:00 p.m. this afternoon. 1500. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I thought we were rock stars.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]