MARRAKECH – Joint Meeting of the ICANN Board & the ASO / NRO
Tuesday, March 08, 2016 – 08:30 to 09:30 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

STEVE CROCKER: Good morning, everybody.   This begins, for the board, constituency day in which we get to meet with several different groups. We don't get to meet with quite everybody. And we're privileged to start off with you all.

Who are you? Oh, yeah, the ASO.

[Laughter]

STEVE CROCKER: And our general style for these is -- I guess I have two standing comments. One is that we're here to -- primarily to listen. In this case, I think we have a few things where we want to ask some questions, but primarily we're interested in hearing your thoughts.

And the second is that we try to make these meaningful and substantive, so not just pro forma statements about how wonderful all of us are and what great work we all do.

Let's find out where the action is, what the issues are, bring them up, and have some frank and candid discussion so that we use our time in a meaningful way.

So with that, it's really your meeting, so Oscar, take it away.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you, Steve. Thank you for your attendance to this session.

I think that it would be good to present ourselves first so everybody knows who is at this table. Is that okay with you?

STEVE CROCKER: Sure.

OSCAR ROBLES: So right now, we start -- Paul, do you want to present yourself?

PAUL WILSON: Paul Wilson. I'm the head of APNIC, the IP address registry for the Asia-Pacific. I'm a -- in that role, I'm therefore a member of the number -- the -- sorry, the NRO executive council. I've been involved with the transition process for a long time, since it -- since before it started 20 years ago.

[Laughter]

PAUL WILSON: But more recently, I've been one of the NRO delegates to the ICG, helping to produce that initial -- that first major report, the ICG IANA transition -- stewardship transition proposal. Thanks. That's me.

REMCO van MOOK: Good morning. My name is Remco van Mook. I'm an executive board member for the RIPE NCC.

AXEL PAWLIK: Good morning. Axel Pawlik, managing director of the RIPE NCC and member of the NRO executive council.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby, member of the board. Thank you.

RON DA SILVA: Ron da Silva, also member of the board.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Nurani Nimpuno, vice chair of the CRISP team responsible for the number community's proposal in the IANA transition and I'm also a member of the ASO AC.

JOHN CURRAN: John Curran, president and CEO of ARIN, the American Registry for Internet Numbers, member of the NRO EC, executive council.

OSCAR ROBLES: Oscar Robles, CEO of LACNIC and the NRO EC chairman for 2016.

STEVE CROCKER: Steve Crocker, chair of the ICANN board of directors.

Let me also mention that Kuo-Wei was unable to come to this meeting, sends his regrets, but he's very active and -- on your behalf as well as on behalf of the entire ICANN.

Are we going to do everybody or what's your plan?

But in any case, I'll just mention we have a number of other board members here. I can actually see most of them in the front row. Yeah. Thanks.

IZUMI OKUTANI: Izumi Okutani, chair of the CRISP team, working together with Nurani on the number community proposal.

ALAN BARRETT: And I'm Alan Barrett, CEO of AfriNIC, the RIR serving Africa. I'm also a member of the ICG. And previous to that, I was a member of the CRISP team but I'm no longer on the CRISP team.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, I don't want to use up our time, again, on formalities, but just what do I see, one, two, three, four, five -- five board members there. Am I missing anybody? Oh, Asha is sitting in the second row. Oh, got a whole second row there, yeah. So we've got about 10 board members, give or take, sitting here. That's -- for this hour of this morning, this is a good representation.

[Laughter]

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. Plus three more here. Yeah. So we've come to rumble here.

OSCAR ROBLES: Excellent. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: And there's Ram.

EN

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you. Well, we have an agenda, but when we were drafting this agenda, we had in mind a different setting for this meeting. We were thinking in a little room, rather than the huge and the main room.

So basically we have three topics. Four topics.

One, of course, is the most relevant for us is -- has to do with the IANA transition and specifically with the numbers proposal implementation and all the things related with the SLA approval, the SLA process, and all these things.

Then the second issue would be a -- has to do with Goran, your new CEO, and his training period, how we could improve that training period to benefit the mutual understanding, not only -- I mean, to improve the times of understanding of our communities.

And the third topic has to do with your concerns. You sent us some questions -- or one question related with the appointment process to the board from the ASO, so we may have some time to address those issues.

And finally, we have the ASO update on policies, so let's see if we are able to cover those topics.

So starting with the first topic, which has to do with the transition, as I was saying, our main interest is to make clear our thoughts on the SLA.

Yesterday, we mentioned that the SLA has to be seen as a -- as a preparation for the transition and it has to be taken seriously as a prerequisite before continuing, and we wanted to let you know what we think on this, so I will ask my colleagues to -- if they want to be more specific on this process.

So I don't know if one of the NRO EC members want to talk a little bit on this.

John?

JOHN CURRAN: I guess the -- we'd like to understand what ICANN's -- what the ICANN board's view of the transition time line is in terms of implementation.

Meaning once -- there are steps that need to happen before the board sends it to NTIA. There's some steps that have to happen concurrently with that. There's some steps that have to happen after that. And we all know we need to get this done, but I guess depending on who we ask, we get different ideas of how these steps line up.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, why don't -- why don't we find out what answer you want, and then we tell you who's going to answer you that. We'll give you -- each person has a -- no. Teasing you.

JOHN CURRAN: If our team working on the SLA could bring up a copy, we'll send you a pen, Steve, and that's the -- what we want.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. So you're asking -- there's -- there's a whole bunch of small details that all fit together in a sort of complicated way.

The easy part is, when we get the proposal, we're poised to be able to forward it rapidly, very rapidly, to NTIA.

It's the steps after that that get to be more interesting. And the basic picture is, two things happen in parallel. The government, with the NTIA, is the front of that process, but a lot of stuff going on behind the scenes will be looking at that proposal and considering it and coming back with an answer saying, "Yes, if you do all those things, it's good."

But in parallel, they also want to see us actually implement the key pieces of that, which are the bylaws and some other implementation pieces.

We had a -- we actually had a meeting last night, and Cherine, you were in the center of it. Chris, you were in the center of it. Why don't you say more about the fine-grain details. It's actually on a very, very fast-paced schedule to make the key pieces.

I will say with respect to the SLA in particular, there is a complicated dance of getting all the details worked out, but the requirements are that we can't sign it and put it in force prior to the cessation of the contract, but we can commit to that fact happening.

There is a tiny bit of trust involved, but most of it can be laid out in a way that's very explicit and just will happen in a particular order.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you.

                       (Off microphone.)

STEVE CROCKER: And Bruce. Hi. Good morning.

OSCAR ROBLES: Before, John, let me say something about this. That's exactly our -- part of our concerns, that in order to have all these steps

completed, there's a lot of things that we have to do and something that maybe we are -- it's out of our control.

For example, NTIA's willingness to do something, that is out of our control. But there are some things that is actually inside our area of control, and yesterday the staff said -- the ICANN staff mentioned rough time lines on this, and they used the term of "a public comment period after the SLA approval."

Well, that's something that you may control, and in that regard, I would like to hear something from the CRISP team that produced all these principles and the basis for the SLA that we have done this in a public way, in a transparent way, in an open process with several period [sic] comment process included and our expectations is that we don't require any other public comment period.

So --

STEVE CROCKER: I got it.

OSCAR ROBLES: John and then Izumi.

JOHN CURRAN: Steve, I guess you indicated that implementation needs to happen in parallel for the bylaws and some other key elements, and I guess we haven't seen a list of those key elements. We'd like to see what that is.

Obviously for our community, the service level agreement for IANA numbering services is a key element and we'd expect it to be on that list and I guess it's not clear that -- what is on that list or what isn't, and that's probably something we need to discuss because there's not a lot of documentation about what's actually planned here.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. I actually empathize quite a bit with you and I should be in a position to see as much documentation as there is, and nonetheless, I see --

I've got competing offers here from --

CHERINE CHALABY: Steve, I've got an order of all the board members who want to talk, so why don't we go Mike, Bruce, and then I'll add a comment and Erika and then myself. Okay?

STEVE CROCKER: Go ahead.

CHERINE CHALABY: Mike.

(Off microphone.)

CHERINE CHALABY: All right. Bruce, then go ahead. Everybody --

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you, Cherine.

Yeah, it's a very good question that you're asking. I think this week we're sort of just in that transition between trying to get the proposals ready to send to the NTIA and have each group sign off and then start to build our effectively work plan that takes us through to the end of the year.

So -- and as Steve mentioned, we had some discussions last night to try and map that out pretty much on a whiteboard. Or a flip chart, in this case.

So one of the tasks is the staff to actually write up the contents of that flip chart that we can share with you, but I'll give you a -- just a bit of a high-level view that might help you a little bit.

So one thing is that we're hoping by the end of this week that -- which will be, say, March 10th -- we'll have a proposal that connects the ICG report, the CCWG report, and a board

resolution that supports those that we can send to the NTIA. So that kicks off a process.

Then we're going to spend roughly four weeks to write up the bylaws that incorporate all that material. So that will probably take us to mid-April.

Then those bylaws will then be published for public comment. So it's the bylaws that are being published for public comment.

In parallel -- and then by, you know, early June or late May, you know, the board is expecting to sign off on those bylaws, basically approval the bylaws.

In parallel, the NTIA is actually doing a review of all this information that we've provided, and they'll also do a review of the bylaws to see that the bylaws are consistent with what we've said in those proposals.

So by roughly mid-June, the NTIA will have a report that says, "We're okay with the proposal and we're okay with the bylaws."

At that point, we could then start signing agreements, so say late June, and we have between June and August, essentially, to complete all the implementation details necessary before the U.S. government would then decide not to renew the contract which is -- currently expires in September.

So they need to make a decision by August as to whether that contract should be extended or renewed, so we have to have all the implementation done by August. You know, preferably earlier.

So in terms of signing the agreement, my expectation would be that we could sign that agreement, once we've received the report from the NTIA, in sort of mid-June and we'd be able to sign the agreement.

I'm not seeing -- given that you've gone through an extensive public comment period on your agreement itself, you know, my sense is we wouldn't need to be putting the agreement for public comment, but we are putting the bylaws out for public comment.

So does that help?

We'll try and map this out on one page for you, but that -- this was all just basically worked out last night, just to sort of try and get a bit of a plan.

STEVE CROCKER: Bruce, I think the question, to get right to it, is: Are the SLA -- is the SLA going to be put out for public comment? If so, why, since they've gone through their own process with plenty of public comment? And where is the -- what is the sequence by

which that gets adopted, committed to, and so forth? Where does that fit in? What do we know about that at this point?

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. So I -- I would imagine that -- my understanding is that that agreement is still -- there are some discussions going on this week, and so once that agreement is, you know, agreed effectively between the parties, I would imagine we'd just post it for information, but I'm not -- assuming your community presumably is agreeing all the terms of that agreement, but we wouldn't be signing the agreement until the end of June because the NTIA has asked us not to sort of create a presumption. We still have to let them run their process and then to be able to say, "Yes, we are comfortable with this transition."

AKRAM ATALLAH: Sorry. Just to clarify. The reason they're asking about the public comment is because our plan is to actually finalize the SLA and post it for public comment.

If -- if the board feels like it was -- it's not necessary for the community to see the final SLA, we -- I mean, it's a decision we can make not to post it for public comment. But the plan is to post it for public comment and we felt like we have the time to

go through the public comment before we can sign. So that was the plan.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah. I mean, I think we'd be publishing it anyway, Akram --

AKRAM ATALLAH: Yes, absolutely.

BRUCE TONKIN: -- and the question is whether we're running a formal public comment period on it or whether it's just a posted document.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Yeah.

BRUCE TONKIN: But, you know, that's, I guess, the discussion with this community is whether you think that's required.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Yeah.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you. Izumi?

IZUMI OKUTANI: Thank you. Izumi Okutani speaking with the CRISP team hat.

So this clarification about the time lines, this was quite new to me and it was helpful that Bruce has clearly explained this in conjunction with the CCWG process.

I do -- I would like to request that perhaps RIRs and ICANN work on the time lines that would be agreeable to both because there has been a request on our global list to have clarity on the overall time lines on how -- at what timing we can fix the final version of the SLA, when we can sign it, when it actually takes into effect.

And just to share what has been my understanding and expectation is that we actually agree with the minority statement that the ASO has made about the timing of the SLA, so the CRISP team was actually expecting that the SLA will be fixed at the same timing as the bylaw changes are to be implemented for the CCWG accountability, because this is equivalent of accountability mechanism and so that was the expectation that we had.

So I do trust that RIRs and ICANN will continue discussing this on what would be agreeable to both.

And one observation about the public comment is that we have actually done our equivalent of the public comments. We've

been doing this on the global mailing list. The CRISP team has been, from each version of the proposal, sharing our observation that it's consistent with the number community proposal. In other words, it's also consistent with the ICG proposal. So I'm not sure if there's a need for another public comment.

So that's -- I just want to highlight this as my observation.

I do want to make a comment about the contents of the SLA as well, but I don't know if it's better to defer it to another opportunity or may I continue, Oscar? May I continue to make --

Okay. So I'm also pleased to share the CRISP team observation that the latest version, Version 4 of the SLA, is consistent with the number community proposal.

Again, this means that this is consistent with the ICG proposal. So this is actually reflecting the consensus that we've gone through in each of the RIR regions as the global number resources community, the three operational communities, and this has also gone through the public comments that the ICG has put up, too, so I think it carries quite a lot of weight.

So based on this, I would like to confirm that any changes that would cause inconsistencies with the ICG proposal is not a negotiation point.

So I observe that in some of the interaction between ICANN and RIR, some changes has been suggested which would cause inconsistencies with the ICG proposal, which has been a concern for -- from the CRISP team perspective.

So I would like to confirm that we all share -- both ICANN and RIR share an understanding that any changes that leads to inconsistency with the ICG proposal is not a negotiation point. We don't want to open this up for negotiation.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you, Izumi. Anyone from the ICANN board or --

John?

JOHN CURRAN: Given the proposed time lines, or at least what's been suggested, the numbers community, when it came to the ICG proposal, we hit the deadline of January 15th, 2015, more than a year ago. We understand the names community accountability provisions as specified by the CWG required ICANN bylaws changes and that's why we launched the cross-community working group for ICANN accountability and went through the process we just went through.

In retrospect, maybe the names community made a mistake because the measures we need for accountability, which we've specified more than a year ago, are in the SLA and it doesn't appear as though they are a priority for the ICANN board to actually get accomplished but the bylaws are. Maybe we should have done that approach rather than use a more typical contract approach.

BRUCE TONKIN: If I could just respond, unless Steve wants to respond on that one?

Yeah.

It does have pretty much the same priority, John. So we formed a subcommittee of the board to actually make sure that that agreement is concluded. So we have Ron, for example, and I think -- at least three other board members. Ron can probably give you an update on that. So we have formed a group. So we are working on all these things in parallel basically.

My expectation is that the agreement that you refer to, that your terms of that agreement should be completed within a week or so, hopefully this week.

What I'm talking about is the actual signing of that agreement as opposed to agreeing to the terms. And the signing of the

agreement is likely to happen after the NTIA has released their report in mid June, if that helps.

JOHN CURRAN: For clarity, would that be after the bylaw changes are adopted and in effect?

BRUCE TONKIN: The -- yes, I believe so, yeah.

JOHN CURRAN: You have a potential race condition if anything in the accountability changes for those bylaws could delay the SLA signing, for example, an IRP against the board signing the SLA. So we just need to be remarkably careful.

The difference between a committed SLA that has condition precedent language, which we've proposed, so it's agreed but doesn't take effect until you're released is that the terms are agreed and it's already a committed act.

Signing that after the accountability provisions depending on the exact language of the bylaws, we know what we've put in the CWG proposal. Now we have to see what comes out through the bylaws drafting. And it would be -- it would be bad if we end up

with a situation where we actually can't complete this on time because we've put things in the wrong order.

BRUCE TONKIN: So I agree, it would be bad. And I think we'll work collectively on trying to avoid that occurring.

But I think the approach here is that bylaws drafting process, the direction that we've given to the drafters is that it needs to match both the CWG and CCWG reports. And also the direction to staff with respect to the RIR agreement is it needs to match the CRISP proposal.

So I think our message is those are the requirements documents. And these agreements and bylaws need to meet those requirements documents and that we're trying to make sure that we've got groups on both the board side and the community side that can help review that. And then the public can then review that as well.

AKRAM ATALLAH: Just to add to -- to address the question from John, the bylaws will be approved but they will not take effect until after the transition occurs. So all the changes to the bylaws will not take effect until the transition occurs so that hopefully addresses your IRP question. Thank you.

PAUL WILSON: Paul Wilson here. I think we've emphasized quite a few times -- I hope we don't have to keep emphasizing that the SLA is our accountability system. It goes with the CCWG report as part of the overall revision and approval -- revision and improvement of ICANN's accountability.

So I wonder -- without seeing, Bruce, the series of specific steps that you spoke about before, it's a little difficult to discuss this very accurately. But can we see the SLA as being implemented, approved, and executed or committed in lockstep with the upgrade to the bylaws and not as some parallel activity that may have its own series of asynchronous steps?

I mean, if we can see the SLA as being, as I say, in lockstep with the rest of the accountability improvements and see that laid out specifically on a time line, I think that would really help us to understand where we're heading.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yes. I think I would take that as an action, that we'll work with staff on that. But, yes, that we'll incorporate that specific agreement as a part of that time line so it's clear. And "lockstep" is probably the right terminology to use. So we'll incorporate that time line so it's clear it's part of the accountability process.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm persuaded that there are some contingencies of the kind that you laid out, John, where things could go awry. But I think most of those have actually been anticipated and are not going to come up. But I do take the point that the picture is not clear enough and the communication is somewhat limited.

So one take-away that I have from this conversation is that an analysis and watchfulness over the entire process from the perspective of satisfying the numbers community is in order and that we should make sure that that's put in place in some fashion. I think that's a quite obvious thing that we ought to do so that there is -- so if there's any reason for discomfort, it's for known reason rather than just for unknown reasons.

CHERINE CHALABY: So I think I fully support the two points made about locking in the SLA development with the bylaw drafting but also as a safeguard for you, the board will not accept or adopt the bylaws drafting until full public comment period takes place and the comments being considered.

So you'll be able to see during the public comment period whether the bylaw drafting matches and are locked in with your SLA as well as the steps that we will take. So I think there's

ICANN|55
MARRAKECH
5 – 10 MARCH 2016

plenty of safeguards in the process to make sure that this diversion doesn't take place.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you. I think what Steve proposes is very much what we want you to pick up from this. We want to watch exactly the periods and the risks associated with this because we also have the risk to fail to have a provider for the services if there's some IRP filed before the 30th of September and the contract with NTIA expires because the 1st of October we don't have the service anymore. So that's another operational risk here, not only about the transition but also about the operational part as well.

So -- well, I don't know if someone would like to address any other issues related to the transition?

Alan, then Izumi.

ALAN BARRETT: Hi. Thanks. This is Alan Barrett.

We've talked a lot about the timing of the SLA and I think we've made a lot of good progress there. We've come to a better understanding.

I would like to speak a little bit about the process of agreeing on the wording or the terms of the SLA. One of the difficulties that we've had is that we seem to be dealing with different groups of lawyers on the ICANN side in different iterations. And sometimes it appears that the legal team who've commented or made wording changes on one version have perhaps not fully considered the previous iterations.

So I think one of the things which could be done to help this would be to identify a person on the ICANN side who has the business responsibility to negotiate the SLA, somebody that we could talk to on the business side and know who it is and it would be a stable contact and that person would, in turn, I suppose, take responsibility for instructing the ICANN lawyers. We don't know who that person is right now.

RON da SILVA: I understand there is a meeting later today with Akram. I think clarity around who on the ICANN side is going to be that person can be set then. But meanwhile ---

(power outage.)

RAM MOHAN: ... proper identification of what audiences and what are the groups and what are the types of issues that are -- that exist.

And once you identify that, to make sure that there is clear engagement. What that means is that in the -- in previous times staff from ICANN in many ways took the lead in identifying and in defining the engagement. And this time around, to augment that, there is also a clear Board engagement and Board involvement in that area.

I'm currently leading up that task to help build out a whole list of what types of engagements ought to be. It's going to be done in coordination with Goran and with the rest of the Board as well. So it's not the Board kind of directing Goran, go here, go there.

The last point I want to make is, it's not focused on what meetings Goran should be in and what flights he should catch because it's often easy to focus on being present at one place or the next and to mistake the effort expended in doing so with the expected effect of actually understanding what issues are important for your community.

So in summary, there is clear understanding and a real desire to partner with you to get your input and to work closely with you, with Goran, in a way that provides not just the presence at the places where you meet and you congregate but also to get to a deep understanding of the issues that are important for you.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you, Ram. I would appreciate if we could talk on this a little bit more and hopefully we could provide you some ideas. I understand that this is not about the trips but also that that's a relevant part of the understanding of the communities. And I think that in that way that help -- that helps to create a better understanding on what's the nature and the day-to-day discussions and the policy -- and the policy but also operational side of the RIR. So don't limited yourself to just the process but also consider that the attendance to some of the RIRs meeting. I mean, you don't have to be -- I mean, he has not to be in every one, but please consider that as well as a regular part of this process.

RAM MOHAN: Why don't we work on that.

GORAN MARBY: Would it be appropriate for me to comment as well, as I'm Goran?

[Laughter]

OSCAR ROBLES: Yes. Sorry.

GORAN MARBY:	First of all, it's quite okay to call me Goran and not the CEO. It is more natural to me. I think -- this is something we discussed a lot together with the Board. Also before the Board wanted me and I wanted you because this is one of the areas that I really want to be, you know, sure of what I'm getting into.
	I said yesterday during my speech that I -- I see my role is to implement your policies, and that's the only statement I've done so far. But it's a very important statement because it actually comes from the Board and through me. (indiscernible) to be able to do this (indiscernible) --- in the job description I have to understand your needs (indiscernible). We haven't worked out the details, but believe me, I've got to spend time with you and I have several questions and I will try (indiscernible) as fast as possible. But that is the priority of my introduction. --- that's something we have to discuss as we go along. But that's the whole intent of (indiscernible). I hope that answers your question.
OSCAR ROBLES:	Very good. Thank you. Okay. Anyone else on this point? All right. So you think that we can move on to the next one.
	(Off microphone).

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you.

 (Off microphone).

OSCAR ROBLES: Good. I think that actually helps that you have your actual understanding of this need. That's the beginning, and I think that we could do something better for this (indiscernible). Thank you.

(Off microphone).

OSCAR ROBLES: You will.

GORAN MARBY: I don't see that as criticism. I see you helping me to improve in the future. That's the way I see it. I will never see it as criticism. I will see it a way as improving (indiscernible).

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you. You will have that. Okay. So the next topic in our agenda, you send us one concern, the ICANN Board share one concern about the ASO appointees to the Board. Do you want to further explain your concern? I don't know who wants to talk on this from the ICANN Board. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks. Let's get -- did we send you this question? I don't recall that we did.

OSCAR ROBLES: Here is the -- what you sent us.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: What are the gaps or other considerations on the Board for the ASO to consider? I thought that was a question from you to us.

It is.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: It is. Okay, cool. If that's okay, I'll address that. Good morning, everybody. Chris Disspain.

I think the answer is in essence it's not -- it's not the role of the supporting organizations or the ALAC to fill gaps on the board. It's the role of the supporting organizations and the ALAC to appoint people that they want to have on the board. It's a -- the nominating committee has a different role.   The nominating committee has -- gets the input from us that says look, we might need this gap to be filled, et cetera.   And the nominating committee also has the role of balancing the board after what

the supporting organizations and the ALAC have actually done. So it's the nominating committee that plays that role.

So other than the fact that it would obviously be useful to have somebody representing the ASO on the board who has corporate experience in the sense that it's great if you can put somebody on the board that has corporate experience, and that's not a requirement, that's just kind of an overarching thing, it's entirely a matter for you. And you can decide whoever you want to put on the board. Does that answer the question?

OSCAR ROBLES: That answers for me, but I'm not sure if someone else wants to add or to further elaborate. No? Paul?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, Paul.

PAUL WILSON: There was a question from ICANN, I understood, early on about -- in the preparation for this meeting about what the ASO is doing or how the ASO is contributing to ICANN diversity.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, that's ICANN diversity. I don't think that was intended to be a pointed question about dealing with diversity with your board appointment.

PAUL WILSON: Okay, thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If you decide that that's what you want your overarching thing to be, that's entirely a matter for you. Okay? Thanks.

OSCAR ROBLES: It's okay for me. Okay. Good.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I wanted to be more specific than Chris. When he said corporate experience, I think he also meant corporate government experience.

OSCAR ROBLES: Okay. Yep. Thank you, Rinalia. Well, we have something else on the agenda, but I'm not sure if we were able to send the -- the PowerPoint. Did we?

                       Yes.

OSCAR ROBLES: Okay. Excellent. We have a last topic on the agenda, that's the ASO policy update. As you know, there are no global policies on track, but we have regional policies. So I assume that's you present it? Excellent. So Nurani as the -- representing the ASO address council will give us this update.

NURANI NIMPUNO: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. I apologize for my croaky voice. Thank you. So I'm not wearing my CRISP hat here but my ASO AC hat. And I'm just going to give a quick update on the different policy proposals that are currently under development, and I'll also give a very short update on the ICANN Board selection.

 So as most of you know, the policy development for -- in the RIR regions take place in a -- on a regional basis, so we don't have policies developed by the ASO AC. All these policies are developed regionally in each RIR community. And they also -- they're also applied in each RIR community.

 This is a very, very small text. But it gives a very quick overview of all the -- a snapshot of the proposals on the table at the moment.

So currently there are 25 proposals in various states under discussion at the five RIRs. So each RIR, as you know, have different policy development processes, but in essence it means that discussions get raised by anyone in the community and discussed in the community and then it goes through an approval process. And there are currently 12 proposals under discussion in all five RIR regions. Two of those in a very last call. And seven are ratified, so that means that they're basically approved and they're about to be implemented.

And just looking at the type of proposals on the table, unsurprisingly most of them apply to IPv4, IPv6, and ASNs. So that basically means discussions about, for example, sizes, server allocations made, specific criteria for the allocations, and details like that. There are also discussions about how these are registered in the database and there are also nine proposals talking about transfers. So that can be transfers within a region, but there's also discussions about transfers between regions.

So several proposals have been discussed to adjust the policy for the use of the last /8 reserve address pool. This is basically based on experience gained from their use. And like I said, there are many proposals discussed about the criteria, reducing the criteria for transfers, et cetera. It says that only AfriNIC still has a free IPv4 pool, and that is true in the sense that they only have a free pool from the -- from the final /8s given, but all the RIRs also

recently reached a /15, some contiguous, some discontiguous, that come from the recovered IANA pool. So those have been redistributed into the RIR address pools for further distribution within their communities.

This is just an overview where you can find all of the proposals. All the proposals are publicly published, publicly available, and you can see all of them on the various RIR Web sites.

So as there are five communities globally, about 14 meetings held yearly around the world and they're open to everyone. You can attend it in person and through remote participation. And we have a standing invitation, of course, to all the -- to the whole ICANN community and, of course, also to the ICANN Board. We would like to invite you all to come and participate and see how policy development takes place in action in all these meetings. For those of you who have not attended one of these meetings, I strongly urge you to come and participate and learn and engage.

And just a final update. As you all are aware, the ASO AC seat 9 was filled by Ron da Silva, and we are now also in the process of filling seat 10, replacing Kuo-Wei Wu, and that process is underway. And that was a very brief update. So any questions on that?

OSCAR ROBLES: Excellent. Thank you, Nurani. If there's nothing else. Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Let me stir the pot here a little bit. So we get drawn into discussions from time to time about what will it take to facilitate the adoption of IPv6. Clearly the focus on the shortage or on the scarcity of IPv4 addresses is intimately related to what the dynamics are of IPv6. From where I sit, it's kind of a shared problem, not owned necessarily by any single party, definitely not owned by ICANN, but that we're all subjected to it. One of the things that I found a little bit awkward over a long period of time is getting a holistic picture of what the dynamics are on the IPv6 adoption process. It's -- it's partly at ISPs, it's partly at enterprises, it's partly at the vendors. It's a distributed problem with a lot of moving parts. And quite obviously the RIRs have a key role, but there's a limit to what any single group or segment can do.

What is your posture with respect to the IPv6 adoption process?

OSCAR ROBLES: Anyone would like to answer Steve's question? John.

JOHN CURRAN: Sure. So each RIR has its own approach. In the ARIN region we have informed the community that the IPv4 free pool for our region is running out. In fact, we did that for several years, and then September 2015 it ran out. We've encouraged all of our customers to obtain IPv6 blocks and provide services over IPv6.

We've actually had quite a bit of success in the ARIN region, particularly among the mobile and the broadband operators. We see statistics for the region show about 25% of the end users accessing dual homesites like Google are accessing over IPv6, and that's up from 10% just a year and a half ago and 5% a few years before that. So it's a pretty aggressive growth rate. The mobile operators have realized that there's no practical way to keep IPv4 going without stacking layers and layers of map, which is unattractive.

So all of our services are dual homed, IPv4 and IPv6, meaning ARIN, we encourage customers to make use of v6. Occasionally we get customers who indicate that they're not using IPv6 because their DNS provider doesn't support it.   And that's caused us to come to the Board, I don't know, last few years, asking what ICANN's posture is with respect to IPv6 support, both in terms of the DNS server being reachable over IPv4 and IPv6 as well as the DNS services supporting both A records and AAAA records.

OSCAR ROBLES: I may answer by the LACNIC side. We announced from this week -- I mean last week, we publicize a research -- a ten-month research with the Bank of Development in Latin America that deals with the ten countries' success cases on IPv6 deployment. And we have now relevant information in a specific index created for this region to understand the IPv6 adoption rate and the concerns and the things that are stopping the proper deployment.

So that's what we have at this moment. Once we are able to analyze that information, we will be ready to start strategies to improve that adoption.

Anyway, we have a few cases like Ecuador, Peru, Brazil, Trinidad, Tobago actually that are doing very good in terms of IPv6 deployment in the users content and some other indicaters. Izumi, you wanted to say something?

IZUMI OKUTANI: Yes, I'd like to comment not with the CRISP team hat but as a member of the number resources community. I'd like to point out that I think the level of awareness by the number resources community, the operational community, on the need of IPv6 adoption is quite high. But the issue is awareness outside those,

for example, corporate networks, maybe awareness level on the national level. And one of the things that RIRs actually did last year was they were very proactively in contributing to the best practices forum for IGF 2016 on encouraging IPv6 adoption, what would be the environment that would actually nurture IPv6 adoption. And that's intended to target non-technical people, government, private sectors so it's something that we hopefully can reach out to including some of the corporations who attend ICANN meetings.

STEVE CROCKER: Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah, thank you very much. I think this IPv6 question is an important one and to add on to what Steve just mentioned is that at ICANN, the staff is working to kind of frame ICANN's position on that and come up with a thing we can do, especially building up on what the RIRs have already done and incorporating where needed because we think that it is an issue that is important for all of us. And the more we work together, the more we can reach out to people -- to a group of people that are outside of our closed circle of ICANN.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you.

I think we should finish for a matter of time.

Steve, do you want to say some final remarks?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you. Thank you for your time and for having this -- for giving us this opportunity to keep this dialogue.

STEVE CROCKER: So I wasn't actually trying to be facetious, but I was trying to be terse. But thank you, all. And as I said at the beginning, we look forward to these. I think we have actually dived into at least a couple of points that were of concern and that there will be some adjustments and some progress on. So it's a useful meeting.

OSCAR ROBLES: Great.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]