LONDON – Transition of NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Functions
Thursday, June 26, 2014 – 13:30 to 15:30
ICANN – London, England

JARI ARKKO: Okay. I think we're going to get started. So welcome all to this session on transition of the NTIA stewardship role of the IANA functions. I think it's an exciting topic. It's a very important topic, and happy to see you here and also people at the remote hubs.

And we've been discussing this for -- you know, for real for a couple of months now and I think we're now at a stage where we actually are going to get to the real work, and the communities have to get going and have to define what they actually want. You know, the ICANN community -- you all -- the RIR communities, the IETF community, and so forth.

So we are going to have to get to work, and I'm thinking that this is a situation where we can take off our jackets and roll up our sleeves and actually start doing something.

So here we go.

[Applause]

Yeah, and I promise that we're not undressing anymore.

[Laughter]

So the kinds of topics that we're talking about today include the organization of the processes for the communities to run this thing.

How will IETF and other communities define what they want out of the transition.

And we also have to talk about the coordination. So you've heard about the coordination group, so how do we, the community, expect that coordination group to actually work.

So these are examples of two kinds of things that we're going to talk about here.

But really, most of the time is reserved for you guys to make questions and comments and tell us how you would like this thing to go forward.

We have an agenda, so Patrik and I are going to do a very short intro here and then we're going to open it up for a couple of brief talks from a few people on selected topics that we thought were important in order to get us all on the same page, and then after that, we're going to do an open microphone with all of you, as well as the remote hubs, and then we're going to conclude with some next steps. And do you want to say anything additional about the agenda, Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes. We should introduce ourselves.

Patrik Faltstrom. I'm chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee here at ICANN, and apart from of course telling us up here, it's important that we all tell each other what we think about the forward movement and to really be constructive.

We do know that we have diverse views. We do know that we have different ideas on how to move forward. But we have to show and

demonstrate that we can work together and be constructive and accept and acknowledge that we have different views on how to do it.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. And my name is Jari Arkko. I'm chair of the IETF. My day job is with Ericsson. I'm based in Finland.

So with that, I'm going to leave it to Patrik to continue a little bit of the background and introduction.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So this magic button clicker is the magic token.

So a little bit of background.

This is some background information from Jari and myself. A personal view. Of course completely disagree or have different views. If you were doing these background information, of course it would have been completely different, but we still wanted to do some kind of background, just to trigger some -- a little bit of discussion here.

We have been looking a little bit, of course, from a technical point of view -- chair of the IETF, chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee -- what does the IANA function imply, and one of the most important messages here that we cannot forget is that IANA function is not only about domain names. The IANA function is about many other things as well.

If it is the -- one could -- one of the different ways of looking at the IANA function, one can talk about protocols, names, and numbers.

It's also the case that one can look at -- for each one of these families of things that the IANA function contains, one can divide it sort of in policy, oversight, and implementation.

And for each one of them, these various roles in each one of the columns might be more or less separated from each other.

Sometimes the boundaries between the various boxes are more blurry. In some cases, the boundaries between the boxes must be, by definition, extremely clear so it's possible to audit and possible to see whether whoever is on each side of the box is actually doing whatever they are supposed to do and not more.

So this is one way of talking about protocol, numbers, and names: Policy, oversight and implementation.

I'm not saying -- Jari and myself are not saying that this is a scheme that should be used, but we both sort of think that to be able to -- we need to sort of untangle the whole complicated discussion a little bit more than what we have been doing so far today, but to be constructive and move forward.

In this coordination group, we have multiple communities which are participating, and this is something that is part of the process that ICANN was asked by NTIA to convene, so this is one of the reasons why you see around this table Jari and myself, we did choose to ask each one of the 13 groups to basically just give -- take one person and put them around this table.

This doesn't mean that the person sitting here is or will be the person represent- -- one of the persons representing the group, in the case that

the group has more than one seat, to a point. We only asked very quickly yesterday, and in some cases today in the morning whether the person would -- whether they would --

We would like to have at least one person from each group, because when we have the discussion, instead of just running up to the microphone from the various groups, why not have a person here on the table that could participate.

But in the later discussion we have with the microphone, the people around this table have the same weight in our priorities for moderation as you by the microphones. So to some degree, they are sitting around here just to make our moderation of this session a little bit easier.

So where are we?

Yet another picture which is sort of one way of looking at the problem, we have this morning been talking about ICANN accountability. We are now talking about IANA transition. Some people think that ICANN improvement is part of either the accountability or the transition sort of processes.

Personally, I think that maybe there might be some ICANN improvement that should be talked about separately. Probably just because I'm chair of SSAC, which is so entangled in the ICANN processes.

But today, we have to try to focus on this part.

So today, one way of moving forward is to try to be constructive and talk about the IANA from a perspective of moving the IANA transition discussions forward, but as you see on this diagram, it overlaps with

accountability and improvement processes, and of course those kind of issues, we expect those to be brought up today, this afternoon, as well.

But it's still sort of down there that we're trying -- that we should try to -- try to focus.

So the next steps is that the various communities should develop their transition plans using their own processes, so a lot of -- a lot of the discussion is, and is expected to, I presume, happen within each one of the various communities which are now going to -- have to work really, really hard to get their views together on how to move forward.

The coordination group participants are to be selected no later than July 2nd. The first meeting is in July 17 to 18, and in that meeting, we'll see they decide what they're going to talk about, but I presume they will talk quite a lot about, for example, when the next meeting is going to be and what the processes will be and how they themselves are going to live up to all the requirements on transparency and accountability for the group itself.

So for example, one thing that could be discussed today that sort of is close to accountability is to give me some inputs and ideas on how to actually be able to bootstrap this process.

Later events include submission of component plans, more coordination, analysis, validation, iteration, and lots of talks and not much sleep, I presume.

At the end of the day, some submission to NTIA and hopefully everything goes well.

But this is not the first time we're doing this.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. So I thought we would make a couple of points, sort of learning so far.

Now, if we think about this process, we're 3 1/2 months into it, or something like that, and of course we've been doing some improvements in the IANA system also in previous years, and I think it would be useful just to look very briefly on kinds of things that we think we may have learned from this -- these processes and we can adjust the future processes based on those learnings. We still have 15 months to go until September 2015.

So just a couple of the things that we saw with Patrik.

So obviously the world has a lot of enthusiasm for this topic. Everyone is very excited about it. That's great. But it's also to the level that we keep surprising ourselves with the size of the interested community, and so you will see that happening, all kinds of discussions where we have some kind of group that, "Oh, but you didn't include those and those people," and then we end up including them and sort of understanding that this will happen on such a broadly interesting topic is kind of important.

I also feel that we've been sort of, in some cases, being focused a little bit on what is the -- on who is on the table rather than what is on the table, so let's not focus so much on the process and the persons, but rather how do we actually do this and what the substance is.

The other thing is that developing consensus cannot be done by the clock, so even if we, you know, set a time line that in two weeks we must do something, then it's not going to be very helpful unless we actually get the community to agree, because that -- an agreement is actually one of the requirements from the NTIA.

And we have to be done by -- or we'd like to be done by September 2015.

And, you know, to get there, that probably means there's going to be intermediate steps. My personal guess is that somewhere at the end of this year, the communities have to deliver a proposal forward in order for those to be -- you know, fit together and revised and iterated.

And some of the communities, of course, have different expectations on how consensus can be reached in their own -- own part.

But the positive thing I also wanted to mention is that this isn't really rocket science. We can do this. You can do this. And in some instances, it has already been done.

I'll just give you one example what we do at the IETF, and I think it's -- lots is similar at the RIRs.

So over the last 15 years, the stewardship of the NTIA basically has been that they've left us alone. Or not alone, but they allowed the communities to grow and develop processes. And the things that we've done is that we established contracts between parties, we defined roles in RFCs, we created boards that have responsibilities. So in our case, for instance, we have -- the IETF has a contract or MoU with ICANN/IANA

and the operations going on around IANA are governed by the contract, then, and other documents that dictate what the roles are.

And if there's an issue on either side, you know, we have ways to escalate those issues and deal with that.

It's just standard business practice, basically.

We have IAB to provide us oversight of this business, and if we ourselves screw up somewhere in -- either in the IAB or the IETF, we have processes to deal with that as well. We have NomCom and recall and appeals and all of that.

So we think we are, you know, 95% of the way there already. We might take this as an opportunity to improve, but -- but I think we're close to it already.

So don't think that this is impossible and we can't ever reach a level where this transition can actually happen. We can do this.

So let's get to the other talks. So what we're going to be talking about here is a little bit of community versus coordination group. You know, what are their roles. We can talk about how to engage participants outside the traditional ICANN, IETF, RIR people.

We're going to talk about what success looks like.

We are going to talk about the relationship of the work on accountability and this work.

And we have Alissa Cooper, Heather Dryden, Marilia Maciel, Olof Kolkman, and Becky Burr to help us introduce those topics briefly.

So with that, I'm going to hand it over to Alissa.

We have a slide issue.

Can we get the different version of the slides or the correct version of the slides up, please? And should we perhaps go to a different speaker in the meanwhile or...

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So while we are changing the slides to make sure that Alissa's slides are available, we'll go -- we'll ask Heather Dryden to talk.

[Laughter]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. Everyone is doing it the way they want. This is like we're changing processes and some with input and we're not -- Jari and myself are definitely not the ones deciding. Everyone should feel comfortable.

Please, Heather.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. Okay. All right. So I'll just leap straight in.

Obviously, the particular angle that I have on the issue of engaging ICANN and beyond is from the perspective of a government.

So on the one hand, the Governmental Advisory Committee has done some thinking about this and has some things to say in the communique about the GAC's participation via the coordination group. And here I will remind you that we have 141 governments in the GAC and 31

observer organizations, including various intergovernmental organizations that are also there to provide some sort of regional or expert perspective on the issues that come in front of the GAC.

So what we'll be seeking is to have five people participating in the coordination group. I see the proposal is for two, but two is a difficult number for us in the GAC, and so what we would like to do is have the chair of the GAC plus four participants from the GAC membership come forward and participate, also involving the vice chairs in that kind of group at least internally within the GAC.

And there's a high expectation about the ability of that group to be sharing information and coordinating across the entire GAC.

It is sensitive when governments are put in the position of having another government speak for them, and so for that reason, we have wanted to expand out our numbers, but also be very clear that we understand that this is a coordination group and that there will be that opportunity for the GAC to contribute fully and develop GAC views wherever possible on these issues.

And so in selecting the members, we will also be thinking about diversity, and that means, of course, geographic, gender, linguistic, and of course diversity of views.

So that's the GAC, and some -- in some ways, governments exist both inside and outside of ICANN. So that is an important avenue, I think, for developing the work and coming out with a proposal.

There is also a clear expectation that the GAC would have the opportunity to comment on the proposal before it reaches a -- the point of -- of public comment.

So -- so that's a short sense of where the GAC fits in.

In terms of getting out beyond even the GAC, because we don't have all governments currently represented in the GAC and we're certainly open to -- to adding more to our numbers, we do think it would be beneficial for the coordinating group to create some kind of facility that allows external, non-GAC members or organizations that deal with governments, to provide input as well into the process.

And none of this precludes individual governments at any time making comments, and some have already, to the process that has been open for the coordination group and the development of a process to develop the proposal. So thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Thank you very much. And I would like to hand over to Marilia Maciel.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much very much, Patrik. I just would like to propose some points for discussion, particularly on the topic of how to involve a broader community outside ICANN in these debates. I think that one very important thing to keep in mind is that the topic of change is -- of the stewardship of the IANA functions have mobilized the attention of the community for a long time and some of us have been waiting for changes to take place for many years now.

Of course we are hoping for changes that will take place in a responsible manner, but also changes that will help to bring more balance and better governance to the functions.

And so ICANN and the coordination committee have a role to build the proposal for change, but that topic does not have an honor. The topic is owned by the community as a whole and it's very important to keep this in mind throughout the process.

ICANN constituencies will be called, in a short time, to choose the components of the coordination committee, so one of the questions that I'd like to propose to you, if you think it's relevant, is: What are our expectations regarding this group? And this would translate into: What are we looking for when we choose representatives for this group?

The NCSG spends quite some time discussing what are the characteristics that we are looking for in our representative, and I think it's very important that each constituency does the same and that these representatives pay respect to the communities outside ICANN that have been discussing this topic for a long time and that have been through great pains to keep this topic into the agenda. And the fact that it has remained on the agenda since WSIS -- so at least for 10 years but of course for more time -- is what allows us to be discussing this topic here today.

Another thing that we should discuss is what real inclusion really means.

Of course we say many times that the process is going to be open, but openness is a passive attitude towards the process. "If people are interested, they will come to us and they will give their opinion."

But given the relevance of this topic, I think that an openness and passive attitude is not good enough. We can and we should do better.

So we should do outreach to outside communities, and one of the things that we should discuss is how to do this outreach, how to provide information and awareness even to reach out to communities in developing countries that have not been aware of how the functions have been administered before and that, after the transition process, will become more involved even in ICANN on a daily basis.

How to use the transition process as a moment for outreach and for bringing communities and countries and regions that have not been involved in Internet governance. We should think about it.

Maybe some structures that we have here in ICANN could be starting points to do outreach, for instance. We have created the CCWG, the cross-community working group, on Internet governance. Should this cross-community working group have a role in the process of outreach? I know we have some members here. Maybe they can chime into this point.

We have the IGF coming up. Maybe it is an opportunity to reach out to communities outside ICANN now in Istanbul. And we need a consultative plan for that. This is another opportunity.

And we have NETmundial documents. We know that many of the contributions that have been made to NETmundial were about the IANA functions and ICANN and the transition. Maybe it is an opportunity also to review what has been contributed to NETmundial.

I think another thing we should ask is what are the roles of these representatives? Are they only conveyers of the positions of their constituencies, or should they be conveyers of the positions and the principles and the suggestions that they will hear from the communities outside ICANN? I think they should not repeat what are the positions of their constituencies but to bring external views, even if these external views are not 100% aligned to what their constituencies think and propose something that is better.

People will not participate in a consultation process if they do not have a clear expectation that their views are going to be taken into account and reasonably included into the process.

So I think that -- I see the members of this group as liaisons to the outside world, of conveyers of information and of people that will merge these ideas that will come from inside and outside ICANN in order to develop a coherent proposal for the transition. And I'm sure they will have the skills to do that.

I think that this moment is a very historical one. This is a very symbolic moment. On the one hand, I think that the fact that the transition is taking place is a sign -- is an attitude that calls for dialogue. Maybe countries that have not -- or the actors that have not been participating much in ICANN on the multistakeholder standpoint, they will see this as an opportunity to engage and to dialogue but is also a great responsibility to do it right.

We have the WSIS+10 review process coming up, and it is very important that we have the multistakeholder principles strengthened by then.

This is another very good opportunity besides NETmundial, which was an opportunity that we took advantage of, to show that the multistakeholder process and the bottom-up process of consultation works. So we have the opportunity to make it right. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. And I hand over to Alissa Cooper.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm actually going to stand on the stage, even though you guys messed up my slides.

So I actually think this is really useful because I think my comments are a very good follow up to both Heather and Marilia. On April 29th, the Internet Architecture Board filed comments to ICANN about the IANA stewardship transition process. And I am here as an active IETF participant and someone who recently rotated off the IAB and, therefore, was involved in helping the IAB formulate those comments.

So I think just to level set and follow on to what Patrik spoke about in the introduction, before we can talk about how they community and the coordination group correlate to each other, I think we need to have some shared agreement about what our task actually is here.

So this is not unlike Patrik's diagram. But when we think about the IANA parameters, the fall into three categories: The protocol parameters, the number resources, and the domain names. In each of these cases, there are existing mechanisms and entities involved in the stewardship

of each particular category. And I haven't listed them all on the slide for brevity, but you can see them there.

For example, in the IETF case, the IAB exercises an oversight role over the relationship between the IETF and IANA. In each of those cases, the NTIA contract is, of course, present, the extent to which the NTIA is involved in conducting oversight obviously varies between the categories and may be fairly light or almost non-existent in some cases but it is there.

So the question is: Once the NTIA transitions away from the stewardship role, what will exist in its place? And that's what the stars are there to represent.

Now, it might be the case that what happens after the transition looks very similar or almost exactly the same as what we have now, and that's my personal hope for the protocol parameters. Or it might be the case that it looks different. But in either case, something will exist to provide the stewardship function in each of the categories.

And in the names case, there may be some more nuance -- actually, in each of these cases, there may be more nuance than what can be represented by a colorful star. But for the purposes of today, let's imagine that the stars are those pieces.

So in the end, I think what we want is a transition proposal that has the components from the three categories stitched together, has the support of the global Internet community, and can be delivered to NTIA. That's what we're shooting for here.

So how can we get there? I'm going to suggest that there's four important ways that we can accomplish this task that we have before us as the global Internet community.

When I say "we," that's who I mean. I mean the global community of people that care about IANA. It is not limited to the people up here, the people in this room, the people in the remote hubs. It is anyone really who has an interest and who is concerned about what may happen to the future of IANA.

So the first way, and the most important way that we can do this, is by conducting the work to develop the transition plan in our communities. So whether that means the protocol parameters work happening in the IETF community, the numbers work happening in the RIR communities or the names work happening in the ICANN communities, the place that the substance of this work needs to happen is out there in the world, in these places where in many cases, we already have really well-defined mechanisms for generating just this sort of output.

So in the IETF case, we know -- we know how to do this. We write a draft. Someone writes a draft. Anybody can write a draft proposing, "This is what I think the way forward should be." We have open mailing lists and consultation where anyone can provide edits, provide their ideas, provide improvements. We iterate, iterate, iterate. Eventually we come to a mature place where we can have a consensus call or a series of consensus calls to determine if there is consensus within the IETF community to adopt the specification.

And it is same thing in the RIRs, there were well-defined processes. In ICANN, there are some well-defined processes. There may need to be

further defined processes in order to ensure there can be broad input from across the various constituencies to develop a proposal for names. But in any event, the core principle is that work happens in the communities.

With that said, we have to then kind of think about what is the role for this coordination group. And in the view of the IAB, the coordination group should really have a very lightweight function. And that function should consist of four different parts. The first one, to what was said earlier, is that the coordination group members should be in the position of increasing participation in those community processes. So getting the word out about, "This is what's happening," "This is where you can go participate," helping to facilitate people who are not accustomed to participating in the IETF or in ICANN processes or in the RIR processes, helping those people get brought into the process so that they can have their views heard. So that's the first role.

The second role is to inform each other. So as these processes move along, there's going to be progress made. It is going to be important for each of the constituent parties from the different groups to come back into the coordination group and provide status updates so that we can have essentially coordination among the various separate processes that are going to be taking place.

As a corollary to that, we think it is important for the coordination group to serve as a centralized repository where the entire world can find out what the status is and what progress has been made. So to provide a place where anyone can go find the latest version of the different constituent pieces of the plan, where they can -- links to the mailing lists

and meetings and other venues where they can participate, all that information gathered in one place so that people who aren't deeply engaged in any particular process or the other have a place where they can go to find out what's going on, what the next step is.

And, finally, the last function is to help coordinate areas of overlap. So if we go back to the communities, there's some areas of overlap between these various categories. We have special use registries. We have areas where it's going to be necessary for communication and for people to be participating in more than one of these processes. And we think the coordination group is a really great way to help facilitate that. Indeed, it is called a coordination group.

So if we think about that kind of lightweight, coordinating, informing function of the coordination group, specifying it that way means that it has no decisional authority. It doesn't actually decide on the substance itself. And we think this is really important because it really should be the communities where these things get decided and not this small group of people. An important implication of that, you know, lightweight, non -- no decisional authority aspect is that it means that it really reduces the importance of how many people are in the coordination group from any one particular constituency or the relative size of the membership from one group to the next. Because this group isn't deciding about the substance of anything. It is really just coordinating. So that's just food for thought.

The next way that we can help accomplish this task is to rely on community consensus. So, again, in the communities, we have well-established processes for how do we come to consensus. And that's

really where the decisional authority should lie, is with the communities.

The other aspect of this is that if we -- if we rely on community consensus, then each community can work on its own time within some structure of timeline, which perhaps the coordination group can be helpful in specifying. We do want to try to finish by the deadline set by NTIA. But, overall, it means that, you know, if one process is going faster or slower than the others, that's perfectly fine. If one group can come to consensus quickly and the others might take more time, that's perfectly okay. And that's another kind of benefit of disaggregating this out into the communities.

And so the final way that we can help make this happen is, you know, in the end of the process, to rely on the coordination group to stitch together these constituent parts, not to change their substance but just to assemble them so we have one proposal and not multiple proposals going to NTIA and to provide a final check that says, Hey, did we actually cover the scope of this? Did we leave anything out of what's currently included in the IANA functions contract? And did we meet those criteria that NTIA set out? And what the IAB suggested in its comments is that those two checks should rely upon rough consensus from within the coordinating group.

I won't go into too much detail about what is meant by "rough consensus" and what it means in the IETF versus in other places. One nice thing about using a rough consensus model is that it is all about the airing of objections and the determination of whether objections can be accommodated or not.

So in this case, if, you know, there's is an airing of objections, we try to address them. Again, I think the way to address them would be to send the proposals back to the communities and see if they can be addressed because that's where the substance came from. If they can't be addressed, then they can be documented and everyone will know what they were.

But, again, it is not about, you know, the number of people who declared that they were in favor or against. It is about the substance of the objections and whether we can work through the substance of the objections. Even if it is one person, ten people, 20 people, it doesn't matter. We have to figure out if we can work those out within the group.

So those are just some suggestions from the IAB about how to make this process work and how to ensure that there is broad involvement from everyone, the global community who cares about IANA. And if you want to read more, the comments are hyperlinked.

JARI ARKKO: Thank you.

[Applause]

Next, Olaf Kolkman.

OLAF KOLKMAN: I will also stand up here. My name is Olaf Kolkman. I will be with The Internet Society in about two weeks, and that is the entity which I conferred in creating this material.

Definition of criteria, what are the properties of a good outcome? That's sort of the question that I've asked myself. And if you go back to what is being asked, it is a bunch of requirements from the NTIA: Support a set of principles to which the outcome needs to comply; support and enhance the multistakeholder model; maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet DNS; meet the needs and expectation of the global customers and partners of the IANA services; and maintain the openness of the Internet.

Another thing that is clearly a requirement is that the NTIA will not accept a proposal but replaces the NTIA role with government-led or an intergovernmental organization solution. To me, these are fairly clear requirements, but I'll get back to them.

What are the recipes for a failure, a process failure? Because I cannot determine or predict what the ultimate outcome will be and the properties of these outcomes.

One of the things that will be a recipe for process failure is we lose major constituencies.

I'm not going to be very careful about who those major -- or carefully enumerate those major constituencies.

But if there is big groups of people that are unhappy whose arguments have not been addressed in the way that we've just talked about, then you probably fail.

Some of the major constituencies are mentioned by name in the NTIA requirements or document. They're probably not all of them.

If the perception is that the outcome has been imposed by X, whoever X is, whether that is ICANN, whether that is a government, whether that is one of the stakeholders, whether that's the coordination group itself, if the perception is there that the outcome has been imposed by one group, we fail.

Lack of transparency, if something pops out and we don't know where it came from, probably hooks into that perception that something has been imposed.

Not delivering. If we fail to deliver something, that's a process failure and that's a bigger process failure because that's sort of the proof that the multistakeholder process doesn't work for these kinds of things. That would be a very bad thing. I think that's something to call out and warn for. We need to deliver something.

If it is the case that we have a global consensus or a consensus around our tables that we're not ready yet or we cannot deliver, I think that is fine. But having this process not end in some way, that will be a real failure.

And, obviously, if the outcome is not accepted by the USG because we don't meet those criteria, that would be failure.

So back to those criteria. I believe that in order to make sure that when we deliver these criteria to the U.S. government, to NTIA, we should be collectively ready to also explain to the other parties in that U.S. government, unfortunately, that are in the loop like the U.S. Congress, the criteria are met well enough.

So I'm going to ask a few questions. And I think during the process, we need to have a clear understanding and a shared understanding that we meet the criteria in this way. We need to support and enhance the multistakeholder model. Are we in sync with what that means when we've been doing this?

You know, my understanding of a multistakeholder model is that it is an open process that's built around what I call rough consensus but some people say consensus, that it is bottom-up organized, developed, and prioritized; materially concerned parties have been able to set their thing. It is argument-based. It is transparent. The process is accountable. Those properties are for me multistakeholder. I find it a very difficult word normally.

And does this apply to the process or also to the outcome? To me, I have an answer. It must apply to both.

Maintain the security, stability and resiliency of the Internet DNS. All these terms are relevant, but what do they mean in the context of the IANA? If we deliver a proposal for IANA, what does it mean in context of keeping the Internet secure, stable, resilient? And very specifically, it speaks about the Internet DNS. I think we should be clear that we're also about the stability of the other things that IANA does, protocol parameters and numbers. But it's a question.

Meets the needs and expectations of the global customers and the partners of the IANA services. This is about IANA services, a very narrow group. Are we all in sync of who those parties are?

Are the customers of the policy bodies that develop policies that feed into IANA, the ICANN community, the IETF, the global user community. They are also customers of IANA. Maintain the openness of the Internet. Do we actually understand what the role of IANA is in the openness of the Internet? It's a very specific and narrow purpose. The IANA function has a very narrow purpose. Do we understand it well enough in that context? Can we define the role of IANA against that abstract notion of an open Internet? I think that these are questions that will be asked when we deliver our paper, and I think that we should be able to answer them. Not now at the onset of our process, but at the end. So let's get to work, keep these questions in the back of the mind. And with that --

JARI ARKKO: Thank you, Olaf. And next, Becky?

                        [Applause]

BECKY BURR: Although I can talk about accountability for a long time as everybody here knows, what I'm going to do is just lay out sort of the accountability issues that are at stake in the IANA transition itself in the context of the broader stewardship role that the U.S. government has played.

                        We know that there are very specific functions that ICANN performs and those are largely related to policy development and implementation. And then there's a set of tasks that are largely administrative and technical related to those functions that IANA

performs, related to allocating an assignment of the unique identifiers, root zone management, implementation of policies that have been developed in the policy body that it would be the other house of ICANN, and managing those things. And in the context of the IANA transition specifically, there are -- there are different ways in which the requirements have been set. So IETF has a contract with ICANN for the protocol parameter services, and I haven't read that contract, but presumably it sets out specific requirements for what they're going to perform and how they're going to perform it. Same with the numbering.

In the case of names, we have largely used the process, the IANA functions contracting process, to set requirements for things like automation, service levels, turn-around times, complaint handling, those kinds of things. And those have all been embodied in the contract between the Department of Commerce and ICANN for the IANA functions.

When we talk about transitioning accountability with respect to those functions, what we're talking about is, what replaces the contractual obligations for service levels. How are those service levels set? Who evaluates whether those service levels are being met? And that is something that is not -- that the names organization has done through the commerce department, through the IANA functions contract. And that's a new thing that we will -- the process -- running the process is something that we will have to do now. It's not that the community has been uninvolved. In fact, the registries, the ccNSO act -- participate very actively in the development of those requirements and standards in the past. Here the question is, what is the -- what's the process that

replaces how those service levels are arrived at, how they're measured, and what happens if they're not. And for purposes of the IANA transition where it's small, that's the accountability issue that we're looking at.

The ccNSO community has said in connection with this that that's not the -- that's not the end of it, that there has been a sort of more general historic stewardship role that NTIA has played and that needs to be replaced, and that is going to be discussed in the context -- in the accountability -- the broader accountability discussion. We feel pretty strongly that those two things need to come together. But they are pretty -- pretty different. I mean, they are not -- they can be on parallel tracks. They need to come together. But justs in terms of making -- understanding what the task of the coordinating committee, the groups that feed into the coordinating committee, we have a really manageable, identifiable set of tasks that have to be parceled out and that clearly are doable.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much, Becky. So we're now going to move into the second phase of this session which is open microphones. The logistics here will be that comments and questions will be limited to two minutes, and regardless of whether whoever is speaking on the microphone is here by the table or by the two microphones that we have. We have two lines at the microphones. New topics on the microphone to your right and continue on the same topic on the microphone on your left. We will also have remote participation and also remote hubs, just like the previous session. At the table we also

now have people from a few other of these groups that are appointing people to the coordination group. And I go from the left to the people that has not been introduced so far. Paul Wilson, NRO; Jonathan Robinson, the GNSO seat from non-registry representation; Carlton Samuels ALAC; Louie Lee, ASO; Keith Drazek, gTLD registries; and Lars-Johan Liman, RSSAC.

So it's interesting that people are standing by the left mic, even though we've not introduced a topic yet. So that's pretty good.

[Laughter]

Yes. No, no, I said your right and your left. So this is for new topics. This one is for continue on the same.

So if it was the case that we were running out of topics --

>>   ---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah, right. Jari and myself have some ideas up here, but let's just go on. So do we have a timer? Are you ready? Here we go. One, two, three. Two minutes.

GUY de TERAMOND: Okay. Guy de Teramond from the Costa Rica board of the top-level domain. Thank you very much for this very useful introduction. But there is a word and that's why I'm in the new micro -- new topic. In fact, it's a new word. I haven't -- new old word. I haven't heard in all those

meetings the word "trust." Totally absent from ICANN 50. I haven't heard the word "trust" in any meeting. And so let me try to give an example with IANA precisely, since I have been the national interface of IANA for the last 25 years. That means most of the history. And I have seen this organization grow from very simple zone file keeping to one of the most sophisticated organization and operations in the world. So this is -- this is really not a joke. And why trust? Because it is the keeper of the root domain system. So this is why the Internet really functions. So that's why it's so important. And the perfect ring bearer, because this is equivalent to being the ring bearer, was precisely the founder Jon Postel in 1988. And why it worked to perfection, because everybody in the community trusted this guy.

So this part is essential. So just to give something to go through, I have been asking people in the corridors, do you know what IANA really does? Oh, yes, it's multistakeholder and this and that transition and all this buzz words but --

[Timer sounds.]

-- very few people really know what IANA really does and that's part of the thing you must convey to all of the community. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Next.

>>   ---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: There's no one at the microphone. Next.

CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. Patrik, forgive me, I'm not going over to that mic to just make a quick response on that comment. Is that okay? The -- I was in a session where we talked about trust this week and I'll just leave it at that. I know everybody can't be in every session.

Three comments. Number one, comment was made early on that we need to get the work started. I want to point out that the work has been going on since Singapore in most every group that's involved in this. So we're not just starting now, and I think that's an important thing to realize.

With regard to the number of coordinating groups, the number of members from each group on the coordinating group for this, I don't think it matters too much except for efficiency, keeping the size limited, provided the coordination group is indeed a coordination group and not a decision-making body. And in that light, I want to totally endorse Alissa's comments in that regard, that the coordinating group should be just that. A coordinating group, not the final decision-maker. And any final decisions need to come back to the communities that are directly impacted and the broader community. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Next.

MILTON MUELLER: Yes, this is what I'm calling my reduce Fadi's blood pressure speech, but I'm wondering if he's actually here. Is he? Kind of interesting he's not. He's in the back. Good. Good. Okay, so there's been a lot of debate about the relationship between the accountability process and the IANA transition --

>>   ---

MILTON MUELLER: -- IANA transition process and I think this has been a point of big friction because some of us are saying certain things related to accountability have to happen before the IANA transition happens and it's a precondition and other people are saying no, they're interrelated but they're not really interdependent and we don't want them to be interdependent. So I think the previous discussion made clear that there are two different kinds of accountability we're talking about. One of them is the accountability of ICANN's policymaking process. You know, is there a membership? Is the board responsive to them? Is there an independent review and appeals process? And the other is the accountability gap that has been left by the elimination of the IANA contract and the NTIA role as the agent, the principal of that contract. So if we separate those two things, I think we could be able to agree that the accountability gap left by the NTIA is interdependent with the accountability process, unless this process, this IANA transition process, comes up with an adequate substitute for that kind of accountability, the IANA transition must not and should not happen.

On the other hand, if you think you're going to solve all of the accountability problems with ICANN, all of the membership issue, all of the appeals processes, the ombudsman, the this, the that, as a precondition of the IANA transition, you're crazy. Number one, it's not going to happen. And number two, that would be an unacceptable bar that would probably miss the historic opportunity to effectuate this transition.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Chris Disspain. I agree with Milton.

[Laughter]

[Applause]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thank you, Patrik. Two quick comments. I mean, for the record, Fadi made himself known to be there in the back so he is in the room and aware of the discussion and following it.

Second, I'd like to support and endorse the comment made by Chuck which followed on from Alissa's about referral back to the community from the coordination group.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Patrik. I'm Carlton Samuels, for the record. I'm from the At-Large community. And I want to answer the question specifically about what the At-Large expects. We believe in some principles, since we're just an advisory committee, and the first one is accountability as in transparency, and you need transparency for trust and confidence. Accountability mechanisms must be inclusive and accessible for redress of grievance. And the end user must be at the heart of all of these accountability processes. And it is for all of us to inure to stability, security, and openness. And then we say that we understand that there are several accountability mechanisms and processes in ICANN and we understand that the IANA function is but one small piece of it. We do not believe that it is contingent on having every accountability mechanism right before we get into the IANA transition process for accountability. So in this case, we agree with Milton.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Becky.

BECKY BURR: Well, I almost always agree with Milton. And let me just say, obviously, of course, the accountability that is sort of built in and fundamental to the IANA functions itself must be in place. Those structures must be in place for the transition to happen. I think that's quite doable. Will we

have achieved perfect accountability overall by the time this process takes place? No. Can we make significant progress and have the community feel assured that we are on the road to true accountability overall when the transition takes place? Yes.

So I do not think that we should be using the word, you know, "prerequisite," all of those things that make things sound like it's being used to stop the transition. However, there -- from what I read from this group, there is a strong feeling that there must be meaningful progress on the general accountability issue at the time the transition takes place. I also read this room and everybody I've talked to as being deeply committed to making sure that that happens.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Alissa.

OLAF KOLKMAN: This is not to the point that Milton brought up but my brain was working a little bit slow. So I'm going to go a few speakers back. The gentleman who said we're not talking about trust. Yeah, that was you. I think we are. I think that one of the criteria, the principles that is mentioned in the -- in the set of requirements, is a secure, stable, and resilient Internet DNS. Security, stability, and resiliency are ingredients to trust. They're not the absolute set of ingredients. You need a little bit of salt and pepper to it, but they're very important ingredients. So in that question of what does this mean in the context of IANA, you just gave an important part of that answer. Trust. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Next topic.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Good afternoon, my name is Bertrand de la Chapelle. Continuing on the line of what I said this morning regarding accountability, correctly framing issues is very important. In the case of NTIA transition, we need to make a clear distinction -- I know this will be the case but I want to insist upon it -- between one dimension, which is the day-to-day clerical function of validation in the work flow, and in that regard I do not personally care -- were there three seconds? I don't personally care whether it's Vernita Harris or Kim Davies that actually pushes on the big red button that everybody is fantasizing about. My key question is, this discussion is really on one fundamental issue which is, where does the authority to manage this function come from. It was by default given by the NTIA. Now we're confronted with the fundamental question which is, how do we formulate in documents who has the mandate to give the responsibility to one particular organization to define --

[Timer sounds.]

-- the SLA requirements and to potentially rescind this authority in due time. I think it's very important to understand that this is the main and most challenging issue.

The second element regarding the coordination group, whatever we want to do -- and I wholeheartedly support what both Alissa and Olaf have been saying -- this coordination group will have an important role of corralling information, trying to help the drafting process. And this is good because I want to highlight one personal criteria that I use on any

kind of subgroup that is dealing with an issue. My sub -- my criteria is not whether you are representing me. My criteria is when I look at the group, is there -- yeah, but it started -- my criteria is fundamentally, do I have the certainty that within this group there will be at least one or two people that I trust enough to convey my positions, even if they don't share it? And what I ask everybody in this room is to have this criteria. Not whether their particular interest is represented. Is there anybody, at least one or two people in this group, that will -- they will have the trust that they will convey their position. Because this is the real condition. Whether it's drafting group or not is not the matter.

And finally, I'm extremely happy to see that because of this exercise the values of the IETF and the IAB are beginning to percolate a little bit more in the decision-making process of this organization.

JARI ARKKO: Thank you. I think next we can go to a remote hub. I believe we have a comment.

BRAD WHITE: Correct, Jari. We've got a question in the queue or a comment in the queue from the Internet Society's video hub in Yaounde, Cameroon.

REMOTE HUB: Good morning. I am (saying name) from ISOC Cameroon. I will speak in French. Thank you.

Good morning, everyone. As you can see -- excuse me. We do not have very good audio quality so I cannot get you very clearly.

I would like to make a comment because we had no opportunity to reaffirm our position, our local position, from Cameroon. So -- so we have -- we want to state our view, our position, regarding the different processes. That is, we believe that the open and multilateral process or multistakeholder process is very important for the Internet.

In Cameroon, we believe that this process is a true opportunity to strengthen the multistakeholder model. Specifically, this is about international governance and a model of this type, they -- both are fundamental pillars of the Internet. And we believe that this should be less regulated by states, as is our case within the African context. This has to be a collaborative model.

The fact that we have -- or that communities are able to choose their representatives, in my view, is something positive in terms of representation.

Also, the fact that ccTLD operators are also integrated, knowing that in Africa they are the governments -- or they are the spokespersons for the government, indeed.

Our chapter, as a member of the Internet Society, and in our capacity as an at-large structure within the Internet, well, we want to congratulate you on the very important participation of the Internet Society in this working group, and in terms of visibility, we want to say that we are willing to contribute and we will be -- have -- or we will have better tools in order to make our input and contribution.

Greetings from Yaounde, and have a successful meeting. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: I believe we have another comment from a remote participant that you'll be reading, Brad?

BRAD WHITE: Correct. We've got a comment from Martin Silva from Argentina.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Does the future contract between IANA and the future operator, does that mean it's going to be identical to the same that NTIA has now?

JARI ARKKO: Does anyone on the panel want to respond to that?

BECKY BURR: I think that's entirely up to the groups that are providing the feedback to the coordination committee, and I think as people have said, there may be three different kinds of arrangements. There's not necessarily one size fits all. So there's no requirement that we read that it be exactly the same.

JARI ARKKO: Right. And if I can just quickly comment from the IETF perspective, I think our model is that there may be some useful things in the existing contract with NTIA that we want to transfer to our RFCs, unless they have already been transferred and that's the question of whether we actually have some misses currently or not. We're working on that.

                               Next comment?

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. John Laprise. So my name is John Laprise. I'm speaking as a member of academia. I'm a professor at Northwestern University. And this is my first ICANN but I'm not a stranger to Internet governance or, for that matter, to U.S. Internet strategy, and I'd like to sort of go on on a few points that Olaf raised to -- specifically with respect to the risks we run in this process, because I think Olaf's contribution is very, very important.

A close reading of the NTIA transition announcement reveals that ICANN is part of the process specifically because the NTIA perceives it to be uniquely positioned. There's no guarantee that ICANN will continue to be perceived this way, especially if the NTIA begins to hear substantive comments.

Secondly, while the GAC has a special role in the advisory structure of ICANN, increasing its representation voice in the transition plan may be perceived by the NTIA as a violation of the nongovernmental establishment clause, potentially diminishing the likelihood of the transition plan's acceptance.

Third, the rhetoric of speed that I've heard at -- here at ICANN a lot, based on U.S. domestic political considerations, is false.

As it currently stands, it's all but a certainty that after the plan is delivered to the NTIA, it's going to be reviewed by a whole slew of governmental agencies, which means that in all likelihood, any decision is going to come after the next elections, which is the fear of many people.

So this rushed time line is not essentially a critical issue.

Finally, the NTIA is the final gatekeeper for this plan and it strikes me that the coordinating group would behoove itself to establish strong lines of -- open lines of communication with the NTIA on an ongoing basis to make sure that the things that they're talking about are in line with NTIA expectations, either voiced or unvoiced. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Thank you. Becky?

BECKY BURR: I'm sure somebody from NTIA is in the room, but if I can speak for them, I take them at their word when they say they want something that is the product of a multistakeholder process and that has support from the -- has wide support.

I do not read them as implying that there are conditions beyond those conditions that they have clearly laid out, and I think that part of the accountability process as a whole will be to ensure the -- that there are -- that there is a robust accountability structure in place so that ICANN continues to remain uniquely positioned and to ensure that this remains a multistakeholder rather than an intergovernmental process.

But I, for one, am going to take NTIA at their word because everything I've heard from them is that they -- they don't have a prescribed outcome.

JARI ARKKO: And Heather, did you want to comment?

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you.   Since you mentioned the Governmental Advisory Committee I just wanted to say that the work that's been underway this week to find a way to participate in and contribute to the coordination group and organize ourselves internally and come to an understanding about how we're going to do that is all, I think, very positive and needs to be viewed that way, and -- and since the GAC is very much a part of the multistakeholder process at ICANN, I hope that that offers some kind of assurances about the GAC really taking seriously this opportunity and thinking about how to engage within what's been proposed for moving forward.

So thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Thanks. Next?

JIAN CHANG: Hello. This is Jian Chang from (indiscernible) but speaking on behalf of Chinese Internet community.

Two comments.   One is that we notice that ICANN has urged each community to take into consideration the principles of diversity and regional balance when choosing the representatives to the coordination group.   We well kind of highly appreciate this stand but so far the selection process seems not quite transparent or clear to guarantee that

result, so we wish that historically underrepresented parties could have more opportunities to voice their concerns in the whole process.

The second one is that in the meantime, we notice that ICANN play such an important role in the IANA transition, so a sound accountability mechanism will be needed to ensure ICANN function properly and account for all IANA customer and affected parties.

We noted that ICANN has decided to conducting these two important things in separate and parallel way, but it seems hard for us to say how to separate this one task from another one, so we just suggest that that may be conducted in an integrated way. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Thank you. And I guess what Milton spoke about earlier about, you know, separating the two types of accountability, that might actually be a useful way of thinking about that and addressing your concern.

Marilia?

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you. I think that's a very important comment because in ICANN we have -- we do have underrepresented regions and we do have underrepresented interests.

For instance, the noncommercial interest accounts only for one-quarter of the GNSO. So I think that we need to really think how to correct these imbalances. Maybe this is something we should think about in a consultation process. How to empower and enhance voices that are not sufficiently represented here, and maybe it will be natural and maybe

inevitable that these interests will be underrepresented in the coordination group as well.

So how can we correct these imbalances.

JARI ARKKO: Thank you. Next?

Y.J. PARK: Y.J. Park. I've been involved with ICANN since 1999, and -- but currently I am involved with at-large as a member of APRALO.

Actually, I echo what was just said by the previous speaker from Chinese Internet community but also I chime with Marilia and also the trust issues brought by Bertrand, because Jari was kind of like highlighting this is more substance rather than process issues, but as we talked before, this morning, this transition issue is closely correlated with accountability. As we're talking about the accountability, the proper representation in all those processes are all critical issues.

So I wanted to remind us that we only have three working days before our, you know, final selection process, and also, as one of the earlier participants, I wanted to remind all of the people here who happens to be in Berlin at the 1999 meeting when we, the community as a whole, wanted to select the GNSO Councillors from each constituency. What happened at the end of the day? Each constituency was selecting of course the best players who have been very well known in this kind of community. They happen to be one percent from North America, one percent from Europe, and, you know, the third position was a little bit of

Asia-Pacific, or whatever, but at the end, there was no representation from specific region, so we had to go through some kind of coordination among those constituencies.

So going back to some kind of specific suggestion which Jari was asking for us, I'm going to make a very specific suggestion for this selection.

Why don't we have one person at least from, you know, one country. Well, not yet -- well, the other way around --

[Timer sounds]

-- so at least one country shouldn't send more than one representative. So at the end of the day, we will have 27 members who are coming from all different countries that can ensure more, you know, the global diversity and also they can kind of enhance the accountability of this whole discussion.

As a last sort of comment, observation of this process, many of us was in Sao Paulo at NETmundial. I was one of them. We were very excited by all those developments. And the governments were in line for the microphone.   They were willing to share their views with the community.

We don't see that kind of excitement in this meeting.   This is a very typical ICANN meeting, back to this process.

So I'm wondering what's wrong with this kind of process. What's the kind of remedy we can do with this ICANN process. I really want these panelists, who have been with ICANN process for long enough, to really consider these issues. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: And I understand we have a remote hub that is going to participate for the first time today.

BRAD WHITE: We've got a video comment from Mr. Nigel Cassimire from the Caribbean Telecommunications Union. He's going to be speaking from the video hub in Trinidad-Tobago. Mr. Cassimire, go ahead.

REMOTE HUB: Thank you very much. This is Nigel Cassimire from -- speaking from Trinidad and Tobago. I am with the Caribbean Telecommunications Union, which is an intergovernmental organization of two Antigua Caribbean states and territories which also has nongovernmental membership from the private sector and academia and from telecom regulators in the region as well. Actually, I should say ICT regulators in the region as well.

We coordinate a group called the Caribbean Internet Governance Forum which next meets in the first week of August this year, and this issue of IANA transition, in fact, is going to be an important point on our agenda.

I'm very happy to hear about outreach and understanding the process of this coordinating group and so on, but for us who are now coming into the process and for the ones who would be the subject of outreach, I think one of the things that I'm still grappling with, although I can see all the conditions that are required of what the final proposal would be

and so on, is that I haven't seen a clear scope of work for this whole process.

So we know NTIA's transitioning its stewardship, but what does that mean exactly? What does that entail? What are the functions that NTIA would be concerned get rolled into whatever new entity is being rolled out?

And I think if we have mistaken or different understandings among the persons involved in this whole process of coming up with a proposal, that is one other item we could add to the recipe for failure that I saw a presentation on this morning.

So my question and/or comment would be that we include in our information to people now coming in exactly what is the scope of work that we're talking about, what are the functions that need to be rolled into -- into this new entity --

[Timer sounds]

-- and if there's a statement that everyone agrees with that I think that would be a basic tool for success. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Next topic?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Before you put the clock on, I think the panel would respond to Y.J. Park.

No. Okay.

Christopher Wilkinson.

Thank you for very clear and excellent presentations of -- which to some extent cover well-trodden ground, but allow me just a couple of cautionary observations.

Lightweight. Lightweight is as lightweight does, and if you've got a weight limit of 23 kilos and you happen to have 25 kilos, you're no longer lightweight.

If the coordinating committee is going to deal with the overlaps, it's going to produce a single proposal and, above all, take responsibility to outreach beyond the ICANN constituencies, that is quite a tall order, especially the time and detail involved with outreach.

Somebody said it was a narrow process, and for the sake of argument, I understand and agree. But I'm quite a lot sure that there are quite a lot of people out there who don't think this is quite such a narrow process and will need convincing.

Regarding decisions, of course if everything is agreed and consensus-based, the decisions will be easy. But two observations.

First, the implication is that within the coordinating committee, there will be a certain amount of arbitration and consensus building going on.

And secondly, I hear Chuck Gomes and others about referring decisions back to the constituencies, but please be aware that if you also wish to meet the deadline, then the relationships between the coordinating committee and the constituencies will have to be very nimble.

[Timer sounds]

You will not have much time to achieve what you've set out to do. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. So I just wanted to quickly respond to the lightweight/heavyweight coordination group part of your comment.

I think there's a clear question of what is the work division between the coordination group and the communities on things on outreach and so on and so forth. I think we have to distribute that load as well. It is not that the coordination group will do everything. We at the IETF, for instance, have to do a lot of outreach on things that affect people who are affected by our -- by the things that we decide on, on our part of the transition plan. So it is not just the coordination group. I think that's a good model to distribute work, to not have a bottleneck there.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Just to follow up on that, I think the set of roles which are classified as lightweight are still a lot lighter weight than offering the proposal itself and gathering global community consensus.

So maybe its -- it's a relative lightweightness, but it is still, I think, a smaller and more easily managed set of functions than the idea that you would put the entire process on the back of the small group.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Patrik. Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Keith Drazek. I'm with VeriSign and the Registry Stakeholder Group. I may have some other comments late, but I did want to try and respond to Y.J.'s question or recommendation about geographic diversity.

I think if we look at the way this process has evolved or has been kicked off, there's been the establishment of this coordinating group. And it was decided clearly that there would be sort of structural components that would allow various customers or interest groups to have a reasonable representation. I think your point is well taken, that I don't think it specified any geographical diversity.

My concern about trying to step in at this point and implement a top-down sort of recommendation or requirement or restriction about that could potentially really delay the whole process. But I do recognize that we should be striving for geographical diversity at every opportunity. And perhaps the way we try to do that is to sort of basically say that we would very much like to see that and that it is incumbent on each one of the groups who are sending representatives to strive for geographical diversity within their group to the extent they can.

I know not everybody has multiple, but I'm just trying to find a way that we can do this in a bottom-up way to, you know, encourage folks to have geographical diversity without having to stop the process and start all over. To your point, the deadline for identifying folks, I think, is on

Wednesday. So I think it is certainly worth talking about and I am glad you brought it up. It is something worth considering.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Marilia.

MARILIA MACIEL: Just a quick comment, that I think we should take account and take advantage of existing structures. That is why I mentioned that the IGF is a very good opportunity to do outreach and that we have a cross-community working group on Internet governance that could assist the working group on that.

But I also think that multistakeholder process, they take a lot of effort. They take time if we really want to do them bottom-up. So do we want to pay the price to do it?

I think that in terms of legitimacy and inclusion, it pays off to have this extra time. People also have a lot of high expectations on NETmundial. When the executive committee, which was the committee that I was part of, presented the first draft, the community insisted that we put the draft online for consultation before NETmundial, which I think it was very positive because people had the chance to get in touch with the text and give their first feedback before they arrived in Sao Paulo. But it took us two days to go through more than 300 comments and incorporating into the text. So it takes a lot of work. It takes time. But I think it pays off. We see the result of NETmundial and how it means to us as a symbol that we can move forward with multistakeholder deliberations into the future in a very open and participatory way.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Next topic.

VITTORIO BERTOLA: Hello, Vittorio Bertola. I think that before getting into the procedural issues, if we don't want to fail, there is a fundamental question that we have to address which is whether we as a community have a shared vision of how the Internet governance resources should be managed because, I mean, who should the administration of the Internet governance resources be accountable to? And the answer in my view is the Internet, not just the government, not just the businesses, not just the NGOs or the technical people.

In short, this is why we actually have to avoid the proposals I have seen circulating to create a (indiscernible) single point of failure somewhere else.

And because -- at least for those of us who were already attending these kind of meetings almost 20 years ago, it was clear since the beginning that the answer to how can you make something accountable to the Internet as a whole was supposed to be ICANN, ICANN, since the beginning, has been conceived as a new kind of multistakeholder structure that would be able to avoid to have a single point of failure in the administration of the Internet governance resources.

So I'm a bit worried that we create a new working group which might start from the beginning 20 years later to think of a new ICANN or something like that.

But, first of all, we have to see whether this is agreed. And the other point is even if we agree that ICANN is supposed to be the model and the structure that is to take the administration of the Internet governance resources, did ICANN fulfill the promises and prerequisites that were put forward even 20 years ago?

Is ICANN enough accountable, is ICANN at a sufficient point of maturation to be able to, I mean, take the small wheels of the bike or fly off the nest, or whatever you want to say? That's the question that I think at least we in the ICANN community have to address.

That boils down to the accountability of the way the board members, I think, are selected. Originally, half of them had to be selected --

[Timer sounds.]

-- by a global vote. Now, maybe that was not the right way. But still I think we are stuck in a small circle of insiders. And we have to get off of that, and much progress has been done. But I think that's the real issue that needs to be addressed. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Becky.

BECKY BURR: The process of ICANN becoming mature enough is a process, and I think the ultimate test now is whether the community can step up to the plate and do what ICANN is giving it the opportunity to do, which is to come up with these plans, to agree on these plans and to produce them and to produce the accountability mechanisms.

So I think this as a -- it's not surprising to me that ICANN's maturation has been a process. I think it's extraordinary what we've accomplished in the time that it's been around. I think there's a really big challenge now that it's going to challenge the community in a way that we've never been challenged before. We can't just sit on the sidelines and complain about ICANN. We have to actually get up and do it.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: And I do think we have a statement -- a comment from Kiev. Is that correct, Brad?

BRAD WHITE: That's correct. We have a question from Alexander Kondaurov from Kiev.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Our side developed a memorandum on multistakeholderism based on NETmundial ideas. And we are looking forward to its support. Our media did the first stem already.

How should countries adopt the principles of NETmundial to state legislation affecting the I.T. community?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: No one interested in commenting on that? Marilia?

MARILIA MACIEL: I think that one quick comment about that, maybe it's something that we could act more directly on, is how ICANN itself can incorporate some of the principles of NETmundial. Some of these principles, I think, fall under the remit of this organization. So maybe one small thing to look into before looking into states -- of course, the document of NETmundial is non-binding. So it is actually an inspiration. It is an example. It is up to states and legislatures to take that into consideration and translate those principles and ideas into their own legislation.

We did that with net neutrality, for instance. We included it in the civil rights framework.

But something very concrete that we can do here in ICANN is how these principles and outcome documents can be implemented in our work. Maybe we had a very good starting point in this meeting with the document, the report that has been presented to us by the Council of Europe that talks about a lot of human rights issues that were discussed in NETmundial. Maybe something to forward and to take forward and discuss in the next meeting as well. Just a suggestion.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Next topic?

NURANI NIMPUNO: Hello, Nurani Nimpuno from Netnod. I would like to make three points. One is that the various communities need to own their own part of the process. So I would like to agree with some of the previous comments made that the work needs to happen in the various communities. The

EN

coordination group should be a coordination group and nothing else. We can't -- we don't want to find ourselves in a position where we construct a top-down governance structure for a bottom-up process, right? So that's my first point.

The second point is in various discussions, I've heard people discuss the criteria laid out and say, What does it mean? How do we interpret them? And does this mean that NTIA now gets to define what is bottom-up, multistakeholder, et cetera?

And I'd actually like to turn that around and say that by responding and by motivating the way we respond, we define those things. So that is an opportunity for us.

And the third point is actually that this is an opportunity. So Olaf talked about potential paths to failure because Olaf is a pragmatist. I didn't say "pessimist."

I would actually like to turn it around and say that this is an opportunity to show that these bottom-up processes, these multistakeholder, transparent bottom-up processes work.

And like Jari said, it is not rocket science. I think all the various communities have processes in place, and we have -- we have gone through processes like this in the past, and we have succeeded.

So it is not rocket science, and let's show that these processes work.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: And then we'll go to a remote hub.

BRAD WHITE: We have a comment or question from Mr. Saheb Saleme (phonetic) who is with the Islamabad-Pakistan ISOC Chapter. Mr. Saleme.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Hello, everyone. This is Saheb Saleme. I have two things to share with all of you, points of information, that our chairman's father passed away when he was actually with you attending the ICANN 50 conference. And we offered all the condolence messages sent by you.

Luckily, we have one more representation over there in the form of Fouad Bajwa. Thank you, Fouad Bajwa.

He would personally like thank Mr. Joseph de Jesus from ICANN constituency travel for the help in finding the immediate flight back home. Thank you, Joseph.

Finally, I have a comment that the IANA transition is an excellent thing to happen. And we believe it will surely be a collaborative model.

And we also wish it to be a community-led driven model rather than a governmental led. Thank you so much. Have a nice meeting over there.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Next topic.

DAVID CONRAD: Hello, I'm David Conrad. In the past life, I had a small role with IANA. In a future life, I suspect I have a slightly larger role as janitorial services at ICANN. However, I'm speaking only for myself.

[Laughter]

Speaking only for myself at this point.

Just to provide a bit of reminder, I suppose, the functions that NTIA currently performs in the context of the IANA, there are actually four of them. A lot of people sort of focus on either -- as was mentioned, the big red switch, the authorization role that NTIA performs for requests that are submitted through root zone management. That's actually probably one of the easiest roles. As far as I'm aware, NTIA just ensures that ICANN has followed its own processes prior to authorizing the change to be processed.

People have also spoken quite a bit about sort of the oversight role that's provided by the control of the contract associated with the IANA functions. That is obviously a very interesting topic to explore and many people see that as a way in which accountability can be implemented, but that is sort of a sledgehammer approach to ensuring accountability for ICANN since it's sort of a nuclear weapon kind of approach.

There are also two other functions that NTIA performs that don't get a lot of coverage. And I just want to remind the coordinating committee to take them into account. One is that NTIA actually facilitates ICANN in obtaining Office of Foreign Asset Control licenses to perform services for entities under sanction. These are both foreign nationals --

[Timer sounds.]

-- as well as countries that are under various forms of sanctioning, including U.N.-based sanctions.

Sort of the last function that NTIA performs is a role of protector. There are a lot of very large economic and national interests that hesitate to take on ICANN, I believe, directly because they know that the U.S. government is providing sort of a backing for ICANN.

If NTIA withdraws itself from the role, as they're intending to do, some mechanism will need to be ensured that all of these functions are performed and implemented in a way that allows for the folks who are actually performing the service of the IANA functions to do so in a reasonable fashion. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Jonathan?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Very brief response to one point from the previous speaker, made reference to giving input to the coordination group. And I just want to make sure that we're clear on the point that you made at the outset, that this is not the coordination group. It doesn't mean it can't go on record for the coordination group, but it is not us right now.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Becky.

BECKY BURR: David, this is in response to you. I have heard other people refer to those of us who are concerned about accountability at large talking about a nuclear approach. There are choices that we all have to make here, and one of them is not to sort of characterize people into corners. I actually think that the people who are concerned about accountability are responsibly committed not to using it as a sledgehammer. And I beg you to keep an open mind.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Next topic.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Good afternoon. Alejandro Pisanty from national University of Mexico and The Internet Society chapter in Mexico.

To belabor a little bit the bicycle without training wheels analogy, you may have the father of the child as a certified bicycle trainer. You may make sure that his license is vetted by many relevant bodies. The teachers have approved that this is the day for the child to start biking without training wheels. You may make sure that all the accountability and transparencies are already designed. If there is not a chain that connects the pedals to the wheel, that child won't learn biking. That bike won't work.

Effectiveness, robustness, resilience are the main criteria that IANA has to continue to have. And the design of the oversight or the transfer of the oversight mechanism has to respect or even privilege more that efficacy because that will be the critical point.

IANA won't die or won't be a target for takeover for not being accountably managed if it first fails to deliver results. The processes are important, but that it works is more important.

And I would urge the design of the coordination committee and this population now to take into account that there is path dependence introduced by the design of the processes as will have it.

The path dependence that I think has to be considered particularly is that it's being approached in what could become a silo approach or a supermarket approach which for each community has steward representatives that they are going to make sure that they get the level of oversight they need. And this has to be balanced against a very, very careful, very thorough risk management approach, considering the risk -- evaluating the risk of splintering the IANA, of creating a centrifugal force in the IANA that would not ---

[Timer sounds.]

And that could be okay or not. But it has to be managed. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Next topic.

PAUL WILSON: My name is Paul Wilson from APNIC, the I.P. address registry for Asia-Pacific. I'm not sure what topic we're on to. But I wanted to talk about the solution -- a solution for the transition with respect to our community.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes, let me just say that these were just suggestions. The topics are decided by you on the floor and the people speaking. So, please.

PAUL WILSON: Okay, thank you.

The thing is in our community, I'd say that the solution doesn't need to be sort of suggested or invented because it very much largely exists already. And that continuity of the way things are currently working is going to be extremely important to our community as it should be to others with respect to I.P. addressing and the IANA role because we are absolutely dedicated to the stability and security and the continuity of that service as it has been over the last 15, 20 years and on into the future.

We in forming these address supporting organizations some time ago followed the ICANN model which introduces -- which involves structural separation so it is worth bearing in mind that with respect to addresses, addressing policies come strictly from outside of ICANN through the ASO and it is implemented by ICANN within IANA. So the structural separation already exists.

The relationships that are needed, they also already exist. And those relationships define what happens between the policy formation and implementation in terms of the ASO and review. The relationships are also defined in terms of what happens between IANA and the RIRs in terms of service-level agreements and understandings between ICANN

and the NRO in the form of an exchange of letters which is a kind of mutual recognition.

We actually have these parts, and all these parts actually do involve the accountability provisions --

[Timer sounds.]

-- as well, I'd say. What I think what we want to do or need to do, in my view, is kind of a review and stock take of all of those elements in our structure to make sure they are transparent and they are understood, that they are open to review, that they are sort of, let's say, polished and made as clear as they can be, possibly adjusted, if needed.

So that's -- that's one way that we would see it. And I'd say, again, because of the continuity issue, that would be that kind of minimal but absolutely efficient approach would be the way we would want to see things going. And we certainly don't like, I think, the idea of the kind of much more radical changes, for instance, extraction of IANA out of ICANN and putting it into some other body which may be justifiable in some sense but would have a huge impact on what we do.

Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Olaf.

OLAF KOLKMAN: I think I heard that same thing from Jari from the context of the IETF and I had to think of the metaphor Alejandro used with the side wheels, and

I remember as a parent I always dreamt to run along with my children supporting them when the side wheels came off so that they wouldn't drop but what happened is the side wheels came off and I couldn't run fast enough to keep up with them. So that was the -- I think that for some parts of this whole structure there are existing relations, specifically the RIRs and also for the IETF. And stability issue there is something -- we can define this in terms of stability issue with respect to that continuity. So I agree with you. Oh, we have a debate.

PAUL WILSON: One more point which follows up on the bicycle analogy is that we would have a different view of the training wheels if we were sending our son or daughter on the bicycle into deep space. We're not doing that. We're letting them go out on the road which is an environment which has many other elements to keep our son or daughter safe. They're going to be required to wear a helmet in most places, they're going to have insurance policies for their bike, and they're going to have a lot of other support. So I think that's the other approach here, is that ICANN is not going to be sailing without it's training wheels in complete isolation from everything else. The bike gets upgraded, gets repaired, and life goes on. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So we have two more topics. One topic in the room, and then end with a remote hub from Cameroon.

EN

AKINORI MAEMURE:	My name is Akinori Maemure, JPNIC, Japan Network Information Center. I may be talking about the ensure the interest of the parties can participate in a sufficient way. Because the IANA stewardship transition issues are very important for the Internet operation, we have already started our own process to engage our community in Japan and discuss together how it should be. And we -- we had a (indiscernible) meeting in last week that's very successful, getting the 40 people participated and including the leading people in the Japan's Internet. And we -- for ensuring the informed -- informed approach of the consideration, we started with the 45 minutes lecture and then -- and then opened the -- opened the floor to the microphone. But the -- even we had 45 minutes lecture, we had a lot of various questions from the technical point, contractual point, political point, a lot of things. Then I realized that this -- this problem is really, really difficult, and if -- if we need to take the informed approach, the outreach is very, very difficult but we should do that. So that's just a tiny point. But, you know, if -- if we really need to, you know, outreach and engage the people to include them in the consideration of the --

[Timer sounds.]

-- this program, we need to have a lot of effort for that. Thank you very much.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:	And now, this is what I call collaboration. We have until 3:30 and we asked for new topics and we have exactly one topic left on the summary and I think we'll end exactly on time. Amazing. So Brad, last.

BRAD WHITE: From Ngek Augustine Chii in Yaounde, Cameroon, the hub in Yaounde, Mr. Chii.

HUB INTERVENTION: I want to ask this, what the cost of the transition to the community or to the American government? I will then pass the floor to my colleague who asks a question in French.

HUB INTERVENTION: Hello, everyone. On behalf of the community I want to express my concern that has to do with governance. Would it be possible to emulate the United Nations model without the veto power so that no one has a privilege over the others? And if any problem -- if there were any problem, we could resort to the world or international community and at that point in time a decision could be made. For instance, regarding privacy and private data. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, so I just wanted to respond to at least the first part which was about the costs, and I'm not sure I care so much personally about the cost to the American government but the cost to the community, I do care about. We all bear that cost. We travel to places, we spend a lot of time that we could also be using in other ways.

                        I think it's well spent money and time, however, if this sort of ensures the future of the Internet. It's not that we have a problem today, but I think it's a good change for the future. So in 10 or 20 years we'll be

happy that we did this -- this work. So I think the cost is okay from that perspective.

And then do you have something to say, Patrik, or should I try to finish? So I had taken a couple of notes and we -- oh, okay.

ALISSA COOPER: Really quickly. I'm not exactly sure if the sort of question about veto power or to where it was directed, but in the context of the coordination group, one note that the IAB made in its comments about the way that the group could run is that a benefit of using a rough consensus model for any decision that the group does end up deciding that it needs to take is that, it isn't really subject to that sort of capture where a single individual or small number of individuals can kind of hold up the process. Again, because it's not about the -- you know, the number of people or unanimity or anything, and it's about dealing with objections and if they can't be dealt with then, just writing them down and moving on. So if that's a concern, that sort of rough consensus model is very useful in that regard.

JARI ARKKO: Thank you, John.

MANSOUR ALQURASHI: John Curran, CEO of ARIN. Follow-up comment following Paul Wilson's remarks. We heard earlier that the IETF has actually -- in the initial slides -- has actually done some of the dealing with its stewardship responsibilities for protocols with some success, apparently. And

certainly there's more to be done and more to be looked at. But there's a feeling of there's mechanisms in place regarding IANA accountability in its performance of those tasks. And Paul Wilson identified with respect to a number of resources, there's also some responsibility, in fact, that IANA already has responsibility to the number -- the RIR communities and the organizations there and that, in fact, there are MoUs in recognition of letters that support that. And both of those, to some extent, provide a lot of the stewardship framework that's necessary for two out of the three elements we're talking about, the protocol parameters and the IP numbers. It's not lost on anyone that the policies and the policy development for those two branches are outside ICANN and ICANN provides a coordination and a registry administration role. And so it's probably worth looking at the successes and trying to figure out whether or not that helps guide us and what we need to do to get it done for all three columns. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Thank you. I think that was a good comment to end on. So I've been taking a few notes during this discussion, and I'm not sure if I got all of this right, but I just wanted to highlight a couple of things that I thought I heard from the community and, you know, with multiple people supporting a particular thing. I just want to go through, and there's four items on my list.

The first one is about the solution or the mechanism that we will need. And I heard several people, John was the last one speaking, in favor of some form of continue your learning from the past. And, you know, we can't change the engines while we're in flight. And that's probably a

good thing. Of course, we may also have to invent some new parts, but we don't have to redo the whole thing because we are changing the stewardship. So I understand that we have a running Internet that we have to keep -- keep running still during this transition. It's really, really important.

The other aspect was accountability. We talked a lot about that. Sort of the take-away from me at least was basically what Milton had said earlier during the open mic session about two different types of accountability. There's that type of accountability that relates directly to what we need for transition and then there's other kinds of improvements in ICANN regarding accountability. Now, of course, also in other organizations, and it will be important to sort of separate those two that we can actually address, you know, and be aware that we need to address the first kind. But the second kind is kind of more long term or ongoing process. And of course all of this is an ongoing process. We at the IETF for instance every year review what we do with IANA and keep making improvements. The one thing that we did this year together with ICANN, we're happy with the service, by the way, was to add an audit process that we audit the results of the operations during the year, make sure that the operation actually has matched what the policies have been set and then that is going to be available to everyone, not just the U.S. government. So that's a useful thing to do.

But indeed, accountability is critical. I think we heard that from the room, but, you know, focus on that is also important. And not every type of accountability, maybe. Then we had a lot of discussion about representation or participation of different types of people or from different parts of the world, for instance. And there's clear consensus, I

think, that we need to strive for this. And whether that should result in, you know, a particular number of seats in some scheme, in some group, that may be a little more debatable. But certainly we should strive for that. And I'm actually optimistic. We haven't seen the coordination group composition yet, but I'm personally optimistic.

And we need to do outreach. Not just passive openness but actually go out and try to talk to different communities. So IGF was mentioned as one and of course we at the IETF and RIRs and so forth, we will also do this. And some of us have been going around and speaking on panels of this sort or other types. So that -- that clearly needs to continue.

And of course multistakeholder model is what we all believe in. I don't think we heard anything else today. So that's what we're going to run with. And finally, the roles of different parties here, I think I heard, you know, many, many comments on the role of the community being important and the coordination is also hugely important but it -- it's coordination. Coordination is coordination. Coordination is not doing everything. So let's keep those -- those two separate. And, you know, it's also useful to figure out different tasks that we're doing, who does -- does what.

And let's see if I have anything more. No, I think that was it. And the other thing that I wanted to finish up with is the next steps on the screen here. I think we showed that already at the beginning, but what's going to happen now is that the communities are -- have already been working on this or will start to work on that, and we'll have to figure out exactly how that goes forward. I think we had a slide, let's see if I can go forward a little bit. There's various places where you can

actually engage in this process. Of course, in a particular community, so there's a couple of links here.   And you'll get the slides, I think, somehow, so you can click on those links. So do go to these forums, the ones that you care about, and be involved. And then the coordination group is going to be selected, final names next week, and they're going to have a meeting next month. We don't know who's going to be there, but one of their first steps is to talk about the procedures and timelines and such. And Patrik is going to get the last word.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. So you heard the summary that Jari just read to you, and I would like to test something here in this room that I don't really know whether it has been tested before but the IETF, as some people in this room   know,   are   checking   and   validating   consensus   building   by humming.   And they just released an RFC that they discussed the humming compared to other ways of checking what people actually believe in the room like this. So I would like to ask the room to hum if it is the case that they do believe that Jari's summary of the session was correct. And the ones that -- and can we please hum, the ones that do not think his summary was correct. Thank you very much. And with that, thanks for this session.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]