
LOS ANGELES – IANA Stewardship Transition and Accountability Coordination Committee (ISTACC)
Sunday October 12, 2014 – 14:30 to 15:30
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

TRANSCRIPT

IANA Stewardship Transition and Accountability Coordination Committee

Attendees:

Byron Holland, chair of the ccNSO
Katrina Sataki, chair of the Meetings Program Working Group
Keith Davidson, .nz
Martin Boyle, .uk
Don Hollander, APTLD
Peter Van Roste, CENTR
Mary Uduma, .ng

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordstrom
Gabriella Schitteck

Byron Holland: Okay, everybody, could we commence the meeting, bring this meeting to order. Hello, hello. Can we bring the meeting to order? Alright you chatty kiwis, come on. Oh, sorry; and Aussies, yes.

Welcome, everybody. Sorry we're getting going a little bit late. I guess that's what happens when you have an Italian run the meeting before you. Has he already gone? Aww. (Laughter.) I don't know, was that culturally inappropriate?

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Multiple Speakers: (Inaudible.)

Byron Holland: Yes. Actually, I wish he'd been here to hear that. It's disappointing he's already left.

Unidentified Participant: Don't worry. (Inaudible.)

Byron Holland: I'm sure he'll know soon enough, yes.

So, this is the meeting of the acronym that I can't fully remember right now.

Unidentified Participant: ISTACC.

Byron Holland: ISTACC. Thank you very much. And fundamentally, this had been started to be an information sharing and exchange between all of the various entities that are participating in the ICG, the CWG on IANA, and presumably going forward, the accountability process, depending upon how that takes shape in the near future; and really, to just -- within the cc community, exchange information, exchange timelines, make sure that we're effectively on the same page and understand what the key milestones, dates, deliverables, etc., are as we move through this multistreamed and complex process.

That said, by default I appear to have become the informal chair of this. And I thought given that there has been no agenda, I would put forth a proposed agenda for this meeting, which is a discussion about the chair, an update from the respective members of the two different groups, the ICG and the CWG, thus far. Also some -- an update on what I know to date about the accountability process, which is certainly still in flux, but I wanted to share what I've heard; to talk a little bit about the schedule and logistics of

this group going forward, meetings, etc., and a proposed schedule for the next meeting, the very next one after this one.

Are there any other points that people would like to raise or include?

Hearing none we can move on then.

So, informally, I've taken on the role of chair. There has been no formal decision on who would be chair of this particular group. I don't think we should elect one right now. I'm happy to continue on for the moment, but I would put it to the group that we should put forward somebody who is recognized as the chair so they can be ready for it, set out agendas, etc. And given all of the other moving parts and responsibilities for the ccNSO right now, that chair cannot be me.

So, I would like to put it forward that people should consider over the next short while, perhaps until our next meeting, who should be chair. And more importantly, people should think about whether they would be willing to take on that responsibility. And somebody -- I would say that person should have a pretty reasonable sense of what's happening in the three streams: ICG, CWG IANA, and whatever the accountability stream ends up looking like. So they don't necessarily have to be on every one, but they should certainly be very directly plugged into them as a participant, potentially as a member, etc. And given that everybody in here is going to, de facto, be a member of one of those groups, they will certainly be plugged into at least one of them. They need to have a good understanding of what's happening in the other two. So I will leave that with the group right now, that for the next meeting we should be prepared to have a person or persons put their hands up to become the official chair.

Any comments or questions on that? Mathieu?

Mathieu Weill:

Yes. You're right that the person should be reasonably familiar with those three tracks, but also very close to the ccNSO council because that's also where the flow of

information has to go back and forth. And you -- whether you chair this group or not, Byron, you will be identified as the go-to person for a number of communities to talk to CCs about what's happening and, therefore, there needs to be a very close communication within the council on this. So, I think that adding a new constraint about the potential chairs, but it seems to me to be quite important.

Byron Holland: Yes, and that's a very good point. And I just want to make sure -- it's not that I will not participate in this group, I will, absolutely, and am close to the three steams in different ways. But I take your point because this group will need to report back into the ccNSO and through the council for sure, but also to the broader ccNSO going forward.

Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Just as an alternative approach, I know this is also -- say in the next hour we'll come up with the SOP, but we've seen with another working group, the Internet Governance Working Group, we found another way is that, say, when this topic comes up, and this is on council meetings, etc., that person, in this case the envisioned co-chair of that working group, will plug into the council meetings and will be -- share the information with the council and the other way around as well. So that's an alternative. Otherwise, you limit too much to council members who already have a full workload, I would say.

Byron Holland: Yes. So just for clarification maybe, Mathieu, I could ask you to help my understanding. When you said, and I quote I think, "should be close to the council," I didn't take that to mean it should be a council member. I took it to mean that they should -- whoever that person is would be participating with the council when required on this subject specifically; not that it couldn't be a council member, but it wasn't mandatory to be a council member. That's how I understood it.

Mathieu Weill: I think we have to be very pragmatic. People involved in those streams are going to be overloaded. Those people who are members of the council already have the council meetings on their agendas. If I get involved in one stream, I won't have time to connect with the ccNSO Council in all conference calls. That's not going to be scaling up in the

agendas. That's why I think -- my idea was that it would be much more practical if it's a ccNSO Council member because connection flows more naturally. You don't have to think about adding a new participant to the ccNSO council meeting and won't this person -- when you set up the agenda like three days before, that he has to free up his own schedule to open the slot, which works maybe once every other time.

Byron Holland: Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: If say -- if the approach is to be as pragmatic as possible but to ensure that whoever is going to be the chair has access to the council and the other way around, then I think that's a good starting point, is find the most practical solution. But the chair of this group needs to be the linking pin between this group and the council, whomever it's going to be.

Byron Holland: So, let's leave this topic at that point. Clearly pragmatism is going to have to rule the day and whoever it may be. And I take Mathieu's point, but I don't think we should limit it to council members only, but recognize that whoever it is will have to interface with the council and there's some pragmatic realities associated with that. But that should factor into the discussion when we do select a chair at the next meeting.

With that, let's move on to an update from the respective memberships. And given that we do only have just shy of 30 minutes for the rest of this meeting, maybe I could ask is it possible to have one person from the ICG update us on where the ICG is at and then we'll do the same for the CWG IANA.

Is it Martin? Thank you, Martin.

Martin Boyle: Yeah, it looks like it's Martin, as Keith sort of point my direction before I could point in his direction.

Keith Davidson: I win.

Martin Boyle: Yeah. The quick heads up, probably, that's for the Cross Community Working Group, all the ICG, ccTLD members, ccNSO appointed members, have now been signed up to be participants in that particular activity, so there's obviously going to be a sort of fair amount of linking and overflow between those two. But certainly, that will help improve that sharing of knowledge and information between the different sides.

This week there are a lot of outreach sessions, not least of which is the various discussions that we've got on Tuesday and Wednesday with the ccNSO. And so I think that's actually sort of a quite useful way of making sure that all colleagues are up to speed with that process.

In addition, there is a link out to ALAC which, unfortunately, coincides with one of the ccNSO discussions so that will not be covered by a ccTLD. That's on Tuesday.

Wednesday we meet with the GAC. And then on Thursday we've got the community discussion in the big room after the accountability discussion, if I remember correctly.

And then on Friday we've got our third face-to-face meeting all day.

Things that have come out from the ICG. Well, obviously the request for proposal's the most significant one, but there has been a charter, the request for proposals; a hard-won discussion on the decision making process where we did manage to get inserted that if there are votes, then if any of the operating communities, and I would read that as including the CCs as one of those communities, is not happy with the proposal, then it can't be forced by the other communities. So in other words, we won't be outvoted if it comes to reaching a consensus decision or a near consensus decision. A small--.

Byron Holland: Can I just--.

Martin Boyle: Yes.

Byron Holland: So is that a de facto veto by every community--?

Martin Boyle: No.

Byron Holland: Or for every community?

Martin Boyle: It would be for the numbers for the protocol parameters and for the Gs and for the Cs, but it wouldn't be for the other communities.

Byron Holland: But it's four discreet vetoes?

Martin Boyle: I would count that as four discreet, but you would need to have all of the members saying this is not acceptable.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible.)

Byron Holland: Yeah, all members of--.

Martin Boyle: Yeah, unanimous--.

Byron Holland: One of those given--.

Martin Boyle: Of one -- yes.

Byron Holland: Communities.

Martin Boyle: Yeah. So it would have to be the four ccTLDs. The ccNSO put forward, said no. And the obvious one would be if it became a contractual obligation requirement that was being proposed.

Then since the request for proposals went out there's been a frequently asked questions that is "a living document" and that is now being published. And I think it's probably worth a read because that -- a lot of that work was led by Manel from the GAC and so it comes in with questions that are very much sort of broader than perhaps we would have got to just from the technical community. And currently, we're working on the straw man for pulling the different proposals together. So this is looking forward to the 16th of January when we receive three envelopes through our letter box.

And that's it from me, I think.

Byron Holland: Any questions for Martin? Don?

Don Hollander: Don Hollander from APTLD. Martin, there are other ccTLD managers on the ICG that were not appointed by the ccTLD community. Are you engaging actively with them as a group of ccTLD managers?

Martin Boyle: I certainly have had discussions with both, but there is no -- as far as I'm aware, no formal interaction between them. And I think we do have to be a little bit careful. While it's useful to have two people who have got a good understanding of ccTLDs, we

have to remember that they also represent different communities. So, Muhammad represents ALAC and -- who's the other one? Who's the other one? Demi.

Byron Holland: Demi.

Martin Boyle: Demi is there for ISOC. I think it's ISOC.

Don Hollander: And isn't Hartmut?

Martin Boyle: Yes, you're right, actually. Hartmut is there, but Hartmut is there from one of the numbering communities. Yeah, sorry. I had forgotten all about Hartmut. How could I?

Byron Holland: Thank you. Any other questions or comments for the ICG folks?

Okay, then there's two other components, the CWG for IANA, which is a much longer name, but I'll use that as the short form, and then an update on accountability, at least as I'm aware of it at this point.

So on the CWG, just as a preface, we as a CC community just clearly identified our members last week and, as a result, those five members were not part of the initial CWG call that was held last Monday. But I did participate in that as I am the current co-chair of the CWG until it actually elects its co-chairs, which is anticipated for later -- for the first meeting -- face-to-face meeting this week, tomorrow, I believe.

So in that role, most of the discussion was really logistical and practical. What are -- when are the meetings going to be, what are -- what will be some of the protocols, who's on them. Also a discussion about any potential face-to-face meeting, etc.; review

of the draft charter. So essentially, a forming stage and getting everybody on roughly the same page and same understanding.

There were -- there are the member, but of course there are the participants as well. And in the first call I think we had 40 people on the call. So there was actually a very significant interest in it because roughly the participants outnumbered the actual members. So certainly on the first call a very healthy participation arena.

Just as a reminder, Lise and Vika will be our -- two of our five members there, which will also include Paul Kane and Stefan (ph) from .sc and Erick from .PE. I think it's PE, yeah. So those will be our five members. Two are from outside -- or non-ccNSO members, three are ccNSO members.

As everybody here knows, it was a little bit of a struggle to get to an end conclusion, so just on that note I want to say thank you for bearing with us, bearing with me on that process. I feel confident that the five people that we have finally put forward will be very good candidates for us in that environment, so I'm happy on that account.

And that is a quick overview of the CWG IANA at this point. A lot more to come as of the first face-to-face tomorrow. There is also, I would say, relatively clear understanding that there will be an additional face-to-face meeting in November, later; late in November. The date is not set yet. And it will be a meeting for members that will be funded by ICANN, so travel funding, meeting funding. It will be very open to participants, but not funded for participants, although ICANN will make every effort to do the full online environment and live streamed chat, Adobe Connect type environment for any participant. And participants would be welcome to attend the meeting, but they will do so on their own nickel.

The other thing that was -- that I understand that ICANN will be doing is providing translation services. So not interpretation, not live interpretation, but translation of all documents and transcripts. At least that's what ICANN's current plan is.

So that's what I'm aware of at this point for the CWG. And thus concludes my report at this point. Any other questions or -- Martin and then Vika?

Martin Boyle: Yeah, I'm a bit surprised at the non-translation -- I'm sorry, the non-interpretation of calls and certainly there's already been quite a lot of traffic on the list about interpretation. Bearing in mind that they are providing interpretation for the ICG, I wonder whether ICANN has actually identified why they thought it was not necessary for this rather much larger and rather more diverse group?

Byron Holland: In no way, shape or form do I speak for ICANN. The only thing that I heard was there were various tradeoffs between service providers for those functions. So there were logistical challenges is the way they were portraying it and that it would be a three day turnaround for documentation and transcripts with a provider that can do interpretation versus less than 24 hour, at least on the English side, if we did translation and not interpretation services. That's as I understand it, but that is a question I think best addressed to ICANN.

Vika?

Vika Mpisane: Sorry, I'm listening and thinking at the same time. But I wanted just to confirm. You said another face-to-face meeting in November. Of which group? The CWG or the ICG?

Byron Holland: CWG. Yes, the one of which you are a member.

Again, this is in the formation stage. So the -- I think the issue is the ICG is holding fairly firm on the January date and therefore there's -- we won't have the benefit of Marrakesh to have a face-to-face. So should there be a face-to-face? And I think generally speaking a lot of the folks in and around the CWG believe there should be and ICANN is responding by proposing a late-ish November meeting, of which they will fund the meeting and travel costs for the members. But it's not a done deal, but my

understanding is it's fairly close to being done, although dates and logistics are not clearly or crisply identified yet.

Any other comments or questions on that? Vika?

Vika Mpisane: Just to (inaudible) we -- the five members are already very much in touch. We are trying to see how we can do our (inaudible). So one of the proposals we have definitely is to see tomorrow, for example, those who are here could meet and also try to (inaudible) those who are not here by via Skype or whatever form. So, we are very much mindful of the timelines.

Byron Holland: Thanks. And when I said thus concludes my report, that's what I understand the process to be at this point or the general status. As the group goes forward the broader group is going to have to identify who the co-chairs are. There'll be two co-chairs of the CWG IANA. Given that the ccNSO and the GNSO were the founding sponsors of this endeavor, it has been generally agreed by the SO and AC chairs of the participating constituencies that the CC community and the G community would put forward the co-chairs. So that means of the five CC members, we will be expected to surface one of those folks to be the co-chair of the CWG IANA.

Kristina?

Kristina Nordstrom: (Inaudible) Peter Van Roste.

Byron Holland: Peter Van Roste?

Kristina Nordstrom: Yes.

Byron Holland: Okay.

Peter Van Roste: Hey, Byron.

Byron Holland: How are you, Peter? Welcome.

Peter Van Roste: Thank you. (Inaudible) update. I had one question. Is there -- are there any plans for these groups to formally reach out to the CC community, or will this only rely on the efforts of the individuals that have been appointed to that group?

Byron Holland: Vika, did you want to answer that?

Vika Mpisane: (Inaudible.)

Byron Holland: So I will just say there are certainly outreach efforts beyond just those five people on their own. There -- I certainly don't believe there's any intent to throw those five people into the group and then cast them adrift. We will definitely be supporting them. We do have use of the CC world list so there's outbound communications there. There is a CC forum that will be going into effect in a meaningful way so there's a broader environment there. And certainly working with the ROs will form part of that. But that's just to begin with.

We have Vika and then Bart and then Lise who also want to speak to this issue.

Vika? Bart?

Bark Boswinkel: Yeah. And that's one of the things. If you look at the charter of this group as it sits here of the ISTACC, it's one of its roles to coordinate outreach and the engagement of the CC community in the two major processes as well. That's why if you would look at the -- for example, the website of this group or the webpage you can see a listing of events, etc., where discussions are taking place. So it's definitely one of the roles of this group as well to coordinate that outreach effort.

Byron Holland: Thank you, Bart. Lise?

Lise Fuhr: Well, we have an initiative in Denmark where we want to summon the Nordic countries in having a day where we discuss ICANN accountability, IANA transition with ICANN, but that's only a local initiative. But I think if we can kind of get more of this, this will help us all.

Byron Holland: Thank you, Lise.

Peter, does that answer your question?

Peter Van Roste: Yes, it does indeed. Thank you so much.

Byron Holland: Thanks, Peter. Don?

Don Hollander: So just a question for the five who are the members of the ccWG IANA and the communications that you're having amongst yourself. That is all going to be available publicly or not?

Byron Holland: Lise?

Lise Fuhr: We actually haven't decided on that yet because we haven't really had a meeting, a conference call, and we're trying to get that--.

Don Hollander: Are you having a conference call or a private conference?

Lise Fuhr: That's going to be a private conference call for the first one. And then, I haven't even thought about if it should be public or not. But regarding -- well, from your idea I will bring it up if we get the conference call before the meeting tomorrow.

Don Hollander: I would just note that the ICG is very transparent and very open about all their communications that they are transparent and open about. No doubt there are some private conversations, but I think that's a -- it's a very good way for people to see what's happening and be able to intervene if they want. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thanks for the suggestion, Don.

Lisa Fuhr: Yeah, I just want to respond. I perfectly understand your point and I'll support it, but I can't speak for the whole group. Let's see what we end up with.

Byron Holland: Vika and then Martin.

Vika Mpisane: Yeah. The spirit just that's amazing is to keep on the transparency. I can imagine that aspect and the consensus approach of things as we tend to do in the ICANN scheme of things. As much as we haven't decided the final thing, but that's where the tone is moving, in that direction.

Byron Holland: Great. Thanks. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yeah. I know the question wasn't actually aimed at me, but one of the things that certainly has been so evident is with the ICG, for example, there is no ccNSO nominated member from Latin America. And I've been keeping Caroline informed about what has been happening so that she has been able to get timely reports out to her community and actually get them into local languages.

And then I would actually flag that there is a similar problem with the CWG IANA where the Asia-Pacific region is not covered. And so perhaps again we need to make sure that there is some machine, some communication channel that gets reports out to that community as well. I think, really, one of the things we're going to have to do is tap into as many of the communication channels as we can find, even at the risk of people receiving the same information more than once, just to make sure that we are getting out and we're getting out quickly. And that then allows anybody to respond to the report with the questions or comments. Thanks.

Byron Holland: Thanks, Martin. That's actually a good initiative. We should do the same for North America, too, which has no representatives anywhere.

Martin Boyle: I think you're on center, but perhaps we need to look at the other three.

Byron Holland: Okay, thanks. Don?

Don Hollander: So Martin, I think that's an excellent initiative, but it is not -- your initiative is not repeated by your colleagues on the ICG in terms of regular reports into their regional constituency. And I would think that it might be easier for the group of you is if you took turns and sent a report to the whole -- I don't know if you edit your notes with a Latin American focus or not, but it would be useful, I think, if -- and I would hope not too onerous, if somebody said, right, I'm going to -- Friday -- the first Friday of the week is my -- or the first Friday of the month its my job and the second Friday is somebody else's job, to do that so that the burden is spread across. Unless there's, of course, one of you who quite enjoys being a journalist, in which case then they might say, well, that

will be my role, is I will send out a weekly newsletter as to what's happening and send it out through the wide variety of channels. Thank you.

Byron Holland: And you have the last comment on this subject, Vika, recognizing we have about five minutes left and two topics.

Vika Mpisane: (Inaudible) the views of my team, especially with using different channels. (Inaudible) from the African region that AFTODS set up a working group, one the IANA and ICANN accountability related stuff and accordingly touch base to say we expect report and working together with (inaudible). So it's a practice that I think we'll have to explore.

Byron Holland: That's great. Thank you.

Two more topics. One is just about the accountability track and then the other is scheduling logistics for this group going forward.

So perhaps I will initiate the accountability discussion in that ICANN has materially changed course, as hopefully you've been able to see. They published on Friday night their new proposed accountability process. It has changed considerably from what we have seen previously and has gone from the two group structure, two entity structure that they initially came out with, and have proposed that it go to a single cross community working group through traditional ICANN-like structure.

So, that's a pretty fundamental change based on the feedback and the input that they received during a common period. They will be doing other things like the seven experts will still be available to the CWG, but they will not participate in any voting or consensus calls. Same with the one board liaison person.

So, they've definitely changed the structure and the governance significantly, from what I can see, based on the feedback and input they receive during the public comment

period. I did send a link out to at least -- I believe at last the council and presumably it's gone out to the whole ccNSO. And we should also be putting it out to the CC world list as well.

So, some major changes there. There will have to be a drafting team set up to create the charter for the Accountability Cross Community Working Group. Initially there has been some comment that we should take the CWG IANA process that we use for drafting, and at least that's a starting point. Not that what's in the CWG IANA would end up being the framework for the accountability one, but at least it's a starting point. And there's a goal that a drafting team will at least be assembled here in, wherever we are, Los Angeles -- here in Los Angeles. (Laughter.)

I don't know, this room looks like every other room we've been in. It could be anywhere. Okay. And it's only Sunday, yeah.

Anyway, since we're here in Los Angeles, we do want to take the opportunity to try to bring the drafting team together to get going promptly on putting a charter together. But there has certainly been some at least initial discussion among the SO/AC/SG chairs and organizations that it would probably be reasonable for at least the structure of the CWG to be similar in nature to the structure of what the CWG IANA has been.

So it's very, very preliminary, nothing cast in stone, but that's some of the initial thinking that's been put forward on how it might happen. And you can all read for yourselves what ICANN has proposed, which I think, to be fair, has really recognized the significant input they got from the public comment process.

So, that's where we are on the accountability as I know it. Any other comments -- any comments or questions or--?

No? Okay. Moving along to schedule and logistics for this group, which will presumably shortly include our members from the Accountability CWG, however that ends up

playing out. This is clearly going to be a very busy period. Those -- the three entities, ICG, IANA and Accountability, will have to make sure that they are coordinating in a reasonable way to understand all of the moving parts so we don't let any balls drop, we don't miss anything and, to the best of our ability, aren't overlapping or duplicating. Given how much effort is going to be required here we certainly don't want to be redundant in our use of that effort.

But, there's a lot going on. So one of the key discussion points I think should be how frequently are we going to meet. It would seem to me that once a month would be too little at this point, certainly between here and December or here and January 15th, for example; that once a month is likely too little for this group to meet.

Is there -- would that be a reasonable comment? Keith?

Keith Davidson: I would agree that monthly would not be frequently enough, I wouldn't think, if we are to all remain in the loop, but weekly is probably too frequently by the same token. So somewhere between two and three weekly. Maybe every 17 and a half days.

Unidentified Participant: You better make it 17 and three quarters.

Byron Holland: Excellent. Well, that'll certainly make it -- that'll simplify it for us, won't it?

Well, then, maybe I would suggest every other week? Every two weeks? Okay.

Don?

Don Hollander: So I know that during the FOI Working Group the approach was to shift the time of the meeting eight hours or six hours each meeting so that the same people aren't at the bar

every time that they have a call or in bed every time they have the call. So the 17 and a quarter days might make some sense. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Or at least that quarter part would make sense, yeah.

Unidentified Participant: It would actually be a third of a day if we gave go to eight hours.

Byron Holland: Okay, so we should take that under advisement. That's probably not an unreasonable approach, that there be some flexibility in the time; or some movement in the time, rather.

Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yes. With a certain degree of hesitation, I think we do need to make sure that during these calls, bearing in mind that everybody around this table is going to be on conference calls probably at least every fortnight, for ICG members having to attend the CWG IANA calls as well that could even be weekly, we need to be a little bit sympathetic, perhaps, on trying to make sure that we don't end up with two 2:00 a.m. conference calls for the same person one day after the other.

Byron Holland: So I'm going to go to Keith in a moment, but also task staff with thinking through how we can balance these to be fair and reasonable, yet also take into consideration the comment that Martin just meant. There's a lot of moving parts to that.

And we'll go to a comment to Bart and then back to you, Keith.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. I fully understand, Martin. And one of the things, and that's the good thing as well, although I shouldn't say it, but I think the good thing is every of these groups has at least

four members until now. So that doesn't mean that each group needs to be represented by all of its members all the time as long -- in order to -- but at least two of these members to ensure the flow of information.

Byron Holland: Thanks, Bart. Keith?

Keith Davidson: Yeah. I think, too, the ICG has a meeting on Friday here and will determine that meeting schedule from here to Marrakesh while here. So perhaps if we shared that, both the date and time of those meetings, because they are on a PTR rotation, maybe we can have Bart coordinate and pass that information through to this group and the CWG IANA group. And so we may be able to coordinate on one sort of timeframe or one schedule of meetings so that we're all horribly inconvenienced on the same day.

Byron Holland: Okay. I think that's probably a good goal, that we should all be equally inconvenienced. Duly noted.

With that, it concludes the regularly scheduled program for this agenda. Are there any final comments or questions that people have? Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Just one. When say -- would it be useful to already schedule a first meeting post this ICANN meeting, say in a week, at the end of the week after this, to debrief everybody so everybody's aware where we are?

Byron Holland: So late next week?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Byron Holland: That makes sense to me to be -- so we will let the ICANN week go by and then late the following week. And that would be the kickoff point to set up our biweekly call after that.

Before we agree to that, Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yeah. I would just like to flag for those lucky people who are going to spend a goodly portion of their life in Busan for the ITU planning part, and it's not the most easily accessible place, it really probably needs to be done Wednesday at the latest.

Byron Holland: Fair enough. Bart, please take note of that reasonable request because, yes, there are a number of people that that is going to impact. So we will turn it to staff to herd us cats and get that organized.

Okay, thank you very much every--.

Martin Boyle: (Inaudible.)

Byron Holland: Oh, just squeezed in under the bell, Martin. Okay.

Martin Boyle: If I could just quickly, and that's to flag Keith's sterling work on the framework of interpretation working group with the progress towards the ION transition. That one also, I'm afraid, becomes center staged and to spotlight. Lots of meetings in ccNSO. But obviously, one of the things we are going to have to do is try and get the GAC up to speed. There seems to be a certain interest in the GAC for doing this. But we're also, obviously, going to need to schedule some liaison with that, which is happening outside our own four walls in that process.

-
- Byron Holland: Thank you. Unfortunately, we have Keith in this group who can be a liaison to this group, certainly on that subject.
- Keith Davidson: Okay. And just a totally new subject, too, Byron. There--.
- Byron Holland: You know this meeting's over, right? Okay. Go ahead, Keith.
- Keith Davidson: Well, it's not necessarily directly part of this meeting, but it probably will be. But the Security and Stability Advisory Committee have released their paper as of yesterday, I think to the SO and AC tiers only, describing the IANA function. So given that Patrik Faltstrom is the chair of SSOC also one of the three co-chairs of the IANA transition group, it is likely that that paper will want to inform the ICG and the Cross Community Working Group on the functioning of IANA.
- So if there are people interested in reading IT, maybe contact me and I'll flick you a copy of it. I don't think it's formally published yet, but it is going to be formally published after this ICANN meeting and it won't be going through any consultation process because SSOC don't do that. So, we've only got this week to actually have any input if there's anything significantly wrong with it.
- So, just if anyone's following that and wants to follow up, flick me an e-mail and I'll share you a copy of the report, despite potentially breaching the confidentiality of it.
- Bart Boswinkel: It's been shared by Robert Guerra to the CWG in total. So if you really wanted -- if you haven't seen it, I can share it without any risk of breaching any confidentiality.
- Byron Holland: Thank you, Bart. And with that I will call this meeting to a close. Thank you, everybody. Have a good week.

Unidentified Participant: May I apologize for coming late. I'm just arriving. Thank you.

CLOSED SESSION