EN

LOS ANGELES – Community Discussion with the IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG)
Thursday, October 16, 2014 – 10:00 to 12:00 PDT
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

If everyone would be kind enough to take your seats, we'll be able to start this next important program.

Once again, if you would be kind enough to take your seats, we'll begin our program. Thank you all.

ALISSA COOPER:	Okay, everyone. I think we're going to start, so please take your seats.

My name is Alissa Cooper. I am the chair of the IANA stewardship transition coordination group. This is our open community session, and what we really wanted to do with this session is have lots of time for discussion and discourse with the community.

So I will begin, will give a brief overview of the ICG, who we are, what we've been up to, and what you can expect from us, and then we'll have short presentations from each of the operational communities. Adiel will speak about numbering, Jari will speak about protocol parameters, and then we'll have Milton and Martin speak about names. And then we'll move on to a discussion and Q&A, so hopefully we'll have more than an hour for that section.

Are we okay over there, friends? Everything okay? Yeah. Okay.

So with that, I will say, just to begin, that we are, in the ICG, a very open and transparent group. Essentially everything that we do is public and you can find all of the records of our activities, our documentation and so forth, on our Web site ianacg.org.

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.

So I think most people are fairly familiar at this point with the background of why we are here, but just to go over it briefly, earlier this year NTIA announced its intention to transition the stewardship of the IANA functions and asked ICANN to convene global stakeholders to develop a transition proposal to transition the current role of NTIA.

ICANN initiated a community process to determine how that would work, and that resulted in the creation of the IANA stewardship transition coordination group, the ICG, which is the group of people that you see here on the stage.

So the ICG is a group of 30 members and two liaisons representing all of the organizations listed on the slide, so we have very broad representation in terms of communities and constituencies that are able to provide input into the group.

And we additionally have one liaison from the ICANN board, Kuo-Wei, and we have a liaison from the IANA staff, Elise Gerich.

So that's who we are and now you can see all of us here together. I can't see all of us but you can see all of us.

[Laughter]

So that's who we are and the next question is what do we do, what is our charter.

As our name implies, our primary function is to coordinate. So we are here from all these different communities so that we can help people in those respective constituencies work on the transition proposal and

have that work coordinated with -- with all of the other work going on, to eventually arrive at one unified transition proposal.

So we are liaising back and forth with those communities, keeping them up-to-date on what this ICG is doing, and also keeping the ICG up-to-date on what's happening out in the communities.

And that's really our primary function.

So our primary function is not to develop the transition proposal itself. That needs to be a bottom-up process that happens out in the communities and that's a process that we ourselves have trying to facilitate.

When we start to receive components of the transition proposal, we will be assessing them for various criteria. We will be assembling them into one unified proposal that can eventually be transmitted to the NTIA.

So that's a brief summary of our charter.

As many of you know, the transition is focused on a couple of specific aspects related to IANA. If you look at the way IANA functions are currently specified in the NTIA contract, they primarily relate to three different kinds of activities. One is the protocol parameters registry management, another is the DNS root zone management, and the third is the Internet numbers registry management.

And so while IANA has other responsibilities, it manages other kinds of registries, those are not within the scope of the transition and they're not really the focus of the work of the ICG or the communities.

The second way in which this -- the focus is being scoped is that it's really focused on the stewardship of the functions, so there's other aspects related to carrying out the IANA functions. All of us are quite familiar with the policy development processes that establish the policies that we follow in order to conduct allocations in the registries. There's other aspects that relate to how IANA carries out its business, but the focus of this transition is limited to the stewardship. So just wanted to make that clear as we talk about what we're expecting in the transition proposal.

The way that the ICG has asked the community to organize itself is to -- is based around those three functions that are currently specified in the contract and carried out by IANA, so we're asking existing operational communities to each develop a component of what will eventually be a unified transition proposal. We're asking the RIR communities to develop a proposal for numbering resources. We're asking the IETF community to develop a proposal for protocol parameters. And we're asking the newly formed cross-community working group related to names to develop a proposal related to names.

And the virtue of that structure is that, first of all, we can rely on some existing organizations and processes that we've used for years and years to develop consensus and so forth, and that way we don't have to necessarily create whole new structures just so that we can all as a global community get together and develop this transition proposal.

It's -- this breaking up of the work this way allows the work to proceed in parallel and create some efficiency by creating communities of interest.

So if you're really interested in protocol parameters, you can go to the IETF and contribute to that process. If you're more interested in numbers, you can go to the RIRs. Or in names, you can go to the names cross-community working group. So it allows us to split up the work a little bit based on groups of interest.

What it is not intended to do is to foreclose anyone from participating in any process. All of these operational community processes are open to anyone who wants to participate. You don't have to be a member. You do not have to have an historic relationship with any of the communities or institutions that are running the processes.

The idea is not to create a separation between the people who are inside the operational communities and outside. There is no such separation. And that's why you can see the little stick men in the middle of the slide. If you've never participated in any of these things before and you want to, you should, and they're open to you.

The idea is just to create efficiency in terms of how the work gets done.

The other really important aspect of this -- again, coming back to the "C" in "ICG" -- is coordination. So we have people who are participating in more than one of these processes. We have some people on the stage who are participating in all three. And the -- and that's really important, because the -- as the transition proposal pieces get composed, they need to reflect that coordination.

There is some overlap between the functions, and those overlaps need to be handled through these community processes, and that happens by having people who are paying attention to one or two or three of

them who can liaise back and forth, you know, informally or formally, and create those synergies between the proposal components.

So that's the development process.

In September, we as the ICG issued an RFP that went out to these communities and asked each community to develop a transition plan with very specific elements.

So first -- first of all, we wanted to know, you know, which function is your -- is your plan about. Obviously in the names cross-community working group, the proposal will be about names and so forth. And how does that community currently make use of the IANA function.

We just want to establish a baseline in terms of how do things work now.

Similarly, we want to establish a baseline in terms of what the existing policy oversight and accountability mechanisms are. So if we're going to -- if we're going to do a transition, it's really important that we're all on the same page, but what the existing mechanisms are, so we understand what the changes are that are being proposed. So there's a section of the RFP that asks the communities to detail what the existing arrangements are.

Those two sections should be very straightforward for any community. It's kind of like writing down facts about how things already work.

The next section asks for the community to explain its post-transition oversight and accountability proposals. This is precisely what is it that

the community is proposing to change or add or not add, in the event of a transition away from NTIA.

We also want to understand the implications and we want to see that the communities have thought through the implications of their -- of the transition plans that they're proposing.

So we want to understand if -- if what your -- if your proposal will create operational requirements, will there be any operational continuity risks that you see, are there any legal requirements that you are relying on in the post-transition world.

We want to see an evaluation of why do you, as a community, think that your proposal is going to work.

And we want to understand the expected time line in terms of any changes that need to be made and intermediate milestones that may be part of those changes.

Finally, we want the communities to do a bit of an assessment in terms of how they arrived at their transition proposals.

There is criteria that NTIA has put forth in terms of what they will accept out of a unified transition proposal.

We want to understand from the communities their explanation for how they believe they have met those criteria, and we also want an explanation of the -- of the process that was followed, you know, describe how this working group worked, and the outreach that was conducted, to make sure that it was open and participatory.

And finally, the consensus level that was achieved.

So it's -- one of the NTIA's requirements is that the proposal have broad -- broad support, and we need to see that that happens within the individual communities as a way to build towards global consensus on a final proposal.

So those are the elements of the RFP.

As I said, the RFP went out in September to the operational communities, and the period that we are in now is the development of the transition proposal components themselves.

So we've set a target deadline of January 15, 2015 as when we as the ICG would like to receive these components from the RIR communities, from the IETF community, and from the names cross-community working group.

The time line -- the January 15 deadline is -- it wasn't arbitrarily picked out of the air. It is based on a series of steps that we expect to come after that deadline, and it's all -- you know, we started from the September 30, 2015 contract expiry deadline and moved backwards from there.

And so as you can see in the slide, it's an iterative process that we expect, and we also, with each phase, need to make sure that we leave time for the communities to develop consensus and reconfirm that they still have consensus.

So after we receive the individual proposal components in January, what we expect to do is assess those for completeness and clarity and so forth, and if we have questions or if we believe there are gaps or

issues that need to be resolved, we will send the proposals back to the communities.

I think actually -- yes. That is the first step.

So in the very first step, we're going to be doing this individual proposal assessment. If we -- if we find any issues, it's not for the ICG to resolve those issues. Those -- the proposals will go back to the communities, and that's why you see on here that in this -- in the first -- or in the second blue phase, we need to give the communities time to make those fixes and determine that they have consensus again. And you'll see that with every step in this process. We give the communities time to make any fixes and make sure that they have consensus, because that's what we need at the end of the day is consensus on the -- on the whole thing.

So that will be the next step, after January, is that we'll do an individual assessment of each proposal component.

Once that is complete, then we'll have a unified proposal assessment, which means that we will put the pieces that come from these operational communities together into one unified proposal and determine if, as a whole, it makes sense if the pieces are compatible and interoperable, if there's anything missing, if the overlaps are handled properly, and we also have had some discussion within the ICG about doing an analysis or an assessment to determine that, indeed, the goal of this process to make sure that the IANA functions operator can be held accountable post-transition has actually been met.

And we're still discussing exactly what that might entail and how we might go about doing that.

Again, in this phase, if we find issues or there's problems, the ICG will not be editing the proposal. The ICG will send those issues back to the communities to have them resolved.

And then finally -- eventually we'll need to finalize this proposal and send it to NTIA. So the idea here is once we have a solid, unified proposal, the communities are on board with it, we will put it out for a final round of public comment. The ICG will review those public comments. Again, if there's changes that are necessary, we will go back to the communities to get those changes done and eventually the proposal will be submitted to the NTIA.

So that's the kind of rough sketch of how we see this all playing out in the next year.

I just briefly -- because we've been here all week already and have been engaging with different parts of the community, we've all heard a number of questions come up. So I wanted to kind of give a brief overview of the prominent questions that we've heard and quick answers in case that helps us facilitate our discussion later on.

There's been a question about whether the ICG is having a joint meeting with the cross-community working group on naming-related functions in mid-November. We are not having a joint meeting. It is possible that the cross-community working group will have a meeting. That's up to them to decide. But there is not -- but there is not a joint meeting planned. So if you have heard that, that's not true.

We've had another question about whether the target deadline for the operational communities to submit their proposals to the ICG has changed from January 15 to January 31st. It has not. The deadline continues to be January 15. We did say these are target deadlines. There's some flexibility. Obviously, if we get one proposal before January 15 or one during or one after, we can start to do an individual assessment of them each in turn. But ultimately what we're trying to do with the timeline is not have the pieces be too far out of sync because when it comes to that stage where we need to do a unified proposal assessment, it will be difficult to do if we don't have all the pieces. So that's why we're trying to keep all of the communities roughly in sync as much as we can with some flexibility here and there.

We've been asked a lot: What is it the relationship between the ICG and the ICANN accountability cross-community working group? That's something that we as a body will be having a meeting -- a working meeting tomorrow and talking about that, how we do that procedurally.

And since that working group has only just been formed, we need a little bit of time to discuss that amongst ourselves and figure out how we might liaise with that new activity.

There have also been questions about whether the final transition plan needs to cover every aspect covered by the existing NTIA contract and whether the transition scope is broader or narrower than the existing contract.

In our RFP, what we have asked the communities to do is to cross-reference the existing contract as appropriate. So the community -- certainly everyone in the community should read the existing contracts

so they understand what it covers. But within the community processes, decisions need to be made about which parts are in scope, if they want to cover more or less than what is covered in that contract and whether there's language from that contract that is worth cross-referencing. So that's really up to the communities to decide.

And then finally we've had some questions about whether the ICANN board will have to approve the final transition plan, whether they will be able to modify the transition plan before it gets sent on to NTIA. And those are questions that we are currently engaging with the ICANN board and staff about.

We've had our own internal discussion about what we want to have come to pass in that final step when the proposal gets sent on to NTIA. And we will continue to work on that amongst ourselves and possibly jointly with the board and staff to make sure that we have a clear articulation of what the steps will be at the end of the process.

So those are just some questions that we've heard and brief answers, but we can discuss them more during the Q&A. Those are just some references so that people are aware. And I think we can move on to -- Adiel is going to talk about the process in the numbering community.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Thank you, Alissa.

As one of the identifiers of the operational community, the RIRs together also working to put in place a single proposal to be submitted to the ICG, and that single proposal will emanate from original consultation done by each RIR.

The outcome of this consultation will be consolidated at the end and be the final -- the final proposal that will be submitted. So we have kind of started this process a little bit early, some of the RIRs.

And at each RIR level, there is a mailing list that has been set up. All the RIRs have a separate mailing list for discussing the transition and coming up with a proposal. And this proposal can vary from one region to another. As you know, we have within the RIR a very clearly defined policy development process. And then when it comes to global policy, we ensure that all the community contribute and agree on the policy. And we have inspired this process from our global policy development process.

So the discussion on those various RIR mailing lists are key for the process. So if you are either a member of the number community or not and you want to contribute, you have this opportunity right now to participate into the list that is run by the RIR serving your region.

In the APNIC region, they have already had their second meeting of the year where a strawman proposal was presented to the community. That proposal is being discussed on their own mailing list right now. And a few of the RIRs are also going to maybe use that -- or share that proposal with their own community.

In ARIN region, they had their public policy meeting last week where this was discussed. They had a panel discussion. And what they come up with is a survey to collect input from the community, and that survey will be the base of their proposal to the comment basket.

In LACNIC region, they have set up a small committee made of three committee members to kind of drive the process. They have sessions scheduled during LACNIC 22 -- okay. The slide is there -- in Santiago in October 2014.

And that will be a -- LACNIC, all right, good -- an informational panel. And they will also try to wrap up the discussion online and come up with a proposal. So from now to then, there is the mailing list internet-gov@lacnic.net that can be used to discuss this.

RIPE NCC also had decided this very early. The first discussion that they had formally on this was in May during the RIPE meeting in Warsaw. This is handled in RIPE region through what they have as the cooperation working group. That's where the discussions are taking place. And the draft statement was now released on October 9, and they are discussing that.

In our region, we had the first consultation during our meeting in Djibouti early this year that result in the creation of a mailing list where we are discussing this. We have moderator for that mailing list. And we have set up a dedicated page as well that gives information to the community. And I think all the RIRs have something similar as well.

And we are going to have a second formal consultation during our upcoming meeting in November. And, in fact, AfriNIC is going to close the loop of this inter-RIR consultation, and that will then lead us to the consolidation of the document.

There is an idea that we are working on now that is going to be published in the coming days, which is to set up a team that would

consolidate all of this. That team is called the CRISP Team. That's will be made of 15 members, three from the community and one from each RIR, three from each RIR region, one from the staff and two from the community. And that will -- that committee will have the responsibility to take the proposal, the discussion from the different regions, consolidate them through a very open process. This will allow us to make sure that the final proposal have the endorsement of the community and has been developed through an open process.

That's it from the number community side. We will be happy to answer any question and provide any further clarification when and where needed. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Adiel.

Let's move on to Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Thank you. Can we bring up my slides or should I press here?

Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: Or we can pass to Milton if you would like to wait for your slides.

JARI ARKKO: Maybe someone will bring up the slides. In any case, I wanted to talk briefly about the IETF process briefly because I think the most

interesting part of today's discussion is the discussion and questions and arguments. But I did want to speak a little bit about what do we do at the IETF in regards to IANA today, how we plan to change that in the future, and how you can get involved in the transition planning process.

And, of course, we spent most of our time at the IETF thinking about the technologies and not so much about IANA issues. But we do need a database of protocol numbers for various things, port numbers as an example, 80 for HTTP, 25 for email, and so forth.

And we use IANA for that. And the -- there is a division of work for doing this -- these registrations or maintaining the database, so the role of the IETF in this case is -- I will scroll forward here. So the role of the IETF is to deal with the policy issues, where we make the decision of what numbers to allocate or what the policy is for allocating numbers. As you many know, many of the numbers are actually first come, first served basis so anyone in the world can request them if they need them.

We have some oversight by the IAB and Russ Housley here. And, finally, we have implementation of the database by ICANN and IANA.

I should also mention that the arrangements for this have evolved over time quite a bit. In the last 15 years, we have seen creation of agreements and yearly SLAs and all kinds of things. Just as one example, one thing that we are doing this year together with ICANN and IETF is implementing an audit. And the purpose of the audit is to verify by an external party, an auditor, that IANA has actually followed the policy that has been specified by the policy party, in this case, the IETF. And the purpose of the audit is not just to inform me or Russ that things

are running well but basically inform the whole world. Anyone can check what's going on. So I think that's a useful thing for us to do.

In a little bit more detail, I wanted to go into discussion of exactly how are we organized with regards to IANA. So, first of all, we have some agreements between the different parties. IETF and ICANN have an agreement over IANA services and the IAB with oversight. And all of this has been specified in various documents.

I did want to go into question of accountability because that's been really key in many people's minds, and I think we have a particular answer for that at the IETF. So you can't really think about accountability as something in the abstract. You have to connect it to a particular topic or issue, basically, you know, what could go wrong.

And things could go wrong in our own process at the IETF. We do have some mechanisms to deal with that. So these mechanisms have existed for a number of years, things like appeals. Any decision can be appealed. We have a NomCom that selects IETF leaders such as myself. And if we screw up in some fashion, we can also be recalled. So there is a set of mechanisms to deal with that kind of problem.

But things could also go wrong in some fashion between IETF and ICANN. So far they have been working great and we're very happy, both sides, I think. I don't see that that's as likely, but we do have mechanisms for that as well. So we have day-to-day operational problems, of course, from time to time, almost -- we produce a lot of documents and some of them are not clear, for instance. We bring up the issues with IANA, for instance. Note any issues and bring it up on our side and deal with that.

If there are any more serious problems, we can escalate through the structure of the organizations ultimately to the boards and deal with that if there is anything serious. And the contracts also do have a termination clause of a six months' waiting period. I don't think it will ever come to that, but those opportunities exist there. I'm thinking about this in terms of regular business kind of thing or contractual arrangement.

I should also mention that this indeed has worked fairly well in the last 15 years and as you can tell from the audit example, making improvements every year. And it is kind of important to note that from our perspective, there is really today -- in today's situation, after all these improvements that have already happened, there's really no role that the U.S. government plays here.

In fact, I think the IETF community has been very clear in that there is really no external or higher authority with regards to what gets done for protocol parameters than the IETF community itself. So that's today.

What do we plan to do for the transition? We've created a working group, and obviously we've been discussing these topics for a long time. We had a face-to-face meeting in March. We had another one in July. And we assume we are going to have some more. We created a working group called the IANA plan working group. Marc Blanchet who is the chair of the working group is attending the ICANN meeting. I don't know if he is in the room. If you are here, stand up. Doesn't appear to be here.

In any case, that working group has a draft plan. It is about two months old, and it is being revised. It is not done. It's been actively discussed.

If you look at the slides, I hope you'll see the link there and -- however, when we created this effort, the IETF community was quite clear in that the transition needs to stay within the current operational model which in our mind means no change to the roles of organizations and no new organization needed. So from our perspective, this is kind of the setup that we're looking at. And it is, of course -- the IETF is an open organization. Anyone can join the discussion. We have a mailing list and a working group and there's no requirement other than your interest in joining. If you have an opinion, please do. And here are some links where you can find out more on the discussion itself. That's the IANA plan, the first link up there, and the second link is about general participation in the IETF which is on individual rather than organizational basis. We have a meeting coming up. Most of our work happens on the mailing list, not in the meetings, but the meetings can also be useful. The meeting is at the beginning of November, and if you do attend the meeting in particular, please do read the second link.

That's what I have to say. So thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jari. Let's turn it over to Milton and talk about G names.

MILTON MUELLER: I'm Milton Mueller. I'm here on the ICG by the names community and specifically the GNSO, the noncommercial stakeholders group. And I have no slides. Basically I think most of you in this room should be familiar with the fact that your community has created a cross community working group to deal with the IANA transition, and really,

the ball is in your court right now. If you want to develop a names proposal, I hope everybody in this community now understands that you don't talk to me, you don't try to influence Alissa, you develop it within your own cross community working group, which means you are working not only with other GNSO people, you are working with the ccNSO people, the people -- hopefully the ccTLDs are not in the ccNSO. You're working with the GAC, you're working with ALAC, you're working with individuals who join as participants who have been unfortunately mislabeled observers, and so the -- really the ball is in your court there.

Now, in terms of what the -- the discussion has already started. There was a meeting of this group a couple of days ago. They have a kind of timeline and a -- they're starting to divide up the work, and I think one of the things they've decided to do is that it should be relatively easy to handle the first two parts of our requests for proposals where we're simply asking you, what are the current arrangements? What do you actually use IANA for in the names community now?

So look for this cross community working group on the IANA transition. I think the only thing that needs some comment here is -- is the coordination of the different proposals around the accountability issue. So obviously accountability will be a factor, accountability of the IANA will be a factor in this cross community working groups proposal. It's a required part of the proposal.

The other -- this is complicated, however, by the fact that there's this enhanced accountability process that's going on in parallel, and that will also address issues of what has to be done before the transition takes place? What accountability arrangements have to be done before the

transition takes place? So that's what we call the track one accountability issues. And we just had some discussion about that in a previous session.

One of my concerns as an ICG member is that these two parts of the names process might not be in perfect synchronization so that your cross community working group on the IANA transition might have an idea as to what's required for the IANA transition and then the accountability track one people might think something slightly different. Again, that coordination has to take place among you at the names level first before it comes up to us. We will not want to be putting ourselves in a position to choose among competing proposals. So we're looking for agreed proposals with lots of support, coming to us in a nice clear bundle to be put into the final proposal with the numbers and the protocol parameters proposals.

So I would entertain any questions about this potentially complicated coordination process in the end game because that's where we come in as the ICG. All questions about what should go into the proposal, of course, is up to you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Milton. Now we'll hear from Martin about the CC side.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you very much, Alissa. Martin Boyle, I'm one of four nominees from the ccTLD community, and Milton has already said probably everything that needs to be said about the process for -- needs to be said from here about the process to move forward in the cross

community working group. But I -- I would like to flag quite how important this is as a phase where we are moving away from talking about process and starting to talk about what we want to come out of the other end. And that really does mean people coming together and trying to identify what they really need, what are the issues at stake. And the reason I'm flagging that is that from the ccTLD community we're actually a pretty diverse bunch. Through -- throughout its one size does not fit all. We're not contractually bound to ICANN in the same way as the gTLD community is. And that does mean -- does mean that the discussion that goes on is going to have to look very, very carefully at the issues that Milton thought were quite easy, and they probably are on the gTLD side, but when you start looking at accountability issues and oversight and operational issues within the ccTLD community, you've probably got not far short of as many different solutions as there are ccTLDs.

I, therefore, actually did rather welcome in the earlier session Steve DelBianco's description of the stress test, and I go back always to saying, you know, we are going to need to try and identify very clearly for us what are the things that we need to have coming out from the -- from the solution.

That actually, though, leads to my final comment because we have within the ccTLD community a lot of ccTLDs who are not active in ICANN whatsoever and probably several of them who can't even spell ICANN. And that does give a very real challenge for us all in outreach. And so I would like to flag up to the community that I would certainly see this outreach as very much a shared responsibility. The names -- the ccTLD community is trying to contact every ccTLD on the planet, whether or

not we know them. But we are also going to have to look to other communities who might actually have links because of national -- shared national location and therefore -- and I said when we met the GAC earlier this week that we would be certainly grateful for the GAC to try and do some outreach for us. And I think also ALAC, but ISOC and all these other networks around the globe, that will help us make sure that we do get the right people coming into the room so that we understand all the issues that confront this very diverse community. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Martin. So I think we have established a good background at this point. Hopefully folks understand where we are in the process, what's going on in the operational communities, and at this point I would like to turn the floor over to my vice chairs, Patrik Faltstrom and Mohamed El Bashir, who will be running the Q&A and the discussion portion of the session. And I guess -- can I just make one comment which is that there are so many of us up here we didn't go around to do a round of introductions, but as you respond to questions fellow ICG members feel free to introduce yourself and let everyone know what community you came from. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. We would now open up the microphones for question answers. We also have ten remote interactive hubs and a number of others that can chat with us and we will read the comments or communicate with them remotely. We will use this microphone on my side for new -- for new topics that are being brought up, and if you want to comment on a topic that we're discussing, you go to the

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Thank you, Patrik. This is ICANN staff reading a question from a remote participant. John Paul (saying name) asks, "Your process assumes that ICANN continues to exist as it is presently structured, a California corporation with no membership, et cetera. On Tuesday ICANN CEO Fadi Chehade told GAC that in regard to the accountability process everything is in scope and nothing is out of scope which by implication includes a possibility that ICANN may be replaced or restructured organizationally. Without knowing the future organizational structure and accountability structure controls of ICANN, how can the IANA transition planning proceed and be expected to produce a competent and relevant proposal for stewardship of the IANA functions unless your proposal provides for a complete separation of IANA from ICANN.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. I will, first of all, see whether anyone from the ICG would like to comment. But of course, it's possible for any one of you to also come up to the microphone and continue to discuss this topic. Is anyone here that would like to say something? Milton? And by the way, let me say one more thing. We are using a timer with two minute marks, so you can see the timer is on the screens here. We will use the timers for everyone talking. So please, Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Nothing in our process presumes that you cannot make structural changes in any of the operational communities relationship to ICANN or to IANA. I think it's just a matter of what these communities will agree to do or what they want to do. So I think the door is open to any change that looks like it provides a consensual improvement in the relationship that responds in a way to the absence of the NTIA that makes things accountable and secure and operational.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Narelle?

NARELLE CLARK: Yes. Hello. Narelle Clark from The Internet Society. I actually reject the assertion that there is an assumption implicit that ICANN continues to exist amongst -- that there are no alternatives that can be proposed amongst all of this.

All I believe we assume in this is that IANA continues to exist and that the three fundamental parts of IANA continue to exist.

So I'm prepared to take any assertions to the contrary there, but I think those are the inherent assumptions in all of this and that's it.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. So let's take the first topic from the queue here.

CRAIG NG: Hello. Craig Ng. General counsel of APNIC. Just a question.

So -- sorry, Narelle. Can't hear me?

In whatever proposal that might be submitted to the ICG, come January 15, it's most likely that whatever proposal it is, it will involve an agreement or contract with ICANN or whichever body that might take over.

Does ICG's role involve negotiating that proposal with ICANN before submitting it to NTIA or during the NTIA process?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Kavouss?

KAVOUS ARASTEH: Thank you. Kavouss Arasteh. The answer is no. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Sounds like we don't need any further clarification.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, I would say one more thing which is that if your proposal involves an entity contracting with ICANN, that entity should certainly be working on that now or next year, whenever it is determined that it's part of the proposal. So while we will not be working on it, whoever wants to have a contract with ICANN should work on that.

CRAIG NG: Sorry. So my question really is that we can come up with a proposal which would be what our community wants but which may be totally

unacceptable to ICANN, for example, so where is that process for that to be agreed upon?

Because there will be no point in us coming up with a solution that we all think is wonderful that's totally unacceptable to ICANN that -- and that is acceptable to NTIA.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah.   I mean, I guess what I'm saying is that as soon as you have decided that's what you want, you should begin discussing it with ICANN.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. I believe we have a question from Benin.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Hello.   I belong to the ISOC chapter in Benin, and my question is regarding the relationship between Africa and this transition that people have been speaking so much about in the last months.

So I would like to make something clear.   We have connectivity problems in Africa, and I believe that our leaders should really become involved in this process, so that in Africa, as I say, we can catch up with the development of everything because we are lagging behind.   We have been lagging behind.

So I would like to know if there is any development. And in this regard, I am addressing the African leaders and they should be involved, so this is

what I would like to know, if there's some mechanism that would allow such involvement. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So thank you for the question, Benin.

I think the -- many of us would acknowledge the very important considerations that you raise. I think the scoping of this transition is limited to the stewardship of the IANA functions, which are necessary and important for anyone who wants to be connected to the Internet, regardless of the standard of that connectivity.

So it is a global problem but does not really get to the heart of enhancing connectivity in any particular location.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So I think, Roberto, you're next and then we have a remote hub.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yes. Roberto Gaetano. I'm an individual Internet user, and as such, I'm a beneficiary of all three major functions that IANA does.

My concern is that by splitting the work in three parts and having three separated operational communities providing solutions, we might first lose the global view and all the interactions; and second, we might come up with different proposals that I understand at that point has to be merged in some way by the ICG.

And I was kind of wondering whether -- what will be the mechanism. And what worries me is that if we wait until that point in time when we

get the proposals to find out that they don't match, there will not be the time to have an additional cycle to this and the things like we do normally for a PDP.

And, yeah, that's basically the thing.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: An end user makes use really, like you say, of all of the activities that are part of the IANA functions contract, but when you get into how those functions actually occur and what are the policy set of things that are followed by the IANA functions activities, they really do truly source from three separate operational realms, and have for many years. And so one of the primary reasons why the ICG, I believe, has asked the individual operational communities to come back with their own proposals is from an end user's perspective, you, unless you're involved in the details of some of those functionalities as an end user, won't really be able to tell that there were three proposals, because in fact that's how the system is fundamentally working today, with three separate sets of activities.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I think we have Xiaodong, then --

                      Do you want -- do you have a follow-up or --

ROBERTO GAETANO: Yeah. Just a very quick reply.

I think that that might be true, but my nightmare is because instead of -- the different proposals can be drastically different.

What I've heard these days -- and I've read all the comments on the list -- is that we go from the pure and simple replacement of the NTIA supervision that is what I thought was the initial task to also a proposal that splits -- that goes to the split of the IANA in three different parts, and that is something that is drastic, is sort of a revolution as opposed to an evolution, to quote what Steve DelBianco has said in the other session. That was my worry.

RUSS MUNDY: And one of the jobs of the ICG in our charter is to look for conflicts or gaps amongst the proposals.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Xiaodong, please.

XIAODONG LEE: Just to give a very quick comment.

I think it's because the proposals must be community-based, then we should -- we should fund the professional community to give professional proposals.

And then if we look at the time line showed by Alissa, there is some overlap time between the community proposal and the ICG work. So I think we have some time. If we can work hard and try our best, we can

have some time to review and merge some proposals. I think we need to have some (indiscernible).

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Wolf, I think you want to respond here.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Roberto, for this question.

That was my concern, actually, when I raised this question in the session before with regards especially to the impact of the accountability issues to the separate three operational lines.

I think it is essential and it's very important to start to communicate between the three operating lines by developing their plans already, not waiting until they are going to deliver that to the ICG.

So that process has to be started immediately, and I fear up to now -- so from learning from the -- what I heard over the week -- that there are still three lines, you know, not very much interlinked at the time being, so that has to be improved.

And I myself, as a member of the ICG, I will take an eye on that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: And Narelle, please. Yeah.

NARELLE CLARK: So just quickly, if we go back to the time line, the first submission date is the January -- January the 21st, so if we can at least get -- if we get great proposals from all three at that date, that's great. Then we can compare them and quickly see if there is any major discrepancies, and then we can flag that back to the community.

So even if we don't get great proposals at that date and we get, you know, lesser and lesser proposals, at least we should have some sense of where the communities are going and we can try to reconcile them at that point and readily flag them back to the community.

So the earlier the community is signaling to us what they want, the earlier we can signal back if there are any issues that we can see between them. And accordingly, they can amongst themselves as well.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Keith, you have the floor.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you. Keith Drazek.

So I would like just to support everything that's just been said, but maybe just to put a fine point on it is that one of the reasons the operational communities, the three operational communities, are responsible for making their own recommendations in a bottom-up consensus manner, in the way that we've approached this, is that the interaction of each of those communities with the IANA functions operator are very different.

We are not one size fits all between naming, numbering, and protocol parameters.

So I think it's critical that we all, as a community, as the ICG certainly, acknowledge that each one of the communities will have their unique interests and then it will be the job of the ICG, once the proposals are submitted from the operational communities, to identify any gaps, any conflicts, or any opportunities or areas for efficiencies. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah.   Just to build on what has been said, I think there already is coordination between the communities so we have people -- a number of people who are participating in more than one of these processes, very much for the purpose of identifying and having their eye out for where there are overlaps between them.

And there are, indeed, overlaps between some of the functions. They're fairly minimal but, you know, we need to keep track of them.

So we don't even need -- you know, we need not wait one more day to do the coordinating function that we are supposed to do. In some ways, we're already doing it.

I also just wanted to respond to the suggestion that, you know, today there's a single oversight mechanism. I don't think that's true at all. I think speaking from an IETF perspective, we don't really recognize that the U.S. Government provides oversight of the protocol parameters

function in any way. We have our own oversight mechanisms that involve the Internet Architecture Board and contract and so forth that Jari has spoken about, and so it's -- I think it's false to say that, well, today we have one oversight mechanism and we need to replace it with one. I think we need to look at exactly what we have today and think about what we might need to change with the exit of the NTIA.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mary, please.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you very much.

I want to address your question in two ways. If we are looking at what we have as track -- the accountability, Track 1, 2, and then the ICG, or you're looking at the three operational communities, in each case, for the Tracks 1 and 2 of the accountability and the ICG, there will still be a community working group where we can harmonize the issues or the views. And again, in order to avoid what you're trying to raise, I think ICG has also made a strong and a good timetable, not a reverse timetable, that we have time for the submission of the proposal from the community, a review period, and it goes back to the community.

So if we work hard within our communities to meet those deadlines, we'll not have problems. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Mary.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. I think my points have been made already, but I may also highlight that the way the RFP is drafted also helps that we get some consistency in the proposals that would facilitate the ICG tasks in compiling one unified proposal and identifying any gaps or overlaps in the different proposals.

So we've been aware of this, I think, while the RFP also was drafted. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So we'll take the next question from the mic, please.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: From the mic?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Okay. Good morning, my name is Bertrand de la Chapelle. I would like, first of all, to say how much I appreciate the clarifications regarding the facilitation role that the ICG is going to play, as opposed to developing proposals on its own.

That being said, when I look at the -- at the podium here, most of the people who are on the podium have been selected precisely because of their competencies in their respective groups.

And if the process is taking place in the three stars that have been displayed on the slides, it would be a great pity if the people who were on the committee, on the ICG, did not participate in the discussion because on the one end, their participation will be missed in their respective communities. And if they don't participate in the preparation for the proposals, the natural tendency in the group will be to use the group to develop the proposals themselves.

My first question is: How do you plan to see -- I see my former colleagues from GAC or others -- to participate yourself and separate the two functions that you're fulfilling as members of the community to contribute to the elaboration and as member of the ICG to facilitate the coordination?

The second question, if I may, is in the part that is going to deal with names -- not the parameters or addresses -- how do you see the organization and the involvement of governments in the discussion? Is this something that is going to be left completely to the subgroup? Or is it some -- is there going to be some guidance? How does the GAC participate in this discussion which is, as you know, extremely important regarding particular ccTLDs. So these are the two questions.

[Timer sounds.]

ALISSA COOPER: Yay, somebody took two minutes. I can see Martin and then Kavouss.
                        Martin, go ahead.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I can see Kavouss and Russ.

ALISSA COOPER: Martin, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you for the question.   For the first questions that the ICG
                        members have two responsibilities, first responsibility as a member of
                        ICG, they perform that.   Second, participation in any of these
                        cooperation community depending on the domain of activity are a
                        member of ICG.

                        For instance, I am a member of GAC and ICG. I'm more connected to
                        the operation community dealing with names. So it is incumbent on me
                        to participate in that group in one way or other and to feed back that
                        one as appropriate.   This is something that depends on the other
                        people.

                        Second, with respect to the question raised at what would be the
                        relations between government, again, as a member of GAC, we
                        discussed that considerably, lengthy. And we decided that it is on the
                        GAC members to encourage each government to their governmental
                        activities plus the multistakeholder nationally inside the country to
                        carefully examine the matter and to contribute.   And, in general, we
                        have to mobilize the government to the importance of this activity and

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Martin, please.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks very much. Martin Boyle.

I think certainly Kavouss has covered a lot of the points that I'd like to make, but I would want to emphasize just a couple of quite clear points. In the cross-community working group, participation is open. And I'm very, very pleased to see that quite a number of people from my own community, from other communities including governments, including my own government, have joined as active participants in that.

This is important because the process has got to identify what people's concerns are. How to make sure that the safeguards are put in place goes back to Steve DelBianco's stress testing ideas or scenario building.

So that I think is really, really important. The other thing, though -- and this goes back to that earlier question that we had, that certainly from the ccTLD community members on the ICG, we are all participants in that cross-community working group.

And I would see our role very much as two-way liaisons in that activity so that we do pick up the issues early and that if we have got doubts, we're in a position to ask the question then rather than waiting still the 16th of January. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Russ, please.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So part of your question dealt with participation in the protocol parameters and the number spaces. And I can say for myself I am very active, involved in the protocol parameters proposal development, and actually took the pen for some of that. I suspect that other people on the ICG will be doing the same for various parts of various proposals.

                            Further, in the slides that Jari gave, he showed how anyone can participate. Governments are part of anyone. And, likewise, Adiel showed how anyone can participate in the five RIR discussions that are going on now. And, again, anyone includes governments.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Now it is Joseph.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you, Joseph Alhadeff. I was on behalf of ICC-BASIS.

                            Bertrand, we also have day jobs. So one of the ways we will do it within ICC-BASIS is that we coordinate with the members who are participating in the actual working groups, and then we work collectively on how that reflects our positions. And that also better enables the participation in those working groups because if I were to participate in some of the more technical community working groups, I think it would be a

frustrating exercise for both them and for me because I don't speak the right language for some of those working groups.

But a number of our members do and coordinating with them is the best way to both add value to that process and gain value.

So I think the stakeholders that coordinate through groups also can adopt that function that you're talking about and be able to cover the waterfront fairly broadly in that fashion.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Adiel, please.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. Just to add to what my other colleague had said, I think the two roles are separated. We are in the ICG to coordinate what will come up. If there is something that we want to participate as an individual, we do it at the community level. And I think for the GAC, for instance, there is no specific group for the GAC. So the GAC members have the ability to participate in any of these operational community discussions.   But when it comes to the ICG, there we work on consolidating one final proposal to the NTIA. So that's the nuances and the differences.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Wolf, please.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Bertrand. To complete that, so speaking for myself and as a member of the German community, so we do evaluate a bottom-up. So

we reach out within Germany to several fora, to several -- and have established a corpus where we are dealing with that. So we solicit all these views from there side and bring it into the cross-community working group where I am an observing member. Others are participating. So we do it very bottom-up, so that's -- included are our GAC members here from Germany as well in those areas.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Wolf.

Narelle.

NARELLE CLARK: So it looks like we've almost worn out the questioner before we've worn out the answer for a change here.

I note also that Bertrand said most of the people have been selected because of their competence within their own selected communities. And I wonder -- were we one of the people that weren't competent? I don't know.

But I think your question also runs to how well we will manage conflicts of interest. I agree that is probably something we can explore some more within our groups. If you look at the size of this group, we have gone to some lengths to examine closely the concept of how we will reach consensus towards the end in order to prevent any single capture by this group, by any one constituency within this group. And we are working very hard to make sure that within this group, we do have very strong communication processes, that we are operating in as open and

as transparent a mechanism as is humanly possible and technology possible.

I don't think I can add any further to that. I hope that's something that the community can trust in us.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. We'll take a remote hub. We have friends in Cameroon who are waiting for us. Go, please.

We can't hear you clearly. Can you please speak closer to the mic.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Good morning. I come from The Internet Society Chapter from Cameroon, and we have two questions. The first one is addressed to Adiel. We would like to give him the opportunity to expand on the issues that are at stake in this technical transition. Thank you.

I would also like to say that I also come from the ISOC chapter in Cameroon, and we closely follow up the meetings under the African strategy. And we see here in Cameroon that decision makers, despite their goodwill, actually participate in the different processes that are underway. Perhaps they are a little bit detached from what is specific to the Internet. So let me talk about the local community here when I speak about this new revolution.

So ICANN should try to come closer from the political world because I believe that there should be more work in this direction, although certain activities are underway. This is not enough. In the emerging countries, this is also important because we could add more value to

the actions carried out by the Internet society. ICANN envisaged a strategy similar to the one implemented by Fadi Chehade. In Cameroon, this has had a great impact. From the point of view of the media, this could have even greater repercussions in order to explain to people what these processes entail.

If these improvements can be made, we hope that we can have a more lasting process. And from Africa, we are watching the work being done by ICANN and we believe that this would -- improving these weaknesses would help from the point of your credibility.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: We will take another question from the remote participant question in Spanish, I guess.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: This is staff reading a question from Eduardo Mendez in Valenzuela. I will read it in Spanish.

The ICG establishes work relationships with multilateral organizations such as the ITU. So what are the expectations regarding the decisions that this body can make regarding the transition process?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So, Adiel, if you can speak to that first question.

ALISSA COOPER: I can speak to that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you for the remote question. It's not the case that we have established relationships with any multilateral organizations, as it turns out.

So obviously as we've said, the community processes are open to anyone who wants to participate, and that is the main vehicle for developing the transition plan. There are not other relationships that we have established, but certainly anyone who participates in a body such as the ITU or any other multilateral organization is welcome to come and participate in the existing community processes.

MOHAMED EL-BASHIR: Adiel, please.

ADIEL AKPLONGAN: So take the first question that was addressed to me, I will speak in French.

Here we are talking about the IANA stewardship transition and the challenge has to do with the fact that for a long time as an Internet governance community we have requested that these oversight exercised due to historical reasons by the U.S. government, specifically the NTIA, can be open and done in a more multistakeholder way. With the U.S. government's decision of announcing its willingness to -- to

ICANN NO. 51 | 12-16 OCTOBER 2014
LOS ANGELES

leave this stewardship function, we think that now we are faced with the opportunity to deal with this mechanism, a new mechanism for the IANA stewardship. And this will be a mechanism that will be based on the multistakeholder model instead of having just one single administration that would be the U.S. government. In Africa, for us the challenge has to do with participating in this stewardship mechanism and to make sure that our needs are taken into account.

RUSS MUNDY: -- one of the representatives from the SSAC and I'd like to just address the second question we had from Cameroon about understanding what the specifics are that are involved and what actually is going on. And the SSAC as an organization itself has published two documents that are intended to help the community get a better understanding of what the IANA functions are and how they interact between the various participating parties at this point, and they are known as SSAC report 67 and SSAC report 68. And so they are available on the SSAC Web site, and the pointers to that Web site has been sent out on the ICG list. If anyone needs more, we can, of course, provide them.

MOHAMED EL-BASHIR: Mary.

MARY UDUMA: I want to also respond to the question from Cameroon about local knowledge, local understanding, sensitization, awareness. And I want to tell you that your -- sorry. Okay. I want to say that you have a great platform, that is the ISOC Cameroon. So it is a starting point. Since you

know, you could also engage others within the community, within Cameroon, with the multistakeholder community within Cameroon to also start desensitization. The (indiscernible), the ISOC (indiscernible) in African hub organized a webinar for you (indiscernible) and most of you did not participate. I want to encourage you the next one we are going to do that you should hook on to the webinar and participate and we'll make sure that it's communicated widely.

And the technical community to the AfriNIC has been doing a lot of work and trying to communicate what the IANA transition is all about. So I also want to encourage you to be part of it. And that's the only way we can do it. And also read, read -- go to ICANN Web site and read what is going on and get informed. And get engaged. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. We'll take another microphone question.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you, Patrick. My name is Roelof Meijer. I'm the chief executive officer of SIDN, the registry for .NL. I don't bring a new subject. I have some clarifying questions, so I don't know if you want me to run to the other mic. I can stay here?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: You can stay there, yes.

ROELOF MEIJER: My questions are directly addressed at the chair, since it's a question of clarification of a statement she made. Did I understand you correctly when, if I say that you said that the statement of Mr. Roberto Gaetano, that there's only one oversight, that that statement is false?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, that's what I said.

ROELOF MEIJER: And did I understand you correctly too that you said that your organization or the IETF doesn't recognize that there is a U.S. or NTIA oversight, particularly for the -- (multiple speakers)?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, I think that the view in the IETF that the -- is that the oversight over the provision of the protocol parameters registry function by IANA is provided by the Memorandum of Understanding that we have with them. It's provided by the Internet Architecture Board. It's provided by a number of mechanisms that we use and exercise all the time, whereas the NTIA contract has not been exercised in any way, really.

ROELOF MEIJER: Is it not true that the scope of this whole exercise and, in fact, the scope of this working group is the transition of the oversight role of the U.S. government or the NTIA?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

ROELOF MEIJER: Is it not strange then that there are organizations represented that deny that such an oversight -- oversight exists in their particular case? Should they be on the panel or in the working group?

ALISSA COOPER: Well, so I think this is why you see in our RFP, for example, that -- where we ask for the -- the post-transition arrangements, we ask the communities to detail what changes need to be made, if any. And I think even if -- if you look at the -- the people on this panel can correct me if I'm wrong, but if you look at the current draft which is being -- the draft transition plan which is being worked on in the IETF, the suggestion in that section right now is that no changes are needed. I think that's what it says right now. Obviously, it may change. We need to develop consensus around that. But that's specifically to protocol parameters, as you already said earlier, we feel very strongly that things are working well, that we have very robust mechanisms for oversight.

ROELOF MEIJER: That seems to be a different thing. Saying that you're not affected by the oversight or say that the oversight is okay or that everything is okay, nothing has to be changed, those are different things. So I understand that you don't need any changes if you are not affected.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: We have people -- we have to speed up the queue here, so I like to run that. Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, just agreeing, first of all, with what Alissa said, but I just wanted to add one thing which is that it may be useful to think about the type of stewardship that the NTIA has had on this topic, and I think it has been more about allowing the communities to grow and develop their processes, and that's been great, rather than something more concrete that they're doing and sort of, you know, overseeing specific activities, and over time we actually have developed these mechanisms and agreements and, you know, all the tools. Not to say that we have everything. There's room for improvement. I think we'll do some improvements as part of the transition, but -- but it's that kind of oversight or stewardship that the U.S. government has had rather than that they did something more specific that we now have to replace. So they've been wise in the past and, therefore, now we have to do less.

MOHAMED EL-BASHIR: Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, I think it's all explained in the historical terms that the -- the reason we had U.S. government oversight and that oversight was focused on changes to the DNS root zone was because in 1997 and '98 there was an antitrust case in which somebody asked Network Solutions, now VeriSign, please put 200 new domain names in the root, and at that time the root was completely privately run by Network Solutions. There was no real regulation on that, and they said gee, this is a dilemma. If we put these 200 new names in, we're really setting

global policy for the root unilaterally. And if we don't put them in, we're seen as thwarting competition, so we would be legally liable for some pretty heavy damages. So they went to the Commerce Department and said, save us, please. Provide us cover. And so the Commerce Department asserted authority over changes to the root zone.

Nobody ever really believed or cared whether somebody supervised the protocols published by the IETF. Nobody really knew much about what was going on with numbers at that time. But the whole oversight apparatus was completely established because of names, and for that reason, and now that we're getting rid of it, the -- there are some implications for these other aspects, but it doesn't mean that they have to make the same kinds of changes that the names community has to make.

MOHAMED EL-BASHIR: Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. So I just wanted -- I fully agree with what Milton just said. I just wanted to make sure that I was clear that my response was specific to the protocol parameter registries, the IETF protocol parameters, not to the other functions. So I'm not sure if there was a disconnect there, but that's what I was talking about. Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

MOHAMED EL-BASHIR: No, there was no disconnect there. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Let me understand -- let me explain what I understood from the reply of Alissa. She did not say that in the activities of the IETF there is no need for any type of oversight. What she said, that this oversight functions is performed through various other arrangements, such as Memorandum of Understanding of activities, IAB. That's all. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy. Actually those of us that have been involved in this for a long time would have different views on the source of the oversight, and mine are somewhat different than Milton's but, in fact, it's earlier than that time frame that there has been some oversight in place but, in fact, the IETF has operated as their own separate and independent mechanism for setting policy for many years.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Do you want to comment on this?

ROELOF MEIJER: Yeah. Well, thank you. This all settled, I think Mr. Gaetano made his point to stress that this whole work is about the U.S. government or the NTIA oversight and it's a relatively simple oversight. And I think he warned us against overcomplicating matters. I'd like to repeat that statement. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: John, please.

JOHN CURRAN: John Curran, president and CEO, ARIN. I'd like to disagree with the prior speaker. The whole manner is about making sure that the community has mechanisms for responsible oversight for a set of critical Internet identifiers. And doing that at a time when the U.S. government has indicated it's willing to relinquish its mechanisms, it isn't about handling just that relinquishment. It's making sure at the end of the day we have a responsible set of oversight mechanisms for how these are administered altogether.   And in some cases there are preexisting mechanisms that have been working perfectly well.

So I don't want to disagree on the fact that the impetus for this is the fact that we have an offer from U.S. government NTIA to remove its oversight mechanism, but no one should be confused and think that that's the only one operative today. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Bertrand.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Bertrand de la Chapelle, for the record. I just want to highlight that the question that Roelof has asked is a perfect illustration of the two different layers of the transition question. The role that NTIA performs today, which I personally prefer to qualify as a global trusteeship rather than a global oversight, is different between the day-to-day interventions in the work flow of any changes, particularly on the

ICANN NO. 51 | 12-16 OCTOBER 2014
LOS ANGELES

names, and the once every three, four years or whatever delegation of the mandate and the contract to a particular organization and particular -- potentially resigning it. The mechanisms and the discussion that came on the different -- on the three pillars, on a day-to-day basis, the role that NTIA performs today is very different in the three pillars, and as has been said, there are situations where it is almost non-existent at the moment. And so the definition by each of the three communities of the service level agreements, the conditions, and the wish list performed is one layer, but there is a second layer which is different which is the role that NTIA performs today in issuing the contract, in negotiating the contract, and in setting the terms of the contract. The second function is a different one, and one of my concerns in the previous discussions regarding the three pillars is that inasmuch as each of the communities is perfectly legitimate in defining the service level agreements for the function on a day-by-day case-by-case changes to the roots and the registries, there needs to be some common glue regarding who is making the delegation of the responsibility. And there are various options, don't get into the substance, but I just wanted to highlight the distinction of the two layers.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. New question from the microphone.

SEUN: Okay. My name is Seun from Africa, from Nigeria to be specific. I just want to make a comment on what has just been said first before I ask my questions. I think one of the very important question has been raised which is in terms of the layers of the oversight, I think one of the

questions that I have asked some people on this list, on this panel before us, is narrow-based question. That if the U.S. decides to move the IANA function to another operator, for instance, does IETF have the right to say no to it because that also says that -- that indicates that they -- they have an oversight. That will determine the actual layer of the ultimate oversight.

That being said, my comment, one of my questions is in relation to I think the IETF has done a very good job of making sure --

That being said, my comment -- one of my questions is in relation to I think the ICG has done a very good job at making sure that the community is discussing in three separate categories. That is good news for all of the community. I'm not sure it's good news for you, because by the time we're providing the proposals, you're going to have to worry about how to put those things together to become one.

So my question is: If it happens -- and I'm going to be talking about scenarios here. If it happens that one of the communities provides or presents a proposal that involves taking out the function out of the IANA -- because IANA is a set of functions, right? And by the time you remove one of it, then you're creating something different entirely.

How does the ICG intend to resolve this?

Because you're saying that you're going to send it back to the community. They have just sent something to you, so are you going to send it back to all the three communities? Are you going to get them all to agree that this is not the way forward? I need to hear a specific response on that.

Time up. Okay.

But let me just quickly mention the second one.

The second question is in relation to what is the indicators that will prove that communities are actually -- what are you going to look at -- look out for in their reports or proposals so that you confirm that they are actually achieving consensus?   What are the highlights you're looking out to confirm consensus? Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. I just wanted to quickly respond to the first comment first, which is that the IETF, as normal, we do have an agreement with ICANN and we also believe that we have an ability to make further agreements with ICANN or other parties.

So -- and I think the question of whether the U.S. Government would hand the operator role to some other party, that's a moot point at this part of the process.

But then your question about, you know, what if one of the operational communities wants to hand the role somewhere else and how that changes things, and the first observation that I would make is that I think that's a little unlikely, at least from the point of view of the IETF.

But I think people are thinking about it a little bit too IANA focused and sort of U.S. Government focused.

It's not just about being able to coordinate this --

I mean, the different operational communities have some interactions and there's some overlap. You know, special names is one example. Special IPv6 addresses is another example. And we have to have some discussions. So it's not really so much about the IANA part. If -- if something -- some changes would at some future date happen with regard to how the IANA function is organized, I mean, and where it's organized, it's not just a discussion to IANA that matters, but between the different parties.

So a couple of years ago we had a case where we had to provide an allocation of an address range for technical purposes and it actually came out of one of the RIRs and it was a lengthy discussion kind of like within IETF rights but we didn't have the space to do that, and it was -- the communities were -- you know, they got together and discussed and we eventually made a decision. And the implementation of that was also a small detail, but the communities had to come together and figure out what they really wanted to do in this complicated case.

So as long as we are clear on what -- what the interactions are and the overlap is, I think we're going to be fine.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Thank you. Lynn St. Amour, and I'm here as a part of the IAB representation.

I just want to echo something that Jari just said, because so many of the discussions that I've heard this week seem to start from the IANA functions operations itself and I think the right way to think about this is to think about the three operating communities and ensure that they have the ability to place their registry functions where they need and where it best suits their work today and in the future.

So if we start our thinking by thinking about those three components of work, rather than focusing on the combined entity today that we call IANA functions, I actually think we'll find a lot more agreement in our discussions. Because I think today a lot of our discussions are potentially talking at cross-purposes because we're starting in some of the communities at the end that looks at the work that's needed and where that work should best be done, and in other communities I think we're starting from trying to protect the set of operations today, and I think that will actually extend the work if we don't actually to a better kind of definitional agreement.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Russ and then we take you at the microphone.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So Russ Housley. I'd like to build on what Jari and Lynn just said.

The coordination that has to happen between the communities that they just described is mostly happening at the policy level, not at the IANA updates to registries level, and so that's the part that's associated with this transition. The communities still need to cooperate on those

special corner cases where we overlap, regardless of what happens with this transition.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. I just wanted to respond to your other question, since lots of people have spoken to the first question, about the evaluation of consensus.

We have asked the communities to explain the consensus level that they achieved. We haven't asked them for very -- any specifics, so they can -- they can do that in any way that they see fit, and obviously their explanation needs to be complete.

And we also asked for references to, you know, documentation, mailing list, archive discussions that demonstrate the process that they used and their achievement of consensus.

I know that, for example, within the IETF it is very common practice for a working group chair who is submitting a document for standardization, we ask them to detail if there were any strong objections to the final document and how those objections were addressed, so that -- that kind of information, I think, will be very useful to the ICG in assessing --

Really, the question for us is whether the proposal achieved consensus within the community. If -- you know, if we get one or if we get several different proposals that clearly did not achieve consensus within

whichever community is sending it, I think that that should be called out to us and will raise a red flag.

So for both of your questions, feel free to let us know if they were answered.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Go on.

SEUN OJEDEJI: This is Seun again. I think maybe --

Thank you for the response. I'd like to also mention here that we -- the community does not have a problem of proposing things. You may even get a lot of proposals. But from what I've heard now, I haven't heard how you intend to resolve conflicts.

Are you bringing -- are you going to resolve conflicts by bringing the communities to the table? Are they going to discuss things?

Because what I'm worried about and I'm concerned about is that the more we -- if you go to all the community Web sites now, you see they all have their silos now. It's like in the way of trying to get good community participation, we've mistakenly also created some structural (indiscernible) indirectly, and that is how the people are working -- indirectly working right now. I don't see the connection. We seem to be missing the connection between the communities. And when I'm saying "communities," by the three individual aspects. I'm not saying name communities. I'm talking about connection between names, protocol, and numbers. In terms of bringing the proposals together,

we're going to get -- generally you're going to get a lot of proposals and you're going to have to figure out how to make sure that this whole thing comes into one and it's going to give us just a deadlock.

Please provide us -- provide -- think about it and provide a way by which you intend to actually get these communities at the table, because there's definitely going to be a deadlock. I've been on the different mailing lists and I've been seeing what people have been talking about, and it's very important to start thinking about this right now.

My second question is -- my question again is -- my other one about is what is ICG doing right now in terms of their Web site, in terms of their secretariat, in terms of their administrative things that they intend to do. What is the status of that. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Alissa, will you give a -- just a short answer to that? Otherwise, we'll also inform people that we do have a working session tomorrow which will be open for silent participants in the room, and also -- also remotely, where you can follow and see explicitly what we actually are doing.

But Alissa, did you want to give a comment on this?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. So I think, again, in terms of the coordination, we had a long discussion about this just a few minutes ago. We have many different means of coordinating between the communities. We have people

participating in multiple ones of them. We have the ability, once we receive proposals, to go back to any community affected by them.

So obviously if we get one proposal which says, you know, all the IANA functions must be transferred to Jupiter or something, then that impacts the other two functions and we need to -- we need to loop those communities in.

So it's -- I don't know. I guess to me it's not like we're putting the communities in prisons and they're not allowed to talk to each other. It's actually just the opposite, that there's lots of people going back and forth and coordination amongst them.

There's also -- as I said earlier, we have built in several months at the end of this process for a global public comment period, so if somehow we go through months and months of this process and there is some glaring issue that has emerged from one proposal that has not had the attention of a particular community, there will be an opportunity at that point for anyone to comment on any aspect, and we will, you know, receive those comments and will have to incorporate them somehow into -- into our -- into the final proposal.

Again, the Web site is ianacg.org. We have been supported thus by the very capable help of an ICANN secretariat. Alice and Ergys are sitting over here. And we are in the process of -- we're conducting a procurement process to establish an independent secretariat to be in place before we start receiving proposals. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So as I said, tomorrow is when you get to know what we are doing. There are many more people that would like to talk but we are going to remote hub.

Benin.

ALISSA COOPER: And actually, we need to close the queues right now as well, all of the queues, so thank you.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Hello.   My name is (saying name).   I am from Benin and I have a question.

Regarding the transition, if by the deadline the proposal presented by the community does not reach the desirable consensus or the NTIA rejects this proposal, what will happen?

The second question, of course if the -- regarding the transition proposal, if there is a proposal, moving forward -- that is to say that addresses -- the IAB addresses first, and the domain names, and thirdly the IETF, this would be a progressing process of how to implement the proposal.

Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: --- starting at 9:45 and running until 5:00 p.m. or shortly after.   We'll see.

Any comments?

Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Sure. So again, everyone -- everyone wants to focus on failure, not success. We want us to focus on success.

So what that means is that something will happen if we miss the deadline, and I don't think it is really the purview of the ICG to say what that is, but what we are focusing on is making the deadline, not missing the deadline.

And we have a year, so I think that's what we should focus on. That's -- that would be my answer.

And also, I mean, the same -- the same sort of answer to the kind of incremental -- right? There's all kinds of scenarios you could spin up in your mind about what may happen if this or that does not come to pass, but we, as a group, I think are focused on having one complete unified transition proposal. If that starts to look unlikely at some point next year, we will have to re-evaluate, but for now, that's what we are all focused on.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. And then we have Gambia as well.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: (indiscernible).

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. Let's try Gambia a little bit later.

Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good morning. I would like to reply to the previous question. My name is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.   I am an ALAC representative in the coordination group.

The second question was whether you would consider to address these plans in stages.

Alissa had already replied to this, but I would like to say that we do not have a predefined plan and this is the most important thing to know.

We will consider the different proposals received by the community and this will determine the content and the form of our proposal and plan.

YOUNG EUM LEE: -- council representing .KR but speaking on my own behalf.

I think most of us in this room are worried about the time frame, the shortage of time, and so my question has to do with the role of the ICG in this process.

I know that the ICG is only involved in the coordination of the efforts and not involved in the detailed content of the proposals, but -- and when we consider that the deadline is January 15th and maybe has been extended to the end of January, if we take out the three weeks'

vacation time in December, and of course if the members of the CWG are willing to give up their vacation time, we're -- that is almost very welcome too.

But since it is a very formidable task, I'm looking at all these capable and able people up here in the ICG, and hearing the presentation by IETF and the detailed nature of the content and Milton having proposed this -- a detailed map during the NETmundial contribution, I'm just hoping that members of this group also -- yes, there was talk of individuals being able to participate, but as a community, if you could coordinate things more with your community and maybe push things a bit more, get -- I mean, so not just doing the coordination, but actually pushing the content, I think that's -- I mean, if you're willing to do that, I think that would also help with the time frame. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Xiaodong.

XIAODONG LEE: So I am from a ccTLD -- This is Xiaodong Lee. I want to give you very two highlights by a comment. Firstly, we are an ICG member but we are the community representative from different communities. So now we have some of the ICG members have started to join the community works.

You're right. The time is very tight. But we start the work and try to finish the first stage before January. Of course, we may -- some people, they are lost in the holidays.

But, you know, next stage, you know, every ICG member, they have different kind of knowledge, it is very diverse knowledge. They work together to facilitate each other. For example, for myself, I'm from a ccTLD. But we also have a delegation. I'm also the active member of IETF. So, so many members have different background and also more background so even better for us to work hard. We will try our best.

I think all of the community members want to finish the job before next September is our target. Yeah.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Xiaodong.

Paul, please. Paul Wilson. Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. Keith Drazek. I'm on the ICG representing the gTLD registries. So I will confine my remarks to the naming community and more specifically maybe to the gTLD space. But I think the question of, you know, can we try to push the content or push as an ICG, as a group, trying to push things along the content, the community, engagement along to ensure we meet timelines, I think by setting out some target dates and the dates that we have in terms of the timelines included in the RFP, the request for proposals that was initiated, we actually have set out some pretty aggressive timelines which has forced in a sense the communities to focus on a schedule that is very much tied to the target date of September 2015 for the IANA stewardship -- function stewardship transition.

But I think at the same time, we as a group have to be very cautious about trying to dictate to the respective communities a schedule that may not be attainable. Speaking specifically for the naming community, we have processes, bottom-up, consensus-based processes that must be followed in order to be able to certify at the end of the process that there is consensus. And so I think we're focused on a deadline or a target date of September 2015. And let me be clear, target date, not deadline, September 2015.

Yet, we have the pressure from the other end of making sure that we as communities can meet our own obligations in terms of process and procedures. So I think at some point we will come together and identify the dates that work best and that are attainable.

But I can say that the communities have been energized. Certainly in the naming community, we have initiated a cross-community working group. The work has begun, and we are very sensitive -- sensitized to the urgency felt by all of us in the community. Thank you.

YOUNG EUM LEE: Can I make one more comment? I in no way was suggesting anything top-down. I was just talking about helping along the way in terms of content. So it is more a coordinating and collaborating and supporting rather than dictating because, I mean, I come from the CC community which also are very much involved in the bottom-up process. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. James.

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you. James Bladel. Just to agree and expand on what Keith had said, I think the danger is not missing the target. The danger is that the process is not followed correctly, and then the legitimacy of the proposal and the proposal process is questioned at the end of that. So I think that that is much more higher priority concern for this group and hopefully for the communities that are developing the proposals than the target date, although the target date is very much in the front of everyone's mind.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. So I guess I agree with what others have said before me a little bit. But all of us, I think, are working actively to make things move forward as individuals or in our communities or in our other communities that we attend to. But it is, indeed, those communities that need to come up with the solution and they need to want it. And it is only then that it is valuable. It is not valuable when it is pushed down from the ICC or the U.S. government or ICANN staff or something like that. It is from the communities. And this is your chance. This is the chance for you to say what is that it you want and you can take control. And I'm seeing that happening in all the communities. So that's great.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Jari. We will take the last question from the remote hub. I think we have Venezuela.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Good afternoon. This is Javala (saying name) from (saying name), Venezuela. We have some questions, three to be precise. The first one revolves around openness. Do you plan to change the licensing system for the Internet standards? We understand that certain conditions are applicable related to copyright. We would also like to have a larger response with respect to the expectations that they could have about the decisions that could be made in multilateral organizations like the ITU.

We would also like to know in principle, the board stated that it reserved the right to receive the proposal from the community and check whether they were in the interest of all the public -- all the audiences in their ecosystems. And if they were not, then they would go back to the community for their review.

Our question would be: Can the board commit to wait for the community to carry out this review and then come back with a proposal so that this would not disrupt the timelines?

Finally, we would like to know also the opinion of the panel regarding their proposal for improving the multistakeholder model. In the proposal for improving this model, we understand that users all over the world are the majority. However, we just have one voice inside the board. So we would like to know your opinion about this. Thank you.

ICANN NO. 51 | 12-16 OCTOBER 2014
LOS ANGELES

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:	Thank you hub. Alissa? Russ? Russ, please.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	So -- Russ Housley. I'll respond to the first question which dealt with licensing. The IETF Internet standards are now and always have been freely available for download on the Internet. And no license is needed to get those documents.
	The license that is available to those documents also authorizes anyone to translate them and repost the translation. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:	Thank you. Now to Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER:	Okay. I will try to briefly take the rest of the questions. So the first question about the relationship to decisions taken in the ITU, I don't think we have a strict relationship. I think folks who participate in the ITU are likely paying attention to the transition process, and I think a little bit vice versa.
	So those who are aware of both bodies and who participate in both parties are, you know, certainly -- whatever goes on, I imagine influences their thinking and their work. But there's not really a formal mechanism or anything that links the two of us.
	I think in terms of this question of what the process will be to have the board review the transition proposal and send it to NTIA, as I mentioned earlier this morning, we internally within the ICG have discussed a little

bit about what our expectations are as far as that process goes. I think we're going to continue that discussion with the ICANN board and the staff and hopefully we'll be able to provide some detailed information about how that will go.

But as we were really only alerted to this issue last week and because it doesn't actually have to be resolved until next year, we have a little bit of time so we can work out exactly what that process will be.

I certainly agree with the implicit sentiment of the question which is that we don't want whatever that set of steps is to delay the timeline in any way so we need to build that in in some way with more detail into our existing timeline.

And then the last question about the board, certainly that is something that if it is of interest to people should be taken up within the ICANN community and with the board itself and perhaps maybe in scope for one of the new accountability tracks but is not really in scope for the work of the ICG.

I don't know if anyone else --

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks very much. I would just like to say a couple of words about the ITU. Nominet is, in fact, a sector member and I will be a part of the U.K. delegation to plenipot which starts next week and goes on for three

weeks. And plenipot would -- is a discussion forum, decision-making forum within the ITU.

And so I can't really predict exactly what might come out from that discussion.

However, I would note that this discussion forum that we have here, through the various community groups, is open to the governments in their own rights, to get involved. And that would seem to me to be the direct approach for governments to use. We are the right forum. I defer to any views that Kavouss might have as being a government rep who will be representing his country in the discussions, but I would make the appeal to the ITU that it is -- that they encourage their membership to come and put their views directly into this -- into this environment. Otherwise, we're going to have a very, very long process via the ITU mechanism and approach. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Martin. As we come to the end the meeting, I will hand it over to Elisa Cooper ICG chair to conclude.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. And thank you to everyone for getting up to the microphone and asking your questions. A big thanks to everyone from the remote hubs and whatever time it might be that you stayed up until or woke up for to be able to participate. I think this was a really robust discussion, and I'm glad we took the time to have it.

In closing, I think I would say two things. The first is that as you can see on the slide, right now is the time to get to work. And so I would encourage everyone who is -- who cares about this transition, who is concerned about the IANA function stewardship, to roll up their sleeves now and start to engage in these processes. That is where we are in this process. It's time to stop talking and start doing.

The second thing I would say is that you shouldn't expect someone else to provide ideas for the transition plans. If you have ideas, please provide them. Please contribute them to these community processes. That's how we will build the transition plan and that's really how we built the Internet in the first place.

And then lastly, just a procedural note. This group will be having a working meeting tomorrow. It starts at 9:45 in the West Side Room. It is open to silent observers. So we won't have engagement and Q&A with the community, but you are welcome to come and observe and it will also be broadcast on Adobe Connect, and all of those details are on our Web site. So please feel free to follow along if you so choose. Thank you. And a big thanks to the ICG for all your work.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]