
LOS ANGELES – ALAC Work - Part II
Tuesday, October 14, 2014 – 15:15 to 17:00
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We'll start in one minute. We haven't got many ALAC members yet. Where are they?

Okay. Let's start the session. Let's have the recording on please.

Right. Good afternoon everybody. Apologies for the delay. We've been one floor down with the GAC and it was a fruitful discussion. We're looking forward to have a fruitful discussion today with the address supporting organization, address council, and the address supporting organization number resource organization.

With us, we have members of the ASO with the chair of the ASO address council sitting next to me, Louis Lee, and Adiel Akplogan the chair of the NRO, ASO NRO, who is sitting at a convenient 90 degrees from us, but we can all see each other, great.

I realize we started a few minutes late, not very much, but we have about half an hour to discuss things, specifically, I think, regarding the IANA stewardship transition, as the ASO NRO is one of the communities, I guess, that are going to be formulating input into the whole process.

Louis, do you have any starting points you wish to add?

LOUIS LEE: Thank you very much Olivier. I just would like the ASO AC members to wave their hands, let everybody know who you are, around the room so

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.

that you guys know we're available for everybody to ask questions during this week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Louis. And just a couple of rules here. With regards to speaking, everyone has to say one's name before speaking because of the fact that we have transcription and interpretation. And so on the other channels, it's always better to know who is speaking.

But to start, I think I should just give the floor to Jean-Jacques Subrenat for a brief position of, not the ICG because we're meeting with the ICG immediately afterwards, but with regards to our process on the ALAC. And the way that we're feeding Jean-Jacques and Mohamed El Bashir who is sitting somewhere here, with the way that we work on the ALAC.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Chair. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat, member of the ALAC until the end of this week, and a very happy member of the ICG as well. Well, I think that the reason I was hesitant to start is that, I haven't found any caffeine in this water yet, but as we go along, maybe that will be repaired.

The method, I think, is interesting because right from the start, as soon as we realized that the ALAC would be able to contribute to the work of the ICG taskforce was setup and it's called the IANA transition stewardship, etc. etc. working group. And the chair of the ALAC is the chair of that working group. It's a fairly open membership, and we have at least a weekly meeting online. And so the duty of the two ALAC

representatives, Mohamed El Bashir who is here, the vice-chair of the ICG, and myself to report, at least give a sense, perhaps not in detail, but to give a sense to this group of colleagues, of what we're talking about, and perhaps what are our preoccupations on the ICG.

And in return, to get feedback or instructions, or perhaps some indication of what the sense of the ALAC is on any particular subject. I say this at length because I would like to, for all of us to get a sense that neither Mohamed nor I express individual positions. We are, both of us, extremely conscious of the fact that we were entrusted with the task of representing the ALAC, that's what we do.

So, whether there may be contiguous points in some of the discussion or not, I would like to impress upon all of us that is very much the case. And thank you Olivier for making that clear in one of the meetings today already. Is that enough? Good, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thank you very much for this introduction Jean-Jacques. It's Olivier speaking. In addition to our formal input that we provide to the ICG via Jean-Jacques and Mohamed, our working group also provides direct input to our members of the cross-community working group on specifically the naming issues, which has just been formed within the ICANN community.

But we also have, as part of our 177 At-Large structures around the world, some individual At-Large structures that take part in the other operational community input processes. We certainly have some

members that are members, or that are active in the IETF, and some who are active in the numbers community.

One of the... But of course, they would be active in those communities as individuals, perhaps coordinating their thoughts within our working group, it's certainly not acting as relays or liaisons like Jean-Jacques, Mohamed, and our members on the cross-community working group. Now with regards to the ASO, NRO, well ASO in general. I think I'll just call it the ASO and the numbers community, it would be interesting for us to hear a little bit, where RIRs are today with regards to this IANA stewardship transition, what is the process that will be used to develop a coordinated proposal from all of the five RIRs.

I think there have been some concerns or questions certainly raised about this. And so I think perhaps I suggest that we spend the rest of the time listening to you, rather than you listen to our ramblings, or at least to my ramblings. And getting a better view of what is going on at the moment and what the current status is.

LOUIS LEE:

So for this dialogue, I would say that Adiel is best prepared for talking with you all, and we'll get started with information exchange and what we're doing on our side.

ADIEL AKOPLOGAN:

Thank you Louis. What I will report on is that basically, as we mentioned before, we are going to use a distributed approach to this. Each area will be conveying the discussion in their region, developing some proposal. And as you rightly put, the issue now is how do we

consolidate all of this into a single proposal that we will submit to the ICG? We have started working on that.

And the document or proposal will be shared soon. One of the idea that come up from few consultation on different mailing lists is to have a community based group that will be put in place, the kind of a ICG base, but more on the area level. That will have the tasks to consultate the different proposal.

It will recall the Chris group, we are trying to build a framework around that and share it with the SO and the others. Made of representation from the community, each region will appoint people to sit on this group, plus area stuff. Like our own idea is to have 15, 10 from the community and five from the area staff, that will work on the final proposal. So they will have time to consolidate it, to share with the community, and have a final document submit on time, by the 15th of January.

So I think that is part of the process right now that we are refining to make sure that we align it before the 15th of January. Besides that, each region is going through their own process of consultation, there are different approach to that. APNIC, RIPE, AARON, and AFRINIC and LACNIC have different approach to that, but the most important at the end, there will be a community driven consolidation process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Adiel. That's very enlightening, since I hadn't heard about the processes. I don't think any of us had actually heard about the processes on how things were going to come

together. What opportunities are there for At-Large members to be involved in those processes?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

I think the call for participation will open, especially the part that will come from the community, will be open to the community for volunteering and selection. There won't be very strict, I would say, assignment or reservation for different group. It will be an open call. So, yeah, if ALAC get into the selection from any specific region, it will be welcome. Basically what we want to achieve is to make sure that what rules submit to the ICG has some flavor of the final one of the community. If you look at processes that we have originally made on our website currently, it states that at the end, the area get together and consolidate the document.

So that is the part that we're improving now, or bring it to the community to do that. So, yes, it is open for anyone to participate, so ALAC representatives can get in, but there is no reserved seats for your community in that per se.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much for this Adiel. We mentioned the process being documented on the NRO website, perhaps we could have an action item for our staff to locate this, or perhaps if you can point us to the right location on the NRO website, that would certainly be of great help.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yeah, I can send you the link.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's great. Tijani Ben Jemaa, you have a question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. It's not a question, it's a remark. Tijani speaking. I heard you at the [London?]. I have a fear. I am a little bit concerned because as we all know, there is a deadline for submission of proposals. And right now, on the discussion list of AFRINIC, there is nothing going on, except your first mail and someone who had made some remarks. But working on the proposals, working on the substance, there is nothing now, right now.

So if there is two possibilities. Whether you are working on your silo, and then you put it as public work, at the end because as we know, it will be January, the submission. So this is an alternative. The second alternative, is that you didn't advance in this work, and both are concerns for me. Because the time constant is really important. So I don't know what is going on.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes, thank you, I think that is one of the concerns that we are having. Not all of the community are actively participating, because what we want to involve is to have kind of a dumbed down kind of approach, coming up with a proposal, but maybe we would end up with that at the end of the day, because if the community themselves, they are not coming up with proposal that can be discussed on the mailing list, to come up with the, a kind of regional proposal, we cannot jumpstart that process.

One of the things that we have suggested on the list is to have a moderator on the list that can monitor what is happening, and help the community organize around that. We got two volunteers. One of them has sent this first summary of the discussion recently to the mailing list. We are planning to have a roundtable during the AFRINIC meeting in [inaudible] 21 meeting in [inaudible], because that's also something [inaudible], and people are more, you know, ready to participate in the face to face discussion than on mailing list.

That is a fact. At the same time, what we will try to do as well is to cross share what is happening on other regions on the list, so that you can get idea, people ideas, about what is happening elsewhere, so that they can... But effectively there is no active, I would say, engagement and participation on the mailing list into this. Sometime because people don't have the, you know, all the full understanding of each, or because they don't, they just want, you know, to have their number of resources, and that aspect unfortunately is not really the most important part of it.

But I think ALAC participation to the mailing list in suggesting a thing on the mailing list are more than welcome.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Adiel. A follow up from Tijani and then Louis Lee.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. Yes again, if AFRINIC is not leading the discussion on the mailing list, it will not, there will not be any discussion. It must be led by AFRINIC.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay. Thank you. Coming from ALAC, I like it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. Louis Lee.

LOUIS LEE: I want to say that in the ARRON region, we are putting out a survey with some principles, and asking people if they agree, disagree. That way we can jumpstart the discussion with some ideas already.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Louis. In fact, I think I have forwarded that survey, the link to that survey, over to our IANA issues working group. So you're quite likely to get individual input from this part of the world, or at least from this community. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you. Holly Raiche for the transcript record. The comment, one of the comments that would concern you from Larry Strickland yesterday was, I suppose two areas of accountability. The first is, in terms of IANA functions, and he's referring to names and numbers and not the policy stuff, his question was more technical.

Presumably there will be benchmarks. What happens? Who does what if they're not met? Well first of all, who judges, and then what happens? And I don't know the answer, but I think he's looking for the answers as part of what the US thinks it needs to be satisfied about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Louis.

LOUIS LEE: Well, like you, I don't have the answers to that also, but yes, those are very fair questions to pose on our list, to get those discussion going because I'm sure everybody has a nice, big range of ideas on what those benchmarks should be. But perhaps we can coalesce into some agreement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Louis. One of the primary concerns of the At-Large community, I would say, is the accountability aspect of the stewardship of the functions undertaken by the US government. With the US government now removing itself from the whole process, and totally understanding the fact that in its history, it hasn't had to intervene in any way, are the RIRs looking at ways to enhance accountability? Or looking at the accountability mechanisms that they already have in place?

What part of the accountability play in the RIR proposal?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay. Again, if you are referring back to the page that we have put together on the IANA website, we have started... One thing that we have done is to say, as RIR, we operate differently. And when we are talking about accountability in this whole thing, we need to access our own accountability mechanisms. What do we have out there?

So we have conducted a [inaudible] RIR survey on accountability and transparency practice, within the RIR. And the result is published right now on the website, with the matters of each of the five RIR, what are their accountability and transparency processes that they have to interest different expectations. That is now published. We have developed the question and answer based on that accountability for, comparative accountability from when that is also published.

Now the third phase is to look at that metrics and see where weakness are, and see how we can improve them. Recognizing the fact that each RIR operate in different country and the different jurisdiction, etc., coming back to some of the fundamental common rule of accountability. So we are building a kind of common framework of accountability, where the [university] will come [inaudible]... So that is already published.

So for us it's an important element because we believe that strengthening that accountability and exposing what we do as area right now, will help us in the process later on, when we will start our relationship with IANA. And we are really, we pay very careful attention to the rule of our community in this process. We want to make sure that no matter what we do, we maintain the bottom up process that we use, where the community play a very important role in all we do, even the accountability and transparency framework.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Adiel. And another question, as I don't see any of my colleagues currently... I guess they're taking all of this in, and it's a lot to

take in all at the same time. Another question I think I've heard from several corners...

Another question I've heard is with regards to the overall coordination. As I said, if there are any discrepancies between the different RIRs, has this been already looked at? Is there a way that you have looked at to be able to have a coordinated approach? Or is this going to be on a case by case basis?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Hopefully that will be the job of that group that we're putting in place, to look at the final proposal from each RIR, to see the commonality to work on them, and if there is a severe divergence on the different proposal, tried to look at working with those community, that the RIR try to find a middle ground in the area.

But I believe that there will be some convergence at the end, because we are starting the work based on some same principle when it comes to number resource management, as part of the IANA function. So basically, the group that will be put in place to come up with a single proposal, will have to deal with those divergent view, if there is no specific mechanism to deal with that.

One thing that we are trying to do is to inspire this process from our group of policy mechanics, which already exists. Although this is not a policy development process, but we are just inspiring the process that we're using for that. So if there is a divergence there will be a way of dealing with that with the different community.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Adiel. I see Tijani having put his hand up, so I'll hand the floor over to Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. My concern is that we are speaking about weeks and not months and years. So, in those few weeks, every RIR will develop its own vision, and then they will try to converge and if they don't converge, they have to find a common ground. What about if they cannot find this common ground?

Can they go to the ICG with different proposals?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Well, our objective clearly is to come up with a single proposal. Yes, time is against us. I don't have an answer to that question. What will really happen if there is severe divergence in the proposal, which I'm not expecting, quite frankly, but when it has happened, probably will have to some mechanism that we have an inter area consultation mechanism to try to find, you know, a middle ground.

And we also, I'll say, trust in that group that we will put in place to liaise as much as possible of their respective community, when they are consolidating to say, hey, this part is not quite in line with what original saying. This is what the original saying, how can we find a middle ground here. So, yeah, but it has go very fast. And that's why I'm saying that the description and the framework of this group would be published this week, probably, and we hope by the end of November to have all the five area proposal already, so we have all the month of December for the consultation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Adiel. And another question, another hard one, I think, for this one. Obviously, the numbers community predates ICANN, predates the IANA, predates all of these other organizations or things. The question here is whether there has been any consideration of a complete splitting of the IANA functions into several independent organizations.

Have there been any discussions on this? Or scenarios? So splitting the functions, different organizations, instead of having just one IANA organization dealing with all of this.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Not really. From what I was seeing, coming up from different place, of course different function as seen with a different, from different angle, with different probably accountability mechanism right now, that's why we are reviewing our old accountability framework. Trying to dislocate IANA, the IANA function right now, and having different piece dealing with different, is not something that is in the proposal that we have on the table right now, and not something that has been, I would say, worked on at the [NRL?] level per se.

But, well, if that's come up from the different consultation, probably that is something that we will have to look at and look at practically how that will fit into [inaudible] proposal that will go to the NTIA.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much. I do realize it is still very early days, so it might have been a bit premature to ask you the question, but it was aimed to be provocative rather than anything else. Any other questions or aspects of the topic that we would like to add? I can see the countdown to zero is at zero, so I was... Oh, John Laprise. Always the very last second.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise, NARALO. So, this might be a difficult, if not impossible, question, but if you took a stab at it. If you were looking at the work you're doing in the numbers community, what percentage of the work is done at this point? If you look at completion, what percentage has been completed at this point? How far along are you in the process?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We've reached zero, and you're saved by the bell. If you wish to.
[LAUGHTER]

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Quite frankly, different areas are at different levels in the process. As Tijani mentioned, in our region, and I guess in LACNIC as well, there are few discussions on substance on the topic, while in that region, for instance, there have been more active discussions, so we are not all at the same, at the same level right now.

So I cannot say a global percentage of where we are. I'm not going to take that risk.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Adiel. I just had a question from Louis on the approach of the ALAC and the community. And I forgot to mention that the working group itself, or the ad-hoc working group itself, is a single working group that covers all of our regions. It's not a case that we have several working groups for each one of the regions. I think that would probably be taxing for us.

And it actually is the case for all of our working groups, we have 15 working groups, I think, on various different issues, and they are usually cross-RALO, across the whole world. We're only divided in the regions with regards to our structure, and bringing forward the points of view and having regular regional calls, etc. But as far as the work is concerned, we work on a prior level across all of the regions. Anything else? Oh, Adiel, back to you.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah, I mean, following up on that question. It is how, because if you look at the RFP of the proposal, they, three operational community have been highlighted. So what is expected is that ALAC contribution to the process of those three operational community, so what is the process within ALAC to make sure that their input goes to those operational community, like Tijani was saying, you know, in the AFRINIC region we have that many.

How do we make sure that ALAC view of the IANA function from the member's perspective is really inputted into the process? I think that will be good for us to know as well, so to engage more effectively the ALAC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you Adiel. Now, it's Olivier speaking. So we have, as I said, a mailing list, but we also have a wiki page which has got all of the details of our working group. We have a part of the wiki page that is a bit of a document store with the different pointers to the different sources of information. And this is why I asked earlier that perhaps you can give us the pointer perhaps to where the NARO resources are.

I think, are you going to that wiki page? It would be helpful to look into that wiki page that we have on this. And so we've got, here we go. We basically have a list of members, etc., and then we have a list of all of the mailing lists that are involved with the discussions, and point contacts. People that are on those mailing lists, and that participate in an individual capacity, but are able to relate back to our working group on a weekly basis, or bi-weekly basis, and able to provide us with a helicopter view of what's been happening on that working group.

It's physically impossible, I think, once the discussion picks up, it will be physically impossible for any one person to follow all of the discussions, but certainly here on the RIR mailing list, you'll notice that on the AFRINIC we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alberto Soto, who is sitting just a little bit further up next to you, Avri Doria on there. On the APNIC, we have [inaudible], who I believe might be around the room as well. Alberto Soto, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Avri Doria. On the AARON, Gordon Chillcott, Alberto Soto, and Avri.

Avri is actually the only person who is able to read all of the lists. On the LACNIC one, Fatima Cambronero, also sitting at the end of the table, Alberto Soto, and Avri Doria. And finally on the RIPE, it's Olivier and

Avri. So we're pretty much covering all of the regions, and those people act as point contacts to relate back to our working group.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay. I just sent you to the link to the NRO pointers, so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great, thank you very much. Louis, any other points you wish to make? I realize we've reached the end of the allocated time for this.

LOUIS LEE: I'll be brief. No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well thank you very much for joining us, it's always a pleasure and I think that was very productive. We've managed to really understand where you're coming from and we're you're going, and this will be of great help to our working group, and of course, to our members. So thank you.

LOUIS LEE: I appreciate the time also. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: See how they behave these days? It's fantastic. Okay. So already at the table, as you might have noticed, we have Alissa Cooper who is the chair of the IANA stewardship, sorry, IANA coordination group. Perhaps, Alissa could I perhaps ask you to sort of join me at the head table so

that everyone can see you? Because we do have some people that are on the same side.

So I should have given you an advanced notice.

And several other members of the ICG are also joining us. And perhaps it would be good, I mean, many of us hear your voices. We listen to you as observers remotely, and of course, we don't have any video capability to see your faces. So it would be interesting to perhaps go around the room and see who is who in the ICG. Certainly, our community knows Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Mohamed El Bashir, but with regards to others, it would probably be quite helpful.

So perhaps I can ask Russ and Gary.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm Russ Housley, on the ICG representing the IAB.

JARI ARKKO: My name is Jari Arkko, IETF Chair and ICG representing IETF.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jari. Of course, we've seen Adiel Akplogan a bit earlier, in the earlier session. Next to me.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm Alissa Cooper. Thank you. I'm Alissa Cooper. I am on the ICG as a representative of the Internet Engineering Taskforce with Jari, and I am the Chair.

ELISE GERICH: Hi. I'm Elise Gerich, and I'm the representative liaison from the IANA functions operator.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I apologize, I was just told that there was no interpretation at the moment. We do have interpretation, but there seems to be a technical problem. Great, we are doing well today. We had a technical problem a bit earlier this morning, for your information, where this box that you see over here that powers all of the microphones, decided to go south, and therefore we didn't have any mics, which doesn't help when you are recording.

So we had to have fly in mics, but as you can see, the table being rather large, and the mics not actually flying, requiring more of a speaker net type transmission. Does this work? Fantastic. I've finished rambling, let's go back to the issue.

So Alissa, we stopped at Alissa Cooper, Chair of the ICG. And then next to Alissa is? Would you please introduce yourself? I know your name, but please introduce yourself, Mr. Arasteh.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. You have introduced me. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are there any other ICG members in the room? Yes there are, oh, of course, please.

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark for the transcript. I'm a member of the Internet Society, Board of Trustees, and also the immediate [plus?] present of the At-Large organization, Internet Society of Australia. And also another At-Large member of ICANN through my day job, which is ACAN, the Australian Communications Consumer Action Network. So it's good to be amongst so many friends.

Even if Olivier told me to sit at the back.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think that was for the previous session, but this session, of course, you're all invited. Over at the back please.

MANAL ISMAIL: My name is Manal, member of the ICG from the GAC.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Michael Niebel from the GAC.

JANDYR SANTOS: Good afternoon. I'm Jandyr Santos, member of ICG from the GAC.

ELISE GERICH: I'm the liaison, Elise Gerich, IANA Functions Operator, and I'm passing it to [Sheldon] Lee, who is also on ICG.

[SHELDON] LEE: This is [Sheldon] Lee, ICG member.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU: Kuo-Wei Wu from ICANN Board liaison for the ICG.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we've pretty much gone through everyone. So that's great. It's great to put faces to the names, and to the voices. And with this, I think I can hand over the floor to Alissa Cooper, who will be taking us, with her colleagues, through a small presentation that you have about the IANA stewardship transition coordination group. Over to you Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So I am going to just spend a few minutes talking about the ICG as a whole. I know a lot of you are already familiar with the ICG and what it does, but some of you are not, and so we wanted to level set, and then we have a couple, well we have at least one speaker who is going to talk about some of the operational community processes.

I know you've already talked about the numbering process quite a bit but Jari and Russ are going to talk about the protocol parameters process. And we're supposed to have someone come and talk about the naming process, but I don't see that person.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There is no one in ICANN who can talk about the naming process.

GISELLA GRUBER: If I may, it's Gisella for the transcript. Just to remind everyone that we have simultaneous interpretation in Spanish and French, so if you could just keep the pace at a reasonable pace, thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you for the reminder. So, we are here to talk about the ICG, the IANA stewardship coordination group. All of our materials are available on our website, IANA cg dot org. So everything that I talk to you about today can be found there. We are a very transparent body, pretty much everything we do is in public. So if you want to follow up, please do so. Go to the next slide, I don't know who is advancing the slides.

Great. Thank you. So I think most people in the room are familiar with why we are all here, and why the ICG was formed, but just to give a quick refresh, obviously. Earlier this year, the NTIA announced its intention to transition the stewardship of the IANA functions, and asked ICANN to convene global stakeholders to develop a transition proposal. So to transition the current role played by the NTIA.

ICANN initiated a community process to determine how we would go about developing that transition proposal, and the result of that was the IANA stewardship coordination group, otherwise known as the ICG. Go to the next slide.

So what is the ICG? You just met several of us here in the room. It's a body that is independent of ICANN, and comprised of multiple members

from all of the different constituencies that you can see on the slide, 13 different constituencies, in addition to our Board liaison and staff liaison from IANA, who introduced themselves. So this is us. We come from a wide variety of backgrounds, and we are working together in a group of 32.

Next.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, it's Olivier speaking. If I could just add, you don't look at all like those figures on the screen.

ALISSA COOPER: Generic representation of who we are. Sometimes I feel just like that actually. [Laughter] We can go to the next slide. That's a little bit about who we are. In terms of our charter, and the scope of our mandate, we are a coordination group, and that word is very important. We were setup to help gather the community in a process to develop a transition proposal.

And not to develop the transition proposal ourselves. We're just a small group of us. The proposal itself needs to come from the many, many people who are impacted by the IANA functions and their oversight. So we mainly coordinate. We liaise with our various different constituencies, so it's a part of the role of each of the members of the ICG to be going back and forth between our group and their home communities, and making sure that everyone is informed about the process, and understands what's going on, understands how to participate, and is kept up to date about the progress being made.

We also have a role to assess and assemble a final transition proposal. I'll talk about this a little bit more in a moment, but we will be receiving inputs from the communities. We have some criteria which they will be accessed, and eventually we will put them all together into one final proposal that will eventually go to NTIA. And lastly, it is certainly our goal to inform and to be as transparent as possible, both about what we are doing but also what's going on out in the communities.

So that's our, that's a summary of our charter, more or less. Next. Thanks. So, I wanted to talk a little bit about the focus of the transition because it very much impacts the focus of the ICG and what we do. The IANA functions are currently are specified in a particular way in the NTIA contract. And what that contract covers is IANA's activities related to mainly three things. The protocol parameters registry management, the DNS root zone management, and the Internet numbers registry management.

And so those are the functions that are the focus of all of the transition efforts. There are other things that IANA does, there are other registries that IANA maintains that are outside of the scope, and those are also outside of the scope of the transition and of the work of the ICG. The other interesting scoping arrangement is in regards to stewardship.

So the NTIA announcement specifically spoke to transitioning the stewardship of the IANA functions, and not the other roles involved in the provision of everything that IANA does. So there is also policy development processes, which you are all certainly very familiar with,

that happen here and happen in other bodies. There are other aspects related what IANA provides, and those again, are not within the scope.

We are really talking about the stewardship of the IANA functions. So I just wanted to make those two points on the scoping. Next. So how is the transition proposal going to be developed? So what we have put forth as the ICG is that it's very important for this transition proposal to be developed from the bottom up, and in particular, to have the loci of the development be within the operational communities.

So the entities that have a customer relationship with IANA. Now what that means is that we wanted to focus each of those efforts on the function that is most relevant to that community. So in the RIRs, the focus is on numbering, in the namings, CWG, the focus is on names, and in the IETF, the focus is on protocol parameters. What it doesn't mean is that the historical participants in those communities are the only people who get to have a say. It's actually just the opposite.

So these processes, and what we have been pushing for as the ICG, is that all three of these processes be as open as possible to anyone who wants to participate and contribute and discuss the substance of the proposals coming forth. And so that's why you see people scurrying back and forth between the communities, and you see the people in the middle who are participating in all three, or maybe have not ever participated in them before but are doing so now.

The processes are meant to be open to anyone who wants to contribute. So that's kind of the initial step of the transition proposal development, and what's taking place right now, that we're talking

about with numbers, and we'll talk a little bit about with the other communities as well.

Next. So, to give you an idea of the timeline. I know the timeline is like the thing that everyone wants to talk about this week. So we issued to all of those communities, and to all global stakeholders, the request for proposals back in September. And the request for proposals outlines the specific elements that we, as the ICG, believed that needed to be covered, so that we can eventually assemble a complete transition plan to send on to NTIA.

So that happened in September. And the phase that we're in now, is the community proposal development. So all of those communities are having discussions about what they want their transition plan to look like for the IANA function related to them. So that's the current phase. And go to the next slide. You can see that the timeline is sort of step-wise. So we set as a target deadline for receiving the individual proposals from those three communities, as January, January 15th, actually, 2015.

And what will happen after that is that we will then have, hopefully, in the ICG, we will have three proposals, one for each of the functions. And we'll need to assess them against some criteria to determine, are they complete? Did they really cover everything that we thought needed to be covered? Was an opened process followed? Was the NTIA criteria met? And so on and so forth.

And if the ICG identifies that there are issues, or gaps, or items that require clarification, we will liaise back with those communities. So it's not the job of the ICG to edit, or to change the proposals that come in,

but to identify where there maybe issues that need to be rectified, and to communicate those back to the operational communities, and everyone who is participating over the current months.

And to have those issues resolved that way, so that's kind of the purple phase that goes up to March. And then you can see it kind of ping-ponging back and forth thereafter, to continue to resolve those issues. So once we have the initial phase, the communities have revisited, perhaps, filled gaps, resolved whatever issues were identified by the ICG. Then we get into the phase where the ICG receives the proposals back from those communities, and has to assemble one transition proposal.

And the unified proposal assembly will be looking for, are there any gaps between the proposals? Are there any conflicts between the different proposals? So whereas the first stage was an individual assessment of each one, the next stage is, do all of these fit together as an unified whole? So that's up to the May 2015 timeframe. Again, if we identify problems or issues in that phase, we'll have to go back to the communities themselves and ask for fixes, essentially.

The ICG won't be inserting the fixes itself. And then the final stage, we will have a complete transition proposal, which will be issued for global public comment. So at that period, everyone who hopefully has been participating the entire time, will be able to provide any final comments back to the ICG, and will allow us to determine if there really is global community consensus to send this unified proposal onto the NTIA.

And our target to get it to the NTIA is in July of 2015. And that's to allow the US government to do its own internal assessment, and

checking, and confirming with all of the bodies that need to do the confirmation, that it really is fit for purpose, and that the transition can go forward in September 2015, which is the deadline that has been established based on the contract expiry.

So, those are the main steps. You'll see also there, there is a testing phase which starts much earlier, to allow the communities to begin to test out any new oversight arrangements that they might be thinking about implementing, and you can see also that we would like for NTIA review to start much earlier than September as well.

So that's probably not too brief overview of the timeline, but details are important. I think that's maybe all I had, but maybe one more.

Yeah. So those are just the references. And then I can take questions now, or we could go to Jari and then come back. You have a question? Maybe we should do a few questions because your presentation is quite different.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We do a couple of questions. I put my tent card up before you Tijani. I'll ask my question [laughter]. No, let's start with Tijani, Holly, and then myself. Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Tijani speaking. You remember very well the discussion that happened about proposals, and how the members of the ICG was divided into two categories. Those who are loathe to submit proposals, and those are not loathed to do so. But there are

loathe to give inputs. And inputs was understood as comments on the proposals.

This is really concerning me because, suppose that those who are not loathe to give proposals have issues, but those issues are not raised by the operating community, operating parties. Does that mean that those issues cannot be raised the other members? This is concerning. And also, what level of consideration those inputs are given?

ALISSA COOPER:

So that's a really good question. I think the, what the design of the process, it's certainly not the case that, you know, some people are allowed to provide input and others are not. That is certainly not the case. All of the processes are open to anyone who wants to provide input. So, I hope that is clear. I think, from our perspective, we want this to be, in the end, a proposal that comes from the communities.

We do not want our little group of 30 people to be making substantive decisions about what goes into this proposal, because that's not reflective of anything really. If we just sit around in a room and decide. So the idea is to have the operational processes be the centers where the substantive discussion can happen. And to focus those on the individual functions, because you have to break the work down somehow.

So, the idea with it is to sort of rely on the efficiency of the existing processes, which should be open to anyone who wants to contribute, and to get as much input that way as we can, so that this small group of 30 people is not put in the position where they receive, you know, six or

seven other proposals, competing proposals about the same function, and then how are we to decide when, you know, we don't have a community that we can rely on to decide.

So really the idea is to not create a double standard, or to have, you know, different classes of commenters. It's to try and get people who care about the same function, in the same room, talking to each other. And if you care about all three functions, that means three rooms for you, I'm sorry, but it's a lot of work. But so that the proposal truly represents community consensus in the end, and not just an arbitrary decision of our small group, which is what we're trying to avoid.

And other people from the ICG should feel free to comment, if they want to.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For the record, Russ Housley just went, you're doing great. Carefully sticking to the side and hiding behind the table. Next we have Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche for the transcript. Going back to, people in this room are going to get very sick of me saying this, but yesterday, Larry Strickland talked about two strains. Now one strain, as he really talked about the functions itself, and within that stream of functions, which is, I think, what you are talking about, right?

ALISSA COOPER: So the two streams are within the ICANN accountability and governance cross-community working group, which is a parallel but separate process to the transition proposal development. This is very hard to actually have any clarity.

HOLLY RAICHE: I just wanted to clarify, so you're doing a stream that's really about...

ALISSA COOPER: The transition proposal.

HOLLY RAICHE: The transition proposal, and what his point is there are accountabilities in there, and the way he characterized it was to say, the accountabilities in there tend to be things like, because a lot of that probably more technical, it's likely to be what are your benchmarks? What are your performance indicators? Or whatever.

Who is going to decide if they've been met? What happens if they're not? So those are the questions of that, for him, it's what's accountability in that stream. There is another stream, which is accountability in a larger sense, and you're not talking about that, am I right?

ALISSA COOPER: Right. So to me, the distinction between the two streams is that they are both, first of all, they are both within the circle of ICANN accountability. So to the extent that this transition actually effects

accountability mechanisms that are outside ICANN, for example, Jari will talk about some of the ones in the IETF, so the transition is actually the accountability scope of the transition is actually broader than ICANN, but those two work streams are, first of all, focused on ICANN.

The difference between them, my understanding, and now I'm just speaking as me and not as the chair of anything, is that one of them is focused on matters pertaining specifically to the IANA transition, and specifically to IANA. And the other one is about ICANN accountability more broadly, because obviously ICANN deals with lots of things that are not just IANA.

And if you care about accountability, you might want to go talk about them in that second stream. So from my perspective, the first stream has a potential impact on the work that we do, and the transition. The second stream is probably much more far afield.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. Tijani, is there another question?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah. Excuse me, Tijani speaking. You just said that accountability and the IANA transition are two processes that are parallel, that are not, that are separated. But the cross-community working group wrote in their charter that accountability will be part of their input.

ALISSA COOPER: Indeed. So, and if you look at, actually, if you look at the request for proposals that we as the ICG have put out, we ask specifically each of

the operational communities to detail the accountability mechanisms. What is separate, which is, you know, was a decision that was made by other people, was within the ICANN context, to do those two pieces of work in separate groups.

That's my understanding is that there is a naming group that is working on transition issues, including accountability. There is an accountability group that is working on accountability issues. They clearly have a tight relationship with each other. But that's my understanding of the separation, that there is more than one group.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks very much Alissa. Mr. Arasteh?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Good afternoon again. I think the question that you have raised is very valid, and has not been properly replied and considered. What you said that the first track, or whatever is called the first or second, dealing with accountability in relation of the transition of the IANA function, if we get that information, how it is fed into the activities of ICG, this is not yet clear.

This has been mentioned in the charter, it has been mentioned in RFP, but after this new announcement of the ICANN last week or so, once before, we have to know how the result of this group, first track, will feed into the activity of ICG, and at what stage, and how it will be implemented. Your question is quite valid. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Mr. Arasteh. In fact, I think that also leads up to a large concern that we have, seeing the amount of work and coordination and so on that is needed, certainly among the names community, and we are part of the names community here. If we go back to the previous page please. We're looking here at a timeline of the ICG, which I quickly looked at and calculate as being about nine months or so from the time the communities develop the proposal, well, finish developing the proposals and provide them to the ICG.

And yet those communities themselves, having to do the hard lifting of putting together those proposals are given three months, which seems quite, for some, to be a very sportive attitude to being able to come up with consensus.

ALISSA COOPER: So that, I think, is a little bit of an unfair characterization. Because the reason why you see here, essentially, two month blocks, is because there is a potential that in each of these phases, that the proposals are going back to the community and need to re-obtain community consensus. And I think it was our feeling within the ICG, that if we were going to ask the communities to go back and get consensus on an edited proposal, that we had to give them at least two months each time, essentially.

So it's indeed, to get to the January deadline, and I will say, some of the communities got started before others, so some of them had more than three months, but to get to the January 15 initial target, is however much time it is, but that doesn't mean that's, the communities are

done. They're still working that whole time, we're still working that whole time as well.

So I hope that provides a little more of an explanation, at least, of why it looks the way it does because that's not like the ICG is sitting around, twiddling its thumbs for two months each time. It's, you know, we need to turn something around very quickly and get it back to the community, so they can have further discussion of the updated proposals.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much for this Alissa. I guess it's when you provide some positive feedback on this, but probably has gotten our members to feel even more concerned, thinking they would only lose three months of their life, and now it's more like three plus the nine months afterwards...

ALISSA COOPER: December 30th is a year off, so everyone better be on the hook for a year.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Now, recognizing the time is ticking, and we still have a number of people listed as speaking and explaining to us what their community is doing with regards to these proposals, I realize earlier we had a deal to provide us with full details of the number of community process. Perhaps, can we skip a deal on this session, since we've already heard

the whole thing, and you've been submitted to the grilling of this community, and you've very well passed.

The next person, I think, who can, oh, there we go. Protocol parameters community, and we happen to have Russ Housley and Jari Arkko here with us. It would be interesting to hear what your process is, and perhaps also reflecting on some of the discussions we just had here regarding accountability.

JARI ARKKO:

Right. Thank you. Something myself, the grilling of this community. So this is, I guess I'm just going to speak fairly briefly, and I think I actually have some slides. So if you guys can skip forward to find. So this is mostly a brief introduction to what the IETF does, how do we deal with IANA today, and how do we plan to deal with it in the future, and how you can get involved in this process. And the process isn't going, it had been doing things around from March, more or less.

So, we are, oh, that's interesting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Is this censorship?

JARI ARKKO:

Yeah, yeah, probably. Someone is [inaudible]. ALAC is censoring my presentation. I forever complain about that. That's all right, don't worry about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ariel, please fix this before someone Tweets this.

JARI ARKKO: So the only thing that I actually wanted to do at the beginning, is to introduce a little bit of people. So you've already seen [Alexandria's], wanted to introduce Mark [inaudible], who is sitting back there. Stand up Mark. He's the chair, or one of the chairs of the working group that is focusing its work on the ITF. And is working on the plans, so please talk to him if you want to get involved. So next slide please.

So I just want to briefly explain how the ITF works, what we do, and kind of important in the sense of how you can get involved. And we, of course, are a standards organization that is [first in the?] core technologies of the Internet. Our mission is to make the Internet work better.

And we are an open organization so anyone can join, you really literally, all you have to do is to be able to sign up to a mailing list. We do have three meetings, physical meetings, per year as well. But mostly the work is done over the Net, I guess. Our positions are based on community consensus, rough consensus not necessarily unanimous opinions always.

And participation through individual. So it's not like organizations like, my day job. Anyone who wants to volunteer first of all in ITF, even if it's the Chair, is not working for ITF per se, but has a day job elsewhere, I do too. My day job doesn't get to have say, in what we do for ITF technology, or Internet technology, individuals too. So if [inaudible] and

say that we need to do a particular approach, then that is something that is taken into account, but not so much organizations.

Next slide please. So the ITF today works obviously with IANA, and so our standards require something we call protocol numbers. As an example, port number support 80 [inaudible] and so forth, and we have a need for database of these numbers, and that's what IANA does for us.

And the arrangement is that there is actually three separate functions there. So, the first function is the policy decision, how do we allocate them and what numbers do we actually allocate? Or you know, what requests should go forward? That's an ITF decision. So the ITF has the policy decision role there. Then we have some oversight from Internet architecture board and Russ here.

And then finally, IANA implements this. So they actually maintain the database of these numbers that have been allocated and published on their website and so forth. So there is a clear separation of roles here. And the other thing that I want to say is that these arrangements have evolved quite a bit over time, so in the last 15 or so years, we've created agreements, and revised SLAs every year, and we have defined, or written RFCs that describe the roles of different parties, and perhaps most important, we have maybe 1,000 or at least several hundred RFCs that specify the policy for making allocations.

So that's today. A little bit more detail if you go to the next slide. So how do we actually work together? So first of all, we have some agreements between ITF and ICANN, that specify the roles, what do we, what does each party do. And there has been a lot of talk about

accountability in this process, and I wanted to touch on that from our perspective what does that mean, because maybe that's a good example to think about.

So this accountability is basically something that you can think about in terms of just in the abstract. You have to connect it to something, how is that related to something else. And a couple of different things where accountability might actually be needed, things that might go wrong. If there are any issues within the ITF process, for instance, we make the wrong decisions in some sense, or the leadership misbehaves, we are subject to our user processes, in that we have appeals process.

For instance, we have a [nom control?] that replaces the leadership, and can even do so on sort of recall basis if that were ever needed. So, we have mechanisms to deal with that. So if our policy process for instance goes wrongs somehow, or our oversight process goes wrong, there is ways to address that.

The other thing that could go wrong is there is something that's going badly between ITF and ICANN slash IANA, and those things are subject to processes defined in the agreements between the two organizations. And in practice, that means that we deal with that, like escalating, that's almost like a daily discussion. There is always something unclear. Why is this request like this? We don't understand.

And we'll deal with that on a daily basis, and if it's more serious, it gets escalated all the way to the various boards on either side. And the contract does provide a termination of calls after six months of a waiting period. So, if it were ever to come, I don't believe we'll ever need to go there, we're very happy with the service so far.

As mentioned, IB provides oversight, and the model as such... I mean, there are some daily problems here and there, but overall, the model has worked quite well. We do improvements when needed, and I also wanted to emphasize that I really know USG involvement here in this process.

None of the details, or even if there is a huge about something, those huge fights between ITF and ICANN, there has not been such a case, but there has been huge fights about some discussions on whether we should allocate a particular code point, for instance, and those are taken on the ITF process using our normal decision processes which there are [inaudible]. So it's really take the difficult cases there. Next slide.

So what do we do for the transition? So we have created a working group called the IANA plan working group that Mark is chairing, together with Leslie [inaudible]. We have a draft plan that has been the initial version, individual draft as a result, I think two months ago. And now, recently was adopted as the working group draft, but it's by no means finished.

It has been discussed by the working group, and it's under constant review and commentary. I did want to say a few things. The community in the ITF has been very clear when we created the working group about what are sort of the limitations of this process, and the scope. So we've been given very clear instruction from the community, that there shall be no change to roles of organizations, and there is really no need for a new organization to be established for this purpose.

So we want to stay within the current operational model, documented exactly what we are doing, if there is something that's missing, it is an

opportunity for improvement, but we are roughly going to do what we, ITF have been doing in the past, and working together with IANA and ICANN on that.

And next slide please. So, the last thing I wanted to say is that anyone here is having opinions about this, or cares about this topic, please join the discussion. It's indeed easy to turn up the mailing list. And from our perspective, the keys to ensure that IANA functionality remains in the community control, and they do what the community wants. And of course, you know, it's running, the Internet, IANA to keep running and also evolving.

We're very much believers in incremental improvements over the years. Here are a couple of links where you can get to the documents on the working group mailing list, and also if you want to get involved, join the mailing list. If you want to come to an actual physical meeting, we have one coming up in Hawaii next month.

And if you were not a participate of ITF before, do read the last link which talks a little bit about how to participate in the ITF. And that's all I have. Russ, do you have anything to add?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

This is Russ. Not at the moment. I'm looking forward to the questions, and I'll help with the answers.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Jari, and thank you Russ for this. You just mentioned Hawaii, there would have been questions to that perhaps,

with regards to surfing, etc. No, let's get back to being serious. We certainly have a queue at the moment, so we'll start with Eduardo Diaz and then I'll take names for any other questions afterward. Eduardo, you have the floor.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Mr. Chair. This is Eduardo for the record. I have a question about this agreement between the IETF and ICANN. If I'm looking at this transition, IANA transition from micro view, basically that agreement will not change that much because it's not with the IANA itself, it's with ICANN, right? That specific thing. Thank you. If you can, give us some...

JARI ARKKO: So we have an agreement between ITF and ICANN. And we have no agreement with the US government whatsoever.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much Jari for this. Next is John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: John Laprise for the record. So if you were here for my final closing question with Adiel, then you're prepared for this one, which is, from the slides, it seems that you have, at least, a skeleton of a draft that's floating around. Bearing in mind the timeline that we were presented with earlier, what percentage of work is completed at this point?

JARI ARKKO: 63.4

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's in true IETF style, but you could have answered it in IPv6 addressing.

JARI ARKKO: But to give you a better answer, I think we're fairly well along and there is clearly discussion on the list, if you take a look, on some points that some of them are not easy. I'm optimistic that we're able to meet the deadlines.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Jari. Any other questions? So Jari, earlier you spoke about IETF processes going wrong. If an IETF process goes wrong, there are ways to address it, and to redress it, I guess. Do you have any examples of the think of IETF process going wrong? Perhaps not specific examples, but an example the type of thing that can go wrong, and yeah. And I'll reserve the second part of my question for a moment.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So this is Russ, I'm going to field that one. The mechanisms... Well the first is the kind of thing that can go wrong. And basically our appeals process applies to any decision, made by any leader in the IETF. So basically within the two months after the public announcement of that decision, anyone from the community can come forward and say, "I think you did the wrong thing, here's why and here is what I think the remedy should be."

So that can be anything. And those of you who are reading the IANA plan working group, will see that there is one individual in the community who believes that the charter language was incorrect, and they want to see it changed, and they have threatened to make an appeal, and we'll see if they do. But, there is an example and how it could apply to this actual work.

So the appeals process is actually an appeals chain. You get to first raise it with working group chair. So I'm sure Mark is ready to deal with that. And if he's unsatisfactory, it goes to Jari, as the ITF chair. And if they are still not satisfied, it goes to the Internet Engineering steering group. And if they are still not satisfied, it goes to the IAB.

And if you're still not satisfied, you may get to go see NARALO, where the ISOC board, if the question is one of, was the standards process followed? Technical decisions do not go to the outside board. They stop at the IAB. So, that's the appeals process. The recall process is quite different, and that starts with the... If you're a NomCom appointed person, and the person who feels that you did something wrong says you're acting against the will of the community, then they start a petition.

The petition starts a NomCom process to determine whether you get to keep your seat or not. So that's basically the two paths. One is, you know, very grained, [inaudible] decision, the other one is a sledgehammer, no you need to be out of here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Russ. So the second part of my question is, whether there are any provisions in the IETF against the risk of capture? Whether captured by commercial interests or by political interests, which I guess, until now, has not been very high on the agenda of the IETF, but certainly with the added spotlight shining on the various ISTAR organizations and other organizations that are multistakeholder in kind, and that currently have the Internet work as it is, might be something that could be coming up in the future, perhaps sooner rather than later.

JARI ARKKO: Right, that's an excellent question. I don't recall if we actually talk about that in the current IANA plan draft or not, we probably should. And in terms of explaining things, I mean, that our plan is not to redesign the mechanisms in ITF, but just to explain what mechanisms there are, for instance, that builds another tools.

For the capture case, I think that's interesting, we do have some rules, as an example, the IETF leaders be selected by our [NomCom] and the NomCom consists of 10 individuals, selected randomly. And there is a rule that prevents from the same company. I don't know Russ, do you want to add anything to that?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah, I think there is one other important thing, is we also have a confirmation process for the output for NomCom. And so, for example, the NomCom selects a slate of the Internet Engineering Steering Group, the set of area directors. And that slate is shared with the Internet

architecture board for confirmation. And one of the big things they look at is exactly this issue, is it a balanced...

And balance is a hard thing, is it... Are the right people for the right jobs here? Or is it all people from one company? Or is it all people from one region? Those are the kinds of questions that the current body asks.

JARI ARKKO:

Sorry, this is Jari again. I wanted to add one more thing, which is, we had some cases in the past where, on a technical discussion, there was a desire from a particular corporation, for instance to push a choice, technology choice, and that they ended up sort of instructing a lot of this, their employees or friends to make comments on an IETF list in favor of this particular choice.

And this was kind of, these kinds of situations have been seen and studied and we've been able to handle them without damage, I think. So, we've seen some of these events in the commercial sense at least. And, you know, we can identify at least the most obvious ones.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this Yari. Next is Holly Raiche.

HOLLY RAICHE:

It's really just a comment. I'm very glad to hear the measures that you've got. I think when you present the case for your proposals, what you need to stress is, these are sort of the safeguards in terms of not only setting the technical parameters, having performance measures,

who looks at them, who vets them, who vets your membership, what happens if something looks kind of odd.

And I think that's what they're looking for. So it isn't just a recital. It's a, by the way, this is how we protect the process. Thanks.

JARI ARKKO;

I agree. And that's a good point. And one more thing, since you mentioned performance measures. I do want to say that we do track the IANA performance quite closely, and there is like a graph every month on where we are in different areas and a quarterly graph on the key performance indicators, and that they've been on the green for a long time, which is great that we do have this mechanisms, and we also, from this year and it's not public yet because it's going to happen at the end of the year, or end of the period, have decided to implement an audit mechanism with IANA.

So they actually have followed the ITF policy decisions in their allocations, and the results of this will be public, so it's not just for us or me, it's for everyone in the world to see, which is, I think, it might be an useful thing to do in other cases as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Jari for this. And so we've discussed, I think, quite extensively, the position for the protocols. I realize that on our agenda we also have time set for the naming issues, but I guess that since we are in ICANN, and the majority of us, judging from how busy the room was yesterday, attended the cross-community working group meeting, face to face.

I'm not quite sure that we really need to have a rehashing of those things. In fact, we've been discussing these also throughout the day, so we'll probably have allergic issues to these very soon. But with regards to serve wider questions to the ICG, one of the questions that has been recurring in the At-Large community is the treatment of any so-called orphan issues, that are not issues primarily dealt with by the three operational communities.

I wonder whether I could call upon Alan Greenberg to take us, yes I have given you advanced notice if you're ready on Skype, of what these so-called orphan issues might be. And I know that Alan has provided some details of these.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Now you have to give me advanced notice that you're giving me advanced notice. The orphan issues are only orphan issues if no one brings them up. The two that have been the largest subject of discussion, are the issue of charging. You know, with this new IANA in the sky, charge for its services? Which it doesn't right now, directly to the operating bodies. And the second one is language.

In a multi-national environment, is it going to be sufficient to have a small number of languages? Do we need to be able to serve communities? And registries, for instance, and RIRs in their own language? And those are potentially orphan issues if no one raises them in any of the three proposals.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. I would also add maybe one more, which is the potential for an umbrella, overarching accountability of the whole system, which is something that might or might not be desirable, depending on how accountability is in each one of the proposals. But this question, by the way, is to all ICG members, so Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yes, I want to answer on the first two. The cost issue, or funding, the current arrangement is that there is a contract between ICANN and US government for \$0. And also the contract between IETF and ICANN as an example, is cost free. I think the reasons for doing this from the various organization's perspectives, exist with or without the US government.

So, I think we can go ahead, if I think I've stated this publically on some mailing list, if we have to find another way to fund this operation, I think we could probably do that, but I think it's a good fit for both, at least in our case. And the languages, so I think that's an interesting point.

Much of the work that we do for the protocol parameters are very technical in nature, and often done in English anyway, sort of a community decision. But I actually, personally that there might be some areas where, you know, other language type service might be called for. As an example, we had this private enterprise numbers for individual companies to represent their identity in various context, and maybe that is something that should be a possible through...

But it's just not in English, but in other languages. But the point is that in order for orphan issues to come up, they need to be raised by

someone. So that's something that should be raised and considered, is this important enough that it affects... And I probably, on this particular issue, I would probably would categorize it more in the class of continuous improvement, over this year that I realized that we need to do additional thing.

We could do this in the next year, SLA as an example for the IETF, if we needed to, rather than transition because it's not about oversight, really.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Jari. We actually have a queue with Elise Gerich first, and then Adiel specifically on the costing issues. Elise?

ELISE GERICH: Right. My role on the ICG, Elise Gerich, ICANN IANA functions operator, is just to add facts about the contract and stuff. And so I just wanted to let you know that yes, indeed, it is a zero cost contract, however, the contract is written that ICANN, if it so chose, could charge to recover costs for offering the IANA functions service.

So ICANN, overall this time, has chosen not to ever charge for this, and as Jari said, our agreement with, ICANN's agreement with the IETF IAB is also not one where there is any exchange of funds. So I just wanted to let you know the contract doesn't disallow any exchange of money.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Elise. So next is Adiel Akplogan.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yes, I just want to add to that, those two questions are often because probably we don't know yet what are the outcome of the [mechanics?] at the end. And as soon as we are clear about that, they would probably come up more clearly. As for the cost, for instance, from the area perspective, we do contribute to ICANN budget, and that contribution is mainly for support to the IANA function, to what IANA does for us.

So, it is a contribution that is already there. So if the ICANN continue to perform this function, at the end of this process, probably will continue doing that, or we're using that agreement that we have. And coming back to the language thing. That's as well, is part of globalizing the services as it is to allow people from different language, be able to read, understand, and contribute to what IANA does.

And that will be probably part of the result of this process. So we will have more clarity on those questions probably at the end of the process, when we know exactly what will happen when the NTIA will go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Adiel. We've got Alissa and then Alan Greenberg. So Alissa Cooper.

ALISSA COOPER:

So I just wanted to sort of echo one thing that Jari said, which is, which you said yourself, which is that the issues is only orphan issues if no one brings them up. So if you care about these, you should bring them up,

in whichever community, or all of them if you think they're applicable. And that's true for any issue, right? It's not just the ones that we can think of today, or have thought of already, but it's on all of us to develop these proposals.

I just want to respond to your question about the sort of umbrella organization, which I think falls into that paradigm as well, which is that if an overarching umbrella proposal emerges from one of the communities, then I think that's one place where our coordination role, in terms of making sure that each community is aware of what's being developed in the others, becomes extremely important.

Because in order for something like that to end up in the final transition proposal, it needs to have the buy in of all of the communities, right? So the IETF and the RIRs, let's say, if the umbrella suggestion comes from the naming community, the IETF and the RIRs need to agree that, yes, this is a good idea, and we think this is how the IANA functions oversight should proceed in the future.

So that's, to me that's the kind of issue that as we in the ICG are all kind of monitoring the different processes, and paying attention to what's going on, that's the kind of thing that we should immediately flag across to the other communities. And we've started to do that process a little between... I know in the IETF, we're paying close attention to what has already been written down in the RIR processes and draft, and so forth, but it's all very preliminary right now.

But I think it's more, as words get written, that coordinating function will become more important for exactly that reason.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alissa. Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. It's Alan speaking. To put it into context, Olivier called on me to identify a few possibly orphan issues, and I did. I wasn't really suggesting that they were questions from us, and indeed, if everyone mentions them, they're not orphaned. But that was the reason that we were a bit of a pain in the backside in the drafting of the RFP, that we wanted to make sure that we had the ability of tossing those things in, if after seeing how things are going in the individual groups, we thought there was something missed, and we wanted to make sure we had a vehicle through which to put it in.

Not a prediction that those would be the ones that we would identify.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan, next we have Mr. Arasteh, and after that...

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Olivier, some of these questions raised by you and others, are equally applicable to the current situation. It's not specifically related to the transition. Some of them, mistakes caused, languages equally applicable to now. So I'm not saying that the question are not valid, they're very valid, but has little relevance to the transition of the functions.

It could that the IETF or others, look at that one, but from the other perspective, but not the transition. It may have very little in transition. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this comment Mr. Arasteh. Next we have Alberto Soto, who will be speaking in Spanish.

...your headsets, and channel number one. If the thing works. Channel number one is in English, channel number three, I think, we've got two and three if you want to listen in French. Two is French, first is English. Go ahead Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO: IF the process up until now is for free, for the time being, there is no charging, if it would be charged, the end users are going to be the final link in the chain, in any scenario, in any kind of charging process. And of course, we, representing the end users, will get claims and complaints that just in the transition, they will say, well the network is not neutral. There is no neutrality, because up until now, all kinds of increases, or changes, have been considered, a shortage of neutrality.

So I don't, if we go from low charging to charging, when will we learn about it? How will we learn about it? And what will the rationality for it be? That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this comment Alberto. Is there any question of actual charging coming into effect?

That sounds like a really crazy question, goodness. Russ Housley.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So, this is Russ. I don't envision, at least from the protocol parameter side right now, any change in the current structure. The, we have looked at what it would cost to substantiate IANA in some other way, that is if ICANN were to come to us and say, "We're giving you the six months' notice, take your work somewhere else." What would that cost us?

We, I think that's just the kind of thing that anybody who was looking at what their budget needed to be in such a change would do, but I don't, we've never really had any discussion with ICANN about the price changing, and they've never come to us and suggested that they wanted to make such a drastic change to our memorandum of understanding.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Russ. Jari Arkko.

JARI ARKKO:

Yes, I wanted to add that it's important to keep things in perspective, agree absolutely what Russ said about the likelihood of these things. But even if something like that would happen, let's remember that the IANA is, [inaudible] is it 13 people right now? Yes. So all of us, thousands of people are looking to have oversight over them.

It's kind of maybe not even appropriately sized concern, but in terms of costs, this is a drop in the bucket if you think about everything else that goes on in the networking world.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this Jari. Any other comments or questions? I think we might have exhausted the subject, or exhausted everyone. But it looks like we've pretty much gone a long way, pretty much ran out of time as well. I think, we just have to thank you for coming to see us. We appreciate that the ICG has only come down to see the GAC, I think, and the ALAC in bilateral discussions, and then there is a meeting that you're holding.

Is it on Thursday? Perhaps a quick update on this, if we have any further questions.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, Thursday at 10 or 10:30, I don't know what time. 10. Thursday at 10, we're having a two hour long discussion with the community about the transition process, so please come and thank you. And we would have met with anyone, but you and the GAC were the only people who asked.

Or responded to a solicitation, we're begging people to meet with us and they said no.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So that doesn't remove our thanks for you to come down and to speak to us for as long, actually probably even more than an hour now, so it's

certainly much appreciated, as our own working group will be continuing the rest of the afternoon for a full 90 minutes.

Perhaps a little bit less if we don't fall off our chairs, in trying to formulate what strategy and what we're going to be putting forward, as far as our input is concerned, and as far as our follow up is concerned on this topic. But you're very welcome to remain behind, but in the meantime, I would like to ask everyone to give you a round of applause to thank you.

And to add, good luck, because I think you'll need it. We're going to take a five to 10 minute break, if it's okay with you. I think everyone is a little bit exhausted. We've had a day that started at 7 AM today, and maybe the interpreters will want to take a break as well. So let's do a 10 minute break. Back here at 10 minutes past five, ladies and gentlemen, 10 minutes past five. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]