SINGAPORE – ccNSO Members Meeting Day 1
Tuesday, March 25th 2014 – 09:00 to 18:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

BYRON HOLLAND:	Okay, everybody. If we could take our seats and get ready to go. Welcome, everybody. If I could, please, get everybody to take a seat. Good morning, everybody. Martin, is that you still standing?
	Okay, let's get started. Good morning, everybody. Welcome to ICANN 49 in Singapore. As usual, we have a very busy agenda, but first I'd just like to welcome everybody to the ccNSO meeting and also to our hosts. Thank you very much.
	Hopefully, everybody is clear-eyed and bright even though the gala was on a Monday night for a change. I know my first meeting of the day, my partner there was a little late. But I won't mention his name.
	Good morning. We have a very busy agenda. The Program Working Group has actually been doing a lot of work over the last couple of months, particularly in light of the fact that we've had some very dramatic announcements recently. And we've tried to really adapt to that and rejig our schedule to deal with some of the significant announcements.
	Katrina is going to walk you through the agenda in a couple of moments, but first I just wanted to say a couple of words. The first one, I am going to be the bearer of some bad news in that, unfortunately, today will be the last time we have a sponsored lunch in the ccNSO.

It's, I guess, the unfortunate downside of the success we are having as an organization with 149 members. The size of the group is just getting to be at a point that it's difficult to find sponsors to be able to sponsor a lunch for that size of group. So please enjoy your lunch today. It's put on by our hosts in Singapore, and it will be the last one.

Beyond that, I just wanted to also make mention of the fact, two things. One is, given the NTIA announcement, we already had three Internet governance related sessions over the course of two days. Katrina and her work group have done a lot of work in trying to rejig what was the content to what will be the content in order to address a pretty different landscape that we find ourselves in just in the last two weeks.

And finally, I just wanted to take a moment to let you know that the ccNSO Council on Sunday afternoon had a four-hour workshops – something that we do every two or three years – just taking a broader strategic look at what we anticipate the issues that we'll be focusing on over the coming two to three years.

So we did that this past Sunday, and we really took a look and had a very fulsome discussion on what we think will be the primary issues that this group will be focusing on over the next few years. And that also gives us some help in terms of planning the chronology of agendas to make sure that they're the relevant ones and also thinking about the kinds of work groups and work activities that we're going to need to focus on over the coming year.

It's something that I would also encourage you to talk to your councilor about in terms of further detail. We will be putting some materials out to the broader community once we've typed them up. So you will see

some output from that session, but I will just take a moment to highlight the five themes that we saw as the highest runner themes over the coming 24-36 months.

Number one, and I think it was pretty much universally agreed to, was the NTIA announcement and the transfer of accountability within the IANA functions. That was definitely the number one issue and no doubt will be something we'll be focused on in the coming years.

General accountability of ICANN and that IANA function was the second most popular topic. The third was the work of the FOI and how that will be implemented and related topics. Fourth was the ongoing work that we have done around ICANN budget and operational planning through the good work of the SOP.

And then fifth most significant theme was around issues internal to the ccNSO. How are we functioning? Do we have a good program? Do we have a good agenda for these meetings? Quorum rules, governance issues, elections. Given the size of this organization and the length of time that it has been around, is there an opportunity to look at some of the bylaws to make sure that they're best addressing the needs we have today versus a number of years ago?

So those were the top five themes that were pulled out of the session on Sunday. There were many, many more, but in terms of aggregating what the top five amongst the whole group were, those were they. And we will produce some material to support that and pass it out to the council so you'll have a better sense of what we were up to.

And with that, I will pass it over to Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Byron. Good morning, everyone. I'll try to run through the slides and highlight the most interesting sessions. I really invite you to participate very actively.

A couple of days ago, I was asked, "Is this mandatory for a ccNSO member to participate in ccNSO meetings?" Yes, it is. So I really hope that you will be here and spending time together and listening to all those presentations.

Of course, the Program Working Group analyzed your responses and all your feedback you provided after the meeting in Buenos Aires, and we tried to accumulate your wishes and provide a program that will really be interesting for you. Whatever you asked, we tried to find presenters.

But, of course, recent changes impacted the agenda. I have to thank Keith, Bart, and Byron for chasing all those interesting and very important people and ensuring that they will be here with us today and tomorrow.

Today, don't forget, very interesting session: NTIA update. Actually, we have like four sessions devoted to Internet governance. Today, we have three of them. Really, this time we're focusing on Internet governance and, well, it's quite understandable. We'll hear about Internet governance development in Asia.

And today, for the first time, we're trying a new format. We're going to have interviewers and people who will get interviewed by the interviewers. And we really would like to hear your opinion on the new

format. Will you like it? Would you like to see something like that in the future too?

And tomorrow, we'll have another session on Internet governance: Defining Principles and Requirements. Keith and Byron will try to – actually let's keep it as a surprise. Tomorrow, you will see how it works. We really hope that you will participate.

And of course, we'll have other interesting sessions: Name Collisions, Security Session tomorrow and ccTLD News and several presentations will be about marketing, how our ccTLDs market their TLDs.

Some other things I'd like to point out. We have Adobe Connect room where you can see the presentations, where you can actually submit your questions, where you can participate in discussions. So please use this tool too. That's another additional tool for those who are too shy to come up here and ask their questions at the mic.

So this time for some reason, Gabi won't be running around with a microphone. Yes, exactly. That's a pity, but just please respect her situation and come up to the microphone here. We have it specifically in the middle of the room.

In the evening, we have another important event: ccNSO Cocktail. You all have received invitation. It's "Carnivore Appetite." Not so far from here, it's really easy to find the place, especially when you're hungry. You don't need an invitation. Just show up. Come and enjoy nice company.

We also, thanks to Alejandra, we have this Google Calendar and everything is calendared and actually you can use it.

Thanks a lot to our generous sponsors for making the last lunch. Thanks to local host and ccNSO Cocktail to happen. And special thanks to Han Chuan Lee from ICANN for helping to organize ccNSO Cocktail.

So thank you very much, and welcome to ccNSO days.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Katrina. So as you can see, there's going to be lots of opportunity to talk about the number one issue at hand. We'll have different formats – some more information, some more conversational and input-based. So there should be an opportunity for everybody to get what they need out of the Internet governance discussion.

With that, the next item on the agenda is an update from the FOI. Keith, if I could ask you to come up and anybody else you'd like to drag along. Nope? All on your own? Obviously, Bernie stayed up too late at that gala? And I would just ask you to bear in mind that we have Fiona and Larry coming very, very shortly.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Sure. Thank you, Byron. And I will be necessarily brief, so I don't think I'll walk you through the presentation that we had today. The presentation and the progress report since the last meeting of the FOI Working Group is on the website now, so please download it or have a look at it online, and if you have specific questions, don't be afraid to come and talk to me during the course of the next two days.

But just to remind the room, because I see there are a few new faces in the room too, the FOI Working Group is the Framework of

Interpretation Working Group that arose out of a review of the delegations and re-delegations decisions made on ccTLDs by the ICANN Board and showed up a number of issues that required some clarity or clarification in the way that delegations and re-delegations might be given their consideration for decisions.

So as most of the old hands in the room will know, there were a series of topics that we sought to determine an interpretation of. The idea was to provide color and depth to existing policies and guidelines and not to invent policy. In fact, any creation of policy was out of scope for the working group. So this was to take RFC 1591 and the GAC principles and provide further color and depth.

We've been through the process of defining the topics: the three chapters of consent, significantly interested parties, and revocation. We've determined our definition of those, and we've just in the last few weeks completed the glossary of terms that should be used by IANA when they're providing reports on delegations and re-delegations.

So that really brings to an end the drafting work of the working group. We still have a consultation process to go through on the glossary and an external review of that. And then our forward focus work is to work with the GAC.

Our continued hope is that the GAC will provide its support for the Framework of Interpretation, and then we can present jointly to the ICANN Board from the ccNSO and the GAC the framework. And because it would come from the GAC, it therefore becomes binding on the ICANN Board, unless they have some good reason to not consider that.

But the idea here was to save us going through a policy development process and use the GAC advice route as a simpler methodology.

So with that, we do have a working group session here in Singapore. It's on Thursday between 9:00 a.m. and midday in the Moor room. And while I think the agenda says it's a closed session, we always have an open-door policy and you're most welcome to attend.

And if we do have time on the agenda, we will allow questions from the floor. But remember, we're dealing with the higher level policy issues, and we don't tend to dwell on individual delegations and re-delegations so please don't bring those questions into the room.

And so the roadmap, I think having completed the glossary, we have some unfinished consultation with the GAC. They've raised a couple of issues that we need to go back to them on. We would want their input on revocation as well. And hopefully, we can make some progress in our joint meeting today and in meetings with GAC folks individually on that for clarification and so on.

So my hope is that by London, we will be in a position to jointly present that to the ICANN Board. And I think for the things that we have had agreement on with the GAC so far, it would be quite sensible for us to now start working on the IANA implementation plans.

A small group of the FOI folks working with the IANA staff to ensure that what we've interpreted is codified into what IANA will do in the future. And if there's anything controversially left between us and the GAC, we will leave that out of implementation until we have that resolution.

So with that, that's my report. And I'm sorry it's so rushed, but is there time for questions?

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure. Are there any questions?

And while you formulate one, if there are any, I would say that the FOI has done some incredible heavy lifting on this dense topic. I would encourage everybody if you haven't read the work, this is the time to read it as baseline information that you must understand to have a meaningful conversation about where we're headed next with IANA. So if you haven't read it yet, I would strongly encourage you to.

No questions? You can also speak to Keith tonight at the cocktail party. Thank you very much, Keith, and to the work group on this subject.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: And I think that is an excellent segue to our next guests, who probably don't need much introduction, but I will anyway. Larry Strickling and Fiona Alexander from the NTIA are with us to talk about the significant announcement that was made recently to offer us their direct and candid insights. And then we also have an opportunity to have some Q&A. So with that, I will pass it over to you. Thanks for joining us this morning.

LARRY STRICKLING: Well, thank you, Byron. And thanks for having us. I'm kind of talked out in terms of explaining this. You all are probably fatigued from hearing it being described so many times. So maybe we should just go right to your questions, and let's get a dialogue going. Keith, thank you for jumping to the task.

BYRON HOLLAND: Could we get the mic on? The floor mic.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you. This room, a lot of our ccTLD colleagues have only just come in yesterday or today, so many probably haven't had an opportunity to hear what you've been saying, Larry. So if you could give us a short introduction, that will be most helpful.

LARRY STRICKLING: Sure. Will do. And thanks for that, Keith.

Okay. So a week ago Friday, the United States announced its intention to transition out of its role in terms of the IANA functions. This is all done pursuant to a contract we have with ICANN that dates back, I mean, the relationship dates back to near the creation of ICANN in the late '90s.

In our role, we have been involved in verifying changes to the root zone file when they're updated and passing them on to Verisign for actual implementation and updating of the root zone file. So in large part, our actual operational role is quite limited.

And when ICANN was formed in the late '90s and when Becky Burr was at the helm back then at NTIA, it was made quite clear at that time that the U.S. government role in this was going to be transitional and temporary.

And so we feel we're now at the point where we ought to go ahead and complete the transition that was envisioned when ICANN was created. And so that was the purpose for which we made our announcement a week ago Friday.

In doing so, we called upon ICANN as the contracting party with us to convene the global Internet community to determine what ought to come in the place of the United States' role.

And that was the process that was kicked off yesterday with the one-and-a-half- to two-hour session in the morning where ICANN in tandem with the Internet technical organizations like IETF and IAB and the RIRs as well as representatives from the key constituencies here in ICANN all basically sat up onstage and heard from the community in terms of the issues that they wanted to see, focusing largely at this point on what should the process be going forward for coming up with a transition plan to replace the United States.

When we made our announcement, we said that there would be certain conditions we wanted to see satisfied in the transition plan that would be prepared by the multi-stakeholder global community. The four conditions were:

1) It had to be true to principles of multi-stakeholder model.

2) It had to preserve the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet.

3) It had to protect the free and open nature of the Internet.

4) It had to meet the needs of the customers and partners of the IANA functions.

And then to make one issue crystal clear, we also said that we would not find acceptable a proposal that basically engaged a government-led organization or an intergovernmental organization as a solution for the role that we play. So we've put that out.

So far over the last two or three days, we've heard nothing but general consensus support for the four global principles that we laid out. But, frankly, we didn't think they'd be controversial, and I've seen no sign from anybody that they are the least bit controversial.

And we were very pleased to see the progress that was made yesterday in terms of the convening of the community, and we look forward to see how the community organizes itself to move forward to create a plan.

The contract expires on September 30, 2015, and that's a date that I think has confused some people because it's not a hard-and-fast deadline, but we felt it was important to put a date out there that the community might plan toward or aim toward. The fact of the matter is if the work isn't done by then, the contract can be extended for up to four years based on two two-year options.

So there's no cliff that anybody's facing here. We're going to ensure that we'll continue to perform our role until we get the plan that the community wants to present to us as the consensus plan for moving forward to transitions us out. So status quo during this period of time.

Hopefully, the community will be able to develop a plan within the timeframe, but no problem if it doesn't.

So those are the highlights. I'm sure I've left something out, but maybe we will get to that in the questioning if there's something that people want to ask about. Alright, Keith, did that work? I'm getting a nod and thumbs up. Okay. Questions?

BYRON HOLLAND: And just for the remote participants and for the record, if you could please remember to state your name before you start speaking.

BECKY BURR: Becky Burr, .us. We've spent a lot of time paying attention to the outcome can't be and intergovernmental, multilateral thing, but one of the conditions that you put down that is particularly important for this group is that it has to meet the needs of the customers. We really appreciate that because CCs have been by and large the biggest customer of IANA naming functions. So we may have a little bit of an unusual perspective just in focusing on that piece.

But one of the things that we've been struggling with is getting a voice in this Internet governance NETmundial thing for the registries themselves. I know that the two things are not entirely overlapping, but I wonder if you could talk a little bit more about what things you would look for to see that it's meeting the needs of the customers.

LARRY STRICKLING: That's easy for me. It will be the result of a consensus proposal in which the community has fully engaged and accepts. That tells me that the customers are satisfied with what's being presented to us. So for me, it's not much more complicated than that.

You made a comment about NETmundial. My view of that is it's a very important conference, but it's not an important conference in terms of figuring out what to do with the U.S. role in the IANA functions.

It's an important conference for dealing with the much broader global Internet governance issues that faces the community now and will continue to over the next several years, which in my mind is: how do you meet the needs of the developing world in this space?

These are countries that aren't particularly comfortable or familiar with the multi-stakeholder model. I mean, we find it hard enough to explain the multi-stakeholder model to half of the U.S. Congress, so I can see how it's hard to explain it to countries that don't have a lot of experience with it.

But the fact of the matter is, as reflected in the Dubai WCIT Conference in 2012, they have a whole series of unmet needs. They're looking for help, and they're looking for a place to get that help and need to understand how they can participate in a way that works for their particular situation.

That's what I hope NETmundial focuses on. I'm sure there will be a discussion of our announcement down there, but I would hope that it would take more the form of an information session, not unlike what

happened yesterday morning with the slide and the explanation of exactly what these functions are and how they work.

But I don't see that conference as being an opportunity to kind of advance the ball on finding the process or finding a solution. I think that will come out of the discussion yesterday, and I would expect that ICANN will put out pretty quickly a summary of those discussions with an idea of getting some public support for moving forward with a particular approach to this.

I found it very comforting from our perspective to see all the different technical organizations reflected on the stage yesterday, including Byron with the ccNSO and Jonathan with the GNSO. And I hope that keeps the focus – at least with respect to the IANA issue – on the customers. And I think that bodes well for getting a process together that's going to work.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Any other questions?

ROELOF MEIJER: Yes, good morning. Roelof Meijer from .nl. Mr. Strickling, I agree that the best way to approach this is the open multi-stakeholder model that comes with a consensus proposal for you. But on the other hand, I cannot imagine that you and your department have in your mind some kind of a sketch. It would be nice if they came up with something like this. And I think we've seen some of the rough strokes of the sketch in your communique where you say not a government-led structure. Can I somehow tempt you to give us a bit more information about the sketch

that you have of which you think it would be nice if it was something like this?

LARRY STRICKLING: Well, two points. One, I don't have a sketch. And two, if I did, it wouldn't be fair to the process to do anything other than submit it as one of many stakeholders for consideration.

We're very cognizant of the need not to be putting our finger on the scale. If we really want the multi-stakeholder process to work going forward, if we're really looking for multi-stakeholder governance of this function or of ICANN more generally or of Internet issues even more broadly, we've got to give the community the opportunity to wrestle with this issue and come up with the plan that they're comfortable with, that they can execute on, and on which they can deliver outcomes.

If there's too much at the front end of people saying, "Well, you can't consider this option" or "You can't go this direction" and "No. This is the right way to do it" – particularly coming from us as the final arbiter on this in the sense that we'll have to accept this at the end of the day – I don't think we're being true to the spirit of the multi-stakeholder process, and I'm going to resist the urge to answer questions like yours as much as I can.

ROELOF MEIJER: So which also implies that the criteria that you have now communicated are the only criteria.

LARRY STRICKLING: Yes.

ROELOF MEIJER: Another probably difficult question to answer frankly: there is an increase in the political pressure from within the U.S. on your decision. Do we run the risk that, either before the end date that you have announced or after presidential elections if we get a change, that this whole thing is turned back?

LARRY STRICKLING: There are clearly people who are trying to take political advantage of this announcement right now in Washington. We've already got two Congressional hearings scheduled on this next week. You have people who think they're knowledgeable about this opining every day on editorial pages and in blogs and that sort of thing. So, yeah, there is definitely a lot of domestic churn.

My advice to the community is the best way to defeat that is to show the world that you are organized, responsible, creditable in terms of taking on this task and showing that a good proposal will come out of this work.

The world is going to watch this, and you have two audiences you need to be concerned about. You need to be concerned about the people who want to make political points on this and are going to be looking to say, "Well, that's not working" or "Can you believe how chaotic that is?" and "Why can't they come together faster on that?"

And the other audience you have to be concerned about is, back to NETmundial, the developing world to whom we need to show that this process works and can work well and can meet their needs.

So the best way to do that, the best way to meet both goals, is to act responsibly. Get the grownups at the table, and let's sit down and get the community to move forward in a responsible way with everybody being seen to be pulling on the oar in the same direction to get a plan put together in a creditable way.

ROELOF MEIJER: I agree, and that might mean that the time limit or the planning is far tighter than probably what you suggest. If we don't have concrete results before 2015, that might be considered by the surroundings as "they're failing to come up with something reasonable."

And especially if we extend past that date, I would think that the pressure would become very high because it seems that there is not going to be a solution. So were you not a bit too optimistic when you said even if you don't make 2015, you can still carry on?

LARRY STRICKLING: I think what the people who are watching this process are going to want more than anything else is to know there's security and stability. As long as the process is proceeding, as long as it's being seen to be responsible in taking on the issues, as long as it's being seen to be open and transparent allowing the engagement of all the interested parties so you don't have people taking shots at it from the outside because they feel they're being excluded from it, that I think goes most of the way if not

all of the way to allowing for the community to get the time it needs to come up with the plan that makes the most sense.

So I'm not too worried about what happens if 2015 isn't the date because we've tried to be clear every time we've explained this that it's not a hard-and-fast deadline. It does give the community 18 months to get on with this. And we thought that would be a goodly amount of time, but we don't have any opinion as to whether you could do it in six months or 26 months. But I don't see that as threatening an outcome here.

ROELOF MEIJER: Okay, thank you.

STAFFAN JONSON: Okay. Good morning. Staffan Jonson from ccTLD .se. I would like to continue because when reading your press message, I noticed the relation between NTIA and the IANA functions. But there are several contracts around here, and I'm wondering if you could elaborate a little bit about what, I guess, is at least two other contracts with Verisign, etc.?

I guess you had this question before, but it's really interesting to hear how you perceive this, the other contracts and how they come into play with this one, if at all.

LARRY STRICKLING: I can speak, though I think the one that's directly impacted here is the cooperative agreement with Verisign under which they undertake to

actually do the updating and maintenance of the root zone file. It should be obvious to everybody if we're stepping out of this, that contract will need to be modified, depending on what the alternative is that's presented and assuming Verisign wants to continue on with its role.

We haven't put anything in play here other than our role. We have not suggested anything about what ICANN does in terms of making these changes and proposing these changes needs to change. We haven't suggested that anything about what Verisign is doing has to be changed. All we've said is that we want to evolve so that we're not in the middle any longer.

So, yeah, the paperwork will have to catch up with that, but it's a minor matter and can be dealt with once the community comes back with a final proposal. This is truly the hair on the tail wagging the dog.

STAFFAN JONSON: So your just retraction from the process actually and not taking active part in the other, at not least for now?

LARRY STRICKLING: Could you explain what you mean? I'm not sure I understood that.

STAFFAN JONSON: I'm sorry. I'm just trying to confirm what you're saying, but I think I got it anyhow.

LARRY STRICKLING: Okay.

STAFFAN JONSON: Just one other quite loose and open question is: political pressure again – I'm picking up from Roelof – political pressure from other actors like the European Union, for example. They had a change in general policy just a couple of weeks before this announcement. And I'm, of course, very interested if you could elaborate relation, if any, with the European Union in all this.

LARRY STRICKLING: I'm not sure what you're referring to when you say a change, but the European Union has been a very strong partner in all of this with us in terms of sharing our support for the multi-stakeholder process, sharing our support for the idea that this is not an area in which governments ought to be controlling oversight or stewardship.

And that's been the case from when I got in this job and first met with Neelie Kroes on these issues, and it continues to be the case. She and I have had a number of conversations about ICANN and Internet governance more generally, and I think for the most part at the top level we're very much in sync with each other.

STAFFAN JONSON: Okay, great. Thank you.

AL MacGILLIVRAY: Thanks. My name is Al MacGillivray. I'm with .ca. Now that you've announced that your role is being withdrawn, actually a lot of us are

parsing around, "Well, what exactly is that role? What's the vacuum that has to be filled?"

So I'd just like to ask a couple questions around that. I guess the first one is a more general one about the linkage, if any, between the IANA functions contract and the Affirmation of Commitments. In the sense that I personally view the Affirmation of Commitments as it isn't a judicable contract. It's a political agreement. So it needs, perhaps, some encourage for compliance going forward.

And I personally view the fact that the IANA contract is renewable every three years gives, or gave, the U.S. government an opportunity, and that is an opportunity to keep ICANN honest vis-à-vis, I guess, its adherence to that Affirmation of Commitments. So is that a valid observation?

LARRY STRICKLING: We haven't done anything by our announcement to say the Affirmation of Commitments needs to be changed, modified, withdrawn, expanded, anything else. In our view, it remains in place throughout this process.

Because of some of the factors you mentioned, the idea that people see even the U.S. contract with IANA functions as providing some overall sense of confidence about the system, which conversely has also been a source of irritation to a lot of other people, but we get that.

We understand that, and we fully expected that the community would want to start talking about when you're talking about replacing the U.S. role when we evolve out of the IANA functions, is there a vacuum left at this larger question of accountability? And I think that's what led to the

second public session yesterday, to tee up that issue and get people talking about it.

We encourage that discussion. Again, we haven't put it in play through our announcement, but we are not surprised that the community wants to go and talk about that and we think that's good.

AL MACGILLIVRAY: Okay, just a second question on that theme but just to go right down to the micro-level. I think if one looks at that flowchart that's in the IANA contract itself – where you have IANA, ICANN, goes into NTIA, then over to the root zone maintainer – on a day-to-day basis when that paperwork or e-mails are received by NTIA saying they want this change to the root zone or whatever, what was the error rate?

I mean, is there, not a policy function being exercised by NTIA, but just like a check and balance like going through to make sure all the boxes are checked? I mean, is that a role that you played, or was that paperwork simply passed through without scrutiny? So if there was error or compliance issues, have those changed over time? In other words, was it bad? Is it better now? Just a comment on that would be appreciated.

LARRY STRICKLING: I'll let Fiona speak to that because I don't know the statistics, but we do look at it to verify accuracy. I think what's important to know is that we never once rejected a request on any sort of policy or political grounds, but on the other issue I don't know in terms of what the actual experience has been on finding mistakes.

FIONA ALEXANDER: What our staff generally does is there's a template that's been agreed through the discussion with the IANA team, and they just verify the process has been followed with respect to the change request that's coming through. Obviously for new gTLDs, the volume has been many, so there was a different template that's been put in place but it's relatively straightforward.

We don't do any operational or technical checks. Verisign actually does secondary checks before implementing. So ours is a clerical process check to make sure process has been followed and things are in the template as they need to be.

AL MACGILLIVRAY: But I guess the question is: how often was the process not followed?

FIONA ALEXANDER: We've never kept statistics. I've been there about 14 years, and I can't think of any meaningful one that's had a problem. I think when there have been questions, it's been a questions about hostile re-delegations in countries raising concerns. So that's irrespective of the IANA team. That's of the issue that you guys grapple with all the time, so it's not an IANA issue.

AL MACGILLIVRAY: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. And just to respect the time of our guests, but also we are off to meet the Board next so we do have a very hard stop in about four minutes, so I'm going to ask this to be the end of the line, and you have about 90 seconds. Go.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My name is [inaudible]. I'm from .cn. My question is under what circumstance is U.S. government be ready to transfer its power to the community. Of course, I see that there is no clear criteria to decide when it is ready to transfer its power. I want to know if this criteria is going to be published to the entire community and we will have the power to decide if this criteria is correct or not. Thank you.

LARRY STRICKLING: I think we did that with our public statement, so I'm not sure what you're talking about in terms of publishing criteria. We've done that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think your criteria is very broad, but I don't know the specific mechanism of your decision process actually.

LARRY STRICKLING: I go back to what I said in response to an earlier question. Bring us a consensus proposal that the community all had an opportunity to participate in and embraces, and I think the rest of it will take care of itself.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, thank you.

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: Jörg Schweiger, .de Germany. I was heading more or less in the same direction because I think that you gave some preconditions about how the solution we should come up with is constrained. But I still feel that there's a lot of work to do, and I'm not sure if whatever the outcome would be it would be welcomed warmly and accepted.

So once again, yes, more or less the same question. Are there any acceptance procedures that are set so that the U.S. government would or would not accept the solution we would come up with?

LARRY STRICKLING: I can do nothing more than to say read our statement. And I guess beyond that, it's time to get to work.

JÖRG SCHWEIGER: Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, with that, I will call…. Do you have one last question? Peter?

PETER VAN ROSTE: Good morning. Peter Van Roste from Centr. It is not a true condition in the message that you sent out – or it is actually – the multi-stakeholder model that needs to support the agreement on any transition model. But of course, as long as you haven't talked to the last person that has

an opinion on this, there will always be somebody saying, "This wasn't a true multi-stakeholder model." Can you share some ideas on where you think how far that reaches? Thank you.

LARRY STRICKLING: I mean, this is a question that ICANN and you all face every day. There's no reason to reinvent the wheel on this. I think it comes down to giving opportunities to people. I think in this case there ought to be a widespread effort to reach out to groups that maybe don't come to ICANN meetings all the time but will have issues at stake in all of this to get their inputs. But, I mean, this is not a new question.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, with that, I'm going to call this session to a close and say thank you very much to Larry and Fiona. Appreciate your time. I know it's a busy week, and good luck in the rest of the week.

LARRY STRICKLING: Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. And for us, we are now headed to the Board/ccNSO session, and that's in Padang room. And that will start at 10:00, which is eight or nine minutes from now. So if we could get down there promptly, thank you.

Okay, folks, we are ready to begin the next session, so if we could take our seats, and I'm going to pass this over to the Chair of this session, Don Hollander.

DON HOLLANDER: Thank you very much, Byron. We have a short amount of time, so we'll just start very quickly. In this session, we're going to look at Internet governance discussions from an Asia-Pacific perspective. So we have Hong and Minjung and Justin. Hong will talk about Internet governance training and developments in the region. Minjung is going to talk about the adventures in Korea, and Justin will talk about adventures here in Singapore.

And before they start, I just want to set some context. So Internet governance, for me, is a very confusing term because it means two separate things. There's the orphan issues that deal with the content of what goes over the Internet, and then there's the Internet coordination – and we'll have no shortage of opportunities to talk about the Internet coordination bit this week. We've already done a lot of that.

And then I just want to talk just a little bit about the opportunities that are coming in the region for the next year or so, to talk about Internet governance issues, including Internet coordination. So we have IGFs coming up in Malaysia [inaudible], for example. We also have an Asia-Pacific regional IGF in Delhi in August.

We have APTLD meetings in Oman and Brisbane. Oman is in May and we're hoping to bring all the CCs from the Middle East and neighboring regions there. And at the APTLD meeting later this year in Brisbane,

we'll be meeting with APNIC and we'll try to get all the Pacific ccTLDs there.

The Pacific Islands will be getting together in the Cook Islands in September, and I'm sure there will be many more. New Zealand runs a NetHui, so there's going to be no shortage of opportunities to discuss these issues within the cc community and within the broader community. So with that in mind, I'll pass it over to Hong.

HONG XUE: Thank you, Don. Thank you very much. We heard repeatedly over this week – and especially from Mr. Strickling in the morning – that future of Internet governance and the globalization of ICANN will depends very much the engagement of developing world.

And if we are going to develop our multi-stakeholder model, so engagement not only involve the government from developing countries but also the business in developing economies. And I feel these businesses are very much outside the radar of Internet governance. They know very little on what is happening in ICANN and the other IG fora. So I feel that capacity building is very much needed – the need to understand what is happening, so in order to facilitate the meaningful and effective participation in Internet governance.

Therefore, two weeks ago on the 12th of March, 2014, we had the pilot capacity-building project to local business community to [help] them understand this very complicated trademark measures developed in the ICANN new gTLD programs. And hopefully, this kind of training could be presumed further and expand to the other area, hopefully working

tightly with the other stakeholder groups. They're all very supportive, like APNIC, APTLD, APSTAR, and especially Asia-Pacific regional IGF, which has been mentioned by Don.

And so let's go to the specific issue, this ICANN right-protection measures (RPMs). Yesterday, ICANN just announced they delegate 176 new gTLDs into roots. And among them, we could see [inaudible] from Asia-Pacific region. Totally, there are more than 300 new gTLD applicants from Asia-Pacific regions. They've been delegate. They'll soon be entering to the period of sunrise. And sunrise means those trademark has been verified by the [inaudible] and enter into the database managed by [IBM].

We have the priority registration opportunity under these new gTLDs, but what I learned from Asia-Pacific, especially from Chinese community of business, that they don't understand what the meaning of TMCH (the Trademark Clearinghouse), what the meaning of this term, the how and why they should send it.

And we can see the outcome of this lack of knowledge and engagement. There are a little more than 30,000 trademarks submitted and verified in the Clearinghouse so far. If we count this composition, you could see more than 200 trademarks is submitted from China, even though China has a largest trademark registration volume in the whole world. So this is surprising, is [where's] the result of lack of knowledge.

So we try to send the message to the business community in China in that little capacity building session. And another necessity, it seems that there's some [wrong] information to be circulated in Chinese business communities. Some organization just self-claimed they are Trademark

EN

Clearinghouse and like the new gTLD operators to work with them and like the trademark owner to submit information to their database. But that is actually useless, because it's not accredited by ICANN and it's not really a [link up] to the new gTLD registry. So the information is very important and available to the trademark and the brand owners in China.

Another problem is that it seems the Trademark Clearinghouse can only work for the registered trademark. It's not so much helpful to the local and registered trademarks.

Another point we can see is the limits of the sunrise registration, is each new gTLD operations have its own limited registration policy. Even though your trademark has been submitted to Trademark Clearinghouse, it may not be eligible for the sunrise registration, because the classification of goods, because the registration days, the registration geographical distributions are specifically defined.

Okay. That's [inaudible].

DON HOLLANDER: Minjung, do you want to go?

MINJUNG PARK: Yes, thank you, Don. This is Minjung from KISA, the Korea Internet and Security Agency. KISA is the organization in charge of Internet address-related matters, as well as security and privacy and spams and etc. Today, I'd like to give a brief overview on Korean Internet governance model.

For your information, I haven't prepared a presentation because I was asked to be very brief so we could have more Q&A sessions, so I'll try to be brief.

Let me first start with a brief history on Korean Internet governance. Back in 1980s, KIST, one of the leading academies in Korea, established KINIC, the department in charge of Internet address resources for the first time, and [KI] service started in that period.

And in 1994, the KI department within KIST was transferred to national organization, the National Informatization Agency, to facilitate registration process and promote the use of Korean ccTLD.

And in 1999, KINIC became an independent profit organization until 2004, when Act on Internet Address Resources was put into force. And since 2004, KINIC became NIDA, a governmental agency under the law.

So in 2009, the structure of Korean government was reorganized and we became the current KISA, merged together with two other governmental agencies. So now we are in charge of Internet governance and security within one organization.

So in the process, there were some challenges. As Act on Internet Address Resources was put into force in 2004, government took the full charge of Internet address, which caused some concerns within the community. So there was a view that government-driven Internet governance model might break the balance between [diverse actors].

So there has been a lot of efforts to deal with this issue, and as a result of continuous discussion, Korean community achieved Internet governance model that we have now. Many fora were created where

many [actors] can stand and speak on equal basis by different entities in the community.

So nowadays, one of the most active fora is called KIGA. It's the Korea Internet Governance Alliance, which gathers experts from diverse entities such as government, business sector, academia, and civil society and allows them to discuss the Internet governance issues in a free manner.

So as you can see from this, there has been some challenges until we finally established this model. But this challenge can also be recognized as a great opportunity which Korean Internet community benefited from. Through this process, we created a new and more advanced Internet governance model.

So we have been actively working on Internet governance issues and continuously developing our own model, as I've presented before. And at the World Telecommunication ICT Policy Forum, which was held May last year, the Korea government presented its basic principle on Internet governance, that we support multi-stakeholder model. And this is recognized as a major achievement for us, because this [theme] in the space of many discussions resulted the diverse fora that I mentioned before.

So based on this principle, we are making efforts in national level, such as expanding issues, scope of KIGA, holding events to share views about Internet governance, and increasing interaction among diverse stakeholders. We are also preparing for a global event, such as the upcoming Brazil meeting in April and also the [ITU PP], which will be held in Korea this year.

We, the government, the public sectors, along with the civil society and industry are working together to have a consensus view on how the future Internet governance model should be. And we will continue to fully engage in Internet governance discussions. Thank you. This was my brief introduction on the Korean Internet governance model.

DON HOLLANDER: Thank you very much. Justin?

JUSTIN LEE: Thank you, Don. Fellow panelists, ladies and gentlemen, good morning. I only have two slides.

The government of Singapore have an interest in Internet government issues since [inaudible] days. Our positions have remained largely dissimilar through all these ten years or so. We believe in the multi-stakeholder model, just because Internet is so diverse that no one body shall [sow] domain over it. We, therefore, favor a model of governance that involves a private sector in civil society. But however, we also support model where the government will have a voice [ensuring] the public policy issues related to the Internet.

Each of us, therefore, have a role to play for government to implement policies that will ensure our citizens' [continual] access to a safe and secure Internet and to create a conducive environments for service providers and operators to roll out and upgrade the Internet infrastructure.

We believe the private sector is in the best position to handle the technical and commercial aspects of Internet architecture. And civil society individuals had a role to create relevant content and community services that cater through unique needs and situation of each society.

We therefore welcome the announcement by NTIA on 14th March 2014 on its intent to transition the key Internet domain name functions to the global multi-stakeholder community. In the coming months, we believe that there will be greater urgency to fight [collisions] on views on the nature and compositions of this multi-stakeholder model.

One group has favored a commercial-driven model of Internet governance. The other group has indicated for preference for a one-man, one-vote sort of system. The key question to us, therefore, is whether a hybrid model can possibly emerge from these two vastly different positions and whether such a hybrid model could actually work. And if not, could it be made to work?

And on the orphan, the issues that many of [which got touched on], I think, such as how to tackle spam or cyber-security, due to the cross-border nature of these issues, it's arguable there's a strong mechanism for [inaudible] among key players, such as governments, will be needed. However, to move forward to that, there's a sense that we need resolutions on the multi-stakeholder model that we have alluded to earlier.

Singapore does not purport to offer a solution to the multi-stakeholder discussions at this point in time. However, we are prepared to work with the various parties in all platforms to find a way forward to a

workable solution that which is acceptable to all. That's my short introduction. I hope it has been useful. Thank you.

DON HOLLANDER: Thank you very much, Justin. Byron, do we have 80 seconds for questions?

BYRON HOLLAND: Absolutely.

DON HOLLANDER: So I have just a couple of questions. So first of all, for Justin, what events do you think Singapore's going to participate in, in terms of the Internet governance issues, both the orphan issues and the coordination issues – particularly the coordination issues – going forward? And are you going to work to consult and cooperate with others, and if so, how are you going to do that?

JUSTIN LEE: I think there are various Internet governance meetings coming up, from an ITU perspective. There's [inaudible] Process in Geneva in June. For IGF, there's another meeting in Turkey in September. The most immediate one that we are looking at is of course the April meeting in São Paulo. There will be many suggestions being floated around and when [inaudible] comes along, we'll be working with our academies, the community, the ccTLDs in our country to come up with a common – not a view, but something that is workable on many of the issues that are going coming up. I think there will be many issues that be coming up.

DON HOLLANDER: Okay. And I have one – if I have time for one more question?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes.

DON HOLLANDER: So, Hong, what are the skills lacking that you're seeing in the community? Can you tell us in 30 seconds the skills that you think are missing and the training opportunities that exist for people to build up those skills?

HONG XUE: So which stakeholder group? The civil society or business?

DON HOLLANDER: Yes.

HONG XUE: All of them? Oh. The skills? Well, first of all, it's the language skills. We can't speak as quickly as a native English speaker has. That's one. Of course, the other is the policy skills, drafting documents, debates.

DON HOLLANDER: Thank you very much.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you very much, and I appreciate the panel and Don as Chair getting us back on schedule. That was very interesting and thank you very much. Thanks for getting us back on the rails.

DON HOLLANDER: Not a worry.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, next up we have even more Internet governance. We have a session on perspectives on the globalization of IANA with a broad panel, so I would just ask if the folks from that panel could start to make their way forward.

So while everybody gets organized here, and as you can see, there's quite a few of us – quite a few of them – to get organized, I just wanted to frame this a little bit in that the Program Working Group has done many things to try to make sure that these sessions, the agenda meet the needs of our community. And as part of that, they have been very diligent in thinking about new and creative ways to keep the sessions interesting – be it in format, in terms of the guests who join us here, etc.

And this session, in particular, is something new in terms of format, where we are going to have various members of our community act as interviewers to try to stimulate the discussion with what you can see is a very esteemed panel of guests from outside our community.

So it is something novel. It is something new, something we want to try. Hopefully it's going to produce the kind of interesting, dynamic

discussion that we hope to have around this subject. So with that, I am going to pass it over to Keith to kick us off.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you, Byron, and welcome, everybody. Milton, please come and join us – there should be a seat here, somewhere. And just noting that Theresa Swinehart is not with us at this stage, but I think the rest of the panel is here.

So this session, I think, is established to help inform us about what the other users of the IANA function or people involved in the IANA function are doing and what their plans are, in terms of their transition, and so on. And in particular, or asides from that, we have Milton Mueller, who drew up a straw man model and gave some principles as a guide to the NETmundial meeting, which was quite interesting and sort of paints a picture.

So I think when you're considering today the discussion, this is about the building blocks of the IANA database. We talked the other day in council about IANA essentially, as far as we're concerned, being four separate vertical silos. There's the area of the IETF or the protocol parameter space, which is largely administered by the IETF. There's the IP addressing space that's administered or controls the delegation of IP addressing for the RIRs and administered partly through ICANN and through the NRO. There's the gTLD space and the gTLDs that are contractually bound for their entries in and out of the IANA database through ICANN and their process.

And then there's us as the fourth silo. And our silo is somewhat different to everybody else's. We have some really interesting tension on the entries within that database. There are the boring, routine updates of the IANA database in terms of IP addressing or telephone numbers of technical contacts and so on that's routine and so we're not really going to focus too much on that in this session. But what I want the ccTLD managers in the room to get a thought process rolling on is around the impact of the changes the U.S. stewardship being removed. And the very delicate balance between sovereign rights for ccTLDs and their governments versus those local Internet community requirements for RFC 5091 and so on. So as we go through and understand more about the other IANA user perspectives, just keep that in the back of your mind.

And the process will be we have our three interviewers and our panelists. We've got some set questions. Is there room for Theresa somewhere? Welcome, Theresa. And so there will be time for some questions from the audience. But our interviewers' job is to finesse down some questions as we go. So can I very quickly, because not everybody in the room will know everybody, can I very quickly go down the line? So can we have your name and your affiliation? So can I start with you, Lesley? Just name and affiliation.

LESLEY COWLEY: Hi. Lesley Cowley from Nominet.uk.

BECKY BIRD: Becky Bird, .us.

ROELOF MEYER: Roelof Meyer, .nl.

MILTON MUELLER: Milton Mueller, non-commercial stakeholders group.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko, IETF.

PAT KANE: Pat Kane, Verisign.

KATHY BROWN: Kathy Brown, the Internet Society.

PAUL WILSON: Paul Wilson from APNIC, one of the original Internet registries.

THERESA SWINEHART: And Theresa Swinehart, from ICANN staff.

KEITH DAVIDSON: This is not the best position, because I can't see down the row. Okay, thank you. Thank you, everybody. So handing over to our interviewers – or actually, shall we go through the panel and would the panel like to describe their interest in the IANA database and the part of it that

affects them for no more than one minute each? So can we start with Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, so, thank you. So we at the IETF of course only care about many aspects of managing the Internet. But one aspect that is directly affecting us is the protocol parameters, so port number allocations and so forth. So the protocol parameters is the one aspect that we have to deal with and how we interface with IANA is basically through agreements where the roles of organizations have been specified and processes have been specified. It's actually a quite well-working system today.

KEITH DAVIDSON: I don't see who's next, but if work down the row, thank you.

PAT KANE: So from Verisign's perspective, as the root zone maintainer as well as a gTLD operator, we kind of take a look at the risks profile from either cutting the zone file and doing something wrong or having somebody else cut the zone file and living with the wrong contents.

                        What the process goes from here will be interesting, because I think the way that it's done today between ICANN, NTIA, and Verisign, we've had a long – we had a good track record of making it work well, and any replacement organization, I think, or replacement entity or regime, would have to just as well, I believe, to service the community the same standard. So that's kind of our interest, Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Pat. And as an interested bystander to the process, thank you. Kathy?

KATHY BROWN: Thank you, Keith. So the Internet Society, as you know, is the home to the IETF, but I leave the discussion of that technical parameter issues, all of that, to Jari who is an expert at this point.

Our view, actually, has always been and will continue to be that the Internet as we evolve and grow needs to remain open, robust, resilient; that what got us here will get us there. And as we go through these processes, we see as our role to remind the world at all times that the multi-stakeholder process is the one that has gotten us the best results thus far. And as we go through these processes, to stay with the principles that underlie those processes.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Kathy. Paul, for the RIRs?

PAUL WILSON: So I am speaking for APNIC. We're one the five RIRs. As I'm sure everyone knows, we're responsible for the allocation and management of IP addresses – IPv4 and v6. Lesser-known activity is the allocation of autonomous system numbers. And those three represent the three registries that IANA operates on behalf of the addressing community – IPv4 and IPv6 and autonomous system numbers.

So our interface to IANA is absolutely different and it's much simpler, if you like, than either the protocol and parameter functions, which are many, many registries and registries are created all the time. We're in a very well-defined, very stable situation in which these three registries are managed by IANA and they are managed in accordance with global policies. And the critical thing about those policies is that they come from outside of ICANN, so there's a global policy process. It's well-defined as to how a global policy is developed and emerged. Once a global policy emerges, it goes through the [ASO] into ICANN for ratification by the ICANN Board, and it gets handed straight down to IANA for implementation.

There's one small part of the DNS which we relate to as well, which is a couple of zones inside [.apa],and that is also managed administratively by IANA. I think that covers it for now.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you, Paul. Oh, I guess just before I hand over to Theresa, it's important for our panelists to note that this room, the ccTLDs, a lot of ccTLDs only arrived yesterday and participated in our technical day, so not so many people in this room will have seen the presentations in the main room on this IANA globalization concept and so on. So please don't treat this audience as if they have been here all week and participating. And feel free to elaborate on your responses along the way.

However, we have just come out of our joint ccTLD Board meeting and we did get some updates from Board members and so on. But Theresa, I noticed you were in that session. Is there anything you'd like to add in

terms of ICANN and what you see might be relevant to the ccTLD community?

THEREA SWINEHART: First of all, thank you for having me here and let's talk about which picture we're posting up there next time, huh? It looks a little bit ominous.

So, no, I don't have much to add. I did have the opportunity to sit in the Board session, and I think one of the key areas that is very clear to all of us is that the situation with the ccTLDs is very unique in the context of both the IANA function itself and then, obviously, as we're looking at the dialogues and the processes around the transition of the stewardship that we were discussing and that was being discussed with the Board. How we look at the process in relationship also to the ccTLD community will be a very important one.

For those who didn't have the opportunity to be here yesterday, one of the core things we're looking at this week is how to ensure that the process is done very well. So this is the beginning of that. And with the input from this week, identify the scope, the process, and the timeline, which will be posted on the 7th of April.

So what would be very useful to hear, also, in this discussion, given the unique situation of ccTLDs, as opposed to – it's no disrespect to IP addressing or protocol parameters – but clearly there's many unique factors of sovereignty and other matters in the context of ccTLDs. Any thoughts and input with regards to a really exceptional process would be really most welcome on that.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Theresa. And now over to the interview panel. Who's seeking the first question? Becky?

BECKY BIRD: I'll go first. Becky Bird, .us. Over the past couple of days, I've been really struck – and I think other people in this room have been struck – by the language and the way we talk about what's going on here. So I'd like to ask each of the panelists just what this IANA transition or transitioning the IANA functions mean?

                        Some people talk about replacing the stewardship role that the U.S. government played, and if that's what you think, what does that mean? Other people are talking about just sort of responsibility for technical issues. And it seems to me that we're not all on the same page. And maybe there's no reason that we need to be on the same page, but we need to understand each other's perspective. So if we could just start – and Theresa, you can take a pass if you want on this. But you don't have to.

THERESA SWINEHART: I would actually really appreciate to take a pass. I'm actually in listening mode, as part of the input into [inaudible], thank you.

BECKY BIRD: Yep. Okay, that's what I thought. So why don't we start down with Paul and come back this way?

PAUL WILSON: Sure, thanks. Thanks, Becky. The key word I think in this discussion is "globalization." One place where that word gained a lot of airplay was the Montevideo statement, which called for, effectively, for the globalization of ICANN and IANA. And that was a short statement and a single word in the statement was discussed at great length and it's been discussed since then. I've been asked many times what it means and there's been speculation about what it means.

From my perspective, and I think this was fairly shared at the time, globalization was a placeholder for a couple of very specific things and different things in terms of ICANN and IANA. So in the case of ICANN, globalization was a reference to the need to change the AoC. In the case of IANA, it was a reference to the need or was a call for a change to the U.S. government contract.

So we're talking about IANA, and I think in our terms, it has got to do with the fact that there is a contract for IANA services between ICANN and the U.S. government, and that contract will disappear or be replaced by something else. So I think that's a simple reduction [inaudible] of what we were talking about in terms of globalization.

As I mentioned before, for the RIRs, we have a very clean interface with ICANN for IANA functions. The functions are very well-defined. They're specified by the global policy process, which exists. What we feel we need to do is to relook. In order for us to be satisfied with the globalization process, we certainly need to look at our agreements with ICANN. There are a number of agreements between the RIRs and ICANN through the – the RIRs are collectively represented by something called

the NRO (the Number Resource Organization). So whenever you see a reference to the NRO, you can consider that to be the five RIRs together.

The NRO has a number of agreements with ICANN, which have to do with the financial contribution we make to ICANN, the IANA, the service level agreement, effectively, and the ASO MoU, which defines that policy process. And I think what we need to do is to relook at that set of agreements, and make sure they are complete and up-to-date and they serve the purpose that they need to serve in the absence of the IANA contract with the USG. I think that's it for now, thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Becky, I think this is an important question and is also is one that is to be determined. Are we on the same page? I think that's part of the conversation. The globalization of the IANA function is in some ways, it's not a surprise that we would be moving in this direction. In a lot of ways, the U.S. government has been moving in this direction for 15 years. And what does it mean by that?

Well, Larry Strickling tells us what it means by that is that it has some role here in the actual administration of the IANA functions. And others in the room yesterday, I heard say, "Yes, but it's bigger than just a small administrative role." It also was, to some who expressed a backstop for the trust in the system.

So both kinds of issues got raised yesterday. I heard, in the conversation, I found it very interesting, for those who were not there,

that a whole line of people had perspectives on this very question. And it seemed to me, as I listened, that three kinds of things emerged.

One was sort of to ICANN, the question of "Can we trust you in this process? Will be you be open to hearing all of the points of view? And will you be a good steward of the process for the process?" It was an interesting conversation along that, and I think there will more discussion around that.

The other had to do with the notion that there were technical issues to be discussed and that the technical part of the functioning of the IANA contract had been well-established, is well-established. Various pieces of this over the years have matured and work very well.

And then there was a second issue around the accountability mechanisms for ICANN itself, some of which I heard people say collide with each other. They kind of get integrated with each other. I, myself, found it useful that these were at least separated for purposes of clarity and conversation.

And then the third thing that I heard emerge that I found very useful was this notion that whatever the community decides, however the multi-stakeholder processes come up with some decisions around how to go forward that these processes had to be tested for actual work on the ground. What is the use case? Can they withstand the stress?

I would add the further criteria that none of what we do can result in anything but an open Internet that is more resilient, more robust, and still remains the platform for permission-less innovation.

So as we go through this, it seems to me that we will come closer and closer I hope to getting on the same page, with respect to a way forward. But it seems useful to me to think about how we process that.

PAT KANE: So when I think about the IANA functions itself, I think about three aspects to it. There's the clerical function, collecting of the changes to the root zone. Then there's the authorization function, which is currently performed by the NTIA. And then the technical function, which ends up being actually making certain that the modifications that are being made to the zone are accurate, they work. And then, finally, publishing the final zone.

In a world of 300 TLDs, it gets kind of hard to do that from a manual check standpoint. But in a world when you go to 1,700 TLDs, and then if there's a round 2, where you got more new gTLDs, it becomes kind of unwieldy.

What I'd focus on what our role is in how the changes are going to occur, how does that process become more automated and how does that process become more in the hands of the TLD operators themselves, without introducing additional risk into the process?

And no matter what portion that you change – whether it be the clerical piece, the authorizing piece, or the technical piece – it all comes back to what's the accountability mechanism that's on top of that? And so with the U.S. government leaving – and I won't necessarily call it a "vacuum," but there will be a change to where we're losing a large piece of that backstop and what is now the accountability mechanism for that?

And we hear people talk about accountability to the world. I don't really know what that means. And so I'm concerned as to what's stepping in behind that and how does that work and who's going to process through that? I've seen some interesting suggestions so far, but I think one thing we have to do in the whole process is take our time and consider a bunch of different solutions to get to a proposal that works for us. And let's not drive – let a milestone, I think the assistant secretary yesterday didn't call it a "deadline," but it's actually a milestone. Let's not let that milestone drive us to a point where we're making decisions that are based upon speed, not based upon correctness and accuracy.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. So, when we talk about the globalization or IANA transition, we can use different terms. We could debate which one to use, but I think, fundamentally, it's really about what actually changes in practices and functions that we're doing. And since we have to get down to details, it might also be the case that different aspects of IANA will have slightly different answers. We'll have to figure that out.

But from our perspective, at the IETF and the IAB, which in the IETF system is actually in charge of the IANA aspects or overseeing that relationship, we like to think of this as evolution. It has been a lot of evolution. The last 15 years, we've seen the creation of MoUs, role definition, RFCs, process RFCs. We created groups to track the relationship and the situation and make sure that everything's running smoothly. We also wrote thousands and thousands of [RFCs] that actually specify the policies for protocol parameter allocations.

So I don't want to look at this as, "Finally, we are making a change in the IANA system." We've been making changes all along. This is a historic step but it's still just a step within the larger process. And so from my perspective, this is more like – the technical communities have grown to handle all the – or at least most of the – issues that we need to deal with, and part of the transition is recognizing that fact that has already happened. And the other part is this is an opportunity for us to do even better.

We certainly need to make improvements, and I don't want to be here and say, "We don't have to do anything." We do have to make some changes. But it's important to realize that there's a running thing already.

So at least from our perspective, this is evolution, not revolution. And there's no drama. It's just business as usual. Sorry to be boring.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, to directly answer Becky's question, I would say that we all should be on the same page. I don't know whether we are. But the page I think we should be on is – the groundwork was laid very well by Pat. We've got three things we're talking about here: the clerical aspect, the authorization function, and the technical implementation.

This change is all about the authorization function. This is what the commerce department is offering to change. In the process of changing that, there will have to be adjustments in the clerical and technical parts. And so we do need to talk about that.

But fundamentally, if you want to know what this is all about, it's about the U.S. saying, "We no longer think it is necessary for us to be the person who authorizes root zone changes." And that has a political dimension. Indeed, the problem with it has always been fundamentally political and the reason for it has always been fundamentally political – that if you have a global governance organization, where does the authority come from? Who is responsible for its oversight? How is it made accountable? And so when we make the change in the authorization function, we're also dealing with issues of accountability and authority.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Milton. And to Lesley and then Roelof? Or Roelof, is yours a follow-up?

ROELOF MEYER: Keith, just a remark. At the beginning of our session this morning, Katrina mentioned that there is a way in which people can send in their questions if they don't want to post them personally. Maybe we can repeat that so that we can get questions in from the room, as well?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Did she? Sorry, can we ask Katrina to come forward?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, there's an Adobe Connect room where you can log in and submit your questions. Christina sitting here,keeping an eye on the room and if there are any questions, so she will let us know.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Okay. Good point. And thanks for picking me up on that. Just as an outcome of some discussions in recent times – and sorry, panelists, it's off-topic – but there have been a couple of comments that people feel sometimes a bit embarrassed to come to the microphone or put their questions in our forum. So the idea that we might have Adobe Connect running in the background and that people who are perhaps not so comfortable coming forward to the microphone can start to push some questions forward. And if the discussion around the room can synthesize and finesse questions on behalf of the room, we may get more pertinent questions coming forward at the end of that.

So have a think about that and if you've got your laptop open, maybe connect on Adobe Connect and start to [figure that]. And maybe, at the end of the session, we can have a card showing if people see that might be a useful way forward for the people who don't want to step up in the room.

Anyway, sorry. So, thanks, Roelof. And now, Lesley, for a question.

LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you, Keith. Okay. So it seems to me there's been a lot of words already on this. We've talked about a process at length. We've talked about an evolution or a transition. And frankly, there seems to have been an awful lot of waffle about it already. Waffle is a kind of lots and lots of words with not a great deal of meaning.

So as a country code manager, as a customer of IANA, I'm really interested in getting down to what are we transitioning to, here?

Otherwise, we're going to talk for months about the transition process before we ever get to talking about what are we transitioning to. And as a fellow customer of IANA, I guess I'd particularly like to get Pat's view, as a registry operator, like many of us in this room: Transition to what, Pat? What would be the good bits on your list of wishes for a transition? Transition to what? What do you want to see from this and what do you most definitely not want to see from this? And if I could give advance warning, I'd also like to ask Paul and Jari, as direct customers of IANA, that same question.

PAT KANE: So thank you, Lesley. I think when we take a look at the cooperative agreement that Verisign has with the NTIA to perform this particular function, the wording in it basically says that the NTIA can anytime remove Verisign from that particular role and hand that over to somebody else. And so we've always recognized that it was a possibility that we would not be the final publisher of this root zone file. What I worry about as a TLD operator is predictability and stability. What can we rely upon in terms of the accuracy of the zone, the modifications that are entered correctly?

And the processes that we put in place and we have developed over time work today, in terms of how that goes. And so I think the last time we made a mistake was 2005 when we put something in incorrectly for .fr and so we've got almost ten years of complete accuracy.

And while I think that whoever actually does this function, there's risk to them if they do something wrong, especially with how people depend upon it around the globe now. The risk that I see in transitioning that

piece to someone else or some other consortium of someone elses is that we've come to depend upon it. I would like to see at least as good performance as what we have done in the last ten years or better. I do not want to see lesser performance or have this technical function go to an entity that does not have as its core mission software development.

LESLEY COWLEY: So while you've got the mic, Pat, can you pay to the rumor that Verisign [inaudible] to use this as an opportunity to step away from your current role? Or is on your wish list, is Verisign still having your role?

PAT KANE: I'm one who likes to control my own risk. So if we were to be asked to continue in the role, I would certainly continue in the role. I'm not looking to leave the role. It's easier to say to our investors that we control our own destiny, and so I like that and I'd like to continue to do that. But I would also welcome more participation in that process, whether it's technical checks or improving the process in such a manner that we make it better.

And whatever the follow-on is, I still would like to be a part of it as operators of .com and net. So I'm not trying to leave, but I'm not trying to give it away. But I want to make certain that it's run at least as well as it is today.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Pat, now that you have the mic, you issued some clear warnings. Do you also see room for improvement? Are there things where you think that if we get another model where things could be better?

PAT KANE:
Well, we have to scale better. So a lot of technical checks that are done today are done manually. So the clerical function, where submissions are being made, has become more automated over time. The technical checks are not as automated as they can be. And we will see, with a couple of thousand new TLDs, over time, you're going to see more changes on a daily basis. If you're actually doing something manually, you introduce more risk.

So we would like to make sure that it's more automated, there's more eyes. To use mechanical turks, if you will, those types of approaches, [m of n] approaches, to get to where more people are looking at those changes, more eyeballs are saying, "Yes, we assert that that's a correct and accurate change," and then publish the zone file after that.

LESLEY COWLEY:
Okay, thank you. So same question to Paul and then Jari. So what's the three things on your wish list, Paul, and what's a no-go area for you?

PAUL WILSON:
I think the thing that's worth saying, just getting back to the sort of catalyst to the Montevideo statement, was that for us, there was not anything actually new in that statement. We had said before, as the RIRs, through the NRO in response to the USG's various inquires, we

said that we want to see this transition happen. We wanted to see steps being taken. We wanted to see an indication of intention and so forth. And now we've got all of that. So again, it's not a new thing. It's a continuity of a system that exists and has functioned well for our community.

But what we absolutely want – although we've had it – is continued stability and security, reliability. We want in no way for that to be threatened. I think the risk, if there's a risk, it's of applying a set of cookie cutter changes or throwing the baby out with the bath water, if you like, in whatever is going to happen, which affects the much larger issues that dominate ICANN – namely, the DNS, the names issues.

Other improvements? I mentioned before that there are a set of agreements which define the relationships and I think we could have some review and possibly some consistency to make sure that those agreements are entirely completely; that there's transparency and clarity in those agreements – what they're there for and what they're there to achieve. So there's sort of ongoing improvements in the clarity and the transparency of those relationships, and also of the conduct of those functions, the reporting, is something that we could go on improving. I mean, we have actually been seeing improvements from IANA over the years, which has been well appreciated, but I think we will always need to keep looking at that.

There are some technical challenges ahead for us in working with IANA, in particular with the RPKI (Resource Public Key Infrastructure), which is the certification system for IP addresses, which will have beneficial impacts on the security of the routing system. So our ability to continue

working with IANA in a productive way has got to be guaranteed, because as I said, it's not something that we've had cause to be concerned about in any specific way so far. So it's the continuity that really needs to be there, absolutely. Thanks.

LESLEY COWLEY: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. So given Paul's answer and my previous answers, it doesn't come to surprise to you that I'm going to say that what good looks like is close to what we have already.

But I wanted to emphasize couple of things. So one is that the good model that we like is structurally such that we have a separation between policy, implementation, and oversight. So in the particular context of the protocol parameters, what that means is we at the IETF set the policy on what allocations are appropriate and under what process. Then IANA implements that. They actually execute the database operations and they make sure that those requirements that we set are satisfied. And then as oversight, in this particular case, the IAB has an oversight role of checking that the relationship is going well and also making sure that, operationally, things are fine.

So I think that's what we should be looking at it. That is, we have agreements in place for the functions be performed, we have specifications of what the process is, and we have Boards that are accountable on both sides – IAB to do the oversight, and then if

something goes wrong, ICANN has the Board. So that's all good and I think that's a success.

There are specific things that we are looking forward to doing. Just one example of something that we already did: a couple of weeks ago, we set a new service level agreement between IETF and ICANN. And one of the things that now says 2014 version is that we do an audit, that all the allocations have been done in an appropriate manner and a public audit that we can actually distribute the results for that audit to the global world. It's just a good thing, particularly since – and you may not realize this, but the protocol parameters registries are quite active, so this year, we've got an about 1,000 allocations there, allocations or modifications – even without enterprise numbers. So it's pretty active in making sure that everything is running smoothly and being transparent about that is a good thing.

If there's any risk about this? Of course, there's some risk about big processes. I think for us, on the IETF side, that the biggest risk may be if there are more difficulties, you say, with the names or with the ICANN processes, then getting stuck behind those questions and not being able to do our thing as fast as we'd like to. That may be the risk.

LESLEY COWLEY: So let me just pick you up on part of your response, there. You referred to oversight being provided by the various Boards, and in particular, the ICANN Board. Do you see part of the U.S. oversight, then, being replaced by ICANN Board oversight? Is that what you're saying?

JARI ARKKO: Well, I mean there's multiple different types of oversights. But I think, replaying something from my previous answer, I think we've grown up over the last 15 years and taken on a lot of the tasks that need to be done. So one particular type of oversight is that, on the IAB side, will track the relationship with IANA and ICANN and we have even an operational small team that is looking at things on a monthly basis and making sure that nothing is missed and no issues are left hanging. And all the indicators are on green, by the way, all the time. It's, again, very boring to do this tracking because it goes so well.

On the ICANN side, of course, there's different type of oversights. If we had an issue, for instance, then we could raise it to the Board and it would presumably get dealt with. We don't have a lot of running code of that because we've not had many issues.

LESLEY COWLEY: Was that a yes or a no? Sorry?

JARI ARKKO: So I think largely the U.S. government roles with regards to protocol parameters have been already taken over by the technical organizations over the last 15 years.

LESLEY COWLEY: Okay, but I specifically asked about the ICANN Board role. Do you see the ICAAN Board having an oversight of whatever we're transitioning to?

PAT KANE: Lesley, if I could jump in on that aspect. I think that's a great question, because if you think about the ICANN Board right now, they really serve two Board functions: one in policy and one, their fiduciary responsibility to manage a California-based non-profit.

Maybe the discussion should be, now, that you split the Board and have two Boards: one covers policy and one covers this other responsibility that the organization has to be accountable to. Because if you move that accountability function from the U.S. government to the Board, I think that overwhelms the Board as it is today, and maybe makes it non-functioning at that point in time. So it could be an interesting topic, to separate into two Boards with two distinct functions.

LESLEY COWLEY: Precisely why I'm asking that question, yeah – who's doing the oversight?

JARI ARKKO: And if I can add one more thing to that. So that's an interesting suggestion. From our perspective, the oversight of the policy functions is entirely on the IETF side. That is where we do those. And from ICANN perspective, we're looking forward to sort of working with the implementation oversight aspect of that. And maybe that's another Board, if that should be the future solution.

ROELOF MEYER: Okay, this was exactly where I wanted to go. Milton, I'll start with you and I think that Theresa would like to comment, too. You called the role that the ICANN Board is playing the authorization role.

MILTON MUELLER: I did?

ROELOF MEYER: Yes, you did.

MILTON MUELLER: Where?

ROELOF MEYER: Here, just now. Anyway.

MILTON MUELLER: The U.S. government.

ROELOF MEYER: Yeah, the U.S.—what did I say?

MILTON MUELLER: You said the ICANN Board.

ROELOF MEYER: Oh, no. Sorry. The U.S. government, you called its role the authorization role. There are two things why I wonder if that although it's

theoretically or formally correct, if in practice, it works that way. And the first one is that just this morning, we had Larry Strickling here and he indicated that what the USG is doing is just checking if procedure has been followed. And they seem to have a kind of a template for that.

And also, we as a ccNSO, we have run a working group, which was called the Framework of Interpretation Working Group. It's still there. It looked into delegations, redelegations] and Keith, what is the other word for—

KEITH DAVIDSON: Revocations.

ROELOF MEYER: Revocation of ccs. And as far as I remember, it was always the ICANN Board that very often on-the-fly developed policy, took decision, instructed IANA. Well, of course this went through the USG, but obviously they never changed anything. So my point will be – and this is in the discussion of – what are we actually talking about if we are talking about globalization of the U.S. role in the DNS? It seems to me very formal and lightweight. It seems that most of the real stuff, as far as the ccs are concerned, at least, is within ICANN already.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The policy [stuff].

ROELOF MEYER: And the decisions. Not just making the policy. Very often, there was no policy. There was a decision first, and from that – well, you can derive policy. But there was no policy first and then a decision. I think that's exactly the point of Keith's working group.

MILTON MUELLER: Unfortunately, it's easy to be a little bit disingenuous about the U.S. role. If you're in political science, you know that if you have power, you really have power if 99.9% of the time, you don't have to exercise it in any obvious way. You're there. People know that you have power, and therefore they do what you want, because they know that you have power.

So, yeah, the U.S. basically sits there and doesn't do much visibly. Now, I would say if you were in Washington or close to Washington like me, you would see a lot of stuff going on around the renegotiation of the IANA contract. You would see a lot of pressure put by interest groups on Congressmen who then hold hearings about ICANN and then pressure the commerce department and the administration on various matters related to ICANN. So there's a lot going on in the background.

But of course when it comes to the actual implementation of the authorization function, the U.S. doesn't have to do much. It just has to be there. And ICANN knows that the U.S. can take the contract away from them. The rest of the world knows that the U.S. can assign the implementation and operational functions to Verisign and not to anybody else. They know that ICANN has to be in the U.S. So a lot of things flow from this authorization function. You can't just look at the act of Vernita Harris sitting in her office and going over some list and

saying, "Oh, nothing's really going on here." Does that answer your question?

ROELOF MEYER: Do you want to go into that? Theresa, would you like to comment on this, as well? Do you agree, or…? We're not following.

THERESA SWINEHART: I'm not sure which part you want me to comment on, sorry. The reason I'm asking is there's been several elements of the discussion on the question that you posted.

ROELOF MEYER: What I would like to check if you agree upon is most of the work, most of the decision making, the policy making about at least the cc work that IANA is doing is not on the level of the USG, it is already within ICANN.

THERESA SWINEHART: I think one of the interesting aspects – and I think Paul's touched on this and Jari's also touched upon it – is that you have the actual policy work happening in the respective forums. And so, as you're looking at the dialogue around this transition, it's I think incredibly important to keep in mind that the policy aspects relating to the areas that the IETF deals with or the policy aspects relating to the RIRs or the policy aspects relating to the name area occur in the respective entities that have the responsibilities for that. And so, if there's a dialogue about a question or a concern around the policy element, that has to actually be taken back to that forum.

And that's where I think sometimes it's easy to – the policy dialogues around the cc space occur obviously both at the local levels, with the ccs. It occurs at dialogues like here, the ccNSO. We have a global policy, obviously we know that that happens there. But those occur in the respective forums. And then as it relates to the IANA function part, that specific change then is under the administrative part that's there. But we're not looking at the dialogue where the policy issues should be happening.

So I don't know if that answers your questions but I don't want to convolute the areas. We're not questioning whether the policy areas that relate to the IETF and the protocol parameters happen within the IETF or not.

LESLEY COWLEY: I just want to make one point. The ccNSO had a significant role in shaping the IANA functions contract. We provided comments. We met with Larry. They took a lot of our comments. And that was a mechanism to get IANA to do things that we wanted them to do. So even if they're just checking boxes, the notion that the contract could be taken away and we had a voice in it is an issue we should be aware of.

ROELOF MEYER: Yeah, no, okay. But my point would be that if we only have to replace a structure that is checking boxes, we probably have to look for something completely different if we are checking for a structure that is actually making policy, making decisions, and so needs to have

knowledge about the problems, the processes, the contents of the decision it's going to take.

KEITH DAVIDSON: I think that Theresa then Paul was the order I saw, so Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHART: Sorry. So Roelof, are you proposing that one is relooking at where the policies are actually being developed?

ROELOF MEYER: I'm not proposing anything. I'm just trying to see if we are talking about the right thing that we want to replace with something else. Because if it's a structure that is actually making policy and taking decisions, that's something else as a structure that is checking if procedure has been followed correctly by another structure that is making policy and taking decisions. Do you get my point? Okay.

PAUL WILSON: Can I mention? I can't answer the questions that are being asked, because they're specific to only one part of IANA. We appear to be talking about ICANN and IANA here in the whole, and yet we're actually talking about names. So please, let's remember that we don't need – it's not the case that the U.S. government has an authority role or an authorization or approval role over everything IANA does. It's only one thing. U.S. government is not involved in any way with IP address allocations. They do not approve IP address allocations. And so, let's just be clear that if we're talking about changing the U.S. government role or

making some change in IANA in this respect, it's the names part that needs to be changed. Let's not sort of make some sort of encompassing and unnecessary change that impacts on protocol parameters, IP addresses, etc.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Paul. And Milton, did you have a comment to add? No, no? Okay. Next question, then. Becky? No? No questions coming? We can go?

LESLEY COWLEY: We never run out of questions. We're just being polite. So if there's some oversight role, if we assume that all of the policy bits stay as they are currently, it sounds like there's an oversight role to be replaced, but currently that oversight is just kind of a position of power in some way. It's not actually counseling anything or changing anything from what it sounds like.

So what is it we're actually authorizing, then? Am I missing something? There's a bit smoke and mirrors here or emperor's new clothes or something? Is it just because there's that possible power, in case the function screws up entirely that can move it away to somewhere else? Is that what we're talking about?

MILTON MUELLER: No, we're talking about the accountability of ICANN as well. So that's the fundamental thing. It's, again, the backstop, the idea that if something goes wrong, if they go rogue, if they misbehave, if they screw

things up, there is some kind of a very fundamental form of recourse. The actual way in which that is done is through this bizarre ritual of sending the root changes through Vernita Harris at the NTIA. Of course, it could be some kind of other mechanism. As mechanisms go, that's probably the least objectionable that you can come up with.

But you cannot underestimate the significance of that backstop role, and so when we were trying to design – to answer your question, "Where do we want to go?" we thought long and hard about what happens when that backstop isn't there? And our original idea was that it would, indeed, be integrated into ICANN. And after thinking long and hard about that, we thought, "We really need a structural separation to balance the power and provide a check and balance between ICANN as policy-maker and IANA as operational and implementer of the policies in the root."

LESLEY COWLEY: So it's largely a big stick role as opposed to authorizational oversight thing, isn't it? I have a big stick, somewhere. Okay. So it probably wouldn't be a good idea to put ICANN in charge of its own stick, then? Okay. All right.

JARI ARKKO: Can I ask clarification from Milton? So did you mostly speak about the names part? Because I think in the other aspects of IANA, we already have kind of that separation, because we, the IETF, are tracking that ICANN and IANA does the right thing and they are and it works actually very well.

MILTON MUELLER: Not only are we talking only about the names part, we explicitly say that. And it's very clear that the names part is precisely where policy is not even separated the way it is with the RIRs or with the IETF. The GNSO is a part of ICANN. The processes are run by the staff of ICANN. The Board participates actively in the making of policy. And the GAC participates actively in the making of policies that allegedly come from the GNSO. So there is no separation at the policy level between the actual registry implementation and the policy making in the name space. And so we don't think anything needs to be done to the protocol parameters. We don't think anything needs to be done now to the address part. It's just the names.

KATHY BROWN: Can I ask a question? So, Milton, I just want to get a clarification. So are you saying – just to use the phrase that's been used – that the entity with the big stick need not be a government?

MILTON MUELLER: We hope it's not a government.

KATHY BROWN: I thought that was something we should clarify, because I have felt, as you've made your argument, it could be interpreted that you think there needs to be a government backstop. But what I just heard you say is no, you think it can be a private sector backstop, so that the fact that

the U.S. government comes out doesn't mean that we need more government intervention. I just want to clarify.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think it is true that there is that – with respect to the functions that relate to the RIRs and the IETF – IANA is globalized and there's no transition that needs to take place.

So I'm going to ask a question. I don't mean to be provocative but it is going to be a little provocative. I look at the folks who are sort of heading, a big part of this process. We have ICANN, who is not a consumer of the functions and actually is the sort of object of the big stick. We have address registries and technical bodies who have essentially already transferred this function. But we don't really have registries. We don't have the consumers of the IANA function on the key inside circle. Are you guys looking out for our interests or is there some way we can get in that game and look out for our own interests?

[PAT KANE]:   Are you asking do we turn the authorization function from an edit function into an audit function, reduce what needs to be authorized? Because right now every single thing that goes through – whether you're changing a contact name or changing your DNS servers – it gets authorized by the NTIA, so that's an edit function.

If you reduce the edits into what goes in and what goes out of the root zone, do you actually make it more manageable and more functionable, so that every TLD operator – whether you're g or a cc or an n or whatever – you're actually managing your own portion of the root zone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's fine with respect to the technical stuff. It doesn't answer the backstop role.

[KEITH DAVIDSON]:   I think, yeah, that's fair to say for the normal responses or process of updating servers and issues like that. That's not so much the major issues for us. It's the delegation and redelegation issues and the sensitivities around that that are of more concern to the names. And that's where, as a ccTLD, you are not making an application for an IANA update. There is a potential removal of your existing entry and replacement somewhere else.

Anyway, I think we're into our last 30 minutes of the session, so perhaps if there's one more burning question from the interview – and I know there are questions emerging in the Adobe Connect room – so is there a final question from the panel? Or are you happy to hand over to the floor?

LESLEY COWLEY: So I've got a big stick and I've got audits. Is this what's on the wish list for people? Because I think, Pat, you've got a very good point. If the oversight is just overseeing edits, then that's actually not really oversight. And the issues that ccs have had with IANA in the past haven't actually been around that authorization function. It's been about the length of time it takes to effect changes, the quality of service, which is why I referred to us as being customers earlier. So

maybe there's different thing as part of this authorization. It's not actually authorization at all. Interested in people's views.

PAT KANE: I think a lot of it has to do with automation and then turning your destiny over to yourself, from that standpoint. The cycle, it takes a long time because, "Is it entered correctly? What are the technical checks that go on?" I know that when Verisign receives it, we have a three-day turnaround maximum in terms of what we do, in terms of effecting the changes.

And so there's a lot of front-end that goes on between whether ICANN has received it correctly or how they process it. They can't take a long time, and I know the redelegation takes long because there's more considerations along those items. But I think the more automation that gets put in place, the more trust you have in the tools that are available, that change can be affected much faster.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Pat. Shall we go to Roelof as a follow-up? Okay, the last one from the interviews.

ROELOF MEYER: It's a quick question, but I don't know if it's a quick answer. So what is the big stick? So this whole thing is about handing over the big stick to something. Now, what is the big stick? Is it the IANA function, or is the big stick taking the whole process bit away from ICANN? It doesn't get any money for the IANA function. The money comes from gTLDs, and

the whole new gTLD process. Is that the big stick? We take that away from you if you don't do what you should do? Because if I were ICANN and I could still do everything except the IANA function, and your stick would be taking away the IANA function from me, I would say, "Okay. Take it. Doesn't bring me any money."

KEITH DAVIDSON: So I'm not sure if that's a well-formulated question but it's an interesting observation.

ROELOF MEYER: [Inaudible], do you agree?

JARI ARKKO: I don't know. Maybe this big stick discussion is taking us the wrong way. I would like to go back to basics. I think of this as two separate things. One is the IANA implementation thing and the other one is the policy process. Let's think about them separately.

For the IANA implementation thing, I would suggest that at least our experience speaks to the customer-producer relationship-type model is really, really useful there. And contracts and there's a way to deal with a problem if there ever is a problem and ways to track that.

The other aspect is that you have policy development and all the different organizations have accountability mechanisms. I think in some cases, we need to strengthen those accountability mechanisms but there certainly are some mechanisms. I think big stick is maybe not the right word to deal with that. I mean, we have international

organizations that have broad participation from thousands and thousands of people, And they can responsibly – and they have responsibly – defined the policies. Keep those two things separate.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, I agree that you do need to keep them separate and that's the whole point, is that at that point, the big stick becomes if the policy-making side does something that is wrong, then the implementation, the operational part of the root, doesn't implement it. And there's a contract. And so the big stick, in that sense, becomes an agreement between a DNS authority that is performing the technical and operational IANA functions, and ICANN, which is making the policy.

And we think it's essential to separate those two things structurally. You don't need a big stick in the bad, old, political sense. You don't need a government standing over and saying, "Yeah, yeah, yeah, you do this, or else." You need a balance of power. Different people have the right incentive to do the right thing. Obviously, the TLD registries – whether they're gTLDs or ccTLDs – have a strong incentive to make the service of the IANA functions efficient, to make them accurate, to make them secure.

And once you've separated and its policy-making process from that, then you can concentrate on making that process more accountable in a way that's much cleaner than mixing it up with these operational things.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Milton. Christina, can we hand over to you for questions from Adobe Connect?

[CHRISTINA]: Yes, we have someone called Nick, who says, "I would like to ask each of the panelists what are the most significant risks they are expecting in this transition process and how could the community fight against these risks as an integrated force?"

KEITH DAVIDSON: Is there any taker for the question?

PAT KANE: I think from the perspective of the root zone maintainer role, ours is very straightforward. And that is the biggest risk in the transition is publishing zone files that are inaccurate. Publishing zone files that can't allow our customer's customer's customers reach their destination on the Internet. Any transition that we do from that perspective should only make it better, not introduce more risk.

KEITH DAVIDSON: I don't think I'll hear a lot of dissent from that viewpoint. Any other comments?

PAT KANE: I like when nobody argues with me, Keith.

KATHY BROWN: So I just want to continue on my theme, and I appreciated Milton's answer here and that is the risk is that – to put it the other way, the

opportunity is – that we strengthen the multi-stakeholder model, which leaves our destiny and the destiny of the Internet in the hands of multi-stakeholders who come to consensus and agreement about both the policy and the implementation in a way we achieve the balance and invite no particular government or governments into the process.

And I just want to keep saying that that responsibility, at this point, is ours and that I think we take it seriously and that it goes beyond any one of us. But it goes, actually, to the future of the Internet and its continuing evolution and growth.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Kathy. Milton and it looks like Paul wants the floor, as well. So Milton first.

MILTON MUELLER: So, risks. The first risk that we saw when contemplating the transition was that ICANN would become unaccountable and too powerful and it would control everything and you would have no leverage on it. I think people are getting that message and I don't see that as an insurmountable risk. I think people will design something that rationally addresses that risk.

The other risk is we won't agree. Nobody will agree on what to do and we'll get stuck in the status quo. I think that's a risk, also. And then the whole political system responds to that by saying, "Uh huh. You see this? Multi-stakeholderism doesn't work." I see those as the two main risks.

KEITH DAVIDSON: I think earlier, Milton, to use a metaphor, having all eggs in one basket as a perceivable risk, as well. And Paul?

PAUL WILSON: I made some comments yesterday about some accountability and taking a fairly simplistic approach. Accountability is a relationship in which one can be called to account by the other. So I am accountable to you, Keith, for something, and if I don't do that something, if I don't fulfill that expectation, then you can call me to account. And that means I report to you, I justify myself, I'm required to do so, and there's some redress if I don't do it to your satisfaction.

These things can all be defined by agreements and they're all fairly well-defined by the agreements that we have. I think the risks [inaudible] that we're all worried about is what happens when the calling to account and the redress doesn't work, because that is surely always a possibility.

And I would like to say, as I did yesterday, that each community needs to be clear on what its redress is and what its disaster scenario is. I think in the case of IP registries and I'd venture to say for protocols and parameters, these things are files and they are files that are recognized by consensus of the community. And someone else can create a file. In fact, the NRO in the first place was set up as a possible placeholder for this to happen, in the case that ICANN could no longer do it.

We're well past that now, but the addressing community needs to be clear on what its disaster scenario is and I can't say that we necessarily

are. But this is what this process will probably encourage us to be clearer on, to the extent that we need to be. But that disaster scenario of that sort of technical problem is one aspect.

Another one I think, as people have said, is that if ICANN fails. If ICANN breaks apart, if the basket is dropped and all the eggs break, then we do have a problem. ICANN plays an extremely critical role in its responsible position for the overall consistent, coherent, responsible management of these functions. And I hope that scenario is a very unlikely one, but we can't insure against all outcomes, can we?

One other thing that occurs to me is that I think accountability is transitive. I think if A is accountable to B and B is to C, then A is accountable to C, as well. That occurs to me in the case of ICANN's accountability, which can be expressed in some form in terms of the agreements that it has with other parties, if those parties themselves are accountable to other communities.

I think the accountability is preserved and all our eggs in one basket doesn't mean to – it would also be a case of all our eggs in one basket if we pretended that ICANN could be individually accountable to every one up and down the chain. It's also a hugely complex and a daunting prospect.

So I think, again, I'd like to keep things as simple and clear as possible. And I think that would be a useful thing to think about, the transitivity of accountability. Thanks.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks for that, Paul, and I'm already liking the idea of Paul Wilson being totally accountable to Keith Davidson. Jari and then I think we'll go another question after Jari.

JARI ARKKO: So I think the biggest answer here is that we'll have thousands of people in 200 countries trying to manage ten people who actually are working for IANA and might be a little bit too much for them. Thank God I'm not one of them.

                                   But on a more serious note, I wanted to get back to Milton's risk, which was that we won't agree and that will result in some harmful things later. And I think that's a real risk. Well, I think, I'm an optimist, we will go through this but it's still a risk that that happens. I'll just point out Project Management 101: set the scope appropriately, don't make it too broad. Let different parts proceed in parallel and independent of each other, and don't put all the eggs in one basket.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Jari. Back to Christina.

[CHRISTINA]:   Okay. Jordan would like to ask the panelists whether they agree that the four things the U.S. wants to hand over are the IANA contract, the root zone management contract, the NTIA role within the IANA functions, and the broad oversight or stewardship of the whole DNS system.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Is there any dissenting view that that's what's on the table? Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Well, I mean, in a very literal sense, it's not quite correct, because the NTIA doesn't do these root zone functions so it can't really be handing them over. I think what they're really just handing over – or actually, not even that. They don't want to say, "handing over." They want to say, "transitioning," or "ending" as their own authorization role. That simple.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Milton. Anyone else have a [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Backstop roles.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Any other views? Okay, we're into the final ten minutes, so we'll open up the microphone and quick questions and quick answers, please. And please introduce yourself.

MARTIN LEVY: Martin Levy, CloudFlare. Is there any example in the past of there being a delay because of the IANA oversight? And will that be used as a metric going forward to make sure that any replacement for that oversight matches, if there was any delay or whether there wasn't a delay, it was quite efficient. I'd like some input on that one.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Shall I venture a – oh, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: No, I just wanted to get myself in the queue, not to answer that.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Well, I think we'll close the queue where it is now, because we'll run over time I think. I'll come back to you, [Alan], if there's an opportunity. So is there someone who wants to pick up on Martin's question? Jari?

JARI ARKKO: For protocol parameters, the answer is no. Or at least, not to my knowledge.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you. Any other views? No? [Thank you, sir].

PIERRE BERNIS: Okay, thank you. Pierre Bernis from afnic.fr. Milton said [interpreting] the decision of the NTIA, that there was a set of conditions and that one of these conditions was, if I understood well, ICANN must remain in the U.S. I heard that. Maybe it was not Milton who said that, but I heard that today.

I just have a question because there was a debate opened by especially Fadi Chehadé a few weeks ago about the globalization of ICANN and the idea that might go [inaudible] in Geneva, for instance. So is that idea totally dropped-off now? Is there a link between the

internationalization of ICANN and the decision to ask [inaudible] to convene the debate? I don't know. I would like to have your views on this topic.

And the last thing, just to remark, I would like to ask Kathy to explain me how you define multi-stakeholderism, because it looks like it's all stakeholder but no governments, and I'm not very sure I understand that well because I was told that governments were stakeholder also, so how can they be part of this? Thank you.

BECKY BURR: I'm going to take a stab at answering the first question. There is no condition on the transition that the IANA functions remain in the U.S. And the issue of whether ICANN remains in the U.S. is an issue that's open and on the table.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Becky. And was there any differing view around the table? And Kathy, did you want to respond on multi-stakeholderism?

KATHY BROWN: Certainly. Thank you for the question. Governments are stakeholders in a multi-stakeholder environment. And they certainly have interests, of course, in this environment. I was trying to get clarification as to this very specific thing about the authorization in the IANA functions, and I felt very convinced and relieved that we were all on the same page, so thank you.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks. I think just a little bit of further clarification. The comment was made there is no role for multi-lateral government decision-making over the IANA, that it won't transit from the U.S. government to a group of governments or a treaty organization like that United Nations, but that it needs to be multi-stakeholder and that can include governments.

But if you go back to the definition of multi-stakeholder, it's about all stakeholders participating equally to achieve consensus. So governments are not, therefore, so able to assert an automatic sovereign, superior right – if that helps. Did you want to add a clarification, too?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I was just going to remind people that we have ccTLD principles that refer to subsidiarity, the rights of country over the country code in effect, as opposed to governments or whatever.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Okay, thanks. And that's a very important point, too. Our last question, I think, because we are just about out of time. Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE: Eberhard Lisse from .na. There's one observation that I have to make. IANA is a function. It's not an entity. So if I hear that ICANN can – or anybody can – say, "Oooh, too much work; 1,700 domain names, we're not sure whether we can handle it." If I was tendering for a contract, I wouldn't approach it like saying, "Oooh, I can't handle it." 1,700 names is nothing. If I have a registration fee of $185,000 US and an annual

percentage of my growth, I can hire enough staff to very nicely make sure that every root zone change for those domains is handled properly.

The other problem that I have is how is this actually going to work? Lesley and Milton alluded to this a little bit. It is an oversight by a government, like in the place of as it is now, whether it's right, legal, right, or whatever, it has worked for many years. And what it means, if this is transitive, then it's accountability. To whom? .uk is run by Nominet. It's a non-profit. It's bound by law to hand over its assets to somebody. So multi-lateralism, multi-stakeholders means one thing, but it means in effect that ICANN or whoever is going to take over the function has to enter into a contract with Nominet about how to deal with .uk – the same with .na, the same with any others.

I don't really see how any other multi-stakeholder is going to [turn] Nominet or uk or .de – I mention the bigger ones because they've got more muscle than the small ones like ours. We're just more vocal, perhaps – how they can tell individual ccTLD how this is supposed to be run. It means 250 individual agreements of the current incumbents maybe under the [inaudible] for working group principles about reasonable behavior. But how multi-stakeholder approach is going to tell any individual ccTLD, "No, we can redelegate you. We can repatriate you like Mali, from Mali to the Netherlands," when in advance of the plans. How this is going to work?

KEITH DAVIDSON: I think the idea of oversight is about oversight of ICANN, not of the individual transactions or IANA, not the transactions. Does anyone have a specific response? I see Pat, I think.

PAT KANE: I'd like to address the first part of the comment. So you talk about the price and how much it costs to do this, and people making applications for $185,000 for TLDs. The reality is that twice a day, ICANN, NTIA, and Verisign, at no compensation whatsoever, publish a root zone file for everybody that has a TLD.

So there is risk involved, there is work involved, and there's cost involved. And so the more [inaudible], the more that will be put upon those entities. And we're proud to do it and we're happy to do it and I love the partnership that we have with ICANN and NTIA in this process. So it's about risk reduction. It's not about compensation.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you. And I think we have to cut off at this point. So just before thanking the panel, can I just have a show of cards for this small conversational and interviewed style of discussion, rather than formal presentations from panelists? If you think this is better than PowerPoint presentations and so on, raise your green card. If you think it's the same, orange. And if you think it's horrible, red.

So I'm seeing green. And can I just see – thank you, I'm not counting them, it's just a quick show. How many people were – just hold up any card – but how many people were in the Adobe Connect room participating? Oh, not so many. And for those who were in the room, green if it was useful; red if it was less-than-useful. Okay.

With that, I think we'll draw this session to a close. And would you join me in thanking both the interviewers and the panelists? Thank you very much. And with that, Byron, I'll hand back to you. Cheers.

BYRON HOLLAND: I also want to say thank you very much to the panel. And on an administrative note, we now have our lunch, which is on the second floor Swiss Café restaurant, which is in the Swiss Hotel, second floor. It's at 1:00 and it's for everybody.

Prior to us all departing, so if I could just ask you to hold on for one second. Our host of the lunch has a word or two to share with us. So come on up! Come on up. Do we have a mic? We'll use the floor mic and please, if I could just have your attention for another moment, our hostess has a word for us.

LINDA HUI: Okay, I promise to be fast. Well, good afternoon. I'm Linda from SGNIC and I welcome you to Singapore. Now, our GM, Mr. Lim Choon Sai and the team from SGNIC would like to invite you to have lunch with us today. As is mentioned, it's at Café Swiss, which is on the second floor. We hope you have enjoyed Singapore and this time will be a [full] time for you at ICANN and for lunch, we hope you can join us and we shall be proceeding from here. Okay, we will proceed from here. We will have a hotel staff standing outside who will lead you to the restaurant. And there's a little logistic I need you to cooperate. Well, you have to collect a little ticket, a lunch ticket, at the entrance. And with that, please proceed to the restaurant. Alright! Enjoy your lunch. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, and on your way out, just a reminder that we will be reconvening at 2:00 for the GAC ccNSO meeting in the Collier Room; 2:00 in the Collier Room.

KEITH DAVIDSON: This session is to look at the outputs of the Meeting Strategy Working Group, and Margarita and I served as the two ccNSO representatives on that working group, perhaps not paying as close attention all the time as we should have, but I think we did have some input that was possibly conceived as useful by the working group. The working group was chaired by Sébastien Bachollet and Chris Disspain took the other lead role from the ICANN Board.

Sébastien has a presentation to walk us through the recommendations of the working group, so this is currently a set of recommendations that will apply from 2015? 2016. So this may or may not be after we complete IANA issues that might through this new schedule into some disarray. But please think about being about a longer-term future of ICANN meetings.

So with that, can I hand over to Sébastien? We have about 35 minutes left, so we'll finish at 3:45. If we can get lots of time for Q&A as well, thanks. Sébastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much for having us here. So working group was created one year ago almost in Beijing and was made up of 21 members with 16

members of the community, two from the far south from your community, and three from staff and Chris and myself on the Board.

First of all, I want to thank you, the member of the working group. They do a very good job and they work hard to achieve what we will present you. Of course, the presentation today is just five slides or six slides. It's just a summary of some highlights. If you want to have more details, please go to the full report. It's not a very long one. We try to keep it short. But it gives more insight of where we came from and how we handle the work.

What is important also to know is that we came with one proposal. We didn't twist the arm of anybody. It was a long discussion. We came with different scenarios, and at the end we decided that one is enough and we agreed on that all together. That's why it's just one scenario coming to you.

I will go through the presentation. I don't know if I move from here or I ask –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, you can move it.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I can move it. Okay. First of all, you can, outside in some worlds, you have the same presentation that I give you here. You have also a tag – a hashtag – with #icannmswg, and if you want to make comments in a short sentence, you can do that, too.

So that's the current situation. We have three meetings a year. We have a geographic rotation, and we have to try to solve what is our trouble today of our growth. We are now with more than 1500 people on a regular basis. Here it's 1800. In Beijing it was 2400, and it's one of the troubles. In Durban, we were with 238 meetings. Now it's 250 – pilot sessions, sorry. And that's the type of thing we will want to try to solve in having these proposals.

We came with an idea to have two different shades of meetings during the year to have three types of meeting, one called A. It's almost the same that current meetings, to be short. We tried to have it organized a little bit better, to have more day with specific type of work and not mixed up with everything. But globally, it's the same lengths and the same type of meeting.

The B meeting is the one with the more changes, I will say. It's the one where we say, "Okay, here we will concentrate on the SO/AC work, and on the cross-community work. We will get rid of all the fancy time waster opening ceremony with public microphone with – we want to concentrate on the hard work this community is doing and with the other community.

The C meeting is a little bit longer than the current one, and the objective is to handle everything we can do in one meeting with all the fancy things and with general assembly meeting, of course, included.

If it's organized well and it's the objective it allows people to come for the eight days of the meeting or to go for the parts they care more of. That means that we want to concentrate the work of one specific

constituency in certain days, and the work with cross-constituency with other days, and to allow people to come where they want to come.

The next slide is – we also suggest that the good part of doing this type with the B meeting is that it will allow us to keep the regional rotation and go to some places where it was almost impossible now to go because there is not enough room.

I want to be clear. The B meeting is not to say there will be less people, but there will be less demand on the infrastructure. We will not need three ballrooms and ten big rooms, but we will have a different set up, and then it will allow to doing in places where we are not any more able to go now.

This one is speaks for itself. We want adequate allocation time for internal work and for cross-community interaction.

Yeah, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Sebastien. This is I think – so this is dealing with the public forum, and what we're recommending is that we split the public forum at the A Meeting and the C meeting to have a public forum at the beginning of the week for 90 minutes for people to talk about whatever they want to talk about, and tell us what their worries are for the week, and what we should be concentrating on and so on. And then have a public forum as usual on the Thursday at the end of the week for the follow-up and discussions and for people to be able to say what's happened and so on.

So the idea there is to make the input from the public forum more useful so that rather it all coming at the end of the week and just being about what's happened and why I'm annoyed for this week, you'll be able to tell us why you're annoyed at the beginning of the week, and then of course at the end of the week you'll be able to tell us everything's okay because we've made you all feel better.

And our goals, if you will, were to try to create more time and space for the SOs and ACs to do their work, and to do their work with the work that they need to do with each other to keep the concept of regional rotation and in fact to open up regional rotation to venues that are currently effectively closed to us because of the demands of the way we run our meetings, and so therefore to, just to take an example – and it is just an example – to open the Caribbean region up to us because currently there isn't a venue there that is suitable for us to use for this sort of a meeting. But there would be a venue there that would enable us to have our smaller SO and AC meeting. I'd love to be able to read the slide, but unfortunately… Ah, thank you. Now I have to put my glasses on, folks. Thank you.

Increase concentrated time on policy work, which I've talked about, increased opportunities for issue-based and language-based interactions. Now, this is very important. The concept of the middle meeting of the year – the B meeting, the smaller meeting – and whilst we are not seeking any way to mandate how those meetings should run, because it's going to be a matter for each SO and AC, but our idea was this: we would start our day at 8:30 or 9:00 – whatever suits people. So the ccNSO would meet over three days, from 9:00 until probably about 3:00, and then the idea was that between 3:00 and 6:00

or 3:00 and 7:00, there would be opportunities for cross-pollination cross-meetings.

So if all of the French speakers wanted to get together in a room – don't know how big the room would be, Sébastien – but if they wanted to get together in a room and talk about anything they wanted to talk about in French, they would be able to do that. If those who are interested in a particular issue, anyone who's been to the IETF will know that they have things called birds of a feather meetings, where just those who are interested in talking about a particular can all get together.

The idea was to structure the days in that way so that SOs and ACs meet until 3:00 or 4:00, and then have organized sessions of birds of a feather, language-based, whatever it may be, smaller meetings around the place, and then each evening have the ability of everyone to mix if they wanted to do so with some drinks and what have you.

So that was basically the concept of that day, and the result of that is that we think there is an opportunity for issue-based discussions to take place amongst interested parties, and then be brought back to the relevant SOs and ACs, and for language-based meetings to take place and then be brought back to the relevant SO and AC.

Then the other goal is to reduce the meeting length for some groups. So to take a simple example, we want to try – and this is with a work of implementation – but as a goal to be able to allow those who just want to come for a smaller period of time to fit in what it is they need to do over that period of time. Now, that may or may not be achievable, but that's certainly one of the goals.

Sébastien, I think I've covered everything. Thanks.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Chris, and over to you. We are open to try to answer any questions.

KETIH DAVIDSON: Thank you both very much for the presentation. I think just before you get all angry with Margarita and I for betraying ccTLD requirements and so on, I think I should comment on the poll that we did of the ccNSO members about meeting strategy, and the feedback we got from the ccTLD community was that you didn't want to hubs, you didn't want permanent locations for meetings, and most importantly that you wanted 2.5 meetings per year, and I think what this is delivering you is exactly 2.5 meetings per year. So I think we've done our job pretty well.

Now, anyways, can we invite – and I think there's a degree of the idea that issues can be more accommodated within the agenda rather than the siloed SOs and ACs.

But with that, I'll open up the floor for questions and comments. Jay?

JAY DALEY: Thanks. Jay Daley from .nz. It's great. I really like the work that's gone into that. Thank you very much.

One question. When you mention, say, one of the meetings still having a three-day ccNSO period, did you consider going to pure issues-based meetings?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Well, no, it was – sorry, yes is the answer. We considered it. There are challenges around that because the general consensus of all the feedback we had from everyone is we want to maintain the ability to do our work in our group.

So the way we addressed it is precisely with the end of each day in the third – in the middle – meeting of the year to say ignore all the fripperies and all the stuff that happens around it," which actually takes up a huge amount of time, and just have the SOs and ACs concentrating on their work, with at the end of each day are coming together on an issue-based – it doesn't have to be issue-based; as I said, it could be language-based – but on an issue-based basis and so to provide rooms.

Now, there's several ways of doing this. My own personal view is that the best way to do it would be, at least in the first instance, would be to leave it free and just say, "There are a bunch of rooms. You decide what you want to do." So not, "We're having a meeting on this issue in this," but the ccs might say, "Here's an issue. I'd like to talk to the GNSO about it. I'll go and corral some GNSO people and we'll give you a room." But that's the implementation and possible.

But certainly to answer your question, yes, and that's the purpose of the second half of the day, if you will, of the meeting of Meeting B.

JAY DALEY: Okay. I can see that working for some elements, but for some really big things that come out, do you think perhaps putting some more

structure around that by specifically creating time for all constituency discussions would help there as well?

KEITH DAVIDSON: I do, and I think that that is a function again of the way that we manage Meeting A and Meeting C. The goal of this working group wasn't to micromanage how it was all put together. We all know the issues: too many caching sessions, not enough time for group dynamics and all of that stuff. Our goal was to make a structure in which it would be feasible and flexible enough to be able to do that.

So to give you an example, the intention would be that if there was – if the Cs and the Gs for example, in the middle meeting of the year, had said, "We want a C and G session, but we don't want to do it at 3:00 in the afternoon, this is a whole day thing for us," then would be able to accommodate that.

We did go through a whole heap of Post-It notes on walls going, "Okay, what's the ccNSO going to want? What's the GNSO going to want?" and all that stuff, and in the end we've structured it in the way that it's as flexible as it can be with the certainty around the number of days. That' really the key, I think.

JAY DALEY: Okay. That's great. If there's no one else behind me, can I ask another one?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Jay, while you're there, please continue.

JAY DALEY:

So the other thing is, did you look at the nature of people's jobs who attend these meetings to see whether you can bring sufficient content together to say, for example, justify a technical person from a sort of a registry being able to come and, say, spend two and three days there rather than having their bits broken up?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

To some extent. The Tech day, or whatever it is now – Tech Week, or something – Tech Day was very much a part of our thoughts about planning. Can we run that in a way that is acceptable that means that people can still go to other stuff as well as that, and is it justifiable and so on?

But again, we're about structure, and so what we're hoping is that now, if we can coalesce around this structure, then what we can start to do is say to the meetings team, "I have to tell you superbly wonderful to say, now, at the next meeting, can we try this? At the next meeting, can we try that?"

But what we didn't want to be was prescriptive about any of that stuff, and it wasn't actually our job. It was to come up with a structure that was workable. There was a lot of – yes, many of the people on the working group had their own ideas about how this should happen and how that should happen. We kept having to come back and say, "No, no, this is about structure." And then there's a flexibility within that structure.

Just to give you an example – we ended up with points on a Board that said, "Okay, so if you assume for the moment that at Meeting A and Meeting C there will be an opening ceremony, and if you assume for a moment that's going to be on a Monday, and if you assume that the public forum is going to be on Thursday, if you assume that the ccs want two days in Meeting A, how much flexibility is there around all that to make other sections available?" And the truth is, not very much.

The only way to do it would actually be to have three 12-day meetings, and even then it wouldn't be enough because everybody would fill the time and then they'd want more. So it's about providing a flexible structure in which we could try and work.

JAY DALEY: Thank you.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thanks, Jay.

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: Hi. I just wondered to what extent you guys have considered an ICANN meeting is not just about supporting organizations and advisory councils meetings amongst themselves and amongst supporting organizations that consult, but also quite a bit of, say, [inaudible] maybe with a lot of business meetings sidelined to the work in terms of coming to policy development [inaudible]. So I just wonder whether it's realistic at such the B Meeting can be held shorter and smaller in size.

KEITH DAVIDSON: So the straight answer to that question, Carsten, is we did, and we actually looked at some length about what's the job of these meetings. And it is not the job of these meetings to necessarily provide the ability of a cold bunch of business people to get together and chat about stuff they feel like chatting about. The job is to provide a venue for the SOs and ACs to do their work. Now I'm paraphrasing here – but for updates from the ICANN staff and what have you about staff, and also from the other members of the community. So what we tried to do was to structure it in that way.

If we had tried to feed in, "Will there have to be extra time for this, extra time for that?" it wouldn't have worked. And the truth is the vast majority of people who come to these meetings to do business contact come to these meeting to do business contact and are going to do that no matter what we do. So that was our outtake. That's the point we reached in our discussions.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I would like to add, as a joke, don't ask us if we think about something because I really think that we try to cover everything, including what you say. It's a joke. You cannot of course say what you want. But as we are multi-stakeholder working group, we try to take into account even what it was outside of our own mission to be there. Then the business people coming to do business here, we try to take that into account.

We also take into account the fact that we want to outreach when we are in the country to have contact for some community with the outside people to try to bring them inside [inaudible] to give them information.

We try to cover everything, but at the end, maybe we forget some things. The goal really is to first deliver a structure to allow our communities to work themselves together, and that's the first goal of an ICANN meeting.

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: Okay. It was just that, when you presented this, in particular for the B Meeting, what would prevent people from coming to a B Meeting and just talk business?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, that's a good question, and I want to reiterate my presentation. It's not a meeting with less people. It's a meeting with less requests on the infrastructure. We don't need three ballrooms anymore if we don't do a public meeting. There's a meeting at the beginning of the week and so on.

Then if we don't have this – and the change in the GAC room, it's also a big improvement because it's the christening in the infrastructure. Now if we have 3000 people coming in the B Meeting, that's okay, but they will not be all together in one ballroom. That's for sure.

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: Okay, thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER: Yeah, this was debated. I was wondering about. So if it's the document, just refer me to the document and I'll read it better. Because my question is going to be who are the 50% of the attendees that are not coming? Because Keith called it half a meeting, but everybody's still coming. It' only that we don't put them together in one single room. But that happens only in one single room, I think.

KEITH DAVIDSON: No, no.

ROELOF MEIJER: So what are the other big ballrooms for?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Let me explain how it works. So what you need for today, for an ordinary meeting, you need a room for the Cs, a room for the Gs, a room for the GAC, and so on. That's easy. Almost anywhere in any convention center, that's easy.

What you also need is one room that is big enough to take however many, and either that room can be split into three smaller rooms, which is you go down to Padang and Collier, is what is happening here, which is really hard to manage because you have to split it open, split it open. So you need that, or you need a venue that needs one big ballroom and two or three smaller ballrooms. That is the challenge – the logistical, mechanical challenge – that makes it very, very difficult to do. It blocks effectively almost everywhere in Latin America. It blocks almost

everywhere in the Caribbean. It blocks almost everywhere in Africa because they just don't have that infrastructure.

So the idea is that the Cs, the Gs will have their own room. Then there a whole series of smaller rooms where people can have the side meeting and the discussions and the bird of a feather, etc.. And when you're finished in the bigger room – the Cs are finished in the bigger room for the day, the GAC is finished in the bigger room for the day – that then can be used for a larger meeting. That's basically the way that it works. It's not fewer people. It's concentrated work.

Now, may there be fewer? It's entirely possible that if there isn't an opening ceremony, that if Fadi isn't going to roll up his shirtsleeves and strut around the stage and tell us all what the latest news is from how ICANN is running, that if there isn't going to be a public forum and an opportunity to come to the microphone and bleat, it's entirely possible that some people will not come to that middle meeting. But that isn't the intention. The intention is that people will still come.

ROELOF MEIJER: And it means that the Board will again will be coming to the ccNSO [inaudible].

CHRIS DISSPAIN: The Board will be there. There's no intention of not having the Board there. The intention is not having a public Board meeting.

ROELOF MEIJER: No, what I mean, Chris, instead of us going to the Board for which you require another large room, they will come to us.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, no, absolutely. No, no, no, no, absolutely. The Board will once again go back to traipsing itself around the meeting. But it should be easier, hopefully.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's another, sorry to say, when we talk about SO/AC, we talk about SO/AC, SG constituency and the Board. All those organizations are supposed to be in the B meeting.

And the other point to add to what Chris says, it's if we have less item in competition or session with big topic in competitions, then we don't need two ballrooms at the same time. Then it's also a question of how we schedule the whole meeting as the four days. It's why we want to decrease the need on infrastructure, but not the other needs.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Roelof, it might also be a possibility that, say, the ccNSO in charge of its own destiny might say, "For Meetings A and C, we will continue to meet as we always have, but for Meeting B, there will not be a members meeting session planned. It will be about a council meeting, council retreat, working group meetings, and so on."

So each individual ccTLD would have to evaluate the value proposition of attending if there was what the ccNSO members wanted. So this is

giving us probably greater autonomy and control over what we're doing and how we do it and so on.

And remember that, prior to two weeks ago, we were thinking that we've just finished the lion's share of the work ahead of us, and had very much lists on our agenda. So given that as a possible business-as-normal proposition after IANA, it could be that a much more sensible use of our time is to have two longer meetings with more participation for members and one confined to really working groups and so on.

So any further questions from anybody?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Next steps.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Public consultation. Sébastien?

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah, the kind of step is that we are in the comment period up into the fourth of April. Reply comment period will be open until the 25th of April. You can go to the corridor and a watch the slides and make comments on the paper if you want. You can use hashtag #icannmswg, and you can come to us and give us your feedback. Then the idea will be to have a final report three weeks before London to allow the Board to take action during the London meeting in June.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just one more piece of the puzzle, which hasn't had a mention yet, which is that those of you who are paying attention will have realized that Meeting B we said was a four-day meeting, but we said three-day meetings for the SOs and ACs.

The working group is very, very strong on having an outreach day. So what that looks like is not necessarily set in stone yet, but to give you some examples, the local ccTLD manager might be involved in an outreach day where there was a town hall meeting held for the local Internet community in the place where we are. There might be outreach to universities and schools, where a selection of people who have prepared to stay on for the extra day can go and talk to them about ICANN and stuff like that.

So there's a very clear intention that these smaller meetings, if I can call them that, these B meetings there is a day for real outreach into the community. Not to the ICANN community, but to the community community. Thanks.

KEITH DAVIDSON: With nothing else, I think it's appropriate that we should thank Chris and Margarita for their efforts on the group, and in particular, Sébastien for his chairmanship and steering a fairly steady path on a fairly rocky road. So thank you, Sébastien. I think you've achieved an outcome that was better than we anticipated. Thank you.

So with that, back to Byron, and remember, if you do have an opinion, go and read the report and make your submission individually. ccNSO could make a submission collectively, too.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Thank you, Sébastien and the entire working group. That brings us to the conclusion of the meeting strategy update, and actually they were very expeditious with their time, so we're now running a few moments early. We have a coffee break at 3:45 in a couple of minutes, but I think we'll be able to get out to that a little bit early. And at 4:00, we have Akram from ICANN, who will be coming to speak to us about name collisions, which has certainly been a topic in the G space. Fom the ICANN perspective, Akram will be talking to us about how does that impact the cc space. What are the impacts, if any? So I think that actually is a very worthy topic for us to pay attention to.

And then Cheryl will be following on after that session with the NomCom update, followed by Kim Davies with an IANA update. And my understanding is that Kim, and possibly Elise, will not just be doing their traditional update around pure metrics, but will also be talking a little more generally about the IANA functions, particularly in the context of course of what's happening at this meeting. And we will be having the ccNSO cocktail at 6:30 this evening.

So with that, I will suggest that we actually have a slightly extended coffee break and make sure we're back for just before 4:00 for Akram's presentation on name collisions. Thank you very much.

Okay, everybody, if we could get ready for the next session, take your seats please. Gabby. Who's driving the show? From this? Okay, welcome back, everybody.

We now have the presentation and an opportunity for questions around the issue – pardon me – of naming collisions, and we have Cyrus Namazi and Francisco Arias here to, from ICANN, to walk us through the issue of name collisions and how and whether they're as relevant to the cc community as they are to the g community. So with that, I'll pass it over to you.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you, Byron. Hello, everyone. This is Francisco Arias from ICANN, Director of Technical Services. While the presentation is loading, I've been working on the name collision issue related to [new] TLDs. So far the name collision risk mitigation has been focusing on [new] TLDs.

However, name collisions will also happen in new ccTLDs, be it ASCII or IDN. So in last February, we provided Byron a briefing paper on this subject, and this presentation is a summary of the contents of that paper.

So what is a name collision? A name collision happens when a user is attempting to access an Internet resource identified by a name. Let's say, for example, in a private network – a private DNS environment – someone has configured a domain name that is not in the public DNS. They attempt to use that, and suppose that the name that they are using in their private environment ends up being activated in the public DNS, for example, by having a new TLD delegated in the root that layer has a second level domain name delegated to another TLD that happens to match what is being used in an enterprise network in that private DNS environment, then you will have the use, who normally accesses

the name – their [inaudible] by the name in the public DNS when they actually attempted to use the name in the private environment.

This is a practice is somewhat common in the enterprise networks. By that, I mean by having private names, it could also be that they are trying to use names for something that is not related to DNS. For example, the old netBIOS protocol in Windows has nothing to do with DNS, but the names happen to look like DNS, and in some situations, those names could link, let's say, to the public DNS, and so therefore would be confusion on the user name collision.

So what have we been doing on this regard? The Board tasked staff to commission a study on this issue last May. We contracted [inaudible] to develop our report for us. The report was published on August last year, and there was public comment on our proposal on how to mitigate this risk, and eventually on 7 October, an updated proposal was adopted by the Board, which is what we call the New TLD Collision Occurrence Management Plan.

I'm going to talk about in the next slides on the detail on that plan that was adopted by the Board, but also relevant to the discussion here is that, in 21 November of last year, the Board passed that resolution directing the staff to, among other things, develop a long-term plan to manage name collisions at the root in general, not just related to new TLDs.

The contents of the plan – the name collision plan let's say for short – has a six high-level elements. First one is the deferring delegation for two strings indefinitely common core that are considered to be in so

widely used in the private networks that it's very difficult to get rid of that use and safely delegate these two TLDs in the public DNS.

Second, we were tasked to do an outreach campaign to raise awareness on the issue among the people that would be using those private names in the networks, so to enterprise IT department so they can identify the issues and mitigate since they have the power to change the situation that is causing the name collision.

Third, there is provision there to deal with the internal name certificate issue. I don't know if you are aware of this. This is related to the way the certificate authorities handle those names that are not delegated in the public DNS. They actually issue certificated for that without basically any [inaudible]. There cannot be any proof you owned the name. This is a private name. And therefore, when there's a delegation of a new TLD that matches a name for that certificate, then you will have issues there. So there is a prohibition to handle that part.

The plan as it contains what we call the alternate path to delegation for illegible strings, that's a measure to allow new TLDs in this case to move forward with delegation without waiting for the long-term mitigation measures for name collision, which is number six – the Name Collision Occurrence Management framework that I'm going to talk about in detail in next slides.

Finally, there is a name collision reporting tool that I'm going to explain also next. So regarding the outreach, so far we have done some activities. We have an information hub with information on this topic. You have the URL in this slide. We developed a name collision informational kit which contains basic information about what people

can do mitigate this risk, and this is focused to enterprise networks so that they can fix their configuration.

We also have a public mailing list [nc-info@ICANN]. Those communities – those community members – that are interested on helping with the outreach support can coordinate with ICANN in this outreach to the potentially-affected entities. We have put several articles in different languages and contact the different IT organizations, raising awareness on the issue.

So the internal name certificate issue mitigation, the other element – one of the other elements in the plan – the way we address this issue is the [CAs] agreed to revoke all the internal name certificates – related to a new TLD that is delegated at 120 days after there is a [inaudible] TLD agreement for that TLD. So for example, if you have – speaking one example – .bike. If they were to sign a certain point 120 days after that, the [CAs], at least those that are members of the [inaudible] forum, will revoke every single certificate related to that TLD, unless there is a proof from the party holding the certificate that they are the new legitimate holders of the name in the public DNS.

There is an exception to these rules of no activation. That's for NIC.TLD. The reason for that is in the New TLD Agreement, we require the new TLDs to have [whois.nic.tld] as the host name to offer WHOIS and a web-based version of that service. We thought that it was important to have that service and it was very important to have it. It was risk management decision, let's say.

Another important point to mention here is that allocation or registration of names is allowed so long as the names are not activated.

So the plan also contains the alternate path to delegation measure. This is a temporary measure that allows the new TLDs that so decide to can move forward with delegation, and the only thing they have to do is they have to block for activation in the DNS the names that are provided by ICANN. This is what we call the SLD block list. The SLD block list is constructed from all the second-level domain names that were observed in the queries to root servers in the DITL data – DITL meaning the date in the life of the Internet. This is an iniative currently coordinated by DNS-OARC, as some of you I'm sure are members are the organization and know what I'm talking about.

They host these big data on queries to root servers, and from there we [started] the second-level domain names that were queried in all the captures that they have that go back far to 2006, if I remember correctly, up to 2013. So all the names that appear there were provided to each TLD, and they have to log those names until the long-term solution, which is the collision framework is developed.

As a [inaudible], we also have what we call name collision reporting tool. It's a web page that we have in the ICANN site that allows a [inaudible] party that believes it's affected by a name collision with a new gTLD. They can report the issue, and if they can prove that there is a [inaudible] by this – by a second-level domain name in a new TLD – then we will coordinate a response related to the gTLD, which can for example suspend – remove – the name from DNS for a period of time until the party that has been affected by the name collision affects the chance needed in the network, so to avoid the harm.

This prohibition is in affect for new TLDs for the first two years after delegation, and so far we have received zero reports. We started delegation of gTLDs back in October last year, and like I said, so far zero reports.

Right now, just to give a pointer, I believe we are in 340-somethingK new domain names under new gTLDs are active in the DNS.

So the long-term plan for managing name collisions is the framework. A draft of this framework is currently in public comment from last month from 26th February until 21st April. I will encourage anyone who is interested in the topic to look at the framework and provide input in the forum.

The two main points in the framework, this includes one more string that is to be considered for permanent reservation and that's .mail. And .corp and .home were already considered by the plan passed by the Board. So the contract that we have to help us develop this framework found that .mail was also a string that should be considered to be permanently reserved because it wasn't safe to delegate.

Regarding the measures to mitigate name collision, what has been proposed is to have what is called a control interruption zone. This is in the case of TLDs that had not been delegated that will be delegated and once, if this is approved by the Board, they will have to have for 120 days after they are delegated no activation period, meaning no names can go into DNS, but they will also have to have some [inaudible] records under the TLD that will point to the IPRs that are listed there. For those that are techies will know that this IPR is in what is called the [look back] [inaudible], meaning that IPRs will not be routed outside the

computer that is making that query. The [inaudible] intention here is to avoid any potential sensitive information leak from the party that is intending to access these newly delegated names.

The purpose of the control interruption is to make it fail, meaning the computer that is accessing these newly delegated names will see an error because it will be unable to connect to whatever the system it was trying to connect to before this TLD was delegated. But we are, by hiring these IPRs and also by not having any activation of names, we're ensuring that there is no potential abuse of these name collisions during this period of time.

So with that, we are hoping to raise awareness, call attention of the people who could be using these TLDs so that they can affect the changes in the network.

For those TLDs that have already been delegated, since we have 182 so far, what they have to do is, for 120-day period, put similar resources – resources record [inaudible] here. By similar, I mean pointing to the same IPRs as above, but only for the names that are in the SLD block list.

So that's for the plan that we have to manage collisions in new gTLDs, and what we are here is to call attention on the potential issues with name collisions with new ccTLDs.

So what we are doing right now, or we plan to do right now is, until [inaudible] received from ccNSO is ICANN will provide the same kind of interim report that we provide the new TLDs in regards to the alternate path to delegation. Or worse, we will provide a newly delegated ccTLD the report with the SLD block list. But it will be the responsibility and the

EN

relevant local Internet community to decide what to do with that [place], so they could either proceed to delegation while doing the blocking of the SLDs in the report, or they could defer delegation until the framework and the corresponding assessment is received so they can implement the measures related to the long-term solution to name collision, or any other course of action that they deem appropriate for handling name collision.

What we would like to request ccNSO is to consider the issue and its implications for new ccTLDs, and we are here to offer to collaborate in any question or any issue that we can to develop a long-term approach to handling of name collisions in new ccTLDs. I believe that's all I have in my presentation.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Francisco. Are there any questions or comments? Don? Yes. If you could go to the mic, just because we have remote participation and the transcript, and just as a reminder always, if you could state your name.

DON HOLLANDER: My name is Don Hollander from APTLD. So in your permanent reserve lists, you have .home, .corp, .email and .mail, which are all in English. So was that based on the data that you saw during the survey, or is that because nobody uses a different language to name their networks?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: These three names were flagged as potentially problematic using the data from the DITL capture. So what I'm saying here is this is based on the queries that have been observed in the root servers.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any other questions?

PETER VERGOTE: Good afternoon. Peter Vergote from DNS Belgium. I might have missed it in your presentation, but did you explain why you ended up with the 120 days period? Is there a specific reason why it has to be 120 days? I'm not somebody with a technical background, but I would assume that you would soon – that you would be able to notice any problems within a more limited timeframe.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So in the case of the internal name certificate issue, the 120-day period comes from the requirements – the discussion with the CAs. They have a requirement for their members – the CA/Browser Forum – to revoke the certificates in 120 days. That's the reason for that period.

With regards to the draft proposal that is for comment right now for the long-term solution to the name collision in general, not the internal name certificate issue, the 120-day period in that case was based on the internal name certificate issue.

In fact, there have been discussions this week here in Singapore with new TLD applicants and others that have questioned the length of the

period. But this is still something that's in draft, so if there are better ideas what this should be, this is certainly a good time to discuss it.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. And one practical question, if I may. You're making a difference between new TLDs that are already delegated and those that are not yet delegated. What's the point to determine whether a TLD is already delegated? Because your draft report is open for public comments until the 21st of April, so let's just assume that somewhere in the month of May it gets to a final text. Is that then the point to decide whether a TLD is delegated or not, or is that point already behind us that you say, "Well, it's actually the ones that are delegated now that matter"?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yeah,. The proposal is that they will be, once and if the proposal is approved. So suppose that the Board approves these on the 15th of May, then after that day, they could update it.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. Thank you.

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: I have two questions. The first one is, you mentioned the reports that can be filed by third parties by the ICANN website. I just want to know whether it will be possible to have more or less continuous update – for example, the ccNSO session, just to see whether this is really a problem or it's "a problem in theory," and I would assume that the reports could be a good indicator for whether there is something out in the world is a

problem, or whether it's really only in theory. So if that would be possible, I'd at least appreciate it.

And the second one is, assuming that a new ccTLD would be coming up for some reason or the other, is that a measure ICANN would also apply for emerging ccTLDs?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So regarding reporting back how we are on the reports for name collision, I don't see any issue with that. We can certainly do it.

Your second question, I'm not sure I understand it.

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: So for example, I guess the latest edition to the ccTLD space has been the Oland Islands which is a small group of like two islands somewhere between Sweden and Finland. They got the country code .ax and that has been in addition to the root. So I just wonder whether in the future if other countries would emerge, as well as 3166, and then eventually put into the root as well, whether these names collision measures would also be applied for the new ccTLDs.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes. The idea is to provide them any new ccTLD that comes for delegation with the SLD block list report and explain what are the issues. But it will be the decision of the ccTLD manager and the local and the local Internet committee how to proceed in regards to the this report.

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: Okay. So this report just doesn't apply for a new gTLDs for but for any new top level domain?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes, it would be the same report that is currently provided to new TLDs.

CARSTEN SCHIEFNER: Okay, thank you.

NEIL EL HIMAM: Hi. My name is Neil El Himam from .id. I have a question about how the name collision will directly affect the ccTLDs. You said that we need to block the .home, .corps and as well as .mail. We are in the middle of standardized period for anything .ID. Does that mean that we mean to block those .mail, .corps and whatever else?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: That point was in reference to TLDs, so what we're saying here is the TLD .home should not be delegated. The TLD .mail, .corp – those three TLDs should not be delegated. So this is not in reference to second-level domain names.

NEIL EL HIMAM: So for ourselves, we don't need to block those?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: We are not requesting the blocking of second-level domain names, yes.

NEIL EL HIMAM: Okay.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, thank you very much. With that, I think we have to draw this session to a close. We'll give Cyrus the last word, but I want to just draw your attention to the ccNSO website, which has the material that they referred to in terms of a note to us on the ccNSO website. Cyrus?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Byron. My name is Cyrus Namazi. I'm the head of our domain name services as a part of the GDD organization inside of ICANN. Francisco's technical services team is a part of my responsibility.

                      Thank you for giving us the opportunity to give you this update today. I just wanted to really highlight that the issue of name collision is not something to be taken lightly. Within ICANN obviously we have contractual frameworks with other TLDs that enable us to enforce, monitor, and essentially get these somewhat restrictive elements into any new delegation, but obviously we don't have that element with the ccs, but that does not minimize the potential risk of name collision.

                      So I just wanted to highlight to you not to take this lightly. Seriously consider option number one or two that you see on this screen here, particularly number one.

And we're at your service to help you answer questions. If we need to set up webinars to you to provide additional information, just let us know. But it's not theory. The likelihood of it is not very high, but the impact of it could be. So please treat it as seriously as you can. Thank you very much.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you for sharing that with us, and we were certainly take it under consideration. Thank you.

So with that now, we are quickly going to move on to a NomCom update and welcome back our friend, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and company. She is no stranger to us, no stranger to us. Welcome. Okay, the rest are my friends, too, but Cheryl has definitely been a regular. And with that, Cheryl, over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, Byron. It's good to know that I have at least one friend as well. I appreciate that.

This is one of those rooms I guess I don't probably have to say the following, but I've been saying it all day, so I'll say it again. Hello, my name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and for those who don't know me, I'm currently the Chair of the 2014 Nominating Committee, and I want to thank all of you for having a little bit of time in your day to hear an update from us.

What you see in front of you, other than Byron – although me might co-opt him one day – is the leadership team of the 2014 NomCom. Yrjo is

the Associate Chair. He is also the person who was Chair last year, and he's also served two years on the NomCom, so we obviously are using him for experience and for the sage-like wisdom that I often need, and you'll be hearing from him later.

Stephane, who I'm sure you also know, is the Chair Elect, so that was the role I had last year, and the Chair Elect we would like to assume we will take on the mantle of Chair. There is some gating that needs to be done. We know have 360 reviews of the leadership team, so it is not a given. It is possible to not be Chair if you are Chair Elect. But it's a very unlikely possibility providing we all do a good job of what we're supposed to do.

And of course, you've got members here, including your very own contribution. Thank you, [inaudible. At least we knew we'd find you in this room. Hans has being doing cameo appearances to confuse me for most of the day. He likes to get as far away as possible at the back of the room, and after I've introduced everybody, so this is why I brought you up the front this time.

We have a couple of positions – leadership positions – that we are looking to fill this year. This year, there are two positions on the ICANN Board. There are obviously one here with you, and there is one with the GNSO. There is also two leadership positions with the At-Large Advisory Committee, but those positions are geographically limited, so that has to be a person who's domicile, is in firstly North America; and for the second seat, Europe. We have no license there. We have to appoint geographically into the ALAC.

We have a new website. We hope it's a friendlier and more useful website. We think it's certainly easier for aspirants and potential candidates to navigate around and to find out a little bit more about the jobs in ICANN that we hope we might be able to appoint them to.

If you have someone, or indeed if you're interested yourself, who is seeking these leadership positions in any of them, with the exception of the ccNSO Council – the ccNSO Council has been kind enough to give us very clear criteria, which we do ask all of the receiving bodies to give us – but your criteria makes it quite clear we should not appoint a person who has a pathway through their activities in this room to the council. So bedside your second pathways, there's something the ccNSO has been very, very particular about.

So with these appointments, as you know, there's a statement of interest that is required. The new website also has an "apply now" button, which will take aspirants to a single page. On that single page is basic information to be filled out, which are the identifiers. When you complete that page, then staff know you wish to make an application for consideration for something.

Staff then set up a profile page, which is absolutely yours. You have as much time as you need – if you started in the end of January, you could still be doing it now – to complete the pages, depending on whether you tick the box or cross the box that says you're interested in a Board position, a GNSO position, or some ALAC positions, and each of those will take you through questions only relevant to the role you want. Until the person has signed off on the bottom of the page that they have finished editing the page, we don't consider it complete.

For an application to be fully considered in this year's rounds, that SOI process has to have begun by 23:59 UTC on the first of April. All right? They can decide at the last second – well, perhaps the last minute would be wiser – to fill out that first starting page, and we will still give you a couple of days to load everything in before we would say that you haven't completed and we won't consider.

Let me make it clear. Historically, NomComs have extended this date, and some people might assume that is going to happen, despite me saying otherwise, that there will be an extension of time beyond the first of April. There will be no extension of time past the first of April, not just because I've been saying it since I took on the role of Chair, although partly I'd like to think that's the case. Not just because I'm being a bit bloody minded about it, which of course some of you in this room know I probably am, but more importantly, there is – watch it, New Zealand – more importantly, there is not enough time – there's a whole row of you; I mean I can just glaze back at it – there's not enough time for us to finish our processes if we start later than that. So it is a not-negotiable date.

I'm now going to ask Yjro to give you a little bit of information about what happens after that.

YJRO LANISPURO: Thank you, Cheryl. April the 1st of course is also known as April Fool's Day, but I can assure you this deadline is no joke. It's fact.

Our work really starts from that date, because until now, we have been in a sort of preparation mode. Then we start a regime of weekly

conference calls, and our first task is to find among the Board candidates, let's say, the 15 best whom we then send – I mean, we send their information about them to a headhunting firm called Ochars and Bernstrand, usually abbreviated to OB.

They scrutinize their applications, and furthermore they make in-depth telephone interviews with them, and we have asked them to concentrate more of their personalities and their characteristics and qualities in that sense, rather than on what they already have done, which is what we already know from their applications.

While they are doing their job, we are concentrating on candidates for ccNSOs, GNSO, and ALAC and making up our mind about them.

Finally, when we get the scorecards from the OB back, we have to decide who of those 15 are going to be invited to London for final interviews, and we try to keep that number as low as possible, but it should be always less than ten.

In London, they are interviewed by us, by the whole committee, and finally, we draw to a secluded, undisclosed secret place for our final daily berations, and finally, white smoke comes out and we have the Board members and others. Thank you.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Thank you very much, Yjro. I'm going to ask Stephane to take up the mantle and give you a little bit more information about some of the things we've been doing this year. Thank you, Stephane.

STEPHANE VAN GELDER: Thank you, Cheryl. Hello, everyone. I just wanted to give you a bit of information on the way the NomCom is working this year, and to give you a bit of background on the way that NomCom works in general.

To explain that the NomCom is each year running a specific and separate cycle to the year before or the year that will follow, this means that each committee, for example, keeps the data of the candidates that it receives secret, and that data is deleted at the end of the year, so it does not survive into another NomCom cycle. For obvious reasons, we treat confidentiality of candidate information as extremely important.

However, since I guess last year with Yjro's tenure, we have worked very hard to make the NomCom a more open body as far as the process is concerned. This is included report cards, as was mentioned, and open meetings. There's one tomorrow, which you're welcome to attend and which we'll show you how the NomCom works.

And it also includes work that has been ongoing this year as Cheryl, as Chair of this year, has requested the committee to work on a couple of areas. One is revising to the SOI and a subcommittee of the NomCom has worked on that to give the candidates and the applicants a much better system than we had in the past, including the possibility of saving the SOI as is, etc. – all this to help them meet the April the 1st Fool's Day deadline that was mentioned earlier on.

And it is a tight schedule this year. Another difference between committees is the calendar and the cycle. This year as we run concurrent with ICANN meetings, we have a very short time in which to do the recruitment phase, and that obviously has to be taken into account.

Another area of work that we've undertaken – and this is subcommittee that I've chaired at Cheryl's request – is one on bylaw revisions. We are looking at the possibility of requesting changes to the committee's structure and possibly to the terms of the committee members. It's important to remind everyone that there are basically two types of committee members. There are elected members that have a vote, and there are members that are nominated by ACs and that are non-voting members, but that they do obviously all take part in the deliberations.

The only committee members that do not take part in the actual deliberations (all have a vote) are the leadership team, so the three of us. Any questions? Happy to answer them. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Byron, if there's questions, we'll take them. If not, we'll leave you to the rest of your very important meeting.

BYRON HOLLAND: Are there any questions for the NomCom? They've explained it perfectly? Now, I think there was some questions, some fuzziness about the dates involved.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll send you a memo, okay? Thank you very much for your time. We do appreciate it. We'd also appreciate it if you do think of someone who may be appropriate, there's still time to get them to apply, or you can follow a suggest: NomCom.ICANN.org/Suggest, and if you give us their name, we'll follow up.

Thank you very much.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you all.

YJRO LANISPURO: Thanks, Byron, my friend.

BYRON HOLLAND: And we are now moving on to the IANA update. Do we have Kim? We do have Kim and Elise. Come on down, right by the laptop. You have a presentation I assume?

KIM DAVIES: Thanks once again for the invitation. You've got the entire IANA Contingent here in Singapore. All right.

So this is the customary IANA ccNSO update. My name is Kim Davies.

ELISE GERICH: My name is Elise Gerich.

KIM DAVIES: And obviously IANA is a big topic this week. There's been many discussions and many more to be had. I'm going to try and stay away from that aspect of the IANA, but Elise suggested to help formulate those discussion and to help frame them, it's probably a useful moment to have a primer on what exactly are the IANA functions. We throw the

word around and a lot of people know the part that they specifically deal with, but perhaps are unaware of the breadth of services that we work on.

So typically we tend to divide the IANA functions into three parts: domain names, number resources, and protocol assignments. In terms of domain names, we manage the root zone. We manage the .int registry for intergovernmental treaty organizations. We manage the [.apa] zone, which is used for sort of internal Internet protocol parameter usage. We also manage a number of second-level domains under [.apa] as registries as well. We manage root-service.net, which is the authorities that are used by the root zone.

And we also operate an IDN practices repository. This is something that's outside of the scope of the NTIA contract, something that the community asked us to operate probably about ten years ago now, something we provide as a service to the community.

In terms of the root zone, I think it's just worth highlighting there's three different policy sources that we act upon. The ccTLDs obviously, there's a policy that derives from the ccNSO, for gTLDs, policy deriving from the GNSO. But it's also worth noting that there's IETF standards that also prescribe certain facets of the root zone, as well. For example, .local has a specific designation in an RFC. Therefore, .local has to be managed in a specific way.

If we look at number resources, there's three broad categories here. One is the IPv4 address space. Second is IPv6 address space. Thirdly is autonomous system number space. Now again, simplistically you might think IP addresses, you petition them out to RIRs. That's pretty simple.

But again, there's actually some complexity to that. There are actually ranges of IP addresses that we allocate directly. So users of multicast addresses, for example, they apply directly to IANA for allocation. They don't by an RIR. They come directly to us.

Similarly, the IETF, through their technical standards, issue special allocations and reservations, so those are now the channel into how IANA manages that registry.

And so the final piece – the third piece – is really the largest piece in terms of sheer volume of requests. This is maintaining the hundreds, if not thousands, of registries that are specified in various technical standards. You heard earlier today the IETF and the IAB are over C how ICANN perform those functions. But in essence, many different RFCs spell out specific registry requirements and IANA's job is to fulfill those requirements.

There are a small number of registries that we manage under the specter of protocol assignments that aren't, strictly speaking, IETF registries. One example is we maintain the official registry of ICANN registrar IDs. These are a fairly minor number, but nonetheless it's useful to highlight them. Not every single protocol assignment registry is derived from the IETF.

Then finally, another non-contracted service we've been providing now for about two years is the Time Zone Database. This is what your computer uses to know when you came to Singapore that Singapore's offset is plus eight from UTC and made the appropriate adjustments.

So this is something that is regularly updated. In fact, there was an update I issued this morning relating to the new time zone in Crimea. So this is something that one of the many registries we maintain that you might not think about when you think of the IANA.

So I think maybe onto updates from our team. Our biggest accomplishment since we last met, we successfully completed our first audit of IANA's registry management systems. So we had a third-party auditor come to ICANN. They reviewed our internal processes. They reviewed our system controls. They reviewed all of our audit material internally – system access logs, all this kind of thing. Made sure that the way we interact with our registry management systems; this is for example the RZM system, our internal system for managing the IETF registries and so on. Make sure that all of our usage of those systems is compliant and meets a variety of different security principles.

This is complementary to existing audits we've been doing for a few years for those that have been keeping count. We already audit the DNSSEC key management portion of IANA. So this really helps expand the scope of internal auditing to be confident that we're doing things in the right way.

One thing Keith touched on earlier today is the work that's ongoing on delegation and redelegation improvements. We all know now about the Framework of Interpretation Working Group, and as we heard in the update, it's nearing the light at the end of the tunnel, so to speak. Our general goal there is, once that work in concluded and ratified, that we want to as staff develop an implementation plan for the communities to review. We want to make sure that we've correctly captured all of the

recommendations in an appropriate way, get feedback on that and so forth.

Following that, our goal is to look into what outreach efforts we might want to do to raise awareness of any changes and so on to the processes.

Another item we're looking at in tandem with that, we've committed to increase the public reporting of pending redelegation requests. This means that if a request is active with IANA, to potentially redelegate a top-level domain, we will be publishing that in some fashion so that there's public awareness that such a request is pending.

New reporting and documentation – for about the last four months, we now publish a greatly increased range of reports, both on group management and some of the other facets of what we do. For example, we now publish a monthly audit report of all root changes. This includes not just changes to the root zone, but also changes to contacts and so on.

I think what we're most proud of is our performance reporting. Essentially, through consultation with you last year, we developed a range of SLAs. We now report against those SLAs on a monthly basis, and you can view those reports and see how well we're doing.

Another element of our improvements is we've added several new documents in terms of how we do things, procedures, help documents, and so on.

So just to quickly illustrate, this is just a little snippet of a relatively long report that comprises our performance reporting. So we have a certain

percentage target. We report on how we met that target, and it's all hopefully in a relatively easy to digest format.

Similarly, this is the audit reports that explains all the requests that we've processed, not just requests that were ultimately successfully implemented, but requests that were closed or didn't succeed for some fashion, and if it didn't succeed, then we provide the reasons why that didn't go through.

And here is just a snapshot of one of the many new documents we've added. For example, in executing delegations and redelegations, we ask for an operational and technical plan that the perspective ccTLD manager explains how they're going to run the registry. This is something that we got a lot of feedback. How do we compile such a [base]? Without being prescriptive, we've provided a help document that helps explain the pieces that we expect to see in such a document to effectively process a redelegation request.

Another thing we're proud of is that we just conducted our second annual customer satisfaction survey. The first one we conducted the previous year was something we conducted ourselves. This time we engaged a third-party survey company to do it independently of us and we could be confident that we weren't skewing the results and the questions were formulated in an appropriate way.

So the results of that survey are now online at that URL. But just to take a snippet of one of the graphs from that report, I think it's fair to say satisfaction on these various factors of IANA was quite high. Obviously, there's room for improvement. But we're happy with the results. In fact,

we're quite surprised at the level of satisfaction. But we will continue to improve and welcome your feedback.

I think I actually mentioned this at the last meeting. We've gone through this business excellence journey for the last four or five years at ICANN. Essentially, EFQM is a quality management model that we've adopted. We're essentially piloting it in the IANA department with a goal towards rolling it out across the whole ICANN organization moving forward.

We also had our first external assessment on that last year as well, and as a result of that, we were recognized with a Committed to Excellence award. This is one of the levels of recognition from that model.

Then, just finally to cap it off, if you hadn't noticed, the root zone is growing at a rapid rate. In fact, we will cross the threshold of 500 TLDs probably in a matter of days. This is business as usual for us, where we're effectively adding TLDs almost on a daily basis. We streamlined our processing. We're typically processing them within a couple of business days, and I think everyone will agree that submitted change requests that hasn't impacted our ability to execute ccTLD requests as we do that.

So that's it. Thank you very much. I'm happy to discuss any of this.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Kim. That was interesting and I think gave hopefully everybody a good baseline overview of the activities that you engage in was I thought very interesting to just see the variety of them and some

of the things that we don't necessarily think about when we think of your organization.

Any questions for Kim or Elise? Given they operate the time zones, I thought they were very effectively in being right on time in terms of finishing, but if you're going to drag us out – Keith, go ahead.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Just a couple of quick questions.

BYRON HOLLAND: You're on.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Really? Quick questions. You talked about redelegation reports going online. Is that every single redelegation request that you receive will be published? Because I had an idea. You were talking about having a flag to indicate that there might be a redelegation request, but given that some of them might be frivolous, are you doing a test first?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah, I think in practice that's exactly right. We want to weed out those that have no prospective success, only publish the identify of applicants that seem to have some legitimate stake in potentially getting a redelegation. But we get requests every day from people who are just trying to see if it sticks, and they quickly realize it's not going to work.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Yes. [inaudible] lost their domain name, so they want a redelegation of the whole ccTLD [inaudible].

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thanks for the update. My name is Peter Van Roste for CENTR. It's more a recommendation than a question. During the discussions following the announcements from the NTIA, the thing that surprised me was that quite a few people are simply not aware that IANA is already abiding by SLAs – whoever imposes them on you. That's a different question. But I would really recommend you to publish those reports as wide as you can, because even in this community they are not that well-known.

KIM DAVIES: Thanks. That's a good idea, and in fact, one thing we've been publishing for years, and again might not be of direct interest to this community, we have very elaborate SLA reporting for the ITF. We produce – I don't know how long our reports are, like 50-page reports every month that explain how we've been executing the IETF protocol registry functions.

     This is something new that we started doing October last year in the context of root management, IP address allocations, and I agree, we should make people make aware of this as much as possible. I know it's been a dialogue in this community for a long time that we should have such reporting, and we're very pleased to be able to do it.

ELISE GERICH: If I can just add to that, I guess we don't boast enough, so we'll try to do that a little bit more. But if you want to find some of the reports, they're

on the IANA.org/performance website, and the IETF ones have been published for seven years, so it's quite a long history on those SLAs.

ROELOF MEIJER: Roelof Meijer, .nl. If you don't boast a lot, you get complements. So a complement to you, and not only for the improvements you've made on your general service, but I was one of the people who, before the [relaunch] of gTLDs, [inaudible] some worries about the question if IANA would be up to the task of adding a lot of new TLDs to the root and doing all kinds of changes, and well, you've proved that you're ready for that. I think that's a good job.

KIM DAVIES: Thanks very much.

ELISE GERICH: And we will take that back to the rest of the team because there was a lot of planning involved in that, and we're happy to see it worked.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, well-deserved. Credit where credit is due. Thank you, Roelof. Any final comments?

Thank you very much. And with that, that brings to a close our regularly scheduled program. The final thing to note is some information around the ccNSO cocktail party, which of course the two of you are welcome to join us should you find some time after 6:30 this evening. You're welcome to come and join us.

I believe there's going to be some information showing up shortly, but probably the most important piece of information is it's a short walk from the lobby of the Swiss Hotel, which is where we are going to meet at 6:15. So if you show up at the Swiss Hotel lobby at 6:15, you will be led to the cocktail party. And with that, thank you very much. See you at 6:15.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]