
SINGAPORE – Board with NRO/ASO
Wednesday, March 26th 2014 – 10:00 to 11:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

STEVE CROCKER: Good morning. It's still morning. This is good. Feels like a long day already. This is our time for the Board to meet with the address community, ASO/NRO. As is our standard practice, we look forward to these because we like to use the time for rather direct, frank, and substantive conversation, so we can dispense with the platitudes, you guys are great, we're great, we're all great, and just plunge right in. So I'm going to turn things over to Adiel and it's your meeting.

RAY PLZAK: Could I suggest that we deal with item three first? Because the other two are going to consume an awful lot of time. Actually, that's a sort of a paraphrase of what I asked for. What I'm concerned about is the Board has no idea at all about all of the hard work that's going on inside each individual region and in between regions with regards to the diminishing free pool of IPv4 addresses that exist in the regions and what's being done with regards to transfers in that situation and what will happen with total post-exhaustion and what mechanisms are in place as far as returning stuff to the IANA and redistribution and so forth. But the Board absolutely knows nothing about this and I think it would be well worthwhile for the Board to at least learn a little bit.

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

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yes, thank you, Ray. First of all thank you. I'd like to thank the Board again for meeting with us. It's always an opportunity for us as well to exchange with the Board and discuss those issues which are important for us. I just want to reassure you, Ray, that that's the way we understood it and that would be, there will be a small update on that which would cover all those points. I think we also all agree it's good to start with that so that we move to the other point. So have one, the status; two, the road map; and three, the agreement between ICANN and the NRO.

So for the IP address transfer market and status of what we have in place among us. I will give the floor to John to give us an update.

JOHN CURRAN:

So, I'll give the brief update because I actually read it literally. But, what you talked about, Ray, may have a bigger scope. We may want to have each of the regions go around and spend a couple of minutes describing what's going on.

Let me talk specifically about the transfer market so people understand. I'm going to talk about the inter-RIR aspect. There is an active inter-RIR transfer market. It is globally coordinated policy. Each RIR institutes their own inter-RIR transfer policy if they're interested in having such.

It's very much like traveling the globe here. If your plug and the socket fit together, then things work. So we have some policies that work between the regions, we have some policies that don't work between the regions. So for example, in the ARIN region we have a policy that



basically says we'll recognize any other region that has a need-based transfer policy and we'll reciprocal transfers in and out.

There is such policy in the APNIC region, so you can go to our website-if you go to transfers, you go to statistics, you go to inter-RIR, you'll see a page of transfers that are shown since last summer that show address blocks moving to the APNIC region because the policies are compatible.

With respect to the RIPE region, there isn't a compatible policy, so we don't have inter-RIR transfers going from ARIN to RIPE. That's just the way it is.

There's no global policy because, well, we don't even have bilateral policies that have a common ground, so how would we have a global policy? But it is getting closer and closer. We're seeing more and more convergence among the policies, among the regions. I imagine in a few years the community will figure out how they want to approach this, but obviously you have to let the community drive and they have to figure out where they're going. And that's the transfer, inter-RIR transfer aspect.

With regards to what's happened with depletion and activities in each of the regions, I'll go first. In the ARIN region we have 1.3 slash-8s remaining. We will, when we get to a single slash-8, get to our final phase of our depletion program.

ARIN does not have a reserve. We have a reserve for IPv6 transition technology, a IPv4 address block. So if you're using translation gateways you can get a block for that purpose, but otherwise we will actually run out somewhere at the end of this year or early next year and then



parties looking for address space will not be able to obtain it from ARIN's free pool. They'll have to go to the market or they'll have to go on the waiting list. There's a waiting list program. We keep a list of all the approved transfers and we'll process them if and when address space comes back, which isn't all that frequent.

So that's in the ARIN region. I guess the other four regions should explain what's happening locally with their address pool.

AXL PAVLIK:

Sure, I'll continue. Axl Pavlik from the RIPE NCC. We have run out, but then there's a qualifier. We have reserved the last – we call it the last, slash-8 for the future and new entrants to the market and the like and we are allocating from that. The only block that you, block size that we can get from that is a slash-22. It's about 1000 addresses.

It works and the forecasts say we will be good for a couple of years there still. We do see a pronounced increase in new membership and we do believe that that has to do with the fact that our members, the ISPs, don't feel able to [supplicate] to their customers, so their customers are being sent straight to our way with the advice to become a member and to get their thousand addresses and to be happy afterwards. So that's what we see. It's an interesting development. It's good. More members means we can split the costs of the RIPE and see across more so the fees go down. Everybody seems to be happy with that, so there's no big issue at this time.



JOHN CURRAN: Thank you. Next.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: We'll go this way, and then [inaudible]

PAUL WILSON: The situation with APNIC is very much what you've heard already. Very briefly, we have run out of our normal supply of v4. We do have what we call the last slash-8 policy which gives small allocations – only one per organization who asked for it. I describe it as a rationing of our final pool. That's expected to last for many years. We're going through it at a steady rate, but it's quite a reasonable allocation. The idea of it is to be, to carry through pretty much the entire IPv6 transition, so there is always v4 address available to those who need it until such time as people don't need it anymore. So it's not actually expected to be exhausted, but we don't know.

We're doing transfers. We're processing transfers from ARIN. We're processing a steady, fairly low rate of regional transfers-less than one a day, a handful per week-of transfers at the moment. They're almost all – or they're all – reasonably small, I think the market such as it is a long way from being sort of stable and well understood. It seems that a per-address pricing is okay for people who want to spend a small number of thousands of dollars on a small transfer, but when you scale that up to the large blocks that are available, you're really talking about tens, or even tens of millions or even higher than that. And clearly that's the kind of money that you start to worry about security and how exactly that's got to be financed and that is not happening.



So I don't think we have a clue as to what happens in the future. We don't have a crystal ball there. Just very glad to see that the indications for IPv6 are exponential growth at the moment, still from a low base. But when you look at Google's figures, are hitting 3% and projecting forward to 10% or so within a year, it's pretty good. So I think while we still are very concerned not to lose momentum on IPv6 deployment, we actually are – as to the extent you can say, we are on track, I think.

I think that's all from APNIC. Thanks.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Andres.

ANDRES PIAZZA: This is Andres from LACNIC. First of all, I have a message from Raul. He regrets not being able to be here due to personal commitments. So that's the first thing.

Also considering our situation, this year we are running out. From the last three years the expectations were this year in May we will run out of our current pool. They remain being the same expectations, so the trend will or may be modified if this process accelerates, but we are very, very close to May, so we believe that in our Cancun meeting we will facing our run out.

We also have a process, soft-landing policy, and we will have a, for newcomers a little allocations that will, I guess, last for a couple of years. Also we don't have any transfer policy. This didn't come up at the



region yet. It has been discussed. Also, it has been discussed not only in the LACNIC forums but the IGF last year. The region is not yet demanding for a transfer policy, but we may see the changes maybe this year. So we are expecting to help the process to be successful if this is a need from the region in the future.

And we are trying to focus on IPv6. We know we are really behind compared to other regions. Our other option hasn't good numbers yet, but we saw, the evolution, for example, of the North American region that was behind a couple of years ago and we understood that there is [a past]. The market is also concentrated, so we are trying to focus in the top hundred of players that maybe they could move the number higher in the future. We are working with governments outside our own policies. Just an active strategy in promoting the possibility of accelerating the IPv6 deployment and we are focusing our efforts there. Thank you.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Thank you. Also the situation in our region is a little bit particular. First thing, we still have a [inaudible] slash-8 free pool, so we have the biggest free IPv4 pool right now. That may explain the fact that we don't have a transfer policy. The policy has been proposed twice already, which has been [consistently] rejected by the committee at this point of time for obvious reason.

We do have soft-landing policy as well in our region which secure a slash-8, a last slash-8, to be able to cater for a last comer to the market and ensure them they have sufficient IPv4 for their transition to IPv6.



So we, however, are putting a lot of effort still in promoting IPv6 and helping operators in the region to adopt the IPv6 because we believe that no matter how much IPv4 we have, when the rest of the world will move to IPv6, we won't have a choice to also process and manage our network or deploy our network using IPv6. So we are doing that as well and we are seeing a lot of progress in that.

I will also probably come back to the transfer aspect and maybe raise what is our challenge there and why there are those inter-RIR transfer and transfer policy within regions. One of the challenges that transfer market pulls is the currency of the information in the registry, the registration information.

One thing that we want to make sure is that when there are transfers there is a way for those who are involved in those transfers to accurately register that information in our database because our responsibility and role is to maintain a correct registration of the user of IP numbers. If there is no formal way to do that, those transfers will happen under the table and the information that will be publically available and resources won't reflect the reality. So that's why it is important when the transfer market become needed that there are policies and there are mechanisms to allow the transfer to happen openly and give people a way of registering those transfers.

In our region we haven't see much transfer yet for two reasons. First, we don't have a lot of legacy space registered in AFRINIC region, so people don't have more than what they need to transfer. We have, however, seen some attempt to get resources in the region and then transfer them later because the need is not in the region, which puts a



little bit more, I will say, pressure on us in the evaluation and due diligence when we evaluate requests that are coming in right now.

So that is the official part of the thing. We will be happy to answer any questions. Yeah. Ray?

RAY PZLAK:

I would also like to hear about the implementation of a global policy with regards to the return of IP addresses to the IANA and the subsequent reallocation of those addresses, so if someone could talk to that please.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Okay. Yeah, we have that policy, which is a global policy, which allows all [inaudible] to return address that are recorded after the global center pool exhausted to IANA for IANA to be able to reallocate, reassign them to area who request them. That policy is implemented. We have received recently a communication from IANA to clarify some aspect of the policy on when exactly they will start allocating this.

There is a specific mechanism to identify how much IP address can be received by an RIR that is requesting IPv4 space from – recovered space – at the IANA level. That clarification has been requested by IANA, we have gone through a consultation in a different region to get everybody on the same line on that. The ASO has forwarded its response to IANA and I think that will be used to stop that process of allocation. I'm not sure which RIR has requested from that free pool yet. I don't think any.

So the pool is still there. There is a global policy to manage that, but we haven't tapped into it yet because the RIR who have run out are still in their last pool. About 12 people still have access to those resources and the rest are still using their normal [inaudible] slash-8. Questions?

STEVE CROCKER:

That's an excellent tour de table of the state of affairs now in each of the regions. If we step back and take a slightly broader look, what do we know about the trajectory? It would seem to me, that the aftermarket for IPv4 addresses is going to interact with the uptake of IPv6.

I'm not yet seeing. I'm not expert at this and I don't spend very much of my time looking at it, but I have not seen anything that is kind of dispassionate and relatively careful assessment of the dynamics and the state of affairs and possible scenarios, futures, pro and con. Are there experts looking at this and building models?

JOHN CURRAN:

The short answer is no, Steve, there is not. We have an interesting circumstance in that there's at least two communities that make decisions directly affecting v6 deployment and a third that's indirectly affecting v6 deployment. The two direct communities are service providers deciding whether or not to use IPv6 as their infrastructure and/or for their customer services, whether or not they're going to provide v6 all the way to the customer. This is making, actually, very good progress.

There's a lot of ISPs who have looked at the long-term, interesting economics of v4 and as much as you can go get another address block,

you can't reliably and cost-effectively serve the customers. Even if you get another address block short-term, long-term, it's very difficult, particularly when you have some number of customers who are specifically asking for v6. If you've got to specifically turn on v6 anyway, and cover the economics involved in that, it's difficult to try to say it's not worth supporting it as a service across the board.

So there's no dispassionate analysis, but if you look at actual decision making of service provider networks, you have a number of service providers – cable companies, mobile phone operators, who have actually said v6 is inherent to their platform, they've turned it on and they've adopted it.

And so the parties who haven't done that are the exciting risk-takers, because if you don't turn on v6 on your infrastructure, you don't take the plunge, you don't pay attention to it, things are easier because you just go get v4 addresses for a short time. But you can't do that forever. And you're deferring a lot of effort, a lot of planning, a lot of engineering you're deferring.

So at the point in time when v4 doesn't become tenable, then suddenly you find yourself on the wrong side of five years of deferred capital investment or six years of deferred capital investment. So, there's no dispassionate analysis, but we're actually seeing the service provider community one-by-one slowly make the decision.

STEVE CROCKER: Is there anybody tracking the story that you're describing so that everyone could see kind of a map or some sort of table of service providers and what they're state of...

JOHN CURRAN: Some of that's tracked by ISOC and the World IPv6 Project. A lot of people use Google's actual IPv6 traffic demand towards their Google services as an indication of deployment. You can go actually look at that curve. That curve is beginning—

It's definitely geometric, it might be exponential and it's now passing three and a half, some odd percent. It's growing up very rapidly. So I would say the Internet Society maintains the best provider by provider information I know of.

STEVE CROCKER: You just said there was more than just the ISPs. There was another major driver somewhere.

JOHN CURRAN: At the end of the day, the content is the most important thing. Because if you're a service provider and you connect someone up, for example, the major service provider who's switched to android phones, they're using v6 as their infrastructure, they're actually simplifying their infrastructure.

So I just came from the Paris World IPv6 Congress. Excellent presentation showing how you can actually lower your traffic – your expenses, lower your engineering, by using v6 for the handset. The



problem is that whenever they go to a v4 website, some percentage of the traffic goes to v4 and has to be gatewayed back.

So if you want to really want to deploy IPv6 and make it really easy for service providers to make a decision to use v6 as their infrastructure, work on the content. Get all the content sites as quickly as possible dual homed.

Now we have some of the big ones. World IPv6 day, the initiative that ISOC helped lead, you've got a lot of the major top Alexa sites. But there's a lot of businesses that have no idea they their existing website should be dual homed. I know in the ARIN region we're doing major outreach in that area totally to content providers to get them to put their website on the entire internet and just not just the IPv4 internet.

Ron, if you want to talk about the service provider view or what you – no?

[STEVE CROCKER]:

I've taken too much of your time already.

PAUL WILSON:

There's plenty that could be said and we could go on talking about this for another hour or day or more, for sure. I just noticed that, it just occurred to me that we've got the Technical Experts Group meeting this afternoon and that might be a time to actually talk in more detail about this IPv6 transition.



STEVE CROCKER: We were so worried we'd have nothing to talk about, so please do come.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, plenty to talk about, thanks.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: So thank you for that, if there is no more questions on the IP address, IPv4 transfer market, then we can move to the other point of the agenda.

STEVE CROCKER: Yes.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: The second point now is the roadmap for ICANN consultation process related to the transition of the IANA function. We know that the process is on the way, but we want to discuss with you at the Board level, how do you see this going forward. And especially what we are concerned about, or what we want to discuss is how we can formally input to the process using our different mechanism of consultation to plug into the wider process that is being put in place.

And related to that we have other areas specific question as well. For instance, upcoming global event like IGF, how ICANN is going to use those events in this process. This is important for us because that will allow us at a regional level each RIR to know how we conduct our own process to make sure that it is aligned with what is happening globally



and make sure that it is taking into consideration and then we have a review mechanism to make sure that those comment are taken into consideration.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm going to leave this open for others to respond. I'm taking up way too much of the—

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you, Adiel. If I could, just so we are all on the same page, we are struggling with this within ICANN so I ask if we can also get your help on this. We do not want to use the term IANA transition because it gets people thinking about all kinds of things. We are talking about the transition about the USG Stewardship of IANA functions. If we could just stick to that language it makes us, at least, aligned in how we communicate this to the world. So you will see that we did not use the term "transition of IANA" in our schedule, in our slides and I hope that we just stick to that kind of key focus. We are transitioning the NTIA Stewardship, or USG Stewardship, of the IANA functions.

Some people are using the word oversight. That's fine as well. The US government is not very keen on that word, but it is what it is. It is USG/oversight.

Theresa Swinehart is the ICANN executive that is in charge of facilitating the consultation. I emphasize the word facilitating. We are honored and humbled that the US government chose us to facilitate, but we are just the facilitator.



Guaranteed failure for us in this effort would be if it looks like ICANN led it and ICANN engaged the ICANN community and ICANN came up with the solution. That's failure. And failure is not an option here for a reason. Let me very direct here. Yes people are saying there's no deadline. And yes, there is no deadline. We should not feel like a guillotine is on our head here. We should do the right thing.

Having said that, there's something small that happens in the United States around November of 2015 called the Presidential elections – 2016. And when this happens, a lot changes and who is in charge, who's at NTIA, who is in the White House, who is in state department, could all be up for change.

So I think it's incumbent among us to try and plan towards the 18-month window we were given. If we don't achieve it, it's not the end of the world. We can find an arrangement with the US government to continue. They are not pulling a plug on that day. We should function calmly get through this process, ensuring inclusivity.

I was just challenged at the GAC by you-know-whom about our inclusivity, that this will be an inclusive process, that everyone will participate. So it is very, very important and I need to stress this that we need your help. We need your help because you and the ccTLDs really are our conduit to the world. ICANN has a global footprint, largely. You have a very local footprint and a regional footprint. We need you to help u. And the design of the consultation is not ICANN's. You know, Adiel, and the rest of you in the RIR community that we've been working in lockstep to make sure that we are aligned as a group into how the consultation will also work. It is crucial, it is our failure, it is our



Achilles heel if we do not cooperate and involve your communities from the get-go. Not later, not as an after fact. We have to bring the consultations to you. We cannot ask you to come to our consultation. We have to come to your communities. We have to spend time with them. You will do the same with your own communities, of course, and nothing precludes that, but we, ICANN, should be actively coming to you and spending time with you and listening to you.

I was struck yesterday that Assistant Secretary Strickling proposed to the Brazilians, just to show you how keen he is on this, that they should actually take a portion of the meeting at NETmundial and focus it on that so that there is a public consultation with the world that is perceived to even be outside ICANN's RIRs, ITF so everyone is welcome.

Of course we'd don't want to spend the whole on this, but maybe take an hour, hour-and-a-half, and say to everybody, "Here's a public consultation." I'm going to speak to the Brazilian government and organizers this afternoon to ask for this and if they agree – and I hope they will, and I'm sure they will – we need you there as well. So, again, it's not ICANN leading the consultation. ICANN is simply facilitating your presence is paramount.

So, timing, I commented on; inclusivity, I commented on; we coming to you I commented on. I call these principles in general. The principles the US government are immovable. Today South Africa and the GAC challenged me on that. They said, "US government is putting a conditional..." I said, "Look, they've been gracious enough to give up control, how many of us do?" So they gave up control and they put general principles. Which of these principles do



you disagree with? We should challenge our communities. Do you disagree with the openness of the Internet? If you do, then you shouldn't be part of this consultation. Because that's a core principle. Anyway, we should be pushing these principles in our communities and standing behind them with strength because they are good principles. Every one of them.

Anyway, these are my comments, Adiel. I hope this is helpful.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Thank you, Fadi. These are helpful, I think we have two comment. Paul and then Ron.

PAUL WILSON:

I just have some personal perspectives about where we are being here at ICANN again and talking to the Board again, talking to the community. There's, I think, a bunch of messages which we're repeating as we do often at ICANN and I have to remind myself of a principle of adult education that repetition is more necessary than it is with kids.

We're coming back to some of the same points, but I've said numerous times in response to questions about the Montevideo statement that there's really nothing new in there, that we've collected together a bunch of things that are, at least I think as far as APNIC and I think the NRO have wanted to say that we've said before and, in fact I think the same goes for those statements that came out of the most recent, the Santa Monica statement, because we have affirmed our support for ICANN in the past. We have affirmed our satisfaction with IANA



arrangements, with IANA performance, with the bundling of IANA functions, etc.

We've said these things before and we said that we've said them before, but we're repeating again that we said that we've said them before, and hopefully it sinks in eventually.

The other thing that bears repetition again is the difference between numbers and names. Things like the fact that we have in the number system a structural separation of policy entirely from ICANN and IANA. So ICANN receives policies from the ASO, ratifies those, hands them to the IANA. And as customers on the other side of that policy arrangement, it's very clear to us if and when policies haven't been followed, we've got really a clean interface there that we like to have always understood because it works.

Another thing that I've pointed out a few times this week to the surprise of some is that the US government doesn't approve any IP address allocations from the IANA, and sometimes it's assumed that they do.

So, it's a case of being really clear about the difference between names and numbers because we've heard a lot of talk these days about changes to our IANA to IANA transition or US government role in IANA, etc. Most of what's been said about those things, apply to names in IANA and not to numbers or protocols and parameters.

So at the risk of sort of exerting some sort of set of changes to IANA that affect everything that IANA does for the sake of names is something that we really wanted to, really want to avoid. So the RIRs are, I think we're all dedicated to our numbers role and dedicated absolutely to the



stability and security of the numbers services that come from the IANA and we just need to keep repeating that as well.

Personally, what I think we need to do between now and September is to be reviewing the various relationships that we have with ICANN and IANA and how those things are expressed and making sure that they're expressed as accurately and properly for today's requirements and changing, amending, updating, renewing them as we need to in whatever form that happens. And I don't know that we've got any clear direction about how those relationships, in what form those relationships should be expressed.

I've got a fairly simple view, to be honest, of accountability. I think accountability comes from the duty of someone to account to someone else for what they do and the relationships we have should describe accountability in terms of how ICANN is to be called to account for under those agreements, and vice versa for that matter.

But I think, again, I see our relationship as being a pretty straightforward affair where we can define these things quite well and I find that a lot of the discussion this week has really been around much more complex issues that don't apply to us and I'd like it to be understood what those differences are from the RIR and numbers case from the names. Thanks.

FADI CHEHADE:

If I could, Adiel, just to respond to this, I want to clarify something you said, Paul. So, I'm with you that we need to make sure that the global consultation on the transition of the US government [troll] of oversight



over the IANA functions does not include a review of our relationships with you. It does not. It's part of why we drew that big simple slide with green boxes very clearly saying these are—

So people will try “to push us there” and I had the same discussion this morning with the root operators. People will try to drag us all into that public consultation. We need to resist that. Now we're talking about public adult education, a million times we need to say, “The public consultation that the US government asked us to do is on our accountability for these functions, but the relationship between the RIRs and ICANN that has been there for a long time and is established and is well understood is not in play here.

Now, when people then come and discuss our overall accountability as an organization, Paul, they may bring up other things, and that's fine. That's fair, I think we should be cognizant of that.

But the homework we have from the US government to go back to them with a proposal does not include a review of our agreement with you. Is that your understanding, Paul? And RIRs? Or am I misunderstanding? This is very important.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Misunderstanding. The nuance is as, Assistant Secretary Strickling said last Friday is while it is true that this is simply a plan for the transition of the stewardship, there's a symbolic aspect to it about accountability of the whole system. So the question that will come up it will be while we're doing the homework assignment, how do we also pragmatically handle people who have things outside of that homework assignment,



how are those channeled, how are those processed, and how does that come to fruition as well in a timeframe that we don't end up with a successful homework assignment for the US government but a symbolic gap in accountability?

FADI CHEHADE:

I'm terribly sorry, Adiel. I want to understand this because if I don't, it's a problem and I will go out and say the wrong things.

So, is it true, or what you just said is that you agree that the public consultation process that Theresa will facilitate and that you will all help us with does not include a review of our relationships? That's a separate channel that will happen? But are you also suggesting that aside from telling people, "Its perfect, leave us alone, it works," that we may need to actually look at our relationship and strengthen it in some way? You're saying yes, Axl?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I just want to do a quick response. Our relationship is a very, has two aspects, but the relationship with regard to IANA services is a service relationship and the IANA contract has the US government providing very pragmatic oversight to that. As I've told people before, I absolutely don't worry about that because it's a service relationship, it has a direct customer. Whether the rest of the world wants to provide oversight or not we're going to and we already do. If there was a mistake made in the IANA we would all be talking to each other very quickly about making sure it was done right. We've never had that problem, but I'm not worried about the oversight of the service that ICANN provides the



IANA function. So the service and the oversight of that is our relationship and what is in the IANA function contract right now.

FADI CHEHADE:

And if people expose that – if today somebody asked you or any of you publically, you have oversight in your contract over the IANA implementation of your policies. You will say yes. And if they say, “Explain this to us. Walk us through how you do that oversight, walk us through what you do – is it visible, is it accountable, is it recorded, does it have audit mechanisms, does it have escalation procedures?” if they asked us these questions today, my hope would be that we would tell them, “Yes, here they are,” and they would look at them and say, “That’s perfectly adequate,” or “We’d like to add to it.”

So is it our job, then, to look at these together and relatively quickly, and make sure when these are exposed in three months to the world, the world will look at them and say, “This looks pretty good. We’re going to add maybe some visibility to us,” or something like that and we’re okay. But we should be prepared because we’re going to be asked very specifically, “Tell us how...” Am I making myself clear?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

If I may. I understand what you are saying and that is my opinion as well. We have agreements, we have the MoU with ICANN which is great, and we have good working relations with IANA and we are happy with the way they are working and we understand we get along very well. I don’t think that latter part is very, very visible. And we have point



two on the agenda, which speaks to that. We should make it more visible, but that's between the two of us.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, that's between the two of us.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah, that is fundamental. That's why we have the two points laid down like that, so to make sure that we, we know what we are touching on. I have Paul. I don't know if you still want the queue.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, I think this is very good communication regarding for, what defines the transitions among all the ASO/NRO and ICANN. I think this wonderful communication. I'd like to raise one and two. I need ASO RIR to think about is in the [NDI] announcement, he's also talking about it's not only in the ICANN community or this community which you explore more, have you think about who we should explore more to invite them to this discussion?

For example, what about [invite] some of the industry people or something like that? Usually it's not in the – generally the people from the ICANN community will say, "Well, you are only limited to ICANN community, in our community."

So we need to do something to identify what is our institution or whatever, and bring them into the discussions. So I think this is the first question I think we don't need to identify now, but we need to be thinking about it.



The second part I think is also important. I think Paul and many of them – you – already talking about it. Actually, a lot of people question about the NTI announcement because many of them don't understand the IANA function. What is IANA always doing? So we have to do some awareness, promotion to tell the outside world, to understand what is IANA administration doing.

I always say many people like to over-imagine what is IANA magic is. So I think this is part of our job, to mirror awareness to the outside world, "Here is the IANA administration." Just like Paul, you say again and again. It's the same thing. We still need to communicate to the outside world.

And of course, a part of that job is ICANN. We have to have much better IANA [rapport] provided to the general public. "Here is what we did every day." And don't let their imagination, don't start about we have a secret [button]. So I think the second thing we maybe need to work together to do the work. Thanks.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

I think that is one of the critical aspect as well of the role of ICANN in this, in pushing the awareness to people before involving them into this and I think that will request a lot of outreach activity on which us RIR would originally more than happy to support. Because you're right. A lot of people see this as a magic thing with huge button that will shut down everything just as if somebody touch the button, which is not the case and we have to be very clear and explain that specifically. We can do that from the number perspective because that is what we do for instance. As Paul said, US government is not involved in number at all.



Nobody knows that, so that needs to be explained. We have to explain the relation with the policy development process, , etc.

So there is a huge aspect of outreach, of awareness that is needed outside of the ICANN community itself, so that is a valid point.

JOHN CURRAN:

Thank you, Adiel. I want to go back to a point that Paul was making about policy. I had a brief opportunity to do this Monday in that there are actually two kinds of policies involved with everybody. One is the policy that is generated that tells the IANA what to do, which are a very small number of policies, really. The most simplistic way of looking at this, in terms of, for example, the GNSO is that the only policy that really concerns about what the IANA is going to do is that when they are presented with an accredited unique string, put in a root. That's the IANA policy. All this other stuff about Trademark Clearinghouses and all the rest of that stuff has to do with how you get to the point of that string, and that's a GNSO conundrum.

The bulk of the policies that are performed inside the addressing community, inside the IETF community – if you want to use the term policy there, loosely – are inside the GNSO, have to do with the administration and the management of the resource. That's what you spend all your time doing.

And so there are very, very few policies that actually pass the test of going through a process to, in terms of the addressing community, become global policies in that they have to pass [inaudible] and they have to be passed by the ICANN Board. Everything else doesn't. And



that is true in the IETF. It's not true with the GNSO. And that's something that needs to be fixed in a different conversation.

But I also want to point out from the accountability standpoint, every time in the IP addressing world, when a policy is sent to IANA, there is accountability features in it. And those accountability features are the fact that they require the RIRs to demonstrate a need. And at that time when you go ask for something, the IANA actually is conducting a very mini audit on what your need is.

So, that is accountability right there, so we need to point out the fact that our policies also provide for accountability. So I think that if we spent time doing the education that we would be very well pleased. So thank you.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Thank you very much. So that kind of introduces us to the last point, which is a form of strengthening our relationship of formalizing, documenting – better documenting – that relationship with ICANN. We currently have a few mechanisms out there. We have the ASO MOU. We have the [Exchange of Letter 2007].

Our question, or our expectation is to look at those and see how we can consolidate them, or evolve them or document, properly document what we are doing, which is part of our relationship, but also part of the oversight or accountability mechanism that we have now, which is exercised through us RIRs individually, but also to our community. Because anything we do related to our relation in regard to the IANA function, we report that back to our community and our community



play an important role because this oversight has to be seen as well from the bottom to the up.

So, that is the second aspect. How can we strengthen that? How can we formalize that and consolidate all the mechanism that we have now so that it is easily accessible by people, visible and [inaudible]. Yes, Ray?

RAY PLZAK:

I think you're forgetting the third document that exist. There's this memorandum. It's an agreement between ICANN and the regional registries with regards to how you do your business with IANA. We put it together I believe the last time was about 2004. That is a relationship document that exists. So I think it would be well served to look at that, because it's in that document there's a lot of accountability features as well.

I would be hesitant to, for example, to open up the ASO MOU, I would certainly think that looking at the Exchange of Letters is probably something that you really want to do because when we did that, many, many years ago, it was as lightweight as possible. We both basically recognized each other's right to exist and that was about it.

So I think that doing it in the Exchange of Letters, as far as the defining accountability relationships might be the way to go, but I would also look at that third document and see what also has to be done with that.



ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Exactly. So that is the kind of roadmap that, Paul, we want to discuss to, first of all, see if the Board is okay for us looking at those documents and start working on them right away to be able to – yes, Fadi?

FADI CHEHADE: Addressing [inaudible] and, certainly, Ray and our chairman. So the way we do that, you want to do this through may be the Board asking the ASO to start the process. I don't know how to do this, but we'll let our Board members help me how we start the process.

But I would like to say something about several comments. OPN the education piece, I already asked Elise to put together an actual course. ICANN now has an actual education platform called learn.icann.org. We're going to put a course, kind of an IANA 101. An important part of that course would be to also put the RIRs, all of you explaining the mechanisms by which you keep us accountable. I think it's important people understand that.

Now if these mechanisms aren't going to evolve through our discussions of number two, then maybe we'll wait until we have the final mechanism. It's important people understand how you keep us in check today. So I'm committed to that and I could ask for your help please. I'd like to revise these materials with you before we publish them if it's okay.

On the second point on the timeline, first I need the guidance from our Board as to how we start that dialogue with you formally. And second, I would beg the timeline of number two is not tied to the 18 months of the US government, otherwise it would clearly show that the two are



tied. In fact, I'm hoping that we can proceed with number two as soon as we're all ready, and hopefully no later than London when the high-level meeting – London is key because it's going to be on the 23rd, on the first day of our meeting, high-level meeting of all governments in the world coming together to see kind of how are we proceeding with our effort. It would be good at that meeting to have some – I don't know if that's too early or something. I'm not imposing a deadlines, I'm just suggesting that this may be politically a good point to announce that we have concluded that dialogue.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yeah. For us, we have no issue moving very fast on that. In fact, that is our expectation, in fact, to be able to do that as soon as possible, because in many cases, there are already documents or language which exists around those. We just need to formalize the documentation and move forward.

STEVE CROCKER:

Two small points. Two thing. Moving quickly is helpful. The more stuff that we can put in place and clear away some of the brush and the better off we are. During the discussion about the relationship between ICANN and the RIRs remains the same. John raised the issue of the appearances related to stewardship. My thoughts were going down to more concrete things.

I don't know how many people actually know exactly how much oversight, stewardship, whatever, NTI has actually exercised on behalf of the address community. Certainly one of the specific artifacts, visible



artifacts, is the report that the IANA group prepares on a regular basis on the number of transactions and so forth that are related to – I mean, they do it across the Board for everything.

One relatively modest-sized portion of that is address transactions. If I recall, one recent one says no address blocks were allocated and that would seem to be the end of it. Maybe there was something on [AS] numbers.

But what I don't know is whether or not there's any feedback. Elise, you're the one that can speak to this, whether there's any feedback or other actions that the NTIF folks engage in with respect to anything that could be viewed as stewardship of the relationship between your function and the address community.

ELISE GERICH:

Basically, there's no active review of process on how we allocate numbers to the RIRs by the department of commerce or by NTI. And the report you're quoting is not a public report, Steve, it's one that goes privately to NTIA. And the public report is one that was built on performance standards that we put out for public consultation and that the RIRs gave us feedback and we set some timeliness and accuracy targets, KPIs.

And we've been publishing the report on that for, I guess it's now five months, based on the public consultation. I think in that time there have only been two number allocations and they were autonomous system number allocations. There have been some multi-cast allocations which are under the IETF umbrella and not under the RIR umbrella.



Does that answer your question, Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: I think it's part of the [indication] to bring that up.

FADI CHEHADE: Adiel, I want use this moment to thank you and the RIR leaders for the incredible partnership you have shown me in the last few difficult months. Really. My personal thanks to each one of you.

And to my Board members, both Ray and Kuo-Wel, for guiding me through, frankly, me not understanding a lot of the history and the details and being patient with me as we negotiate and respecting – and my hats off especially to John who is in DC – respecting the fact that we agreed together that ICANN will be the interlocutor to the US government and until the last second you have and I thank you for that. Really thank you for that.

Our partnership now and the next few months is even more important, because if we are not aligned and strong together – and you saw that I used you to protect the discussion on Monday, right? You noticed that. When people were attacking some of the boxes on the slide saying, “Why can't we get into that box?” I said, “This is defined by the RIRs. This is not for us to discuss here.”

So you are our back and we are your back, and on that basis, let's continue this partnership and thank you sincerely for being patient with me personally during a tough period.



STEVE CROCKER: Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I suggest we hold this room for another 30 minutes so we can have a real numbers controversy at ICANN.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

