
SINGAPORE – ALAC Work Part II
Tuesday, March 25th 2014 – 14:00 to 16:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

SUSIE JOHNSON: Welcome to the ALAC Work Part II from Singapore, 14:00 Singapore local time. Please remember to state your name when speaking for transcript purposes. We have live interpretation in French, Spanish, and Chinese, so please state your name when speaking in order to identify you on the various language channels as well as for transcript purposes. Please also speak at a reasonable speed in order to allow for accurate interpretation.

Over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Susie. Welcome, everyone, to the second part of our discussions today. We have three things to deal with this afternoon in the next two hours.

First, we have a hot topic discussion which here is written as “internationalization of IANA.” We had “globalization of IANA” which put us in trouble, “internationalization of IANA” which will put us in even more trouble, and is it “IANA stewardship”?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Stewardship of –

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.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: “Stewardship of IANA function,” there we go. So, the first action item is to change the title to “Stewardship of IANA function.” I think we all know the topic. We’ve discussed it this morning with the Board. I wanted to bring forward another additional request which was made, but first I’ll open the floor for some initial comments and then we can dig into the additional request. Tijani Ben Jemaa?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, about the name. It is the transition of the stewardship of the IANA function. This is the name, the complete name.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. And for the record, that’s on the 25th of March. We’ll see what it is on the 26th. Evan or Holly, who’s first? Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: I’d also like to identify clearly what we’re going to talk about. I don’t think any of us really want to go into the technical details. I think our focus possibly is on technical for some high-level principles, but it’s really more about the accountability/enforceability question mark issue that is the big issue for us and for ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Holly. Tijani Ben Jemaa?



TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I don't know why we are speaking only about IANA function, about the stewardship of IANA function. There is also the stewardship of ICANN, also. There is also the accountability of ICANN. So we have, perhaps, to speak about it, too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Tijani. These are two different things. And what's on the table today is just the IANA function, for the time being. It has been made clear that the ICANN itself, ICANN accountability is not something that's immediately on the table. It is the IANA function.

I have Evan Leibovitch then Rinalia Abdul Rahim and Fouad Bajwa. So, Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Actually, Olivier, my question is to you in terms of the discussion. So you're saying that the discussion right now for today as a hot topic is specifically on IANA, not talking about the separate track of the accountability issue? That we're not dealing with both today, or just this is the main thing that we're going to focus on? I just...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Evan. The accountability was related closely to the ATRT-2 (Accountability and Transparency Review Team), which is somehow a topic that is slightly different to the actual topic of IANA. The topic of IANA effectively is the removal of the U.S. government oversight and control of the IANA function – function – not of IANA but of the IANA function.



Which was effectively, for those of you that – I’m going to profess, aren’t I? – those of you that don’t know any new addition or removal from the global root as far as ccTLDs are concerned, as far as gTLDs are concerned, has to go through a process where there needs to be a tick in the box from the U.S. Department of Commerce before Verisign actions it. That’s what’s changing.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Okay. So now that you’ve answered that, so I guess I want to make a bit of a comment that sort of comes out of the discussions we had with the Board this morning.

And that’s that I found there to be a couple of very confusing things that are conflated, and I think we need to get a little bit of clarity between them.

One of which is making the IANA functions themselves accessible to end-users. That’s an education issue. I think it’s something in which we’ve taken a leadership position in. The Board was making crystal-clear to us, yes, these things have been made elsewhere available within ICANN. I think we need to check for ourselves whether or not they’re sufficiently accessible at the level of other educational materials that we’ve made.

Before we can go and have a true bottom-up grassroots process, we’ve got to make sure that there’s not a lot of FUD (fear, uncertainty, and doubt), which is what I’ve seen in a lot of the media reports that have come out on this issue. When you have Sarah Palin coming out and talking about some of the things she does – yes, that expert on ICANN



functions, Sarah Palin, who can see Russian routers from her home – it just makes me wonder about the public perception of what’s going on. So I think we have a role to play in making those issues clear.

Having said that, there was a significant part of the Board discussion this morning that was not, to my mind, clarifying what we need to do in the sense of, yes, it’s one thing to know what IANA does. But now, ICANN is being tasked to recreate some body that will provide the stewardship over IANA to replace the U.S. government function. That’s a significant thing that needs to be done.

And so I think one of the things we need to focus on going forward, at a governance level, is what is going to replace the U.S. government in the stewardship? How is that going to be done? How do we contribute to that? I think that’s one thing that we need to get involved with. As an action item, I’m going to suggest later on to perhaps put this in the realm of Future Challenges Working Group, in terms of stewarding this particular issue going forward.

Anyway, that’s my piece for now. But I think in terms of focus, this is where we need to be.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Can I just ask you one thing? Do you believe that it is for the ALAC to draft this information for end-users, or should we be helped in having, perhaps, staff draft or some of the SOs and ACs draft their bit and use us as a channel or a collector of that information to channel it out?



EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm going to go under the assumption – in fact, Fadi himself has made reference to the mischaracterization and the FUD on multiple occasions. Senior management of ICANN is surely aware of the communications issues and the global confusion over this. So I'm assuming that elsewhere within the organization, they're also trying to figure out how to make this accessible.

It's a communications issue. I guess Sally has a role to play in this. There's other senior staff. If we can engage and if we can help in our role of supposedly being the eyes and ears of global end-users, if there's a role we can play, I guess I agree with you that this is not something that we need to undertake on our own but work with partnership with ICANN's own communications bodies to figure out not only what the message is and how to send it out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Evan. Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The issue of stewardship of the IANA function and ICANN accountability, they're both integrally linked. They decoupled it to make sure that they can handle the inputs that are coming in for each one of them. But as we move forward in trying to deal with the IANA issue, we have to keep in the back of our heads how does this relate to accountability of ICANN?



And I thought that Internet.NZ had come up with a very useful tool for us to actually begin to grapple with that because they have diagrams with options. I would like to request that they actually be given an opportunity to present that to the ALAC. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rinalia. I note that further down the list that Ellen Strickland is here. Do you have those in your possession? You do? Have you shared them with staff, or would you be able to share them with us?

ELLEN STRICKLAND: Sorry. I distributed a copy of it yesterday on the At-Large Discuss, so there should be a document there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. I think it's on the APRALO Discuss, but let's get staff to – in anticipation to your intervention [inaudible].

And sorry, Anthony, you can't sit here because this is going to be for the ASO when they arrive. Well, no, sit here during the session and then, yeah. Next 30 minutes is fine.

Yeah, if staff can prepare this in anticipation for your intervention.

Let's go to our queue. Well, Rinalia, are you – was that your? Okay, fantastic. Fouad Bajwa, please.



FOUAD BAJWA:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm Fouad Bajwa, APRALO. I wanted to share some comments as an observer. This morning's meeting was something I would say for even developing countries to be very discouraging, the comments that were coming from the Board. Fundamentally, developing countries have always been behind in most of these processes, and this puts them even further in the backward position where they don't have the technical and the [record] knowledge.

Stewardship itself is about planning and management. So this is like two different things, and they'll be dealt with separately, as well. And this is where I believe that ALAC should, from this day forward, start planning its positions as well as sending in at least drafting statements and conveying these positions to ICANN and in such a strategic manner that they're not only just to be sent to them, but so also to be asserting of a position to them.

The concern of the users from developing countries at this stage, most of the people I've had discussions with, they're confused. They're really completely confused. And that confusion comes from the rising gap between these issues of planning, management, and then the technical side of IANA itself. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Fouad. Sorry, I have to talk, think, write, speak all at the same time. We've got José Arce. Right before that, we have Ellen Strickland.



ELLEN STRICKLAND:

Yeah, thank you very much, Rinalia, and for the opportunity to speak. I did actually sort of indicate to speak before presenting, but it relates to the paper that I circulated yesterday, which the team has developed.

And I would just like to stress, having attended the At-Large and Board meeting this morning, the importance that we see in a multi-stakeholder process around coming together with a vision for the future in a changed environment. There's a catalyst, here.

What we've offered is to try to look at the different components that are being handed over. So, acknowledging that it isn't one function that the U.S. government has served. We've listed it out as three, which is the contract of the IANA and RZM function; then the administrative role – the clerical role in the IANA process; and lastly, as the overall steward of the Internet's DNS.

And we think it's really important that all of these components be considered. Because what we need to come up with now, as a community, is a vision for a new process that works as well – or hopefully better – than this process, that takes into account that those functions aren't going to be done anymore.

And towards that discussion, what we did is try to shed some light on how it is now. So you can see, the first page – if you have the PDF – is an overview of those functions and looking at the kinds of separation that exist within policy, operations, and oversight.

And then we've gone through looking at the organizations that look after those, which have included the NTIA, ICANN, and Verizon, as well as the IETF and the IAB.



UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do you mean Verizon or Verisign?

ELLEN STRICKLAND: Oh, Verisign, sorry – yep, Verisign.

And then we've gone through and tried to just – from listening, looking at the proposals that have gone around – to try to make a consistent set of models that go from where we are now and what's being proposed by different groups or discussed.

And it's not to go through and make a judgment about them, but to have the opportunity to look at what are the different visions for the future we could have? So then we can talk about our different perspectives and the risks and opportunities that exist around these different models for all the people involved in all the institutions as well as broader users. So that everyone who is a stakeholder should be able to have input into this vision of the future post the transition.

Yeah, so we welcome – we've actually been approached by additional models. People who said, "Oh, well, I have a model that isn't here," and we're happy to – we're working with them to have some additional models.

And I guess what I'd like to add is what I'm working on at the moment, and this is my role. I'm collaboration and community lead for Internet.NZ. I'm very interested in the process and that we ensure that we provide feedback about the importance of the role of users in, as we said, the accountability and the stewardship.



That overall vision of the future needs to be something that we ensure that the people who have a stake in this – which is the whole Internet community and all users – to try to make it accessible to them through that work.

So I do support the idea of providing more information about what is the IANA function. That's partly what we've tried to provide some fodder for that discussion. Are there any questions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fouad Bajwa.

FOUAD BAJWA: Thank you, Ellen. What is really concerning for me when I look at the process going forward is one is the friction which is being created inside ICANN, where there's one Internet community over here. Then there's the broader Internet community out there, which is going to engaged as a starting point from the NETmundial. And that has already restricted participation in its sense that you only had 850 people allowed to go over there because that's the amount of space they have.

Now, when these things started from the source, which is [inaudible], 19,000 people were, in one day, present in those tents. And those negotiations are going on for ages, right? Nearly three years.

So the point is this: that version, there was an anticipation over there. Now, the reality's actually happening after more than – it's almost a decade, now. And within this space, the amount of confusion which is emerging – and when I look back, I might talk with people back at home



and with the community – for them, this whole transition, there needs to be information which is not just about IANA but how the stewardship process actually works.

I bumped into Steve Crocker right after the Board meeting this morning. I said, “After 14 years, this is when you’re thinking about IANA for governments? IANA for private sector? IANA for end-users?” Look how large this gap has been. Are we going to be able to reduce this gap just within a few weeks? Is it going to be done by NETmundial? I doubt it.

This is a very strong commitment that has to be made to the user community to bring them up-to-date, number one. And they’re not going to come to come to the ICANN website to look for it. There’s a lot of going back-and-forth.

So when this discussion happens – we did this for years in the IGF – when we say, “We want participation,” “We want this,” and, “We want that,” the reality is engagement. Rafi is a very good example, who’s sitting right next to you. He’s been in the IGF secretariat.

This whole issue about taking backward and forward these issues and actually building a certain point of view and bringing that back to these global settings is a very big challenge. I’m still really amazed at how easily everyone in ICANN is just saying, “We’re going to take it out. Here’s the accountability, this and that” like it’s happening between some few people. It’s not happening actually at the broader level.

So my concerns are the friction which are now being created, and this is going to add up to the trouble. Look at who’s going to be at the NETmundial: those countries, mostly those who didn’t agree to sign the



[inaudible]. You'll see more of the participants approved to that meeting.

And this is a reality. This is already in discussion between government people. Just to get the amount of friction this whole issue is creating, and I haven't heard a single word from anyone across ICANN about risk mitigation of this whole process. Where is that? If the end-users have to or the Internet users have to bring this forward to ICANN, I think that should be started.

And that's what I was mentioning earlier, that our positions should start now, not based on weeks but on days. Each time we come out with a position, if any members have accessibility to ICANN and they can quickly get it through, that has to be continuously made forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fouad. Can I just follow up on this? You mentioned "friction" with users around the world. Could you clarify a bit as to what friction?

FOUAD BAJWA: Friction, you can call it the temperature as it's rising on the issues.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But surely, the fact that the U.S. government is stepping back on this would have perhaps brought down the friction or brought down the heat.



FOUAD BAJWA:

No, that is one belief. It takes decades to reach multilateral treaties and, in this occasion, you're not going for a treaty format. None of the nations are going for a treaty format. This is a cooperation-based model. And that guy yesterday, when they were having that session with ICANN about the IANA issue when somebody mentioned use cases and they were talking about it's just technical, it's not going to be that anyway.

Planning and management: that's why I clearly mentioned that. Stewardship, I've left out the technical function because IANA, if you look at the technical part, IANA has no trouble. IANA functions really well as far as the technicalities are concerned. And as a person who comes from the technical background, I can tell you that is not our problem.

The problem is the planning and management process, and that is where the whole friction is going to be. And you have two opposing sides at the table who want to – even for them, at the moment, they don't understand this.

So this should be a process which is being regularly updated. It's not going to wait for three or four months or six months for a meeting to happen and then we'll have something brought forward. This has to happen on a, let's say, half-a-weekly basis, a weekly basis. People have to really seriously get into this because we are only assuming the users are believing this at the moment.

When we go back to our ALSes and when we come back with the issues, you'll see that – and you'll see it in London, actually – you'll see there is



concerns. You'll see the risks. You'll actually witness everything. And you will actually feel the friction where the issue are grinding against each other and nobody's clear about what are our positions, what are our statements?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fouad. I wanted to ask, actually, with a quick show of hands: How many of you were in the morning session yesterday on the issue of the IANA function? Oh, I see a lot of people. The morning session just after the opening session. Okay, I think nearly everyone here. Okay, that's great.

And how many of you were in the afternoon one? I know in the afternoon, there was a collision. Well, there were all sorts of things. The afternoon one was about accountability. So the morning was about the technical and the contracts and the afternoon, accountability. So, less, of course, because we had also something going on in this room at the same time.

The understanding behind it is that ICANN staff wishes to treat the two issues separately. And I think that probably is the correct way to look at it, although we know that the two are linked together. But certainly, on the accountability side, we definitely have some big questions. I see the issue as being on several levels.

In the morning, as you remember, the contract itself – so all the contractual stuff, is actually not just one contract. It's several contracts with several organizations. There was a discussion as to whether the ALAC should have been on the head table or not.



This morning meeting, by the way, was actually all put together by a group of us – myself included – the night before with Fadi and with senior staff and all of the Chairs of SOs and ACs. We discussed the ability for ALAC to be at that table or not. And there was one problem, and I think it was explained later – was it today or this morning? It was explained that this thing really had to hinge on top contracts between the affected parties. The morning session was really about the contracts and about how those contracts would need to evolve.

So, for example, the Protocol Parameters involve the Internet Architecture Board, which is part of the IETF. So Jari Arkko had to be at the head table. The General Purpose IP Address, as well the Regional Internet Registries, had to be at the head table and Adiel Akplogan was there for the head table. The Generic Domain Names, of course, we needed Jonathan Robinson from the GNSO Council to be here. And for the Country Code Top-Level Domains, of course, it was Byron Holland who was at the head table. And each one of these entities actually have a contract with the U.S. government at the moment.

And so this is the reason why: At-Large does not have a contract. Now, as far as contracts are concerned, I think we don't have very much to stand on because we're not into any contract at the moment. And there's not going to be any contract anyway because we're not actually running any of the infrastructure ourselves. These are organizations that have a specific responsibility.

As far as the accountability is concerned, that's a completely different kettle of fish. And I do have concerns that whilst I think we should understand that on the contract side, fair enough, that there's nothing



for us to deal with. On the accountability side, there needs to be a really core user involvement one way or other.

But I'm concerned that, at the moment, we're being batched in the same, saying, "Well, you're not in a contract, so you don't have anything to do with the accountability anyway." That's a concern.

I'm opening the floor. Some of it is stimulating. I see some say, "Yes," some say, "No." This is very interesting. I'm not quite sure who to start with.

Certainly, the first table which was shown to the SO and AC Chairs and SG Chairs on Friday, actually also had Future Accountability, which was not something that anyone agreed with.

On the contractual side, Fouad, you said that the technical side of things, there's no real problem with. In fact, there is. There is because there is a concern with regards to – well, at the moment, Verisign has got the contract for running things. In the future, well, Verisign doesn't have a contract already in the future. So do you then list Verisign there? Or do you not list Verisign there? It becomes political on that basis, as well. But I don't think it affects us directly – at least, not for the time being.

Fouad, back to you, and then I'll take everyone around the table.

FOUAD BAJWA:

Quick answers and quick reactions.



By “technical side,” I wasn’t referring actually to the contractual agreements, just for clarity. I’m talking about the technical functional management of the system itself. Who’s doing it and how they’re doing it, that’s a separate discussion.

Number two: yes, accountability is a major area where we can really continue to intervene on. What is really angering me in all these discussions out there, outside this room, is that they’re continuously stereotyping users. That is my problem.

And within the ICANN system, as long as we’re in an ICANN public meeting – and inside this public meeting, where the ACs, SOs, and all the constituencies are – when they talk about users, we are concerned. And if they want to market or if they want to project whatever version they have of the situation at-hand and saying, “We’re accountable to you”? Okay. I understand that when they say it that way.

But when they say, “We’re accountable to all the users across the world”? Hey, stop. That is the same problem which occurs with many organizations when they talk about within the context of global Internet governance and so forth.

So my concern at the moment is, yes, inside ICANN, it is accountable. But we don’t really know the model of the future where ICANN will be accountable globally. How can it be accountable globally? Who’s going to keep that check in balance? Against what points is it going to be audited? Who’s going to be enforcing something? What is the enforcement going to be like?



These are all factors which we call, like, look at the political economy of the situation. The political economy is being developed outside ICANN. Within, ICANN there is a political economy which exists. And they should not be using or not be trying to build a confidence around a community which exists within ICANN. It has its position. If it does not have a contractual agreement which – no contracts with ICANN, IANA, and NTIA – but, at the end of the day, the affectee is always the end-user of all these policies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Fouad. And I think you touched on this: accountability, transparency, and enforcement. The enforcement part is a big question mark, the chicken and egg scenario. Whatever outside organizations might enforce the accountability and the transparency, how are they themselves accountable and transparent? It basically goes up from level to level.

Let's start going through the queue. Tijani, I've got you down. I've got Ellen Strickland. I haven't caught anyone else put their cards up. Yeah, Fatima Cambroner or is it José? No? So it will be Fatima then. Okay, so let's start with Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. What kind of contract the GAC has with the U.S. government or with ICANN?



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The GAC is involved because the ccTLDs, some of them are run by governments.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The ccTLDs have contract, that's right. But the body who is running the ccTLD has the contract. It is not the whole government, and it is not the GAC at all. That's why we have exactly the [inaudible] status as the GAC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We'll note that. I have no point of view in that matter. Interesting thought, I hadn't thought about it. Ellen Strickland.

ELLEN STRICKLAND: I want to make a point that relates to what you were saying, Fouad, about the broader context as well as, I think, the relationship between ICANN accountability and this and that relationship.

And that what the U.S. government has said is the transition will happen and have asked ICANN to convene a multi-stakeholder process to decide how that happens. And one of the things that we have seen from what was proposed to the SO/AC Chairs was, again, those three components of oversight – stewardship – policy, and operations, that there seems to be a proposal or assumption, perhaps, that oversight goes to ICANN.

And that isn't what's been asked to happen. What's been asked to happen is a process, the convening of a process to look at those three functions.



And so, I think it's very important that the whole ecosystem is engaged in this. That's what's been asked for. And from the many sessions I've been in with the U.S.G. that's here, they're saying that is a condition of it being handed over, that that happens. So it's not acceptable that we be thinking this is a foregone conclusion, that this is about just handing over to ICANN and that through ICANN processes, we can make a plan.

Towards that, my point is that there is step before planning, which is about a vision for the future. And you can't make a plan unless you have an agreed vision of where we're going. And that vision needs to include other institutions. It needs to include broad engagement. We need to be thinking about our role in that as At-Large Structures.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Ellen. Next is Fatima Cambroner. And by the way, in the meantime, we've actually scrolled now to the overview of functions that you were speaking about earlier, although it's a bit difficult to read. You can read it on your Adobe Connect. It's sent on the list and yes, apologies. It was sent on the At-Large list, I understand. Fatima Cambroner?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. After Ellen's comment, what I'm going to say is a bit obvious. But I do agree what the other speakers mentioned before. There is a certain degree of confusion inside ALAC with all this process. And I would like to make a call for election so that we can invite experts so that they can explain to us. And to organize webinars or call



conference so that we can become informed about this process that we are initiated or been part to.

I do understand that after this process, we will get to the conclusion that we need a new mechanism, a new organization, or organism that will be the steward of all these functions. Or perhaps any of the mechanisms already existing will be useful.

But what came out of all of this, although it might not be related to this – as Rinalia said – this has to do with the accountability meeting that we have yesterday, where there was a need to have an external, independent body that may be in charge of this accountability function.

So that is what they have in common, these two issues that we are now dealing with in parallel. And within this context, I understand that NETmundial is another instance of this process. And perhaps, before that, NETmundial didn't have the same meaning and now it has a different meaning.

I would also like to say that we may need, while reviewing this technical function that ALAC does not have, we can make a self-review and decide what could be our inputs so that we can participate with a rationale. And not just because we need to participate, so that we can provide the right inputs so that we can move forward.

So in that sense, I would like to remind you that we may have a role. We can embrace the other players who have knowledge in technical issues and work together with them. The idea of participating just because made us be someone to legitimate this multi-stakeholder model and



this is not the case. I think we need to provide valuable input and we can be valuable in providing input in this process. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima. And when you mentioned the action item for a webinar, I remembered this morning's action items from the meeting with the Board, where one of the action items for Fadi to follow up on a webinar and a beginner's guide on the IANA function and the IANA transition.

I think that the webinar is something that we probably need pretty quickly. And it, obviously, will need to be interpreted in Spanish and in French, as well. That's something that's important enough, so perhaps we could add the languages to this. Yeah, the other ones are not to do with that, but this one is particularly important, so yes.

As to the rest of your declaration and your suggestions, let's open the floor. Let's see if there's traction. Personally, I think they're all very good ideas. We need to engage in this proactively. Fouad Bajwa?

FOUAD BAJWA: When issues of global importance, when they come into your court, the approach is to start certain very well-managed and organized activities in parallel.

So if we were to advocate our user position, we should start that. We should start out with capacity building. We have to be really strong in understanding ourselves that where are the issues which are really affecting us?



And then we need another group which looks beyond ICANN, as well. Because if such a function is created in the future, an independent global function, we also have to bridge ourselves within that setting.

So I think that earlier this morning, Jean-Jacques posed about the Future Issues Working Group in ALAC. So that's initiated in parallel. That is really important, as well, because I was thinking over it continuously.

Capacity building? Deal it at all the three levels. Webinars should start immediately. Even if we can get a recording of a webinar, which we can make available even to our members back home. That is really important. Because at the end of the day, a lot of people in our part of the world have problems participating and actually accessing those webinars.

Published materials? I think we really don't have to go into paperwork, but we can have a good amount of PDF documentation and more visual than text. That will really help in explaining these issues back home.

So open up in parallel on various fronts so that by the time real activities start happening or when we engage with these – within ICANN and outside ICANN – we're well-prepared.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fouad. And of course, this morning's action item will also obtain clarification on the amount of material that is going to be made available. It's obvious that there needs to be material made available even though this is a very short time frame.



Just a couple of things more. We have a meeting with ASO in a few minutes. We might wish to also touch on this issue. The discussion with the ASO is going to be specifically about this issue, as well. So I don't know whether we wish to think of anything in advance of that or we'll just continue the flow and then when the ASO leadership joins us, then we'll just be able to continue.

Oh, don't know who is the first one who – so first, we have Leon Sanchez, and then we'll have Eduardo Diaz. So, Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Olivier. If I understood well this morning, what we're about to define is the transition on the stewardship of the IANA function, not the IANA function itself. As things are today, we users don't have a saying on the IANA function. But that doesn't mean we won't have a saying forever. So we might as well considering having a saying on the IANA function as a result of this process.

And also, I think that – if I understood well – the NTIA communication is very clear in stating that obviously we're defining the process of this stewardship transition, but as a result of this process, we also will define the mechanism on which the stewardship will be taken on the future.

I mean, my lawyer mind structure doesn't let me be apart from my profession, and I think of checks and balances. I think that we have the responsibility as users to establish a very well-identified system of checks and balances in this stewardship mechanism that will allow us, as users, to raise our voices in the case that we do not agree on how the



stewardship is being carried out. I think that's what we should focus, into defining these checks and balance for the good of the community.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leon. Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to express my confusion here with this theme, because I – like you said – I see this as a two-pronged thing. You have the IANA contracts, and those things have to be figured out. And even though if we are not part of the contracts, I'm not sure if we as user have to participate in the process of how those contracts are going to be changed from one place to another one.

And then, on the other side, you have accountability, which I didn't have a chance to go yesterday. And I don't know if they have a panel in the same way they had it first in the morning. They had somebody there, saying, "This is the people who are going to be working on accountability."

And going back to the meeting this morning with the Board, it was a strange meeting. And I think we were talking like this. They were talking about IANA and maybe, and they're talking about doing this contract thing with these four elements. But then, they say, "Once that's done, we're going to do accountability and the multi-stakeholder thing." Things are happening at a different phase, and they should be in parallel.



I'm confused. And if I'm confused, it's going to be very hard for me to go back to my ALS and explain what's going on. So it's very important that we, as a group, we understand this or we have a position on it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Eduardo. Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Two or three remarks. First, geo-strategic overview, if I may. What's all this about? If you look at it from the point of view of policy planning from some government or a group of governments, what the NTIA statement – which is carefully crafted, actually – should lead us to understand that there's several reasons why the NTIA came out when it did come out.

One of the reasons has nothing to do with the IANA function at all, I think, which is that – in a way – Washington had to react to the whole thing about NSA and GCHQ. In other words, the Snowden revelations. We can't shoo that away. It's a fact.

The second remark in the geo-strategic area is that the United States seems to be saying, "Look, you don't want to continue oversight by one government? Okay. So now, we – Washington – require that heretofore, it will not be any government." You remember their statement says, "Administration by mechanisms not governmental or intergovernmental."



So I think that we have to be aware of that. In other words, Washington is placing the standards very high for another form of stewardship.

Now, to come down to a more practical level, I have two remarks. What this morning's session between the ALAC and the Board told me was that we were speaking past each other.

Olivier, you asked me something after the meeting and we had a private word about that, so I won't come back on the detail. But for me, it's quite serious. We have to take care not to be speaking in a language which, perhaps even for bad reasons, is not comprehended, is not understood by the Board or other parts of the community. So that means that we have to always prepare this kind of major subject in a more careful way.

The other remark about practicalities is that whereas we can prepare internally – in fact, we have to, to be spot-on on all these subjects: on the technicalities, on the legal aspects, on the international aspects – I'm afraid we cannot claim, from the start, that we must be part of this. I think that's a very, very difficult statement to make, that At-Large or the end-user or whatever you call it, of course he has a stake, but very indirectly. So to claim that we must be part of that consultation is pretty difficult.

Of course, the CEO – because he is CEO – will always answer, "Oh, yes, of course you're part of it." But there's a difference between saying that and actually making it happen.

So my conclusion on this last remark of mine is that we will probably have to go through the processes which are already open for that,



meaning public comment periods, the things which Fadi has opened to the public. We have to respond along those lines. I'm afraid that the only other way would be to make an ALAC statement. But there's no intermediate solution for expression general user point of view than those existing mechanisms.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. On the part of non-government involvement or the non-involvement of governments that was in the NTIA letter, a clarification was requested by some GAC members from Larry Strickling himself because there was a rumor that was going around that this actually meant the United States did not want any government to be involved with any participation, whether it would be multi-stakeholder or whether it would be multi-lateral.

The response that was given was that there was a wish to avoid a multi-lateral involvement, but if governments were to be involved in a multi-stakeholder building of the future, that would be absolutely accepted. So that's one of the points which required clarification and which was made yesterday.

On the other points that you make, certainly I think we will have to have an At-Large statement at some point, maybe more than one, even. This is not a sprint; this is a marathon. This is something that is not going to be done quickly.

I spoke to Fadi late last night at the gala and let him know that Rome wasn't built in a day and it looks as though, because the frenzy started on the last Friday or Friday a week ago, we already have ready-built



solutions which are now being presented and shared via all sorts of means: the media, etc., which seems to be the silver bullet, but the silver bullet for each one of the organizations that are presenting it.

And one of the big concerns is that some might think that this actually is a reboot of ICANN, going back 15 years. All past work is off the table now. Let's start again. Let's build something brand-new. Let's change everything radically. And there's a real concern that this might destabilize the organization, as well.

That's definitely not the case. We're not dealing with a reboot. We're dealing with just a set of contracts at the moment and, certainly, the search for a new accountability mechanism and a new enforcement mechanism.

So that's in addition to what you said. The question I do have, actually, for this community is whether we need to have a working group created to deal with this or whether we can already house this under an already-existing working group – ad hoc working group or it existing?

First, Jean-Jacques and Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry, I'm just going to reiterate what I suggested earlier and that it could be handled by – and I think would be very appropriate to be put under – Future Challenges, given that this is a think tank looking forward, non-regimented approach to this that allows us to accept all.

And I think it would be appropriate, and also noting the comments earlier that simply because one or both of us, the Chairs, may be term-



limited on ALAC does not keep us from being involved as Chairs of the working group.

So having said that, I think we're both interested in the topic, interested in shepherding this through. I think it's appropriate. If there's a desire to make a special group for this, so be it. But I think it's suitable and appropriate for Future Challenges. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Evan. And for the record, you don't need to be an ALAC member to be Chair of a working group. We've had some working groups that were not ALAC members.

Was it just Alan or anybody else? Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Couple of comments on what Jean-Jacques said. First of all, I disagree. I think it is fair game for us to say don't forget us when we're putting together various working groups and components of whatever it is that will be deciding things, and perhaps the end results if the end result is indeed a multi-stakeholder operation.

However, I think that puts the onus on us to then be informed, useful contributors to the process. And we don't get a seat just because we're there. Or maybe we do get one because we're there, but then we better contribute and have something to put forward in the process.

So I strongly support some activity within At-Large to be thinking about what the alternatives are. There aren't a lot of obvious answers to how



we address these problems. We're going to need some innovative thinking, and we're as capable of that as any. We won't come up with the final answer, but we may contribute to it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. And I'm afraid I need to cut this discussion short, because various members of the ASO and ASO Address Council have arrived.

What I suggest is that we continue this discussion at 16:00 at the end of this session. We have another 15 minutes to discuss this. We need to agree on action items. And I would like, also, you to have a look at a proposed joint statement from SO and AC Chairs regarding the announcement from NTIA.

So thanks very much, all of you, and let's move to the next part of our agenda and that's our meeting with the – it's written on the agenda as the Meeting With the ASO, which I believe is both ASO, RIRs, Address Council, NRO, and the whole ecosystem coming to see us.

So, Louie? Louie and Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Listen, I don't mind being here, but I wasn't expecting to be the one. I think Adiel, the NRO Chair is on his way and should take his seat. But until he does, I'm okay if you are.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, welcome, and apologies for the cramped space. Usually, we have a wider table, but this is a long room so we're a little bit close together.

This meeting with the ASO is actually now a regular occurrence that we've had at, I think, every single ICANN meeting recently. Well, this is the last two, only, and more. So effectively, looking at the agenda page, there are a couple of items – in fact, no, there is just one item. And that's NETmundial and the IANA function.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, goodbye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Adiel, we saved you a seat up here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For those people who cannot see the head table, Paul Wilson tried to run away but was lassoed back and is now at the table. Fantastic, thank you. Welcome, gentlemen. We're trying to get name cards.

So the topic on the table is NETmundial and the IANA function. Okay, they're in one sentence. There is an "and" in between the two. They're to be treated separately. We understand they are separate things. And I'm not quite sure whether we should start with NETmundial or the IANA function first. And I'll leave it down to Adiel Akplogan, sitting next to me, to my left, and to Louie Lee, sitting one seat further, to start and to let us know which one of the two topics we should start with.



ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Thank you, Olivier. I think we do not have a specific preference, here. I think the meeting is for us to exchange on those two topics with the ALAC, so up to you. The one which is more important for you maybe we start with, and then we move through the second one so we can drop it if we don't have time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Adiel. So you might have not heard, but this morning the ALAC has met with the Board. And the one topic that was discussed was the IANA function. Unfortunately, we had the title as "IANA Globalization," we had a title just to the previous session. Now it's being "IANA Internationalization" and we got hit on the fingers for using those terms – bearing in mind these agendas were built over two months ago.

So we're effectively dealing now with IANA. Holly, you've got the right – microphone, please.

HOLLY RAICHE: "The Transition of the Stewardship of the IANA Function."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Thank you, Holly. And we're well-aware of what the transitions means and of the different parts of the whole challenge that we're faced with. We have requested, from the Board, to receive more clarity as to exactly what is involved through a webinar that will be



dispensed to our members. But we have also identified a number of real concerns that we have, especially in respect to Internet users out there.

If there is confusion that you see in the papers and what's been written outside these walls, at the moment, we really could have a role to play in clearing up some of that confusion and in helping out. And so far, this avenue doesn't appear to have been even evaluated or looked at it by the Board or by ICANN staff.

So I think perhaps as a first step, it would be interesting to hear from you gentlemen as what you see as being the current transition and what it is at stake. And then we can compare notes with you as to what we have understood it to be and then see where we can move forward from there.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay. I will try to lay down our understanding.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And if you can introduce yourself. Everything is interpreted in two languages, so we do need to say our names before.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: So, Adiel from AFRINIC and Chair of the NRO, as well. I think the accurate way of presenting this is effectively the transition of the stewardship role of the U.S. government from where it is today to another mechanism that is multi-stakeholder. So to make sure the IANA function – which is one element, as I say yesterday, of ICANN globally; it



is not everything that ICANN does but it is just one aspect of it – is in check and it perform at the expectation of those who benefit from the service. But also take into consideration the community expectation as whole.

So it is the transition of that stewardship, specifically, that we are talking about. It may have a link with ICANN globalization, internationalization, whatever we call it, but that is something very specific. And I'm happy that we are aligning, now, toward that definition and that understanding of [what it is].

Now, going back to the function itself, as you have seen, the IANA function has several element of it. And practically for all [inaudible] NRO, we have the number aspect, the IP address as number aspect of that function. Which is that the IANA, today, allocate, register those number to the RIR.

And that allocation or the management of those number general purpose unallocated resources are done based on global policy. And I think that is also some very specificity that we have in our way of dealing with IANA that need to be understood by everybody is that we have those global policy, which are defined by our respective community.

Every global policy has to be proposed in each region, agreed by the community through a different policy-development process. That is where the ASO come in to ensure that in all the five region, a policy, for instance, got consensus, follow the PDP, and then they report that back to ICANN Board for ratified. And it is that policy that IANA use to



manage the number resources. There is no link between those policy and the original policy which we, as RIR, we use individually to manage number resources.

So what we are talking about here is the global policy applying to IANA functions, specifically, not the original policy. Probably, Louie will say more about the role of the ASO in that global policy aspect.

For us, the process of what will be the mechanism for that stewardship going forward has to be conducted in a very wide-open way, involving the community beyond the ICANN framework. I think that has been said and repeated several times. And at the NRO level, that is our position, as well.

We are prepared to engage our various community, as well, into this process because we are one of the direct recipient of IANA service today. And we want to make sure that our community is aware, well-informed about the process, what will the process will be and also provide those necessary information for us to input into the process.

So that what I can say briefly to start with. I'm here with my other colleague from the NRO AC and the NRO, as well. And I'm sure that they will be able, also, to contribute where needed. So, Louie, you want to add anything?

LOUIE LEE:

There's really nothing for me to add at this point about our involvement in the global policy. I stated it once earlier this week, on Monday morning. But I'd like to see if there are any questions about how the



global policy works, at least in regards to our relationship with IANA – if that helps with any kind of talk about accountability, whether IANA is actually implementing the policy the way that we expected IANA to.

Up until now, when IANA sees a possible issue with implementing a global policy, we do see them coming back to us and asking us for advice. They may offer a couple ways to implement the policy. They don't care one way or the other how to implement, but they want us to tell them how to do it. And "us" being not just Address Council in the ASO, but when they ask us to do that, we actually go back to the global community to find out if the implementation matches – in which direction of implementation matches the intent of the policy.

So, in that way, there's a little bit of accountability in that they do come back to us about it, but we don't have much of a mechanism that I can see. If they choose to implement it a different way, without consulting us – or even after consulting us – other than that, that we are a customer of IANA and they have their own customer stats to report on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah, I'll maybe add to that that beside that, especially on the implementation, the operation side, as RIR we have regular meeting with IANA staff and ICANN Board, as well, on the operational performance of IANA service, which happen regularly, where we review what is being done by IANA related to numbers specifically.



So we have to put this in that very specific context of our relationship with IANA and raise issue where they are and try to work with IANA to fix them. Those meeting happen regularly when we see issue. And to add to that, we also contribute to the ICANN budget based on that service as is provided by IANA.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Adiel. Paul Wilson and then Holly Raiche.

PAUL WILSON: I just thought the description so far has been very good, but I found it quite helpful in some of those discussions to make a couple of things very clear about our structure, which are often missed because I think from RIR's perspective, there's so much more about names in ICANN than there is about numbers and so many assumptions are made.

So one thing that's really important is to understand that ASO structure puts all addressing policy matters outside of ICANN. So the ASO PDP produces global addressing policies that go into ICANN. The role of ICANN is that the Board will ratify those policies to make sure that there is not an objection or a problem in terms of process or other stakeholder groups. Then, the policy goes to IANA for implementation.

So we actually have this complete separation between ICANN and the policy process that comes out of the RIR regional communities. And that's something that's really important to understand because the vision is not so clear in other cases.



The thing, then, about that relationship is that it's very clean and easy to define. So we actually do have a set of agreements – the ASO MoU being one of them – that says that ICANN will implement those policies, through IANA, will implement those policies faithfully. Just thought it's worth pointing out that kind of fundamental feature of the addressing side of things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Paul. Andres Piazza? First, I'll take Holly Raiche and then Andres.

HOLLY RAICHE: A couple of things. I think – before I forget it – Paul, the point you raise which is really almost the complete separation. I hadn't taken into account how complete it is. It's almost as if developing the component of the whole issue of the transition of the stewardship, the technical bit is almost us dealing directly with you. Because if we go through ICANN, it's like – you're actually the holders of that part of the transition, really, from the way you've talked about it.

PAUL WILSON: I think it depends on the way you look at it, Holly. I'm not sure whether that sort of relationship's – you're talking about a relationship between Addressing and At-Large?



HOLLY RAICHE: I think what I'm saying is I hadn't realized that – one of the issues that At-Large has is putting our hands up and saying, "Actually, not only do we have an interest and would like a say in" – as you know, Fadi has actually separated the issues really separately into the IANA functions, i.e., technical – and maybe that isn't our bailiwick, although we think it is – versus the issues around the stewardship, accountability, that sort of stuff, that are more clearly in our bailiwick.

I think what I'm reflecting is I hadn't realized how separate the technical issues are and how, really, although you've got an MoU with ICANN, it's you guys that do it. And so, really, it's almost a direct relationship – instead of us going through ICANN, it's almost as if we through you for that aspect of this transition.

PAUL WILSON: That's why I think it's a matter of opinion. What is the role of ICANN?

HOLLY RAICHE: Maybe that's what I'm asking.

PAUL WILSON: Well, in some sense, the ICANN Board is aggregating the interests of many stakeholder groups. And its function is to make decisions and one of its functions is, under our agreement, to ratify those global policies.

So, in theory, it's a place where some concerns with global policies could be expressed. And that would be a role of ICANN, to bring that



perspective. But there may be other ways to do it, and that's why I say it seems like there are options.

Just one other thing I forgot to mention: the U.S. government has got absolutely nothing to do with any allocations that IANA makes. So we don't have U.S. government approval required for anything that we do, either. That's another thing that's worth bearing in mind.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I had a second part to the question. What was said at this morning's Board meeting was what, I thought, quite a stark statement, which is essentially the IETF – it's afternoon – tells IANA what to do and then they do it.

And it sounded awfully dictatorial, almost as if that's the beginning and end of the role. And I'm hearing that perhaps it's not that simple.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Still have Andres in the queue, but I'll first go to Adiel, and then to Andres Piazza. Then we'll continue with [inaudible].

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yeah, I think I just want to reassure you that in term of consultation in this transition of [inaudible], the consultation is wide open. We are going to lead that within our community as any other stakeholder group will do. And ICANN will do that. And we'll get feedback into the process.



So that will happen. And people will be called to contribute, to participate. Using any of the channel, that will be open. But for sure, we will formally engage our community in this because they are the first recipient of this service and they are the one who define the global policy which IANA used to provide a number. So going through the ICANN process or going through the RIR process, at the end of the day, it will come into the same basket.

In term of dictatorship maybe, to tone that down a little bit, is that the IETF has a community behind them. And that community is the one who define the standard. And when they define the standard, they also define the Protocol Parameter that goes with them. And how are those Protocol Parameter, what are the policy for that?

And then they give that to IANA to execute. So then behind each of us, there is a community that is multi-stakeholder, that has different variety but very focused on that specific topic, which is IP address for us, protocol standard for IETF, and so on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is Andres Piazza.

ANDRES PIAZZA: Well, actually, I was allowed to say two remarks and Paul made one, Adiel made the other. So just to wrap it up, Paul make the remark of the role of the U.S. government in our policies and Adiel about our communities and the process that will be starting in the IANA oversight discussion.



I certainly know the structure of the RALOs, and I want to encourage, especially to the RALO, that the regions are not similar, not exactly the same as the RIR division of the regions but very, very similar. So they have in the RIR communities and in this discussion, this same process that will eventually find its place in the same basket here at the ICANN community.

But we will be dealing with five different process in our five different communities with the discussion of the IANA oversight – particularly in the LACNIC space. We have a brand-new list for that discussion open, and we will do that in our next meeting. And for the RALOs, there is an opportunity to have the discussion in their own regions with the RIRs. And I really encourage them to engage in those discussions.

There will be ten events – well, actually, some of the RIRs already did the first event in the year. But there are plenty of opportunities in your region to discuss this. And this is the opportunity that I think you still have at the RALOs, considering that we have over 150 ALSes and there should be input there. So maybe there's something to – there's a helpful space at the RIR communities to engage with. That was the very first point, so thank you for the opportunity.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Andres. You mentioned...

ANDRES PIAZZA: Let me say thank you for the opportunity of being here, also. I feel like home, here, so I'm glad about that.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome back. You mentioned the mailing list for local regional engagement of all stakeholders. I wonder, is this something that all of the RIRs are currently doing? Not question just aimed at you, it's aimed at all of the representatives here. Are there similar initiatives, or is it maybe done differently?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Well, in our region specifically, we have call for the discussion to happen on two mailing list. We have the African mailing lists that we host, which is one of the lists dedicated to ICANN-related issue, that's host by AFRINIC. And we have our resource policy mailing list, as well.

We are much observing what is going to happen here, at this ICANN meeting, to have more clarity on the final process, as well, to define precisely what other mechanisms we are going to use. In our next meeting that we are going to have in Djibouti, for instance, we're going to have a panel dedicated to this where we are going to have input. And during this kind of meeting, we have had good cooperation with the RALO in our region. AFRALO, last year, has a session during the African Internet summit.

So we are going to have that consultation at those meeting, as well. But I think most of the input are going to come from online platform, which are mainly used there.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Adiel. APNIC? Okay, thank you. I don't know if anybody from RIPE or from...first I was going to get the answer to my question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, if I may use Wilfried Woeber.

WILFRIED WOEBER: [inaudible], Wilfried Woeber, one of the three members of the Address Council for the RIPE region. And just in line with many of the other statements that we had already, in our structure there is two different things.

One is extremely similar to all the other five regions: this is the Address Policy Working Group, as we are calling it. And this is specifically dealing with all the aspects of policy for distributing resources within the region as well as being the vehicle to join in with the discussion about global policy. So this is the very focused thing.

In parallel to that, there is since – if I remember correctly – since about two or three years, there is a separate working group and a separate mailing list infrastructure for interaction with other bodies and other groups and other projects. This is covering, certainly, the issues in the European region with interaction like with the European Commission and with other things. But this is naturally, I think, also the platform and the vehicle to deal with questions or discussions in this framework.

And the third thing to come up is our next physical meeting's going to be in May in Warsaw, in Poland. And there is certainly going to be a



major item on the agenda for that one, for obvious reason. So I hope this is good enough for this question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Absolutely, Wilfried. Thank you.

WILFRIED WOEBER: Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you may pass the microphone to the ARIN representative – will you take it? Introduce yourself, please.

CATHY HANDLEY: Cathy Handley with ARIN. And we're fortunate because we're first RIR that's going to have a meeting following this week and all of the announcements. And that's in three weeks in Chicago.

We are in the process of trying to get our hands around what's been said this week and all of the processes. And we'll have some lists probably over and above our standard public policy mailing list and that available for comment.

So I encourage you to look at ARIN.net and watch. There should be some announcements there.



PAUL WILSON: Maybe I should jump in. I didn't realize we were doing around the table on what all the RIRs are doing but we are – I mean, I don't really need to say much about it except that we going to, naturally, launch into a particular, purposeful community dialogue about this. I won't use "consultation" because I think it actually is a bit of a risky word, as we heard the other day. But definitely a dialogue, and a structured one, that will feed back.

And I think, as I pointed out in the forum the other day, I think we really need to express an expectation that ICANN's consultation – or whatever it is – is an iterative affair and that we actually will get the chance to comment on and then to see the comments, taken into account in successive iterations of whatever it is that's being produced.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Paul. Wilfried, you wanted to just add one thing. I do realize we are two minutes over the limit and we still have two questions. I sent Heidi to ask the Chair of RSSAC if it was possible to...

WILFRIED WOEBER: It's going to be very brief. What I forgot to say is that our mailing lists and contributions are open to anyone from around the globe. So there is no membership thing; there is no restriction. If anyone wants to join in in the discussion, everybody's help is welcome to do so.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think it's the same for all. And we've covered this in prior meetings with the ASO and NRO.



We have Eduardo Diaz, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, and I think with the question is and maybe Fatima, but no. I'm afraid we really are beyond – changed my mind at the moment. So, Eduardo, quickly, please.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Very quickly, Mr. Chair. Maybe I miss it or I came late, but I'm curious, yesterday in the morning, I was under the impression that one of your organization has a written contract with the U.S. government. Is that correct or this is just we're talking about a relationship that is based on this multi-stakeholdering thing? Thank you.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Well, none of our organization have a contract with the U.S. government. We are a recipient of IANA service and those service, we receive them directly from IANA without going through any contract with the U.S. government. And that service is what we say we review regularly for the NRO.

I'm talking about the numbers aspect of this. We review regularly with ICANN Board and IANA staff to make sure that they provide – I think that will be useful, as well, is to read the report that IANA produce on their website that touched specifically on this to see exactly what is the expectation we are talking about here, when you come to [inaudible]. So, no, there is not in my knowledge any contract between us and the U.S. government.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Adiel, so it's not a contract. Is it an agreement? Is there something signed?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: No, not between us and the U.S. government. We have an MoU with ICANN for the ASO, which is called the ASO MoU, which is public, which define the policy process between us and ICANN because, as I explained, it's separate.

We have an exchange of letter with ICANN where we agree to contribute to ICANN budget up to certain level to support the IANA function service. That's all. There is nothing else beside that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question: As I understand it, the regional community dialogue is about to start for each region. And I'm sure that the timing is not quite exact for all of them. And I'm sure that you would have defined when the first round of comments need to come in so that you can have a look at it and then compare across regions so that you know if there could be a global positioning. I just wanted to have a sense of what that timeline could be for the first round of input coming in.

The second point or question is I've seen indications from the IETF community saying that they are quite happy with the IANA performance



and of its functions. And I wanted to know whether the RIRs are of the same position regarding to the services provided for you.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Okay, I will start in that order. Well, that what I said before. We want to see what will be the final timeline, a roadmap after this consultation of ICANN [at the first], because something is sure. ICANN has been requested to lead or organize this, even if it is beyond the committee.

So we will have the consultation or the dialogue at the different RIR, but the inputs to the global process will depend on what is the global timeframe will be. And that timeframe I'm not sure is defined yet, completely. So, at the end, we will have a point where we will rally, but for sure, we will align to that global framework that will be come up after this consultation.

The second question, if we are happy: yes, so far, we are happy with the service we are receiving right now from IANA. I think that we mentioned that. And we have mechanism in place right now to allow us to check on that, which we do through our different contacts. So we don't have a major concern about the quality of service that we are receiving right now from ICANN performing the IANA function.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you very much. And I think we have to bring this to a close, unfortunately. We would have loved to spend another half-an-hour with you, but unfortunately, not enough hours in the day.



This is clearly going to be an ongoing thing. And I'm sure we're going to continue discussing this in London and maybe even before that at both various conferences but also in Brazil, as you all know. And I think that some of our members are on their way, at the moment, to go to their respective RIR mailing lists because, being myself on all of those mailing lists, I can see it's heating up at the moment in all those parts of the world. So thank you very much for joining us.

And I now invite to the table the members of the Root Server System Advisory Committee, the RSSAC.

Lars-Johan?

Okay, let's take position, please. Okay, thank you everyone for joining us. Thanks. Next to me, on my left, is Lars-Johan Liman. And next to him is Suzanne Woolf. And we have a few members of the RSSAC around the table, as well. Perhaps you'd like to introduce yourself?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Kaveh Ranjbar, RIPE NCC K-root.

BRAD VERD: Brad Verd, Verisign, A and J.

JOHN CRAIN: John Crain, ICANN, L-root.



TRIPTI SINHA: Tripti Sinha, D-root.

ELISE GERICH: Elise Gerich, liaison from the IANA Department.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Well, thank you for joining us. It the first time we have a meeting with the RSSAC. Oh, there's on the other side, okay.

HIRO HOTTA: Yes. Hiro Hotta, JPRS from M-root.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And then behind me, is Duane Wessels, liaison for the root zone maintainer role.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thank you very much. And I guess this first meeting is going to be pretty much a lesson for us. There's been a lot of discussion about the root, the roots, the roots, the root network, okay, I'm bastardizing the whole thing. I was just hacking a little bit earlier on the DNS.

I think we need to have a bit of a backgrounder as to what you do, what the root server network is, and how it all works, and so on. If I could ask our staff to put us to root-servers.org so as for our members to be able to have a look at the nice, beautiful picture of the world. And in the meantime, I'll hand the floor over to Lars-Johan.



Root-servers.org.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

Hello. My name is Lars-Johan Liman. I work for Netnod, who operates I-root out of Stockholm, Sweden. And I'm one of the two co-Chairs for RSSAC. The other one is Jun Murai, who unfortunately couldn't make it here to Singapore at this time.

I would like to tell you a bit about the root server system as such and a little about RSSAC, what we're doing and how RSSAC is connected to the root server operators and how it fits in in the ICANN circles. And we're going to share the task with Suzanne, here.

So the root server system consists of 12 operators that operate 13 – they're known as letters – instances, types of IP addresses that you can reach to have service regarding the root zone. And the root zone contains the delegation that points to the servers operated by the various registries. So the root zone is the entry point for the client side when they want to look up a name.

And the map you see there is on our webpage that we have for cooperation between the root server operators where we can list the locations where we have servers installed.

I said there were only 13 IP addresses; we actually play tricks with the Internet here and announce the same IP address from multiple locations. And we let the network, the entire Internet network, take care of finding the closest one and send the packets there. This is a technology often referred to as anycast. Most root server operators



deploy anycast nodes, not all of them, but I believe there are one or two who still doesn't.

The root server operators obtain the root zone file from a common source. And that source is Verisign, who operate as root zone maintainer – is that the term now? Get it right? And they, in turn, receive the updates from IANA.

So IANA does the administrative part of it, verifying that everything is okay. They create the database change that need to be deployed, transfer that to Verisign. Verisign makes that implemented in the DNS system, and the other 11 root server operators copy that from Verisign and deploy it on their own servers.

And these 12 organizations are not connected to each other in any other way than that they actually operate the same service. So they operate independently from each other, but they perform exactly the same service. And of course, we have coordination meetings to make sure that we provide the same service and to make sure that we develop the service in an orchestrated fashion, that we're all coherent and performing the same things. So we meet three times per year to do this.

Now, all that is regarding root servers. Now, we haven't started to talk about RSSAC yet. RSAAC is an advisory committee within the ICANN infrastructure that is designed to advise the Board. Maybe you should continue, because you're trained on that part.



SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure. Just to time check, how long did we have? I think this is going to be the whirlwind tour.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we have around the world in 15 minutes.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Fifty?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: One-five. Fifteen minutes.

SUZANNE WOOLF: One-five, alright.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Supersonic. We started about five, ten minutes late. If you're okay with it, we can run over. There's a long break after this.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay, so we will try not to run over – we will try not to be what's between you and your break but, yeah, it would be tough to do this in 15 minutes – 20, maybe – 15 is challenging.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: People here don't get paid. They don't need to drink water, whatever. They'll remain there. Trust me, you will want to leave before they do.

SUZANNE WOOLF: But I'm doing the short version of a presentation, some remarks that we did in our public session yesterday where my title was RSSAC in the ICANN Community and Internet Ecosystem.

Because if you look at what my colleague introduced, it's a very simple and straightforward and purely technical service. What the root server operators are here to do is provide answers to DNS queries for users all over the world. But that's real simple and straightforward.

Looking at RSSAC, though: who is RSSAC? It's the root server operators, as we've introduced. Also, there are other stakeholders involved. The criteria, the basis for the interaction of the group is people are of technical and operational orientation, primarily. We're strong in DNS expertise, ccTLD and gTLD technical folks.

And as part of the reorganization we're currently doing as a result of the standard review process, RSSAC is reorganizing rather extensively. One of the things we're doing is looking to broaden participation from other stakeholders – technical and operational orientation – basically, our customers.

What the root server operators do, just make sure that what the operators do is provide the straightforward technical service. What RSSAC does, as an advisory committee to ICANN, is a little bit broader. RSSAC and root server operators do a certain amount of engagement



explaining what it is we do, reaching out within the ICANN community and elsewhere. RSSAC provides liaisons to the NomCom and the Board and other information outreach, other interactions of this kind.

In the unlikely event that you wanted to go look at the charter for RSSAC in the bylaws, it's chartered to provide, in addition to providing the – it basically provides advice to the Board from the perspective of DNS expertise and operational responsibility. We've done things like provide input to the Board and the community on deployment of DNSSEC for the root, root scaling in connection with new gTLDs, adding IPv6 for the root servers – there you go – and documenting service expectations on root servers, which is actually something we're currently working on.

And RSSAC is also, again, we try to keep the purpose very sharp and focused. So there's a set of things we don't do as RSSAC. RSSAC does not tell root server operators what to do. What RSSAC does is provide work with the root server operators and other stakeholders to generate advice that root server operators and others can then reasonably take.

It's not a prescriptive role. In addition, there's not a prescriptive role with regards to ICANN, either. Some of the SOs, the policy-generation bodies, provide results that are binding on the Board and the community in various ways. We don't do that. Again, we provide advice.

There's almost no policy component to what root server operators do. And RSSAC is not a policy-generating portion of the ICANN ecosystem. What we do is provide input to the policy bodies.



In addition, when we're talking about the operations of the root servers, many of the organizations also play other parts in the ecosystem as exchange operators, as ISPs, as registries. But root name server operations and RSSAC activities are kept strictly separate from all those other things. So there's basic governance around performing the role of RSSAC and of a root server operator.

We knew we would be asked coming in for RSSAC, what role do we expect to play or what's our involvement in the IANA functions oversight – there's not even a clean phrase for it yet – I guess the IANA function stewardship.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes! We have an expert who has been tracking this all day. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: The transition of the stewardship of oversight of IANA.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Back to you, Suzanne.

HOLLY RAICHE: Wait for two hours.

SUZANNE WOOLF: As a computer scientist, I can call that several layers of indirection, which probably is a good thing. Gives you flexibility, it's a good thing.



But again, we expect to be playing – we’re certainly eager to step in and be part of the conversation, as RSSAC and as root server operators. But in keeping with the narrow mission, the operational responsibility of root server operators and the narrow mission of RSSAC, we do expect that the relevant input from us is focused on security, stability, and resiliency of the root zone distribution system for all Internet users and provide as much solid operational input to the process and the considerations and the dialogue as we can.

We can take any questions or we can wait until the end, but I think I’m going to turn over to Liman, who has been doing his rap on the reorganization and what we’re trying to do as far as the new structures we’re putting in place.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Suzanne. Liman?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. Yeah, so what we’re trying to do with the so to speak “new” RSSAC, the new generation of RSSAC, is that we’re creating a two-layer model where we are going to have an executive committee that deals with driving process and taking formal decisions. And then, to that, we’re going to connect a larger body, a pool of people that we hope to be able to use to create work parties and perform the work.

So the executive committee will have the formal role of creating first, now, the initial process and procedures, how to operate this new body. And it will select and keep track of the various work items that foresee



that we will work on. And then it will appoint members of – the term we have chosen is the “caucus” – a larger group, a pool of people. And from that, appoint work parties to focus on specific issues that we deal with to create draft documents.

And once the draft documents are produced, they will be shared within the entire caucus, the wider group who will then go through a consensus process. And eventually, we will have a document where the entire group has consensus, which will be published by the executive committee. So the executive committee will have the responsibility for actually publishing the document.

The executive committee will also appoint and accept liaisons to other parties and is responsible for electing the Chairs, the two co-Chairs. Currently, we have liaisons with the ICANN Board – that’s Suzanne – and with the ICANN NomCom – that’s Bill Manning. And we have incoming liaisons from the IANA, the NTIA, and the root zone maintainer – which is Verisign, in this case –and also from the Internet Architecture Board, which is part of the IETF structure protocol side of things, from ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee and also from the GAC very shortly. We haven’t formally decided on that yet, but it’s in the works.

The caucus, our intention is to make a pool of people with various expertise, like DNS protocol side, where you design the protocol and how it’s going to work. You have the DNS operations, people who actually deal with DNS on a daily basis on their servers. And that has two sides. The root servers and TLD servers operate on the authoritative side, they give out information. Then, you have the consumer side,



where ISPs and others collect information and go to the authoritative servers and ask questions and receive the information.

And how these environments operate is also something that's important to the root server operators, because we need to know how our information is received, how our service is appreciated.

And also, of course, people who operate registries, people who are experts in security and so on. So we will try to create a wide selection of people with various expertise that we can draw from when we create work parties. And the caucus will, of course, then review all the documents and, as I mentioned, it will be consensus-driven.

The current status is that we, earlier today, had a meeting where we set a time plan for this procedures document that will govern the entire process. And we hope to have that finished now by the last day in April. We'll cover the procedures for elections and liaisons and work party information and publication and all these practical matters.

And the next steps, now, are to make that document finished and actually published so that we can use that as a basis for recruiting people to the caucus. And once the caucus is formed, we have already two documents which we inherited from the previous generation of RSSAC that are right now sitting and just waiting for publication, which are one document regarding a root server expectations. What you should expect from a root server and a root server operator when it comes to how the service is performed?

That document has a companion document, which is published by the Internet Architecture Board. And we divided the expectations into



different parts. One is the operational part: How do you perform the service when you operate the servers and connect to the Internet? The other one is the protocol side, the quality of the data, how should the servers respond when you query them? And that's more of a protocol thing, so it's practically – that expectation doesn't belong with the root server operator side of things but with the Internet Architecture Board side.

So we have two documents that we will publish in parallel, and both of them are mostly done. But we lack the process for actually publishing them, so everything hinges on this procedures document.

The second document describes a set of metrics for measuring the performance at the root servers. And it has its roots in the new gTLD program, where we want to see that we're suddenly starting to add a large number of new, top-level domains at the rate that we haven't seen before. Maybe before, it was maybe a change per year or so. Now we have maybe a ten per week. It's a totally different thing.

So we want to establish a number of metrics where we can measure the root server system just to make sure that it doesn't show any signs of stress, so that we can maintain a top-quality service. And we need to do that over a long period of time.

And we also need to make sure that all the root server operators perform the same measurements on their respective server systems so that we can compare the metrics between the server operators. And that's why we want to specify this in a document. And that's also pretty



much done but, again, we lack the process for actually getting the document out.

SUZANNE WOOLF:

No, I think that's generally what we have been introducing. And we can go ahead and maybe take some questions, maybe let some of our colleagues who have been kind enough to join us here comment on any of these things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Any additional comments from some of the other letters? L? I? D? K? No, first thing, I'd like to thank you very much for this introduction. I think it's extremely helpful for us. And it's good to see that you are an organization that is building itself at the moment.

I wanted to present you with the Policy Advice and the At-Large Advisory Committee Beginners Guide, which actually shares – well, it's Beginners Guide for Our At-Large Structures, but it actually shares the way that we do policy advice and the way we have – so the first statement, second statement, etc. And it might inspire you to, perhaps, when you start building your policy statements and things that you might have similar methods and paths that you're dealing with. Obviously, you're geographically distributed and I can't imagine you meet every day, so it's a sort of thing that might be helpful.

I'm going to open the floor for questions. And we've got another 10-15 minutes or so for this. I was going to ask the first question, which is the



dumb question that often get asked. But isn't it a dumb question? Actually, it's a good question.

Someone goes, "Well, you know, I'm living in country X. And I'd like to have a root server in my country. We need a root server. Can I e-mail you at root-servers.org or is there an e-mail for the RSSAC so you can put one in my country?" Deliberately provocative.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

This is not the first time I've had this question. There is no one entry point to the root server system operators. They don't have an organization. There is no one that can speak for all of them, but they're all approachable through this common webpage here. You'll find the contact address for all the root server operators, and you can contact them individually. They're not more than 12, so it's a doable thing.

And I know that several of them – not all, but several of them – are deploying root servers in many places using this anycast technology. And several of them are open to proposals for how to bring servers to more areas.

So, it's definitely doable. I wouldn't say that, "Yes, we promise that everyone who comes to us will have one," but there are numerous examples of where that has happened. And there is a positive attitude from several root server operators to deploy more servers in more nations.

There are, of course, also always questions about, "Can we fit it into the networking environment in that country in a good way?" "Can we



finance this in a good way?” There are things that need to discuss and negotiate, but the positive attitude is there.

JOHN CRAIN:

Can I follow up on that briefly? Besides the contact details, there’s also links to websites for each of the individual roots. And most of us have details there about how you can get an anycast instance.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, John. Just a word. I was looking at the page from far away and you had these little squares and then the little pointers with the letters in it and thought, “That doesn’t sound like there are very many root server mirrors around.” And of course, each one of the squares, some of them have got twenty-four – represent twenty-four mirrors that are geographically distributed. So how many mirrors altogether? Do you count up the total number of mirrors at the moment that are around the world?

JOHN CRAIN:

Yeah, if you scroll down, it tells you. You can also look per letter. But it’s hundreds. It’s not tens. It’s definitely hundreds. We have 145, I think. Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

So it’s not just 13 computers under a desk that could be unplugged when the Hoover gets [inaudible]?



SUZANNE WOOLF: That makes a really nice story, but a lot of the historical stories, they're stories.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What, that wasn't true? That wasn't true? I always thought the one in MIT was true.

SUZANNE WOOLF: There's not a root server at MIT.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Urban legend from Usenet back in '88/'89.

SUZANNE WOOLF: But it actually illustrates a really important point, which is all of the infrastructure has had to evolve from a few thousands of people to billions of users in a relatively short period of time. So a lot of things, we've had to learn how to do pretty quickly and, frankly, under some pressure. And it's really remarkable how well the system has scaled, given the growth and the stresses on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Eduardo Diaz.



EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a question. So when you get a change in the A-server, everybody copies from that? No? It doesn't work like that. How does it get replicated to these other little servers around the world? I'm just curious. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. We got A. Brad Verd.

JOHN CRAIN: I'll defer to the root zone maintainer expert.

DUANE WESSELS: So it doesn't work that way. They don't copy from A. In fact, Verisign maintains a number of what we call shadow masters and those are distributed around the globe, as well, and so all of the other root servers copy from the shadow masters.

EDUARDO DIAZ: So they copy from these shadow masters and to the roots. And then from the roots, goes to all this other replicas around the world?

DUANE WESSELS: So, at the moment, the different root server letters are – they can choose how they want to do it. A root server letter that has more than a handful of locations, they can either set up their own internal distribution, or they can have all of their sites pull directly from the



shadow masters. But there is no distribution farther than to the root servers themselves. Does that answer the question?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes. It answers the question, but that means that every root operator does things differently. Okay. And there is no problem doing it that way, that everybody does it differently. No?

DUANE WESSELS: Correct. There is no problem. And many people see it as a feature that they all do it different – not all do it differently, but there are different ways of doing things, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you. And just to close the loop on this, I did hear it was not even the same software that was running on the different boxes.

DUANE WESSELS: Correct. There is diversity in the software, yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Kaveh?

KAVEH RANJBAR: Just to add some point. For example on K, even reading one letter, we use different software and different hardware. So, for example, in some



of our sites is Cisco routers, in some it's Juniper. So we try to diversify, also, on the hardware and software, as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Suzanne?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure. The other thing to keep in mind about this – and we've thrown around a lot of terms and so on – but the other thing to keep in mind about how it works, just in the day-to-day operations, is that it's all very standard, literally, according to the technical standards and relatively simple and straightforward.

It's very conservatively engineered so as to keep – the way the root server system works is actually simpler than many other DNS services that you'll contact in the course of an ordinary day. Because since it has to work for everyone all the time, people are actually extremely careful about how they engineer the system, how they over-engineer the system, and being very slow and careful about how things are changed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have two people in the queue. Rinalia Abdul Rahim and Alan Greenberg. Rinalia, you have the floor.



RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Suzanne, this is going to be a political question. Do the root server operators have the capacity to check and balance ICANN?

For example, if you disagree with anything that ICANN does, can you refuse to publish or propagate whatever it is that is inserted or changed in the master root?

SUZANNE WOOLF: First of all, I don't mind being asked personal – yeah, personal questions – political questions. But I have to say that – and it's strictly on my own recognizance, I'm not speaking for RSSAC or the operator of F-root in giving you an answer for that.

My answer to that would be no. That the root server operator has no direct control over the contents of the zone, particularly since the zone is signed, which means that anybody who wants to can validate at any time that the data they're being served is exactly what the root zone maintainer put in. So there's no real capability for doing that.

The other thing I would point out is that the way the service is operated by all the organizations – and if any of my colleagues are comfortable chiming in, I hope they will – the operational integrity of the service is the primary value and operators assert no policy role. If any of my colleagues has anything to offer, has anything to add to that, please do.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Sorry, is that based on contract?



SUZANNE WOOLF: I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is it based on contract?

SUZANNE WOOLF: No, I heard the question. I want to hear of a little bit more about what you meant by that.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yeah, I'm just curious as to this integrity of the service delivery. Is that just because of operational requirement that you, yourself, take onto yourself rather than having a contract with ICANN or other parties saying that this is what you will do.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Okay. The answer to that varies and, again, I hope my colleagues will chime in because it does vary by operator.

For example, as an observation regarding the organization that operates F-root, there is a public document that was based on a ccTLD-style accountability framework document, where the organization does commit – among other things – to carrying the data that IANA gives it.

The answer for the other organizations, they would have to speak for themselves. But the answer to your question on that varies.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Suzanne. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll ask the companion question to the one Olivier asked. I'm really unhappy about the fact that all the root servers are operated out of such a few number of countries and perhaps countries I don't trust. How do I become the N-root?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Currently, there is no well-defined process for that. That said, root server stewardship has been transferred in the past. It's happened a few times. It doesn't happen often. We're talking about years between the occasions. And every time it's been treated as a one-off thing.

But we realize that as the Internet grows and as the economy and political system starts to depend on this more and more, it's probably a good idea to start to look at developing such a procedure for root server succession. But as far as I know, there's no formal process established today for doing that.

ALAN GREENBERG: So unlike hotels and office buildings, we consider 13 a lucky number.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: In a way.

SUZANNE WOOLF: It's worked out so far.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Brad and then Elise.

BRAD VERD: You made the comment that you don't trust some of the countries that the roots are in. I would say if you trust the protocol of DNSSEC then you trust the roots that are being served – if you can validate it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will point out that wasn't a personal opinion but one I've seen voiced.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But it's a good point. The trust comes from the key, not from the location or from the equipment. Elise Gerich.

ELISE GERICH: So, I don't know if, Alan, this was part of the point of your question. But the reason there were 13 to begin with was a mathematical one and about how many they could have based on the protocol and the size of the data. So it wasn't just an arbitrary lucky 13. I figured you knew that.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Elise. That was in binary, though, wasn't it? Okay, any other questions? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, but it's been very, very helpful. And I hope that you've found this to be helpful, as well.

If I can have just one minute to tell you about the At-Large. We're divided among five regions. Each region has got a regional At-Large organization called a RALO. Our members amount to 160 At-Large Structures all across the world, and we operate purely in a bottom-up fashion.

So we get the policy and the input from our At-Large Structures into our RALOs, into the 15-member At-Large Advisory Committee. Each region selects two people onto the At-Large Advisory Committee. The Nominating Committee selects a third person from each one of the regions, so it makes 15 people.

And all of our statements are drafted in a way which is described in this document. We have very little money, so we can only print one a year. You've got our yearly copy. No, we'll try and get a few more to you. And we do our policy development purely by consensus, although we do ratify every statement that we ratify is ratified with a vote.

I think that's the one-minute description of At-Large. And, of course, much of our work goes into the other way around, disseminating ICANN information over to Internet end-users. And of course, at this moment in time, there's a lot to disseminate out there.

But I hope that we will be able to meet with you again in future meetings, and you're absolutely welcome to come and see us. Thank you.



LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Just as a last comment, I would say we would welcome your input. We are here to talk to other people, so if you see us around, if you have questions, please come and talk to us. We are very open to that. Thank you for having us here.

~

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Test, test. Test, test.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For those people following us remotely, apologies for this. Just had to run a meeting just now, a short meeting. So it's significantly more than five minute break. But we also seem to have lost a few people at the moment.

What I suggest is that we start again in a minute and then people will start walking back in here. And we definitely need to continue the discussion on this. And perhaps I will have to present the statement to the people present and we'll have to e-mail everyone else. So we'll start again in one minute.

Okay, take your seats, please. Okay, so, there is a statement – so, welcome back, ladies and gentleman. And apologies to the people that are following us remotely. We did take a short break. It's been a very, very long afternoon and the room went from hot to cold back to hot and now it's back to cold. I think you get the pattern.



So, effectively we're back over to the discussion about the IANA – Holly, could you please give us the name?

~

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: ... around the IANA function, should therefore continue to be carefully specified, taking into account transparency, accountability, as well as the role of the multi-stakeholder model in its context. Scroll down, please.

We also acknowledge – it's in blue because there was a late edition on this specific version. We also acknowledge the affirmation of commitments (AoC) and the resulting Accountability and Transparency Review Team and review processes – so ATRT and review processes – as being contributory to and supportive of the multi-stakeholder model.

Through our respective communities, we commit to support and engage in the multi-stakeholder-designed process that is consensus-driven, participatory, open, and transparent that will launch at the ICANN 49 meeting in Singapore. Of course, I think that will be changed to “that has launched,” obviously.

We will work to make this process collaborative and globally accountable while the IANA functions continue to ensure the continued security, stability, and resiliency of the top level of the Internet system of unique identifiers. Scroll down, please. Scroll down, please.

And that's it. That, I believe, is the statement as it is proposed at the moment. There might be some changes. Is there anything that springs



to mind that needs to be changed, apart from the blatantly obvious?
Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: You said “apart from the” but I didn’t hear the word afterwards.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The obvious. Leon Sanchez.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Olivier. I’m just concerned. I mean, this is a doubt, a question. Does “support and enhance the multi-stakeholder model of Internet coordination” includes that the outcome of this process assures that the new mechanism of stewardship will be multi-stakeholder?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Leon. Quick answer: make no assumptions.

LEON SANCHEZ: So, therefore, should it be fair to specify it?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Define “fair.”

LEON SANCHEZ: Accurate.



ALAN GREENBERG: What we want.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Sandra Hoferichter.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, Olivier. The last sentence, “we will work to make this process collaborative and globally accountable” and so on and so forth, this implements that we are doing something. And they will say, “Okay. They are doing something? [Let’s do them.]”

What I actually think or would propose is we should collaboratively think about what we can actually do and how we are going to perform within this process. And this was actually my question earlier today in the morning and yesterday to Fadi, to say we should really sit down and think how we can meaningful contribute. At the moment, it says, “We will work.” “We are doing this.” And then they can say, “Okay, they are doing this, so we don’t have to talk to them.” And you understand what I mean?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Sandra. Thank you. I mean, I guess this is a high-level statement as to say, “We promise to work.” I mean, I think the purpose of this really is just as something that will go on ICANN’s front page to support what is going on at the moment. It’s a message of support to show that the



community is behind the process that is being engaged, whatever that process is.

A counter-letter would be, “We object to the IANA function transition,” etc., etc. “We object to the process that is currently take place.”

The thing that I find – and my personal point of view on this – is the fact that this is a letter that has a significant number of errors in it still at this late stage, and the devil is in the details with regards to these sorts of statements.

And so I’m putting it over to you here as to whether we should accept it as is or should we perhaps put it on a wiki, work on it, come back to – it is on the wiki now? Oh, fantastic. You say it and Ariel does it in a second – nanosecond. Alan, you had put your hand up, and then Eduardo Diaz.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Given that you say this has gone through a good number of iterations and they can’t even get what ICANN stands for properly – never mind the proper name for the U.S. Department of Commerce – I do not feel comfortable approving this statement to be modified in unknown ways and then published under my name.

So I would like to see a clean copy, at the very least fixing the typos. And saying, “Yes, this is what we are approving.”

It sounds like it’s too late to make substantive change to it, given the number of other people who are looking at this in parallel. And this is constituency day.



So I'm happy to approve it in principle, subject to, what's the expression? [Etoilette]? I think Cheryl used to like, of cleaning it up, getting at least the names of the principle actors – the U.S. Department of Commerce and ICANN – correct. And if there's any other punctuation and things like that that need fixing. And then approve it on Thursday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Alan. There is another version which has been sent by the NCSG onto the mailing list with, actually, some of the errors corrected. For example, Internet Assigned Numbers Authority is corrected. I'm not quite sure ICANN is. Well, it's not there. There is a shorter statement done by the NCSG. Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I can support a letter like this maybe when it's finished. I will also [inaudible] on JJ to look at it, because he's very good. He has that diplomatic thinking behind his experience. And I don't know if only a few of you looked at this or all or he has seen something like this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. Any other thoughts on this? I think I can see Tijani and then Aziz. Tijani and then Aziz. Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You said "I see Tijani and Aziz."



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Then comma.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Can someone who is skilled in techniques explain me what is the top level of the Internet system of unique identifiers? I think that we can shorten it and make it more clear for everyone which is the Internet unique identifiers, that's all. The top level of the Internet system unique identifier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Tijani. That's related to the IANA function itself; that deals only with the top level. And I think they said "system" because every word in that one is loaded, actually. There was a question regarding this, and I think that it was the SSAC that added or that modified this sentence to this, which apparently is a clear explanation of what it is. Alan Greenberg, is that correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: I was just going to say I think the sentence is worded awkwardly but correctly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you. I have one problem with this, is that it eventually will be accurate. Will it be understandable is another question. But the



accuracy, I guess, is important in this. By contrast, the NTIA statement was understandable but was not accurate. Holly Raiche?

HOLLY RAICHE: Isn't the question to whom is this aimed? Because if it's aimed at the people who are going to worry about whether they get support or not, it can be written one way; if it's aimed at a larger audience and we have to explain it, then maybe there's a different spin on it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Aziz didn't put his card up, so I didn't see him. Aziz, sorry. Go ahead.

AZIZ HILALI: [speaking French]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Aziz. This declaration is to be signed by all the SOs, ACs, or whichever SO, AC, and SG Chairs that can sign it. So, in effect, you will notice it doesn't mention any specific supporting organization or advisory committees. The only ones that will be mentioned will be a list of the different supporting organizations and



advisory committees as a list of signatories. Eduardo Diaz and then back to Alan.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just wanted to say the same thing you just said, that there will be a list of the organizations. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Eduardo. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Going back to the question that was – I don't remember, somebody asked of – what is this for? My impression – and I haven't been party to any of the discussions which led to it – is this essentially is the credentials for ICANN leadership, CEO, whoever, to say they are speaking on behalf of the various component parts of ICANN in discussions which will inevitably be held at various levels over the next month or two.

This essentially says they're not acting purely on their own behalf but have support of the organization. That's what I assumed this was for. So it's essentially not written aiming at anyone but just as an indication that the overall concept has been vetted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. But I think I can sense we all agree this needs to be correct and not have any errors before we can proceed forward with



supporting this. I've understood, at least from Eduardo and I think Alan, as well, that you wouldn't feel right into proceeding forward. Fatima Cambroneró?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Olivier. [speaking Spanish]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima. That's good to know. I was not aware of this.

What I suggest we do, then, is to create a wiki page with this text on it. And the wiki page does exist, it's already on the right-hand screen here in the room. Can we just divide this wiki page into two and have a second space on that wiki page for the build-up of our own statement?

There is a request – that's the next thing I was going to touch on. There is a request, also, if SO and AC and SGs would like to speak to a statement, make a short comment or a statement during the public forum – at the beginning of the public forum, the first 30 minutes of the public forum. And I think that it would be good for the ALAC to say something there as a short statement.

What the ALAC should do and what it should have in its statement is not something that I know at the moment, since we still don't even know what the title of this thing is. But certainly, user-centricity is something that's important, I would believe. Carlton?



CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Chair. Might I suggest that you hold off making any statement or producing any statement for a little while? This thing is still in flux. To my mind, the ALAC would probably be better off if you give it a couple of weeks to settle down before you make a statement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Carlton. I'm afraid I didn't hear you, but others will have. Any comments? Okay, wait and reflect. Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: The counter to that, really, is the real answer to your question that I made up an answer to, of why are we doing this. If this has some import in the next little while to indicate that there is support within the organization, then I'm happy to sign off on this and craft something more specific as we go forward.

If I'm reading it wrong and this has no real need, then, sure, we can delay. But I get the feeling that there was a purpose behind asking for support of this statement. And I'd want to make sure that we're not missing an opportunity to go forward.

Fadi at a meeting yesterday said, "Well, if we don't make the 2016 cut-off, then we just extend the IANA contract and keep on thinking about it." The reality is if the U.S. presidency changes sides, Lord knows what's going to happen after that. So we may not have that open window.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Holly Raiche?



HOLLY RAICHE:

I'd just like to support what Alan said. I think that there's a purpose for this statement, which is as much to ICANN to say, "By the way, you can say people are behind you," but I would hate to see anything more detailed.

And I think that the reason that we've talked about where does this sit? It sits in the Futures Working Group. We have a working group we're going to probably have to split in two talking about comments about the IANA function itself, discussion.

There's going to be a lot of talk, and we may feel very uncomfortable about certain aspects of what's going on, which we can elaborate. But right now, I don't think that's – we don't have the time to go through anything like that process. That'll take a long time to get the kind of detail.

Right now, we just need to say, "Yeah, our hand's up." Because otherwise, we look pretty stupid if our hand isn't up and everybody else's is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Holly. So I think I hear that there's no consensus on actually signing this statement that we have on the screen as-is.

Several action items: #1, staff to find out from David Olive the latest version of this statement. Tick? Complete? Fantastic.



#2, to put the latest statement on the wiki and immediately start the process. And please e-mail the whole ALAC. There are some members that are missing because they're in other meetings, so the ALAC list for comments on this so we can start building.

#3, who wants to be the shepherd for this process? A penholder shepherd. Any takers? Alan is shaking his head in a negative way. Are you volunteering, Holly? Holly Raiche, you have the floor.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I would except it. I don't have quite the same knowledge that somebody like Alan does. There are things he would pick up I wouldn't, so I just don't think I'm the right person. I'm happy to help somebody.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I will certainly volunteer to read proofs and comment on them and critique them. I just don't want to take – be the penholder, at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you, Alan. Well, it's not really penholders, I guess. The editor of the edits. We could ask staff to track the edits and just make the edits that are there. Dev! Hooray! Number two! He's aligning them.

For those people who don't know, Dev did produce this first statement a couple of weeks ago and that's a definite step forward. So, yes. So Dev to shepherd this. This really is a shepherding thing. You're going to have to make sure we get the input from the At-Large community.



Now, the second statement, the spoken statement at the public comment. In his absence, I think that we might wish to get Evan Leibovitch to hold the pen on. He has volunteered earlier and said, “Oh, if there’s any statement or things to draft, I’m happy to do so.”

And Evan, if you’re listening, we can’t hear you, so I don’t hear you saying “no.” I think let’s put it as a placeholder for the time being. So Evan will be holding the pen on this statement, unless he strongly objects to it. And that’s for our spoken statement in the public forum.

The deadline for this whole process, the ALAC wrap-up – I hope you’re paying attention. Thank you. Okay. I think that pretty much closes this segment of the previous item. And I really do apologize to the Chairs of the next agenda.

Just wanted to acknowledge and thank the Net Mission ambassadors who have been with us all day. Do you want to say a couple of words, actually? Just step up. And apologies if we put you on the spot, there and then, but reflections on your day.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Firstly, thank you very much for having us in such meaningful moments. And, wow. I didn’t expect it but actually, before I sat on this meeting, I was very skeptical about At-Large meeting. But after seeing all this procedure and after all the heated debates, and then I finally changed my mind. And then I think you guys, indeed, reflect Internet users’ opinions very well.



And then I feel very credited to you guys. And then thank you very much. And I hope you guys will sail through all this procedure and then make this environment better. I mean, secure and safe and resilient. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hello, all. Also, I am honored to be here, and I thank you for having me here. For my reflection, having heard all the conversation and the discussion all day, I felt that what was behind all the plans of what is happening on the Internet regarding privacy and all sorts of things were really went through this high-level and sophisticated discussion. And then I am really glad to be in a position to be hearing the discussion at the fingertip. And I would like to hear more discussion ongoing next coming problems on the Internet. Thank you for today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, well, thanks very much. And I understand you do have to go shortly and so on, but thanks for staying with us. And I hope that it's given you an idea and perhaps brought you some inspiration to join in this community from tomorrow onwards or whenever you feel like it. This space is open for you to join, so thank you.

And now we'll go over to – is it Holly Raiche, the next? Registration issues. That, I believe, is co-Chaired by Holly Raiche and Carlton Samuels with apologies to both. Fifteen minutes, if you want. It's really your call, now.



So we finish the ALAC Work Part II, thanks, everybody. Bye-bye. This call is adjourned. Or, this meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

