

Function

LOS ANGELES – At-Large Ad-hoc WG on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA Function
Tuesday, October 14, 2014 – 17:00 to 18:30
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Good afternoon again, everyone, with apologies for the delayed start to the At-Large Ad-hoc Working Group on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA Function. We were scheduled for 90 minutes on this topic. We've already had a lot of discussions on the IANA issues earlier this afternoon, first with the Address Supporting Organization, Address Council, and Number Resource Organization, then also with the IANA coordination group, but then also with the IANA Coordination Group and the various members of the IANA Coordination Group.

By now, having had an afternoon of IANA issues, we should be quite well kitted out to be able to formulate our strategy during this meeting, which unfortunately will have a hard stop at 18:25. Oh, dear. So exactly in 60 minutes from now.

Now, the agenda reads as follows. First, a feedback from our ICG members. I think we've already had much feedback from our ICG members so far. Perhaps feedback on what we've heard in the meeting with the ICG. And then the bulk part of our discussion will be based on the formulation of a proposal or discussion on our strategy for the ALAC proposal, identification of issues, our main goals, perhaps conflict management, and also obviously looking at all times at the end user perspective, and so we can start with... I don't see Mohamed at the table. He was here somewhere, but we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat, so

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

Function

let us find out from Jean-Jacques and his feedback regarding the previous sessions this afternoon. Jean-Jacques, you have the floor.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Chair. I have a question first, Olivier. What I have to say is really at a high level — concluding remarks, as it were — the way forward for our working group. Do you want me to talk about this now? Okay.

So, several points. I think that this has been an interesting day, including at the ALAC plus GAC meeting, where we had some input also, and of course the most important for us on this subject was the meeting with the Numbers, etc., and then with the ICG representative.

Now, this is what I take away from the day so far. Several points. First of all, in constructing our contribution, we will have to be very selective. By selective, I mean we don't want to make a catalog, a shopping list of things we want in the transition plan.

I think that our approach should be as follows. We have to make a list of things we think are important from the point of view of the global Internet user. That is really what will make the difference between our approach and the approach of other contributors, and as you can imagine, there will be proposals from all over the place.

Probably others will be better situated or perhaps more inspired to talk about certain subjects. What will really make a difference is if we concentrate on those issues where we can bring added value. So I think

Function

that is really the important point, to think in terms of our contribution as bringing added value.

Second thing I'd like to touch upon is that during the meeting with the ICG chair and some other members, the question was put whether there was still this notion of two categories of contributors.

On the one hand, the operational communities, and that was called in the earlier speeches, contributions, and then the rest from the rest of the community, which was input. And the reply from the Chair of ICG was that there was no longer categories. Obviously, for well-known reasons, there would be some considerations of a purely technical nature coming from certain parts, but all input or all contributions would be regarded in the same way. I think this is an important point, and we should take note of it, and it should be well-transcribed into our report of today's meetings.

When I say this, I think this should give us confidence in our drafting, both in the choice of themes or topics we want to touch upon, but also the way we treat it. It must be treated with realism, but also with self-confidence on the part of the ALAC.

And my last remark is about timing, or the timeline. There were discussions in various areas of ICANN today about the possibility or the probability of a slight shift in the timeline, but as I said already today in another meeting, I think it is our duty – and certainly the interest of the communities we represent – to start from the assumption or the guiding line that there will be no change in the timeline. We have to work towards that. If there's a major problem — not because of ALAC,

Function

by the way, but for some other reason — which would appear, let's say, in the spring or the summer of 2015, fine. We'll deal with that when we come to it, but we don't foresee that, and I would like to underline very clearly here that I think it is really in the interest of everyone, both the ICG but also ALAC as a contributor, to respect that timeline.

I'd be willing to answer questions or remarks, but this is really the high-level takeaway that I have for today's meetings. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. Before I open the floor to questions or comments, I just wanted to let you know that Heidi is taking notes about our discussion, so we will have not only the transcript of this session, but also Heidi's notes. I wonder whether anyone else would volunteer to also take independent notes perhaps, so as to have two different sources, and being able to then put them together. Sometimes in those discussions we tend to miss a few words and a few things. Vanda?

Heidi lets me know she got everything. "I've got everything! I've got everything! I got it!" Okay, excellent. You've got everything, but Vanda will also be taking notes. That's great. Thank you very much, Vanda Scartezini. So now you might have everything; Vanda will also get some.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

You have it too.

Function

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I have it too? Okay, where do I have it? I haven't got anything.

HEIDI ULLRICH: In your Skype.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I can't read my Skype any more. It's all red. Okay, we now have the queue. I saw first Tijani Ben Jemaa and then Fatima Cambroner. First to Tijani. You have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. Jean-Jacques, you are very optimistic, because—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, your headphones are too close to the microphone. Go ahead, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I am sorry. I think that Jean-Jacques was optimistic, because he said that Elisa answered well the question and said there is no difference between the proposals. She said that, but she said that they think and they [pursue] that the proposals have to come from the operational parties. It's the way they see it. So it is more or less the same thing. The position doesn't change. They think that the proposal have to come from the naming entities from the EUTF and from numbering parties.

Function

Everyone is able to give input, but what is the meaning of inputs? This is a problem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. In response to this, Jean-Jacques, and then Narelle Clark. Oh, okay. Narelle Clark, you have the floor since it's specific response, and then I'll come to you afterwards, Fatima.

NARELLE CLARK: Thank you, Olivier and Tijani. I wanted to reinforce that it is certainly my view on the ICG, as an ICG member, that we will hear proposals from anybody. We will, but what we do want ultimately to get to is consensus, and we would really like to see the communities come through with a strong consensus beforehand.

I realize this is possibly a nirvana. I realize that, but we need to see the communities work through the issues, identify the issues, and bring them through to a new place, a post-transition situation.

And so if people try earnestly to work within the communities and find that it is not working for them, then we will also look at the level of consensus that seems to be operating in each of those groups and make some sort of assessment of that.

Where we see groups being in transition, we will ask them — my expectation is that we will be asking them to look at it again. That's what, as Elisa called it, was a ping-pong process, where things go back to the groups, comes forward.

Function

So I just wanted to reassure you that certainly, at least for this member of the ICG — and it is a view I think is shared, and I'm confident that that view is shared across the group, that we will hear dissenting views and we will hear proposals from people outside the community, but what we want to see is consensus.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Narelle Clark. Jean-Jacques, do you want to add to this? No? We'll go back to our queue then.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBARET: I'd be glad to, but maybe there's another comment or question on the same aspect. I don't know.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Let's go over to Fatima Cambronerero. And will that be in Spanish or in English, Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Yes, sorry, in Spanish.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Spanish? Okay, so, please, all put your headsets on. Please give us a second. Go ahead.

Function

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Olivier. I'd like to thank Jean-Jacques, as I've been doing ever since we started working together, because he's very clear when he explains his ideas and tells what is happening. I fully agree with what you said earlier on about this summary of three items. I would go to item two, which was also taken up by Tijani, and I also understood that we as another community, another operational community, may make some contributions. Contributions, not comments.

From that point of view, I think this is the time, now that we are all here face-to-face, we should at least make a list of the issues we would like to include, and start working on them, because if we are going to take At-Large opinions to the other communities, in our case it's going to be tougher because we'll have to work twofold.

If we want to make a contribution, we'll have to make a contribution after that. We'll have to participate in other processes with the opinion and position of At-Large. I'd like this to happen because many explanations have been heard throughout these days on what the process is like, what the status is, and what we might do, and I think we should start working right now on something which is a substantial proposal. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Fatima, and perhaps we should start with drafting a charter for this. No, I'm kidding. Let's not go into process. Let's cut straight to the discussion and the actual content.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat?

Function

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Olivier. Having listened to Tijani, Narelle and Fatima, I'd like to say this. This reinforces, I think, what I said earlier. It is by being on the topics we want to take up. Of course, the quality of our arguments. But also we should feel completely confident. I think that there was a time for ambiguity, perhaps doubts about the different categories of contribution, but I think we should not dwell in that mental state. We have to go forward and consider that we are entitled to do it, so we have to do the very best.

I think that one of the first things, Mr. Chair, would be really to narrow down on the number of subjects which we think, which you think, are really crucial as representing value added from the user community.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Jean-Jacques. Next is Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: I like the way the discussion is going, because my intervention, if it hadn't been for a few up until now, was "let's stop talking about process, and let's get down to substance."

Remember, for the IANA transfer, there are three components. There's IETF, addressing — protocol numbers; IP numbers, to be blunt, but there are other ones , I know — and names. If we have something substantive to say on either of the numbers, then it is going to have to

Function

be us who says it. That perhaps should be a focus – a parallel focus – to what I'm going to say next, but a focus.

On names, I'm presuming we will not be putting in a proposal unless we vehemently disagree with what's coming out of the CWG on the same subject, and want to counter what the rest of us says, but we're part of that "us." We cannot forget the fact that we are part of one of the three who is allowed to submit proposals.

So I think we need to start identifying what is it we want to say on the numbers issues, and is there anything we want to say on the numbers issues where we are so unique that we don't think the groups that manage those things are going to say it, and there may well be. I haven't thought of one, but maybe someone will.

Then, how are we going to start contributing on the composite ICANN contribution to the ICG on names? We have five formal representatives in that group. We have a potentially infinite number of participants, and what is it that we want to say, or how do we want to see that direction going?

Hopefully we will not have to submit anything directly to the ICG on names, because we will be a vocal and persuasive part of the CWG, but let's start identifying that. The CWG is going to start meeting soon, and what do we have to say there?

Function

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Alan. What I would suggest then, as you very well suggested, Alan, is that we start with, I guess, perhaps the portions which we might have less things to say at this very moment, and that's the addresses, the IP addresses, and the protocols, and to go around the table, and try and basically brainstorm, and first make a list of all of the points which we think we might be wishing to address, and then narrow them down as per Jean-Jacques' suggestion.

This is just a case of brainstorming, so come up with the point that you think we should be addressing. I've got the list of working group members here, but others are also invited to contribute. I think we can open the work group up to those present around the table and further in the room. I was going to put Eduardo on the spot, who is holding his head at this time of the day, but, Eduardo, you might have a few points. So, addresses, IP addresses, and protocols.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I wasn't thinking about IP addresses, but I think there is a major thing that we should brainstorm, and it's the issue that we have been talking about almost all day about accountability, what happens, what are we going to be accountable for. Everything that we have heard the whole day is "We don't know, we don't know, we don't know." But we don't see brainstorming, and say, "This might happen, or this might not happen," and I would think that will be a very brainstorming in IP and numbers. I don't know. I don't have anything to say for IP and numbers. Thank you.

Function

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Eduardo. I wasn't pointing at you. I was pointing at the flip charts that are behind you. For some reason, they are remaining from previous moments. I wonder whether we could have someone on the flip chart or bring a flip chart forward and maybe put points into this. We're putting a number of staff into action here. Maybe someone will volunteer to hold the pen on the flip chart.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you for clarify. I thought this session is on the IANA stewardship issues, not the accountability. Is that correct, or are we a free-for-all?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. You're absolutely correct, Alan, but I think Eduardo was speaking about accountability specifically with regards to the IANA stewardship. The point is that yesterday we were in the Cross Community Working Group, and one of the participants provided details of the fact that, at the moment, we're dealing with this contract between ICANN and the US Department of Commerce, and that introduces a whole set of accountability mechanisms and so on that are ingrained inside the contract, the number of clauses and so on. What we have to look at is when that contract goes away — which it will; there will be no more contract — then what happens? And certainly the issues relating to that, I think, are what Eduardo is speaking about. You look perplexed, Alan.

Function

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess I just took his comments a different way.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Back to you, Eduardo. Expand a little bit on this, please, so as to convince Alan of your righteousness.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is a question about, if this [inaudible] transition goes through, what happens if it doesn't work? Does it go back? Who we get accountable to because it doesn't work? How does it get fixed, or something like that? That question is there, and everybody's saying we don't know yet. We know it's there. It's part of the accountability. It has to do specifically with the transition, but we need to do some brainstorming and come up with some ideas, and write them down and pass them so we can start a substance to this transition, because all of the meeting that we had with the CWU was more about procedures, and this and that. Basically I felt, when I came out of that meeting, that really nothing happened.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: To hone in on what you just said — "what happens if things don't work" — do you mean what happens if a proposal doesn't get drafted in time or do you mean what happens once the transition has taken place? If something goes wrong, what happens?

Function

EDUARDO DIAZ: The second part. Let's say the proposal goes through. They say, "ICANN, okay, this is yours," and something goes out of whack. What happens?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I gather then what you're looking at is post-transition safeguards? Okay, so that's the first word that will magically appear on the flip chart.

Tijani Ben Jemaa, you're next.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. As Alan said, our contribution regarding the naming function would go through the Cross Community Working Group, and I hope it will be transmitted through this working group. Otherwise, it will be a separate submission, and as Elisa said, they are looking for consensus, so it will complicate the situation.

Also, regarding the numbering function, as Adiel said, they have put a page as NARALO to work on the issue, and the contribution of the community is welcome. So I think that also we have to work with them. I was looking for working with the AFRINIC, but on the meeting list there was nothing, but he said that they have their contribution on the NARALO page. Let's go there and see.

And I think that we have to work also with the NARALO, and if it is possible, we contribute there so that the submission will have the consensus rather than have our own submission, and Elisa will try to find the consensus, etc.

Function

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this contribution, Tijani. I think you mean the NRO. From here it heard as NARALO, and I looked at Evan, and he didn't feel quite concerned about this. So, the NRO. Yes, the question, though — you've mentioned here the process by which we should go and touch on these issues. In other words, go and get involved with the NRO. But what should we tell them? What is the topic? What springs in your mind? What should we be touching on?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I understand. That's another thing. It is exactly the same as with the Cross Community Working Group. It is the same for the naming function or for the numbering function. It is the same. We try to work with them to have our contribution with them, but for sure we have before think about the issue and try to have our point of view.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. Now's the time, so we'll get back to you in a moment. On the list at the moment I have Holly Raiche, then Alan Greenberg, then Seun Ojedeji. Was Vanda before? Vanda and then Seun. Go ahead, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: To start with, I'm going to repeat what I said today, which is essentially I don't think any of us, or maybe some of us, are not fully qualified to understand the technology. I think what we could all agree on is the

Function

need for measurable performance indicators that will indicate something is or isn't working; performance metrics that have been measured and are published; some description of what happens if something goes [skewey]. In other words, you're probably looking at a management type matrix.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Perhaps could we just put these on the flip chart? I think these are very valid points. So, insisting for, what, performance metrics—

HOLLY RAICHE: Performance metrics that are published regularly. Probably response strategies. I was actually thinking of a risk management matrix, so that you've identified the usual, which is a little consequence — major importance, minor importance, whatever — and then the likelihood in between the matrix. Then you know what it is that you really have to watch out for, and [fielding] as to what the responses are, whose responsibility they are. That's the way I actually see. I'm not sure we do it, but us looking at what somebody else does — I think those are the things we look for.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We would have to ask for these to be part of the proposals for post-transition. So, risk management matrix — M-A-T-R-I-X — and also performance metrics. No, no, the performance metrics remains as metrics, but the risk management goes into matrix. M-A-T-R-I-X. Yes,

Function

that's the Australian accent for you. Oh, dear, I've got a lot of Australians here. That's French. That's obviously is...

Okay, next is Vanda Scartezini. No, sorry, Alan. Alan, I'm really sorry, I missed you. Sorry, Alan and then Vanda.

ALAN GREENBERG:

He's just trying to forget me. Couple of things. A lot of what Holly mentioned is the status quo — I'm not fighting with you, I'm just saying it's the status quo. So clearly something we would want to see is that whoever takes over the IANA function commits to doing at least what we're doing right now, and perhaps more. So that's easy to define at some level.

The optimal contribution that we should make is nothing. If what's coming out of the three organizations as we look at their evolving, and I hope we'll be watching them as they evolve, is something that we say, "Yep, looks good." Then we don't need to make any special contributions, and of course on the names part, we're part of the "we," so we should be contributing to that.

If you listen to our good friend Mr. Strickling yesterday, he is clearly presuming that the recipient of this final responsibility will be ICANN. Not all of the people on the ICG agree with that, but that's sort of his assumption.

If that is this case, then some of what Eduardo was talking about is a situation where IANA, ICANN's employees, are not doing what ICANN

Function

has committed to philosophically, if not legally, and that's an employee management issue.

The ICANN going rogue and giving bad instructions to IANA is what the accountability and governance track will be looking at. So if we are working towards an outcome, which I would hope we are, where we are recommending that ICANN be the recipient of the IANA responsibilities — there certainly are people in the CWG who would agree with it and probably a few who disagree — then I don't think we need to worry heavily about those levels of details.

If we believe, for instance, that ICANN should be the ultimate recipient of it, then we need to find a way to say that and feed that into the names group. Although we fought hard to be able to make a contribution under any name, our better target, our optimal target, is not the have to.

So I think we need to start recognizing what it is we're going to be happy with that the numbers organizations come up with. How do we recognize happiness, and what are the overall parameters that we're looking for in someone to manage the root zone?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Alan. I guess I've taken two points from here. How do we recognize happiness; the second one. It's important. Or satisfaction. I'm not sure what we would call it, but how do we recognize how we're satisfied by the proposals? And the second one is confidence in

Function

managing the root zone. Yes, confidence in managing the root zone. These are two issues which we would be pointing at.

We now have Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you, Olivier. I just want to make two comments. In relation to the NRO sites, I think what the NRO sites currently contain is majorly the [IANA] governance matrix, which has been released on the [IANA website] and perhaps what could be useful, or maybe a point of recommendation for this working group could be, that we make it as a to study the matrix to understand how the [IANA] processes work.

However, I do think that doesn't necessarily indicate currently, as the last time I checked, which was yesterday, what is on the website of the NRO does not actually indicate how the NRO is intended to globally collect and then develop the contributions from the regional communities into a single proposal.

So there's really no clear— and, by the way, I need to also mention that this was also the reason, in the last ARIN meeting which was held a few days ago in Baltimore, and the response that [inaudible] we will see you if our [invention] indicated it was that they were going to release that process soon, but the reality at the moment is there's no process yet on how the NRO intends to [inaudible] the contributions from each region into a single proposal.

Function

The second comment I'd like to make is in response to Tijani. I think I also agree with Tijani. The names issue. The names side of this then is we are already part of it, so we don't need to develop any concurrent process for that.

However, the challenge with the numbers — and that is where the naming is different from the numbers — is that the numbers world is not as global. It's not on the global level like we're doing this Cross Community Working Group.

On the numbers role right now, [inaudible] we are discussing in different [silos]. So, it'd be difficult to get this working group, for instance, to globally send a communication direct— who are we sending to? Who are we sending the communication to? Are we sending our interests or our observations to AfriNIC, for instance, who's sending it to ARIN, for instance?

That is the problem, and perhaps one of the things that we'll be asking the NRO to provide us is for them to tell us what is the means by which this working group, At-Large, can contribute? We should formally ask them, so that they know that we are interested. What are the means by which At-Large can formally contribute globally to the IANA proposal? Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Seun, thank you for these observations, and the unfortunate thing – we had a meeting with the NRO earlier this afternoon. I unfortunately

Function

didn't see you in the room. We covered that, actually. We also covered afterwards with the meeting with the ICG.

This sounds to me like process again, and we're trying to focus on the points we want to raise as in for our own proposals to the end process. I invite you to perhaps listen to the recordings the earlier sessions this afternoon. There was a specific part when we spoke with Adiel Akplogan, who provided us with details of how the different proposals of the different RIRs were going to come together. I don't think that we should interfere with the way they're going to run their process [inaudible] RIRs.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

I'm sorry, Olivier. I cannot apologize for not attending. That is because, as a fellow, I have some obligations, other meetings I need to attend. However, I think it's fine for us to list the points out here. How do the points make any difference? That's why I think it's important to understand what is going on within the RIR community.

I don't know whether it has been discussed extensively, but I think while we are developing our own point, how do we fit it into that process they're doing? That is the point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Seun. Briefly, we just feed it in through our RIRs, through our involvement in the different RIR communities on the one hand, and on the other hand, of course, through the numbers – sorry, through the

Function

protocols – through the ITF mailing list. That has been covered a bit this afternoon, but that's fine. This is a very valid point, and we raised the point a bit earlier on this.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Just [inaudible]. So our statement here, whatever it is that [inaudible], we're sending to the five RIRs... That's what it means, right?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Two ways. First, on the one hand, we participate as individuals into the different mailing lists, and come back and forth in actually building the proposals of these operation communities, but what we're working on at the moment is to see if we want to have our own contribution in addition to the contributions from the operational communities coming the ICG, directly into the ICG.

The brainstorming is about what are the points that are strong and that are dear to the At-Large community, to Internet end-users. What do we need to have in those final proposals?

And we've also been told it's not just a one-shot process. The first process is the initial contributions, and there's very likely to be some going back and forth, and therefore having a second shot and modifications to the initial contributions that will have been made.

Okay, next is Vanda Scartezini. Vanda, you have the floor.

Function

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Thank you. What I'm trying to raise here is some kind of assumptions that we need to have from the new solution, that we're going to guarantee addresses in balanced way [inaudible]. Remember when we started discussing IPv6, IPv4, IPv6, and a lot of things raised [inaudible] – how much we're going to ask for payment, and blah, blah.

So we decided in that time that we're going to see the same first distribution, and then we did that, but this is past. Next two years, three years, we're going to need another slot of IPv6, and we need some assumptions that we need to have same equal balance no-cost distribution. That's my point to put in that decision to guarantee that this is for us users.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Vanda. I take it from your comment here we would wish to insist on having a guarantee for no cost being passed on to users in the future for something that's provided at no cost today. Is that correct?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. Now, it's mostly the balance that will make the same fair distribution of addresses around the world. That's because we did that, but some time ago. Nobody's talking. It's going to change the environment. Someone will take place and take the lead. We're going to need to discuss again. Could be very interesting to have some assumptions that this will follow the same kind of balance and fair distribution around the world.

Function

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this, Vanda. I translate this as being a continuity in allocation of IP address distribution policy.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes, fairness, maybe.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, for this specific point? Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. On the issue of being distributed free to the user community, that's a local RIR decision. Just because they get it free doesn't mean it has to be free coming out.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think we're speaking here more like fairness in the number of addresses.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought there were two issues. One was free to the user; one was fair distribution among.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Free to the user, I guess, is not something we can pursue.

Function

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Because I've paid for IP addresses. I don't think IP addresses are free, per se. Fairness. Fairness is the one.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I continue? Thank you. I am assuming that currently IANA distributes addresses based on the policy agreed to by all five regional registries. I would be completely floored over if that was not part of the requirement that they're going to put into the transfer, so although I agree with the sentiment, I'm not expecting that to be an opposing position.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. The question from Holly was, isn't that something we are looking for, that there would be no change to this policy?

ALAN GREENBERG: Fair [again].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] allocation of IP addresses and fairness, and no change to current policy, which seems to be the—

Function

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [I know] we can suggest no change for the future, because it's far away. My point is just keep the equal and the fairness distribution around the world. That's the main point. We cannot give the one country that is not using Internet yet [inaudible], and not have the same opportunity. That's the point.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. I think the two here somehow capture the spirit. Continue to have allocation of IP address in fairness. Just making sure second one also have IP somewhere on the sentence or just before the bullet points. We know it's directly regarding IP addresses.

On the list, I have next Fatima Cambronero, and then Tijani Ben Jemaa. So, Fatima, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Gracias. Thank you, Olivier. We started talking about the parameter of protocols and IP [duration]. The first brainstorming is about that, or is about names, numbers, and parameters of protocol.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLON: Thank you for this, Fatima. I think we first felt we could do first IP addresses, then protocols, then parameters, but looking at the board, it looks like we actually have a mix of everything, and it probably is better time-wise that we actually mix everything, so we have several pages that we can take from there, and then I'll just reorder than afterwards

Function

Did you have any suggestions to make on any of the other IP protocols or addresses?

FATIMA CAMBRONER: No, not for now. I am organizing my mind, though.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, keep on organizing. Are you running v6? Tijani Ben Jemaa. As long as you don't run out of addresses in your mind, that's fine. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMMA: Thank you. First of all, I would like to thank very much Seun for his contribution, because he's young, he's a fellow, he has commitment with the fellowship program people, and yet he comes here and he contributes. He also contributes on the list. He's a member of this working group, so thank you very much, and please continue to contribute, even if you don't have all of the information. Please continue. This is very important for us.

Now, coming back to the substance. I think that Alan touched the heart of the question. We are speaking about the transition of the IANA functions stewardship. We know the transition is from home, but we don't know to whom, and this is the question. Alan said more likely to be ICANN itself. It could be this [inaudible] , but in this case, the accountability becomes very, very important. Otherwise, ICANN will be

Function

the one who does everything without any oversight, any accountability mechanisms.

OLIVER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani, and I gather that this point was made in relations to the names, not the IP addresses and not the protocols, because I definitely cannot see the IP addresses or the protocols agreeing to being subjected accountability through ICANN. I can really tell you that, judging from the discussions on those mailing lists

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: And this is worse, because in this case there will be ICANN for the naming function, and other thing for the numbering and for the protocols. It will be [dislocation] of the IANA function.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, that's what is there now at the moment. The oversight has some aspect to it, but from what we've heard earlier, it appears both the IP addresses and the protocol are quite happy with their own accountability processes.

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I do understand that, but don't think that the NTIA oversight is not over the numbering and the protocol functions. There wasn't any problem,

Function

any complaint, any if you want, any problem in the oversight, but they have this power of overseeing the three functions.

Now, if you say that ICANN will be in charge of the function of naming only, it would be very, very dangerous, and I don't think it is a good way to go forward.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. I have a queue at the moment with Seun Ojedeji, Jimmy Schulz, and then Eduardo Diaz. Oh, no, Eduardo, you've put your – were you in the queue? Keep your card up so I can catch up. Tijani Ben Jemaa. Sorry, not Tijani. Seun Ojedeji.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, Olivier. I'd like to make some clarifications, some points in relation to the numbers community, because I happen to be quite involved in the numbers world, and I love the processes in the numbers world. It's very, very organized.

In fact, when I started joining ICANN, those who have been seeing my mails, you see that it was quite strange to me how complex the names world was, because the numbers world was quite organized. We had the PDP. We followed the policy development process. Everything is organized, so I don't think there's going to be any major problem with numbers.

However, I think this working group wants to ensure that what is currently working in Numbers is maintained in terms of the PDP, policy

Function

development process, and most especially the GPDP – that is, the Global Policy Development Process- which is what actually concerns ICANN.

I've had an opportunity to read those documents a couple of times, and I think there's one bottleneck on that document and the bottleneck on that document is the fact that whenever there is any disagreement on — I'm saying "if" because it hasn't happened — there are any disagreements on a particular policy, a global policy, the final decision lies on ICANN.

So maybe, going forward, when we want to ask for a clear resolution process that makes sure that the final decision lie on the RIR community? Maybe that could be one of the things we want to watch out for so that we don't get boxed in by the ICANN Board or ICANN management.

Also, in terms of the GPDP, yes, I'd like to agree with Vanda. It does not need to remain the way it is. It can be improved. However, we want to align that. Whatever improvement that is made on the GPDP should actually further ensure [inaudible], ensuring that's the community's view, or the community's further involvement in the decision-making is upheld, because that is what is has been. We the community developed the policies in the numbers world, and all what NRO does is to follow through the processes and then deliver what we have agreed to by consensus through the ASO.

These are the two things. The first thing is that GPDP policy should be maintained, and if there's a need to improve on it, it should be to the advantage of the community involvement. The second thing is to

Function

improve the resolution process, review the resolution process such that the final decision lies on the NRO or the numbers community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Seun. What I've captured from here is mainly two main things. Keep the processes that work for IP addresses identical — don't change them — and the other one, need for a clear resolution process that makes sure the final position rests with the RIR community rather than going back to ICANN in any way.

Did you want to add something, Louie? We have Louie Lee here of the ASO Address Council.

LOUIE LEE: Hi, just real quick, I want to provide some clarity on the global development process.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: GPDP, is that the one?

LOUIE LEE: Yes, yes. GPDP. In that when the proposal is put in front of the ICANN Board, at that point, since it's already been so well-vetted around the world in all the communities, the Board is just looking at fiduciary type issues with the policy. They're not evaluating whether the policy is good or not, because that discussion has already happened. They just want to

Function

make sure that it doesn't cause undue burden on IANA. They want to make sure that the policy has gone through the process correctly, met all the timelines, things of that nature.

So, if they see an issue, they will send that back down with their concerns, but it's not really a matter of them looking at the policy itself. I'm not sure if that helps clarify things, but yeah.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That does, Louie, thank you. But would this remain post-transition?

LOUIE LEE: We believe so, yes.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Seun, and we're just running out of time. I still have a queue, I think. I've closed the queue for the time being. I know I've got Jimmy. I've got Jimmy Schulz, and there were some others. Anyway, Jimmy, go ahead, and Eduardo, of course. Go ahead, Seun, just one last quick – yes, in response.

Function

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'm aware of the process, and what I'm just saying is, whether I would like it or not, or whether I want to face the fact, the fact is that ICANN Board approves policies, right? That is the fact. I'm not saying we've no experience in situations whereby they rejected a global policy, but what if they do? What if they said no? That's what I'm saying. W

e are entering a regime where there is no shock absorber. Let me use that word. We need to look at the "what-ifs" and consider how to provide some backup plan for the rescue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Seun. I was told that Vanda was next. I thought it was Jimmy that was next. Alan, I'm afraid you've missed the queue. Next message. Fair enough.

JIMMY SCHULZ: I'd like to come back to what Tijani and Alan touched. We might end up with ICANN in the final decision and we don't know yet, but it seems very likely to go that way, but I think — and I'd like to add to what Tijani said — there must be some control there, and this control, there's a proven concept since centuries how to control power, and that is by separation of powers into three separate powers, and this has been proven since, well, the French Revolution to be a quite good concept.

So maybe we should think about that, that we separate the powers to — well, the ICANN is doing the stuff, the executive. Someone probably

Function

outside the ICANN will control it, and if anything goes wrong, there's a court that they can go to. Maybe this is a way we could approach that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jimmy. So, what you're proposing is to keep an umbrella or something?

JIMMY SCHULZ: Yes, as an oversight. A democratic oversight, a multi-stakeholder oversight.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Jimmy. Aren't we creating a new ICANN at that point?

JIMMY SCULZ: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So we're doing another ICANN to provide oversight over functions which are – it's a possibility. Let's put it down on there as well. Creation of another oversight body is your suggestion on this. This is brainstorming, so we have to put all the points on there.

Next – I've got a blank list after that. Eduardo Diaz, I think, was after Jimmy.

Function

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to comment on Tijani said about what things are there between the numbering and IPs, and I remember during the — what's his name? The gentleman here from the IETF.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Jari Arkko.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Jari Arkko, yes. I asked him when he put the — how you call it? — the presentation here that there is an agreement between IETF and ICANN or the NTIA, I asked him, just something with the NTIA. He said, "No, we don't have any agreements with the US government."

What I'm trying to say is that that infrastructure that is there, I don't think it's going to change. And he talked about appealing processes, stuff like that, that is already in place for things when they don't go the right way, so I feel comfortable with that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Eduardo. I can't focus on the discussion any more. I think we have another meeting that's supposed to take place right now. It's all recorded. We've got a flip chart here. We've made some progress today. It was a little short, and we're starting to get into it, but what I ask you is to perhaps continue on this length.

Function

Think about further points that you would like to see on the flip chart, and then e-mail them over to staff, and we'll make a full list of them. It's a good start, I think. We've got quite a few points here that we want to touch on. Certainly the performance metrics and the response strategies and all these are important.

I was going to touch on another issue, which was the file which was sent by Jordan Carter to the naming issues discussion, looking at the potential structural separation scenarios, but that is in the IANA Issues Working Group mailing list, and so I encourage you to have a look at those. It's quite an interesting document which looks at different scenarios for basically separating IANA, and breaking it apart into several pieces and things, but that's it.

So, ladies and gentlemen, thanks very much for this, and I would like to thank the interpreters, thank of course our staff, and this session is now adjourned. Thank you.

GISELLA GRUBER-WHITE:

If I may, as we have a closed meeting taking place now in this room, if I could just ask everyone if we could leave the room, please — thank you — except the Chairs of the RALOs who will be staying. Thank you very much, and see you all tomorrow.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]
