

At-Large Ad-hoc WG on the Transition of US Government Stewardship of the IANA Function

14 October 2014

Draft Notes

JJS: His comments are at a high level for the way forward for this WG

- 1) Meetings with the numbers and then the IGC reps.

Several points:

1. We will need to be very selective. We don't want to make a shopping list. Our approach should be that we make a list of what we think are important for the global internet users. That will make us different than the other groups. Others will be more inspired to talk about different issues. We need to focus on where we can bring added value.
2. During the meeting with the ICG – it was put whether there is still two categories (contributions and input). Reply from the ICG was there are no more categories. Instead, all contributions will be regarded in the same way. This will be well transcribed in the recordings of today's proceedings.
3. Timeline – slight shift in the timeline has been discussed. However, it is better to assume that there will be no change in the timeline. No shift is seen. ALAC needs to respect the timeline as is.

Tijani Ben Jemaa:

Believes that JJS was too optimistic re categories. Alissa said that the proposal for this has to come from the operational partners. So it is mainly the same thing. They think that the naming entities will need to make the proposal . Everyone will be able to make inputs, but what is the meaning of these inputs?

Narelle Clark:

I would like to reinforce that we will listen to proposals from everyone. However, we want consensus. We need to see the communities work through the issues and get to a post transition place. We will look at the level of consensus reached. Where we see groups are in transition, we will take that into account. I am confident this is shared across the communities.

Fatima Cambronera :

I thank JJS for his comments as very clear. I will comment on his 2nd point. This is the time for us to make a list of issues we'd like to discuss. If we want to make a contribution, we will need to work with other processes. We need to start working right now which is a substantial content.

JJS:

We should feel completely confident. There was a time for doubts and ambiguity. We now have to go forward and that we are entitled to do it. One of the first things is to really narrow down on the number of topics to be seen as value added from the user community.

AG:

I like the way to discussion is going. Remember, for the IANA transfer three components: internet protocol numbers, numbers and names. If we have anything say on numbers, we need to ... on names, I think that unless we disagree with the ICG comes out with on that, then we can't forget that we are one of the three that are allowed to submit proposals. We need to think where we can add value on the numbers issues. Then we can discuss on the names issues. We have 5 reps on this group. Hopefully we won't need to submit anything to the ICG on names as our reps will be vocal on the CWG.

OCL:

So now we need brainstorming.

Eduardo Diaz:

I think that there is a major thing on and that is the accountability, what happens, what are we going to be accountable for. We are only hearing "we don't know".

OCL asked staff to set up the flip charts

AG:

Questioned why accountability is to be discussed.

Eduardo Diaz:

Re accountability, how does it get fixed if we don't get what we want. We need to do some brainstorming. I felt our discussion with the ICG – it was more on process. Not the content.

OCL:

Asked for clarification on 'if something goes wrong'

Flip chart:

Post transition safeguards

TBJ:

Regarding the numbering, they have put a page to work on the issue and the contribution of the community is welcome. I was looking forward to working with AFRINIC but haven't seen anything yet.

If possible, the submission, we need to work with what the NRO. This way consensus can occur.

OCL:

What is the topic with the NRO?

TBJ:

It is the same.

Holly Raiche:

I don't think several of us are not qualified on the technical. However, we could all agree on performance metrics that are published regularly, risk management matrix, response strategies.

Alan Greenberg:

A couple of things. A lot of what Holly mentioned, is the status quo. Clearly what we want to see commits to what we are doing now and perhaps commits to doing more. The optimal contribution that we can make is to say nothing. As we watch what comes out of the three orgs, than we don't need to make any contribution. Larry Strickland is clearly presuming that the final recipient of the proposal is ICANN. If that is the case, then some of what Eduardo is saying is that some of ICANN staff are not doing what they are supposed to do. That is a management issue. So if we are working towards an outcome that I believe that we are working toward – that is, that ICANN is the ultimate recipient of the IANA Stewardship Function. (confidence in managing the root zone)

So we need to discuss what would we be happy with on what comes out of the threes orgs?

Seun O.

Metrics which have been released on the NRO site. Perhaps an outcome of this group is that we study these metrics. However, at the moment ,no idea re how NRO will incorporate comments on their metrics.

Second point is that numbers...the numbers work is not as global. It might be difficult to get this WG to work on this.

So, we need to ask the NRO by which At-Large can contribute globally.

OCL:

Pointed out that this sounds more like process and this was covered earlier in the day.

Seun O:

Repeated process of contributing to NRO

OCL:

Explained how.

Process: We will participate as individuals on mailing lists. However, what we are working on is whether At-Large will make a separate contribution. What is our value added. There will be multiple opportunities for additional contributions.

Vanda Scartezini:

We need to have assumptions that we are going to guarantee...Remember when we began discuss IPv4, IPv6...but this is past. We will now need another slot of IPv6. We need to have assumptions that we will have a balanced distribution.

OCL:

So no cost?

Vanda Scartezni:

Equal distribution. Fair distribution.

Alan Greenberg:

On issue of being distributed free – that is up to the regional RIRs.

Vanda Scartezini :

Fairness.

Alan Greenberg:

(Didn't capture), but I would be floored over if the organizations didn't come out with that.

Vanda Scartezini:

No, main point is that the distribution should be equal. Just because a country doesn't have the capacity now, doesn't mean they should have the opportunity in the future.

Fatima Cambronera:

Asked for clarity

TBJ:

I thank Seun for his contribution. He is young and a Fellow and should continue. Re substance, Alan touched the heard of the issue: We know transition from, but transition to whom? Likely ICANN. If another, then accountability is key. If not then ICANN does everything without accountability and oversight.

OCL:

That is what we have now

TBJ:

If you say that ICANN has only function over naming, then that is not a good thing.

Seun O:

(Didn't capture). If there is a difference,... We may wish to ask for a clear process that puts the community in the final say. Otherwise we may get boxed in by ICANN and the Board.

The second thing is to review the process such that the final discussion lies on the numbers community.

Keep the process for numbers as is.

Ensure that the final say is said by the community.

Louie Lee:

Clarity on the GDPD – since it will have been vetted by the global community, the Board will only be looking at fiduciary issues. If they see an issue here, they will send it back down.

OCL:

Will this remain post-Transition?

Louie Lee:

Yes

Seun O:

The fact is that the ICANN Board approves policy. What happens if they say no to the GPDP?

Jimmy Schulz:

I'd like to come back to what Tijani and Alan touched. It seems very likely that it will go to ICANN. There should be some control. We need to think about separating the powers – ICANN is the executive and if anything goes wrong, then an external oversight that is multilateral and bottom up.

OCL:

Asked for people to send additional points to At-Large staff.