
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large Capacity Building Program 2015, the first webinar on the topic “IANA functions, standards, naming and numbering” on Wednesday, December 3rd 2014 at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing a roll call as it is a webinar, but if I can please remind everyone on the phone bridge as well as the computer to mute your speakers and microphone, as well as state your name when speaking – not only for transcription purposes but also to allow our interpreters to identify you on other language channels. We have Spanish and French interpretation. Thank you very much for joining and over to you, Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Terri. This is our webinar about IANA functions, which will be presented by Patrick Fältström, who is the Chair of SSAC. Patrick will try and explain to us what the functions are. This webinar is basic knowledge for the whole community of At-Large. If we want to understand the transition, perhaps first we need to understand what actions the stewardship will be given, to another body for the NTIA, the US Government. Patrick will do that today. I want to remind you that we’ll have another webinar next week, on December 10th.

It will be about the transition. This call will prepare for next week’s call. When Patrick finishes his presentation, we will open the floor for questions. Thank you very much. Patrick, the floor is yours.

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.

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Thank you very much. As you will see on the slide deck, it consists of two parts. The first one is the description of the IANA functions, and the second one is the description of the process from the viewpoint of the ICG. I have included that second part, just because I feel that my duty as the Co Chair as the ICG it also shows that... Someone else is changing the slides there. We need to agree on who is doing it.

Okay. As the Chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, which is a sibling organization to ALAC, we've been looking at the IANA and its functions in detail. I'll explain to you our view and our findings. First of all, the background for all this work is the announcement on March 14th 2014 that the Commerce Department announced it would like to transition out of the current role. What they're talking about is not extending the contract further. The US Government wrote a contract with ICANN once upon a time in the late 1990s and that's been extended over and over again.

Together with lots of people, I was helping with the creation of the first contract, and in those days I must admit that we thought this process, the step we're in at the moment, would take place around the 2000s. Boy, were we wrong. We're not here 14 years later and at last we have the situation that the US Government don't want to extend the contract. It's very important to remember once again that the US Government do not have the intention of extending the contract with ICANN, and the US Government asked ICANN to convene the process; that is to come up with a proposal on what to do, if anything, when the contract is no longer extended.

By the way, if anyone has any questions, please raise your hand in the Adobe Connect and I will try to note that and give the floor to you. The word 'IANA' is the traditional name that's used to refer to many different kinds of things. What it means depends on context. Depending on who you ask, it will actually mean different things. It's a traditional name used to refer to the technical team that actually make the assignments and publish the results or act according to whatever the rules for the assignments are. This technical team is doing a couple of tasks that involves the administration of these various identifiers.

For example, when one identifier, one thing is taken care of, certain actions have to be taken – for example when the address of a registry for a TLD is changing, then the WHOIS database should be updated. When the IP address of a name server of a TLD is changing then the root zone is to be updated. When a protocol parameter for example if a private enterprise number is allocated, then the database over private enterprise numbers is to be updated. So that is the IANA in the form of the group that do the assignments of work with the assignments and parameters.

The other way of looking at IANA is to say that IANA is the current set of tasks that involves administration. You have to differ between the organization, the tasks that are done, and also as you'll see later on, the various issues that are covered by the various contracts. There are a number of different contracts that describes the current IANA function. The most important one is the one between ICANN and NTIA, and among other [unclear 06:53] very high level, we talk about the DNS root zone management, we talk about the management of IP addresses, we talk about the protocol parameter registry, which is mostly what the

IETF work with, including the management of the .arpa top level domain, on request from the Internet Architecture Board, and we also talk about management of the .int top level domain.

As you see here, even before we go into the various details, IANA deals with more things than just the domain names, and that's really important to remember. If we look at the history and overview of IANA, the SSAC has written a document that is number 67, and it was published in August 2014. What it's trying to do is explain what functions the IANA Team is working with. It describes the activities not only included in the IANA conscience contract – it also talks about all the other things that the IANA team at ICANN is doing, for example the things that are performed under the MOU with the IETF.

It focuses though on the IANA functions contract, and it describes the various activities that are related to IANA functions, as they are currently performed, including those that are outside of the IANA functions contract. So there are two differences here between the contract and what IANA's doing. The first one is that the group of ICANN that deals with IANA issues, is doing more things than what is in the IANA contract. The second difference is that certain things described in the IANA contract have evolved over time, and what the IANA group at ICANN is now doing is a modern version of what's in the contract.

It's really important to remember that there's a difference between the two though. To make that even more clear, SSAC also wrote Document #68, that we published in October, and in this report we provide an overview of the key elements of the IANA functions contract, so we were not only talking about the functions themselves. The first

Document, #67, starts with the IANA group of ICANN and looked at what they're doing. The second document, #68, is starting with the contract, and looks explicitly of what the contract is talking about.

The documents also, in much detail talk about the role that NTIA currently plays with respect to IANA functions, based on the current contractual information. #58 goes through the contract, looks at what IANA's doing and also looks at what NTIA is doing, based on the contract. If you look at the various functions and how NTIA is involved, if you look at the most prominent functions and take them one by one, we'll see that for DNS root zone management, the involved parties are ICANN, NTIA and Verisign. The [unclear 10:22] here is to be the contract administrator and also the actual root zone management process administrator.

We'll look at that in a minute. For the other functions, the Internet numbers registry management, the protocol parameter registry management, and .arpa and .int management, the NTIA is only the IANA functions contract administrator – so it's only the first one, the root zone management – where NTIA actually do have a role; more than holding the other end of the contract. If we look at the parties involved, as I said, the DNS root zone management, there we have the ICANN, NTIA and Verisign.

For IP addresses we have ICANN under authority of the RIRs and their communities; the RIRs, which is RIPE, APNIC, AFRINIC, LACNIC and ARIN. For the protocol parameter registry management, it is ICANN, under the authority of the IETF and/or Internet Architecture Board, or other organizations that have requested IANA to take care of various

parameters, and one of those groups is actually ICANN, but for the primary role it's the IETF. For .arpa and .int it's ICANN, under the authority of IETF, the Internet Architecture Board and other existing processes – and .int is a bit complicated because it has to do with international treaty organizations and their ability to get domain names.

If we look at the root zone management, which is the parameter that's a little bit special, we see that in the top left we have the TLD operator within the grey bubble, and the TLD operator [unclear 12:22] on a functions operator, which is at ICANN. They communicate with the root zone maintainer, which is Verisign, and the administrator, which is NTIA. What is happening there is the administrator, which is NTIA, says an explicit okay to the change and then the root zone maintainer does the change and the changes made by the root zone maintainer Verisign in the root zone, and then the root zone is then distributed via the root server operators to the various root servers around the world.

In this case, as we saw in the previous picture, NTIA as an administrator, is part of the chain of authorization of the change request. That's my summary of the IANA functions themselves. I've now changed that slightly to being Co Chair of the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group, which is a very long name, but we call ourselves ICG. I'll point out a little bit more in detail of what the process looks like. I do know that we'll talk about this next week, but it's really important to look at the overall architecture in the context of what I've just presented to you.

The background of course is exactly the same, and the ICG itself, as many of you know, consists of representatives appointed by these

various organizations, and the various organizations or groups have appointed between one and five Members of the ICG. The role of ICG is not to write anything or do any proposal developments, and yes, Olivier, it is an incredible acronym. I got a question on Monday afternoon in Copenhagen on what ICG stood for, and I actually forgot it myself. If someone on the call can really spell out all the acronyms on this slide, I'd be happy to buy [unclear 14:37] next time. Very complicated.

The important thing here is that ICG is only coordinating. We're not writing any proposals. Instead, the work is concentrated among looking at these three different groups of things that I just talked about, when I described IANA – the protocol parameters, the root zone management for DNS, and the Internet numbers. Those are the three major themes, which you saw on my previous slides and you'll see here again. The reason for this, that it's divided in three, is because we have these three communities.

At the moment I work really hard on trying to come up with proposals. We have the IETF community that's writing a document for the protocol parameters, and they released their proposal last week. We have the naming CCWG within ICANN that's working on their proposal. The first draft was published Monday this week, and you have the RIR communities, which with the help of a group called CRISP, are trying to come up with their proposal which will be, if I understand correctly, made publicly available, the first version, at the end of this week or maybe within the next couple of weeks.

So you have these three communities, but as individuals we can work in each one of those if we want to. We can move between them or we can

focus on the group that we're most concerned about, depending on what part of IANA we're most concerned about. That is what we're trying to illustrate with this stick-man; that they can work back and forth between these three groups. Our intention in ICG is to make sure that the various communities can come up with some proposals, and we've sent out an RFP and we want responses by January 15th 2015. The groups have told us they think they can deliver maybe not by January 15th but at least no later than January 31st, so early next year these proposals will be ready.

At that point in time, we in ICG will look at those and see how well coordinated they are. We'll look how the NTIA criteria were met, we'll look at the consensus level and community process, but once again, we are not writing up any proposals, we're not going to rewrite anything. Instead we're looking at the consensus and we hope the communities can work together. If it's the case that people don't have synchronized enough proposals then people need to start talking to each other – really important. If you look at the timeline, we have this year. In purple you see what we do in ICG.

We worked a lot in September until October, and there was quite a lot of work that we did. At the moment we don't do so much, but the communities work really hard on getting these proposals together. Moving to next year, in 2015, we see that the various communities develop their proposals and they're sending it over to us. We need to work very, very hard. We think we need to work on these proposals until March something – beyond the ICANN Meeting in Singapore.

What we'll do is then go back to the communities and ask them whether our interpretation is correct, and based on that response we'll develop a final response between May and June, and in June we need to pass things to the communities for a last consultation, and in July we have to pass things to NTIA. In the meantime of course, from the proposals that come in in May, the communities ask, you in ALAC – we all have to do some texting and trial to see whether the various proposals fulfill and match all the various requirements from NTIA and the requirements the community set up.

The various steps that are going to go through it – that we're going to do some assessment of the proposals for the complete or the clear criteria, and also the objective criteria. What's the consensus level? Has there been inclusiveness in the community process? The next step is to do an assessment of a unified proposal. Is it possible to merge these three into a unified proposal? Are they compatible with each other? Will they inter-operate? Are there any gaps or overlaps? What about the accountability that's going on in a different CCWG inside ICANN? Are there any accountability indications on IANA, on ICANN, and other changes that might need to be done?

Finally, there's some finalization that has to be done; public comments [unclear 20:11] ICG again, mainly changes that are done in the various communities – once again not by the ICG – and then finally a submission to the NTIA. Those are the steps. I wanted to show that even though we talk about the process next time, the three parts of IANA are something that you see again when looking at the three different communities, and then we're looking at the actual merge that we'll do in

ICG. Then I have one page here with lots of references and links, etcetera.

The actual processes themselves have to be open. For example the ICG, where I'm the Co Chair, as you'll see at the bottom of this page, our internal mailing list is open, so you can't join the mailing list but you can look at the mailing list archives and look at all our discussions. You can see exactly where we agreed and disagreed. The only thing that has not been published are the things to do with procurement or explicit human resources related issues, regarding secretariat and administration of the ICG itself, but everything else you can see on the mailing list, just by looking at the archives. That's one way you can follow the work that we do in ICG.

With that, I'm done, and I'm happy to receive questions and move into Q&A. Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Patrick for this presentation. I want to really thank you because you have a strategic way to present those functions, which are more or less complicated. I want to remind the group that the aim of this webinar is to understand the key functions of IANA, so please try to focus on this when you ask questions. If you have other questions about the transition, yes, Patrick is one of two Vice Chairs of the ICG, so please ask questions. I'll ask one question to Patrick. Suppose you manage to get harmonious proposals from the three communities that you can compile later and have only one from the three.

Suppose this proposal meets any conditions except one of the NTIA conditions. Shall you refuse it, or if everyone is convinced with it after the public comment, and there is only one condition of the NTIA that's not satisfied, shall you refuse the proposal or will you negotiate with NTIA.

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM:

That's a good question. First of all, we will only hand one proposal to NTIA. You used absolutely correct terminology here. We get one proposal from each one of the communities. We might get more from others as well, but our job is just like you explained, to create one proposal that we're handing over to NTIA. In the first step, we in ICG are evaluating whether all the requirements are met. If our view is that the requirements are not met then we'll push back to the communities to ask them to please fulfill or ensure that all requests are fulfilled.

If, on the other hand, we draw a conclusion that all the requirements are met then we'll pass it over to NTIA. If they then say, "Sorry, you've not met all the requirements," in that case it will be a combination of us convincing NTIA that the requirements are met, because we draw the conclusions that the requirements were met. If you call that negotiation, I don't like to use that term because it implies that we would make changes to the documents and the proposals that the community has created, and we've promised the community that we would not make, other than the editorial merge between the various proposals.

If NTIA refuses to accept what the ICG thinks is a complete proposal, then we need to push that back into the communities to re-do the work. We view ourselves [unclear 25:23].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Patrick. So they are the Bible, more or less – not negotiable. Thank you very much. Ron, you have a question?

RON SHERWOOD: Good morning. Thank you Patrick. Can you have a link where we can redo the slideshow that you've just presented?

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM: I take for granted that the slides will be available for the participants on this call and other people in ALAC. Secondly, the description I presented in the first part, you can find much more detailed in the SSAC document – SSAC 67 and 68, and I'll point you out to those documents in the chat shortly.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Ron, I can tell you that all the material of this Capacity Building Program will be available on the capacity building page. All the presentations – not only this one, but the upcoming ones also. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Patrick, you mentioned at one point the .int and you mentioned this was one of the functions that needed to be somehow

dealt with as well. Who was supposed to be dealing with this and to what extent is this actually affected by this transition of stewardship, .int?

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Regarding .int, that is something that the IANA do have a process for how to handle it. That's a combination of the IETF, the IAB and the naming community. .Int is in between the naming community and the protocol parameters, and whether one or both of these communities will pick that up, that is something I don't know – it's up to those communities. The rules for .int, the policy, is that you need to be an international treaty organization and the UN do have a registry of those, and that's the policy and that's to be followed, so there's not much to say about .int. But it's up to the naming and the protocol parameters constituencies to make up the mind on who will [unclear 28:44].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Patrick and Olivier. I have a question on the chat from Fatima. The question is: "You said people have to start talking with each other on something like that. Is it new that each community had to coordinate their proposals with the other communities before they submit to the ICG?" This is the question.

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Thank you Fatima. Very nice to hear from you. Yes, it implies that the communities need to talk to each other. That's something that's not so hard to do as the communities are time-wise pretty well synchronized.

As I said, the naming community and the protocols community both now have the first versions of their documents publicly available. Exactly how they're going to do the coordination, I don't know. Maybe there's enough to just have individuals participating in the multiple processes. That's something we all together as individuals have to work on – exactly how to do the coordination.

But the evaluation of whether there is overlap or gaps, that's a job that the ICG needs to do. So it might be very well that we in the ICG discover that there needs to be more communication regarding specific issues, and that we in ICG will let the communities know that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Patrick. Gisella has kindly answered Ron's question, saying you have the link to those slides on the Agenda. Any other questions? We still have 25 minutes, so please go ahead. I have another question Patrick. Do you think that it's possible to have proposals [unclear 31:37] three separate oversights on the three IANA functions? Do you think it's possible to replace the NTIA by three oversight mechanisms?

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM:

First of all, I don't want to answer that question because that's something the community has had to decide themselves – whether that is possible. There are also questions of course on whether any oversight is needed at all. There's also a question of if an oversight is created, whether it can be, like in the case of the IETF, the policy development body. Remember, the IETF are doing oversight over the enterprise on the protocol side of IANA. So there are a lot of open questions, and

those are the questions that the communities need to respond to. That's exactly what they're going to work on, and I don't want to [color 32:37]...

I do have people on this call who've had to make up their mind and participate, and really run a clear bottom-up process. I don't want anyone to think that this should be a [public 32:52] design of what the outcome will be. I really don't want to answer that question. I'm really sorry.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Patrick. I didn't want to ask for a confirmation or anything, but do you think it's possible?

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM: Let me answer that question. Theoretically, of course you can have different oversights. You already have that today with the existing IANA, to some degree. The important thing is that the oversight, if there is one, if there are multiples of them, are not in conflict, or if they are in conflict that they are known conflicts and how to resolve them. In theory, absolutely.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have another question with regards to representation from the different stakeholder communities in the overall process. To what extent has there been good representation from the different stakeholder communities? I've heard that governments have potential challenges in being able to catch up with the speed of the process. Are there any plans to evaluate afterwards the extent to which the overall stakeholders have participated – bearing in mind I think it's part of the presentation of the plan that has to be sent to NTIA? Would it then be part of the ICG's work to assess this, or is that part of the operational communities to assess this?

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM: Who's going to assess it? To be honest, I don't really know. It might be that part of this is ICG. As the Co Chair of ICG I can say that I personally think that together with other Chairs will do an assessment. I hope that the operational communities do an assessment. I also hope that the various groups that appoint people are doing their assessments on how effective the appointments have been. I also think that maybe, because this is created under ICANN's processes, that the future ATRT might have a look at this. I would be very nervous if there's only one assessment.

I think a multitude of assessments is what we need here, to be able to learn from what we have done. Now, you used the word "representatives" from these various entities. I must say that that is not how I, as the ICG Chair, or how I as the Chair of SSAC, is viewing the participants on ICG. We see the individuals as being appointed by these organizations, which is something completely different. On the other hand, that's exactly the kind of – if I use the word [steps 36:08] – and

you brought up the Government Advisory Committee as one example, where they have very explicitly said that they have – just like we from SSAC – have appointed people that are participating in ICG.

But what they are saying is not what the group appointing what their view is. Some other groups, they've appointed people who've had issues speaking unless they speak on behalf of that organization. This is something that at the moment I see as being maybe one of the issues that one might see more issues with in ICG; that the different groups have different views of the role of the individual that's participating on the ICG. Is it a representative of the organization, or is it an individual that's participating because they're appointed by the organization?

One thing I really hope is that regardless of which it is, that that will not create any problems when we are moving into the actual coordination work that we have to do during the spring, because that might be something that creates some issues. If it is creating too many issues then it's something that we need to resolve.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Patrick. Olivier, you asked for the floor again. Please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you. Following up on what Patrick's said there, you mentioned the ICG's timetable. There appears to be much possibility for community feedback. I see here "final response review", "final response

delivery”, or “review of the draft response”. Who would perform that review?

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM: The review is the blue compared to the purple. The purple is when ICG is doing work and the blue is when communities, anyone, is doing work. View the light blue areas as public comments periods. Does that answer your question?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I can see that, but by communities do you mean operational communities or do you mean the wider community in the whole world; speaking directly to the ICG or going via the operational communities?

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM: I think we need to do as much outreach as we can. It should be noted that specifically with a process that has this tight time schedule, it will be extremely hard to reach out for example to communities that do not have Internet access, that do not have good web access and do not have good email access, so it will still of course be a very limited outreach, but that’s when we all have to work together. I don’t see this as being limited to the operational communities. Absolutely not.

On the other hand let me say that if people are given feedback and it’s for example on what’s coming from an operational community, I personally think that if an individual wants to give feedback, it will have most effect if it’s coordinated within an operational community that can then be a joint feedback, instead of having just an individual sending

something during a PCP. I hear you ask two things here: “Can I, as an individual, respond during one of those review processes?” My view is absolutely yes.

“Will it have as much impact if I as an individual write to ICG as if I participate in a community operational group?” I’d say probably not, just like now. If an individual you can write a proposal and send it to the ICG, but I recommend all individuals that talk with me to instead participate in one of the communities because it will have more impact there.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Patrick. You clearly say that the weight of the proposal defers from being from an individual or an operational community, so the operational community has the most weight regarding the proposals and regarding the comments too.

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Let me clarify here. Regardless of whether it’s an operational community, when you have a PCP we also see that in the work happening in ICANN, because I think this will be very similar, in ICANN, in the RIRs’ work, in the IETF. The larger the group is that coordinates their response, it might be from a certain geographical region or across communities from a specific language region or across communities from a specific culture – the more response coordinated the higher impact it will have. The likely ones again are to be viewed as PCPs, where of course the more homework you’ve done, the more impact it will have.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Patrick. I say that because we have been told that everyone can make proposals, everyone can make contributions, comments, etcetera. They said there is no difference between the proposals. Now I understand from you that it will be better considered if it comes from the operational community.

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM: Don't misunderstand what I'm saying. The ICG needs to listen to all people on the planet that have internet access. If we get something written by one individual that's not by anyone else, it's very hard to say how much weight that will have, compared to if that individual has been talking to, for example, everyone else in South America or everyone else in Sweden, or everyone else that speaks Arabic, for example. That's how we should see it. But absolutely, everyone can send in a proposal or comment, and this is not like a democracy. This is a meritocracy.

What people are saying and what the comments people are coming into, is based on the weight and the quality of the comments. That's always the primary issue. The quality of the comments depends on for example if you have been talking to your friends and other [unclear 43:22], because that will increase the quality of what you're sending in.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Patrick. Because of what you said, may I rephrase what you said like this. The comments will have more weight if they are coordinated with communities, and the [unclear 43:42] operation.

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yes, that is correct, but when I say communities I don't... I think one way of sending comments for example is to send in a comment from a specific geographic or language region, across the operational communities. Because the operational communities that do the proposals, they're very much divided on the three different parts of IANA, while the reviews might come from example, one from Europe, one from Asia and one from Africa, which is across the operational communities but from another community. So you might have different community definitions. Anyone can send in comments. I'll emphasize that once again, because that's absolutely correct.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have a follow up question. Patrick, you've been doing this presentation a number of times, and of course you were one of the key drafters in SSAC, for the SSAC 067 and 078 and all of this very valid and valuable information, which I know has been used by a lot of people in the process, from all the different communities. What are the frequently asked questions or confusions that people have made with regards to the IANA stewardship transition process, with regards to the IANA functions, that you had to answer to set the record straight and make sure that people understand the issue.

What are the most frequent confusions that people make? I think it would be helpful if you gave us a few answers without us actually being confused before you give the answer. Thank you.

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Thank you Olivier. I've done this a couple of times so this is not too hard to explain. The first confusion is that people think that IANA only has to do with DNS and domain names and the root zone. That is number one. It is also IP addresses and protocol parameters. The second confusion is that people think that the IANA group at ICANN and the IANA functions is only what is covered by the contracts by NTIA. It is not. There is a difference between what we do and what is in the contract. The third thing is that people think that the question is what will replace NTIA? The question is, "What is replacing NTIA at the other end of the contract?"

That is not the question. The question is given that the contract is not extended, what is to be done, if anything? Maybe the answer is, "Please continue. We can do this just like it is today with absolutely no changes, without NTIA." Maybe that is the answer. Maybe the answer is to replace it with one organization, maybe with many. I don't know. But the important thing is that given that the contract is not extended, what to do? Very generic, very open-ended question. The last thing that is confusing, which more has to do with the protocol parameters, is people do believe that only the IETF or IANA takes care of protocol parameters, for example. That is not the case.

Also other organizations do, such as ICANN. It is also the case that some thing IETF is asking IANA for everything. That's not the case. They have all sorts of [unclear 47:40] to take care of at least one parameter. People have to remember that there are many details when you dig into the details here, but the most important question I get is, "Wait a

second, IANA is more than DNS?” And secondly, “Wait a second, IANA is not only what is covered in the contract?”

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Patrick. That’s really helpful. As you know, at the beginning, when we announced the call, we ask that questions or ideas be submitted to the community before the webinar, so that they are [unclear 48:23] to ask questions. This has not been done because this call was very difficult to organize because of the availability of Patrick. Thank you very much Patrick for making yourself available, despite all your commitments. May I ask you Patrick, if you don’t mind, to write some questions, so that we distribute them to the community and so that if they still have a question to ask or they still have comments, they can send them to us and we’ll give them more clarity?

PATRICK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Yes. If you have further questions based on this, just send them to me and I’ll do the best I can to respond to them.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. Any other questions? We still have some minutes, so please make use of them. I see no hands, no questions. I will thank you very much Patrick for this presentation, for doing this despite your commitments and the very short notice, because the date changed because of the evolution of the situation regarding the transition. Thank you again, and I hope that our community now understands better the functions and has a good introduction to the transition. We will have

another call next week about the transition, and Olivier would like to give you a summary of all the webinars organized about the IANA transition. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. In the chat right now I've put a link to a page that describes the public comment that's now been opened up for the naming part of the IANA stewardship transition. As Patrick said, it was the names, the protocols and the IP addresses. Within ICANN there was a CCWG That dealt specifically with the names. The public comment opened on December 1st and will close on December 22nd. There are webinars to explain the actual proposals, and as you'll see on that page, there was a webinar just a few hours ago. There are two more webinars that will take place tomorrow – one at 12:30 UTC and one at 16:00 UTC, tomorrow, Thursday, 4th December. There is a time zone converter on that page so you'll be able to find out. All the details on how to join that call are given on that page.

If you want to speak during the meeting you'll have to ask for a dial-out. If you want to follow the webinar and have no need to speak, but will be able to type in your questions, then you can go into the AC room that's displayed on that page. Why is it important to follow this? Because this, as Patrick said, will feed into the overall process and ultimately be sent to the US Department of Commerce. There are many different issues involved, as far as the names are concerned. The document in the report is quite large. It would take quite a while to read. It's probably a lot easier to get a nice summary.

I attended the one a couple of hours ago and it was very well presented by the Chair of the Working Group and by the various Chairs. That was really helpful. I forgot to mention the At-Large community also has a Working Group that's been following this very closely. As you know, we've been feeding into the process. We had some people that met in the face-to-face meeting that took place in Frankfurt a couple of weeks ago, to build that proposal, but the At-Large would like to comment on the proposal itself.

Our plan is to have something ready by the webinar next week, and use that webinar to present the At-Large IANA Naming Issues Response to the proposal of the CCWG, and gain your feedback. Because it's particularly important that we are able to gain the feedback of the At-Large community on what we think is important, and what our response it.

I advise you all to be on that webinar next week; the date of which has been sent by email to everyone. I've sent a quick note. It's on Wednesday, 10th of December, 21:00 UTC. More details about the agenda will be sent soon, and the At-Large IANA Issues Working Group, as I said, is working together now to put together a presentation and document for you next week. Come with questions. We'll be absolutely happy to answer any questions you have on the naming issues. We look forward to seeing you all there.

Last but not least, as you know everything is recorded, so please tell your colleagues as well to listen to the recording we've had here and also if they have the time, going over to those IANA stewardship transition webinars – attend at least one of them. Very interesting to

see what the points are and what the proposal is. Thank you very much Tijani for letting me do a commercial plug for this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier for that. I just want to make it clear that the webinar tomorrow is one webinar replicated in three different times – one today and two tomorrow – so that all people in all regions of the world can attend it without pain because of the time. This is the first one. The second point is that the webinar next week, on December 10th, will be dedicated to the transition of the naming function – the stewardship transition of the naming function.

At the end of the webinar, after explaining all the process, Olivier and people who are from the CWG, will give the proposal and try to get from all the community all the feedback about the proposal, so that At-Large will make a contribution, which reflects the point of view of the whole community. Thank you very much all. Thank you Patrick, thank you interpreters, thank you staff. See you tomorrow on the other call. Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]