TERRI AGNEW:	Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the NARALO monthly teleconference on Monday, the 12th of January, 2015 at 20:00 UTC.
	On the call today, we have Murray McKercher, Ron Sherwood, Howard Deane, Garth Graham, Joly MacFie, Allan Skuce, Loris Taylor, Matthew Rantanen, Ken Whitehurst, Evan Leibovitch, Gordon Chillcott, and Ogi.
	Our apologies are from Judith Hellerstein, Glenn McKnight, and Olivier Crepin-Leblond.
	From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Terri Agnew.
	I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much, and back over to you, Evan.
EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	Okay, thanks very much. First, I just want to confirm, is Alan Greenberg on the call?
TERRI AGNEW:	He has not joined yet.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. He's on the agenda, and he did tell me he would be attending, so I will move forward on some of the other things first. Thank you.

Welcome to everyone, and especially to the two people who are on the call, Howard and Ken, from the Consumers Council of Canada, our newest ALSes, and we'll talk a little bit about that in a moment.

So first, could I ask someone from staff to update us on the action items?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Hello. We are going to review the action items.

The first action item is the First Nations Mentoring Program. Heidi, if you would.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. Thank you, Silvia. The FY16 advisory committee special request process will be beginning likely this week for At-Large. We're in communication with Alan and Tijani, who are the Chairs and Vice Chair for the ALAC Subcommittee on Finance and Budget. This program, the First Nations Mentoring Program, will be going ahead as one of the proposals, the requests. I have been asked to lead that from staff, and I have a small team for that and will be moving ahead with that.

If I could continue on 2.2, which is the VIBUG, to have Garth have access to VIBUG. My understanding is that the IT team of ICANN have been in contact with Garth and VIBUG for this. I think this one might be able to be closed because that's ongoing and in progress.

Over to you, Silvia.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you, Heidi. Yes.

I can add to 2.2 that this action item, adding access to visually impaired, is also being looked at under the Accessibility Taskforce. So there is progress, and staff are looking at these issues and working with IT to implement technical possibilities to grant access to not only visually impaired, all other impaired persons.

Then 2.3 is the ALSes decertifications pending. From a staff perspective, we don't have any update. I don't know if NARALO has any progress.

If not, we can go to 2.4. This is the signature of the NARALO and ARIN MOU. A consensus was reached and signature of the agreement will take place in Singapore. Gisella just told me she's working on scheduling and finding a good time to do the signature, so we'll get back to you on exact date for this. Congratulations on reaching this important agreement.

Then 2.5 is the update on the application of the Consumer Association of Canada. Yes, the ALS has received notification of accreditation today. So welcome, and congratulations to this new ALS.

Number 3, I believe, is a duplication of the decertification.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I just wanted to ask her, I was on mute partially between 2.3, and I just wanted an update of why it's on hold and what are we waiting for?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Okay. I do not have an update on what are we waiting for. I believe that the due diligence has to be conducted, and we need from NARALO a decision on whether to decertify these ALSes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Evan, if I could add to that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: My understanding is that Peoplewho was asked to go ahead and decertify that one, but the Web405, the representative from that organization was in actual contact with Garth. I think the effort there was to revise or revitalize that organization.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alright. Was it Garth or was it Glenn that was actually following up on that? I knew there was somebody within NARALO.

HEIDI ULLRICH: My understanding was it was Garth. He was the one who was reaching out to all of them. So again, on Peoplewho.org, I think that one could go

ahead with the process if we can get the evidence together on the Wiki pages.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, so If I could then make a request that at very least for that one, that we have a preparation. So at the next NARALO call, which will actually take place during the Singapore ICANN meeting, can we have it ready to go on the agenda for an actual decertification vote?

HEIDI ULLRICH: We can go ahead and do that, but again, it's the ALAC who decides to decertify. Are you saying that you wanted to first have NARALO vote on decertifying those to ALAC?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No. You're right. I believe we achieved the consensus to do that at a previous meeting. So the next thing that has to be done, as you're saying, is that this needs to be put forward to the ALAC for approval by the ALAC. Is that going to be a Big Pulse vote, or will that be done in person in Singapore?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Normally, that's done by a Big Pulse vote. But as we have Alan on the call, perhaps he will confirm that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. For decertifications I think we will always do a formal vote, so we have a breadcrumb trace of what we did. The request has to come from NARALO. It doesn't necessarily have to come from a vote. I believe Evan is correct that some previous meeting – we should verify that though – did request that we proceed with it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Right. So I think I can verify that in the case of Peoplewho that there was due diligence, that there was no response. In the case of the Web405, that we did, that there was some engagement. So if I could put through, Heidi, for you to put on to the ALAC agenda the single decertification vote recommended by NARALO for Peoplewho.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just to confirm, even though we are going to do a Big Pulse vote, you still want this on the ALAC agenda just as a for-information of an upcoming vote?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No. I'm saying NARALO is putting forward to ALAC to conduct the vote however ALAC wants to do it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: That means we just have to fill in the web page. Staff has done those before. There should be a trace of e-mails, because I know Garth did send one a while ago. That we just have to fill it in and start a vote. There's no other issue related there.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Alright. Let's move on. Is there anything remaining, Heidi or anyone else from staff, on item two?

Moving on. Since we've covered partially of that, an ALS update, so I want to formally welcome the Consumers Council of Canada to NARALO.

I notice there's a couple of people here from the CCC. Would any of you like to just spend a couple minutes introducing yourselves? It's a relatively friendly bunch here, so if somebody could, it'd be great if you could just say a few words about yourselves.

KEN WHITEHURST: Howard, do you want to take the lead? He's here somewhere.

This is Ken Whitehurst. I'm the executive director of the Consumers Council of Canada. We are a national consumer group in Canada.

Howard Deane is going to be our primary representative. He's on the call, but I don't know what happened with his audio.

We're very pleased to be involved. This is our first meeting. You can learn more about us at ConsumersCouncil.com.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Excellent. Coming into NARALO and participation in the ICANN policy process, do you have any particular goals or interests coming in, or is it a matter of learning as you go along?

KEN WHITEHURST: Go ahead, Howard.

HOWARD DEANE: I think my mic is finally turn on.

Initially, my view is to watch and see, and see where we comply and to how it might affect consumers in Canada at best. We're familiar with Internet and technologies, but not to the extent that and the detail of this group has responsibilities. So we want, just like I said, wait and see and watch, and then pretty sure we won't be very shy.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Well, excellent. Thank you. Again, welcome to our bunch. We maintain an ongoing Skype chat as well as a mailing list. If either of you have Skype IDs, if you could e-mail them to staff or basically anyone else, Glenn or myself, we can get you involved in that. It goes through periods of activities interrupted by occasional bursts of significant amount of interest and useful information. I welcome you to be on that, and I believe that I saw some subscriptions to the mailing list happen already this morning.

So welcome, and please feel free to dive in as deeply as you'd like. There's plenty to learn here. I'm sure lots of the folks here would be more than happy to answer any questions or anything.

There's no such thing as a stupid question. Everyone had to come in here essentially the same way and try to learn the ropes. So please feel free during calls like this or on the mailing list or any time there's something that sounds a little weird or you don't understand, please feel free to stop anybody.

Number 4, update on public consultations. Would anyone from staff or Alan like to go through this fairly quickly, just to give us an idea of what's been going on?

Item 4. Going once.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be quite honest, no. I'm not prepared to do that.

I have been so engrossed on the IANA and issues in the last four or five days that I'm not sure if there are any things. I don't believe there are any that are open for consultations that are of any substantive issue to us, but I really don't know that for sure.

I know there are a couple of IDN ones that are currently out that we're currently working on statements, and one of them is drafted and the other one we're at some stage near that. There's a new public comment on release of country names that we have chosen several times not to comment on before, and I presume we will make that same decision. I don't recall what other ones might be there.

I don't think there's anything of great substance, but I might have missed something.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alan, thank you.

Yes, you're right in the sense from what I see there. Some of the public comment processes that are out there on issues to do with specific requests from specific TLDs such as .bmw and so on, ALAC has tended not to get too deeply involved in that. What I've seen tends to go along with that.

Does anybody have any questions on number 4?

Joly, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

JOLY MACFIE: Yes. There was a thing where, I'm also an MCUC, and Robin Gross had posted a thing about the GAC on geographic names, where she was gathering opposition to the fact that the GAC had a veto on geographic TLDs. I posted this back to ISOC and Larry and said, "Do we agree with this?"

Tom Lowenhaupt, who's also on our board, said, well, in fact, there was discussion of this within ALAC or something, and that ALAC supported the GAC position. And so we decided we didn't have consensus within the ALS or within ISOC and right to say anything one way or the other. But I wondered if I could get any feedback on that topic.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't recall any explicit time the ALAC has supported the GAC on geographic names. We have tended to take the position that we don't see the need to restrict names, and, in general, we have advocated them being released and available. And if there is a name that is also a trademark or something, then so be it. I don't believe we have supported the GAC.

Now my recollection is from regard to release of second-level names. The current registry agreement says you need to talk to the GAC or talk to the GAC people from that country or jurisdiction, and essentially settle it among yourselves. I believe it says something like that.

I don't think the ALAC has ever particularly weighed in on it. Other than on occasion, we have said we don't see real reason to restrict use of two-letter characters or full names. I may be wrong, but that's as I recall it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Joly, did you want to follow up?

JOLY MACFIE: I was wondering if Tom would follow up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alright. Well, Joly, perhaps I would bring it up on the mailing list to see if there is any interest ongoing, to describe it in a little bit more detail, especially to some of our newcomers and to take it up on the mailing list. I don't think we're going to decide much here.

JOLY MACFIE: Will do.

TOM LOWENHAUPT: Is my microphone working?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Any other comments on number 4?

JOLY MACFIE: That's Tom. Let's hear it from Tom.

TOM LOWENHAUPT: If I may just for a moment.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, Tom. I didn't see you. Tom Lowenhaupt, go ahead.

TOM LOWENHAUPT: I was surprised my microphone was actually working.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: It's very faint.

TOM LOWENHAUPT: It is? I'll try and get closer.

My reference, Joly, I must apologize, is that I hadn't looked at it carefully enough. There was a statement that the ALAC had fine-tuned, with Alan's help, a month or so back that I thought referenced the same issue. As I was sitting in here now, I think I was probably not correct on that. I'll have to look at that again. I apologize for jumping to a conclusion there.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Tom, are you okay with the idea of taking that to the mailing list along with Joly so we can flesh that out to make sure that everyone's satisfied with the outcome?

TOM LOWENHAUPT: Yes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Excellent. Thank you. Any last comments on number 4 before we move on?

Joly, you still have a hand up. Is that an old hand?

Thank you. No? Okay, thanks.

Moving on. Number 5: CROPP applications. Allan Skuce, would you like to spend a word or two on talking about the status of the current CROPP applications?

ALLAN AKUCE: Yes. As some of you may have known, both Darlene and I have had a number of access problems. I've just finally managed to get back onto the Internet about half an hour ago. I was able to get onto ICANN and log in.

I have not been able to get access to provide my update to the coordinator confirming part of the application. But the applications have been forwarded by Dev to the vice president for North America. So at least they're moving along, and hopefully, with some help, I will be able to get in there and fill in the CROPP RT section of these applications.

I don't think I have anything else I can add at this time. I haven't heard from Darlene at all, so I have no idea what her status is.

Can you guys hear me okay?

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes. We can hear you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. It would help if I wasn't on mute.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi. Evan, this is Heidi.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes. Go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Is this number 5? Is this trip number 5?

ALLAN AKUCE: Yes.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Right now, my understanding is that there are two applications that are outstanding. One is for, I believe, for LeMarie to attend a meeting, and then there's another one for me to attend after.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I've just now seen a note from Joe Catapano who is working with Chris Mondini. It says that number 5 is approved by Christopher Mondini, which is a requirement I believe for that one to go ahead. So that one is the one with LeMarie going to the IEEE.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Are there any issues to do with number 6?

ALLAN AKUCE: It, as far as I know, was also sent by Dev to Chris. But I haven't seen or heard back from either of them yet.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Heidi, since you've been in contact with Joe or Chris, has there been any feedback, or is this simply a matter that one happened before the other?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Right now, I'm only seeing number 5.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, but there hasn't been any rejection with this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. In fact, I'm seeing a thread from Dev that was on the CROPP review team e-mail. He says that given there are no further concerns raised, he's going to forward that to the North American vice president for his approval, so that should be coming along shortly as well.

ALLAN AKUCE: Yeah, that's what he did.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Excellent.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct. Thanks, Allan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, and just the other issue that you raised, Allan, Darlene hasn't been participating for a while. I'll try and reach out to her personally and find out if maybe she needs to step away from that and that we need to appoint somebody else. I'll endeavor myself to see if everything's okay and to see what's happening. You shouldn't have to do this alone.

Any questions or comments? Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll note that the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, which is one of the parents of the CROPP group, has been reorganized, and one of the items on the Finance and Budget agenda in cooperation with the Outreach Committee is to look at how we handle CROPP requests in the future. Do we continue with a similar group? Do we put together something different?

Given the fact that we're near the end of the budget year anyway, I would not try to reappoint a replacement for Darlene at this point. But give us a couple of weeks. By Singapore, we will probably have a new set of rules, which may not be different, but nevertheless a set of rules we can go forward in or [inaudible].

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No, Alan, thank you. That's valuable, and it basically saves the effort now, I guess, in having to do that. I still want to find out from Darlene if everything's okay. She's not on this call either, so we'll deal with that.

Otherwise, it means as far as CROPP is concerned, we shouldn't spend too much time worrying about that, especially if number 5 and number 6 are approved, then that's basically the entire North American allotment anyway for this year. There's not much more to do after that, I guess.

Moving along – number 6. Glenn is not on the call, but Eduardo and Alan are. The two of you have the floor if you'd like to talk about whatever is on the issues for ALAC at this point, priorities or other issues, not counting the IANA or accountability stuff, which Alan has been budgeted some time for on its own. Who of you would like to go first?

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me start, and Eduardo can fill in whatever is missing at this point.

Given the IANA and accountability issues, which we'll talk about later, pretty much a significant part of the ALAC has been overwhelmed – maybe an understatement – on the amount of activity. For those who don't know, for instance, the IANA Working Group met for nine hours over this last weekend and met regularly between the Christmas and New Year break.

That shows the level of discussion, and I'll talk about the specifics in the next item. So almost everything else has been on hold, but I will identify the things that are important.

Probably the highest priority thing that we have to work on, and we'll be getting to very soon, is the review of both the detailed rules of how we approve, and accredit, and de-accredit ALSes, and that's just a review of the mechanical process, not the logical one that we use.

But it's come to our attention that the rules we have actually on the books are not really the ones we follow, and we need to clean up the paper work, and that's something that will be going ahead very soon and hopefully completed very soon.

The larger one is the whole issue of what criteria do we want associated with an ALS and what is our expectation of ALSes? There has been a background issue that we always talk about, but haven't done a lot about.

We're not getting as much participation from ALSes as we'd like to, as we envisioned we would. This is not a North American issue. It's true in virtually each of the five regions. Although, there are some ALSes that are very active, there are many, many that are not.

The question is we have never really said what we expect of them, so it's hard to fault people and groups for not doing something when we haven't told them what we're looking for. I think we need to do some deep thinking about that.

That may end up resulting in some ALSes disappearing, but it will also hopefully end up in a lot more activity if we can identify and tell people what we're expecting and, moreover, give them other options because it's quite clear that not everyone in the world is interested in arcane ICANN policy. Yet, we often focus on that to the exclusion of other issues that maybe we should be talking about. There'll be a significant amount of work going on with that, and we're hoping for involvement from people outside of just the ALAC, so that we can make sure that whatever new rules and processes we come up with make sense and are useful.

I think those are the main issues. There's certainly a lot of other background issues we're working on, and maybe Heidi can remind me, but to be honest, my brain is frozen.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Eduardo, would you like to add anything?

EDUARDO DIAZ: No. I was going to talk about the IANA transition, but that's all the work I have been doing in ALAC. Like Alan said, it has been time consuming and very interesting work but very time consuming. Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Heidi, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Just a couple of other ALAC updates if I might.

One is definitely Singapore. That's coming up in less than one month.

A couple of events happening for NARALO – number one is the signing of the MOU with ARIN. That's going to take place Sunday late afternoon at the end of the full-day session. Glenn's offered to do some photo op activities there.

The other one is the NARALO meeting. We're just now hearing that that one will need to be moved for what we currently have that as, so we will update you as soon as we know the confirmed day and time of the NARALO meeting. Again, that's one activity.

Another one are the proposals for the FY16 special requests. Again, as I mentioned earlier, that process will be starting likely this week for At-Large. Please, once you see that e-mail come in, please do start discussing some of the proposals that you would like to submit this year.

One new criteria that Alan and Tijani are going to request that it be a bottom-up process. So rather than one person developing a proposal and submitting it to the Finance and Budget Subcommittee, that it go through the NARALO list or all RALO lists for that matter.

I think right now that is an update. Thank you, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	I want to go back to Alan for just one or two more things. Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Yes, thank you very much.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	I'm sorry. Eduardo, you still have your hand up. Did you want to talk?

EDUARDO DIAZ:	Yes. I just wanted to ask a question about the signing of the MOU. Are you, Evan, the one that is going to be signing that via Garth? Is that the way it would work or how?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	That is correct. As acting chair, since Garth will not be there and I'm serving in his stead, the signatories of the MOU as far as I understand it will be myself and [Mr. Brown].

EDUARDO DIAZ:	Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	Alan, the floor is yours.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Evan.

Yes. I was reminded of one other thing, which is certainly worth talking about. It's not an ALAC thing per say, but it is a result of an ALAC thing.

You may recall hearing that at the last meeting, the ALAC provided advice to the Board that we were still very dissatisfied that the new TLDs that have to do with regulated industries where the GAC had provided some very strong advice on how they should be dealt with had still not been addressed by the Board. Well, that's not true. The Board addressed it but in ways that some of us believed are inadequate.

We provided advice to say that that the TLDs associated with those strings be frozen. That is, no more delegations, no more contracts signed, until we figure out how to address the problem. That's a rather strong position we took.

Soon after, the new chair of the GAC followed up with a very strong letter, basically reminding the Board that they had not addressed all of the safeguard issues, which the Board thought they had. The Business Constituency wrote a very good letter identifying all of the times we've discussed these problems before and the lack of progress on them.

We got the attention of the registries, who basically said you can't freeze things. That will create an uneven playing field. It will hurt our businesses that have already been delayed by all sorts of time. Again, pushing their points to the hilt.

As a result of all this (and I won't try to go through all the intermediate details), we were approached by the Board new gTLD process

committee to form a small subgroup of ALAC members and Board members to discuss a way forward, to make sure that we both understood what the issues were, what we saw the issues as, and to perhaps come up with a way to go forward.

This, I believe, is the first time in ICANN's history that any group other than the GAC has ever held private discussions with a Board group to try to understand problems as opposed to just tossing resolutions and communiques over walls. It's rather revolutionary, I think, and a number of us will be meeting with the Board members later this month, and we'll see where it goes. But just the fact that it happened, I think, changes the whole lay of the land.

Thank you, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you, Alan. I'm happy to at least have seen one thing on the report that was to do with actual ICANN policy as opposed to how we churn. This is the kind of thing that is at the end result of all the restructuring and the verifications and things like that, which is why we're here is to affect how ICANN works and what it does.

ALAN GREENBERG: Evan, I'll point out, this is an issue our newest ALS might want to look at because it's very much a consumer issue.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: As a matter of fact, I'd like to put in another open invitation, putting on my hat for a moment as the chair of the New gTLD Working Group of At-Large. I will talk to my friends at the CCC offline afterwards, and if you'd like to be briefed on the issue, I'm more than happy to do that.

Moving on to the biggy that will take up the rest of our meeting, which right now has about 22 minutes left in it. Alan, the floor is yours to try and bring members of the NARALO nicely and gently into the world of the IANA transition and ICANN accountability. You have 21 minutes to do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will do that and probably not even take all that much time. I do have to leave sharply on the hour, so you can have my commitment. I won't go past that time.

Let me go back to the beginning. As many of you probably know, the U.S. Department of Commerce currently is the part of the U.S. government that over the years has taken responsibility for the various aspects of the Internet that started off as ARPA Department of Defense projects and slowly moved into the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The NTIA, the National Telecommunication something Authority – I can't remember what the "I" stands for.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Information.

ALAN GREENBERG: Information. Thank you. It has a number of contracts and other agreements.

The agreement with ICANN is something that's currently called the Affirmation of Commitments. That's a number of memorandums of understanding and letters that have moved over the years. Currently, the AOC, the Affirmation of Commitments is the structure that essentially governs the existence of ICANN and gives them the credentials to do what we do.

In parallel with that, there are several other things that are done. There is a group called IANA, which is the group that essentially maintains the databases associated with running the Internet. There are several of them.

It maintains control over the address space. It allocates addresses to the regional registries to sub-allocate to individuals and groups. It maintains a registry of the IETF protocol parameters, which essentially govern how the Internet runs with the various IP protocols and other protocols and autonomous system numbers. There's a lot of things that go along with that.

Lastly, it maintains the database for the root zone, which is the basis of the whole domain name system. There is yet another contract that the NTIA has with Verisign to physically manage the root zone, that is to manage the database of what the root of the DNS contains. It then publishes the contents of that for the root operators around the world to reflect, and they are available for real DNS queries.

So there's a whole bunch of agreements. The root operators, by the way, are not working under any agreement. They just do it voluntarily. That's a rather interesting part of the overall equation.

The NTIA in last March announced that it would like to give up having the contract for IANA and asked ICANN to take responsibility for coming up with a plan to get the U.S. government out of the equation on IANA without quite saying where it would go, except there were some parameters that said, for instance, it could not be taken over by another government or a government-led organization. So it was put into ICANN hands.

ICANN has created a number of groups to do that. First of all, there's a group called the ICG, the IANA Coordinating Group, which is responsible for presenting a plan to ICANN who will send it to the NTIA. They in turn went out and asked the three major groups of IANA customers – the RIRs; the IETF; and ICANN for the names function, the ccTLDs and gTLDs – to present a proposal for how IANA should be transitioned from the U.S. government to some other entity to control it.

Each of the three groups put together working groups to come up with a proposal. The IETF has submitted one, I believe. The RIRs, I do not recall if it was submitted or it's just there are drafts out that are outstanding.

In both cases, they said very clearly that we are happy with ICANN doing the work. We have no reason to change. We will sign a memorandum of understanding or something, and we do reserve the right if ICANN ever messes up badly to take our data and move it somewhere else.

ICANN was in a position to do something similar. The problem with ICANN is there's a bit of difficulty for the policy organizations, the GNSO and CCNSO, within ICANN to say if we're not happy, we're going to go somewhere else, because internal parts of an organization normally cannot tell the rest of the organization what to do. Certainly not to the extent of telling the Board they're wrong, we think you're messing up, we're going to take our stuff and go somewhere else.

So the names part of the equation was much more complex, and we have had a Cross Community Working Group looking at it for the last several months. It's been an interesting group in that it's largely ICANN but not exclusively ICANN. For instance, there are ccTLDs that are not part of ICANN, but they're clearly IANA customers, otherwise they wouldn't be in the root. So they have been involved as well as the normal stakeholders within ICANN.

The proposal that was arrived at by the group essentially said the NTIA should transfer the responsibility for IANA to a new corporation. That corporation would then issue RFPs like the NTIA does, which ICANN could bid on it. There was, again, a general satisfaction that ICANN is doing a good job, but in the future if something were to happen, then this corporation could award the contract to someone else.

Many people in the community seem to support it reluctantly. A few supported it with great eagerness. The reluctantly is because what has been proposed is somewhat complex. There's a lot of new groups that have to be created.

However, the alternative, which the ALAC has been proposing, is that there not be a contract. That the NTIA confers upon ICANN the responsibility of running IANA. The question that then gets raised by parts of the community are what happens if the Board really messes up?

Within ICANN, as it stands right now, the Board essentially cannot be second guessed. The Board can make whatever decisions. What happens if you have a rogue Board for some reason that's completely out of control and does completely stupid things and refuses to change?

The question is how do you fix IANA at that point? If it's not working and the Board refuses to do something about it, and that's really the question.

There is, in parallel with all of this on the IANA transition, an accountability process going ahead to say how can we make sure that ICANN is really accountable to its stakeholders? The very simple translation of that is how do we make sure the Board doesn't do something stupid if everyone in the community thinks it's stupid?

You can ask yourself, "How could that happen since half the Board members are selected by the community and the other half are selected by NomCom with members in it from the community?" There's no real answer to that other than if for some reason we end up with a whole bad lot of Board members, it's going to take a while to get rid of them, and can we afford to wait that while, or do we need something quicker?

The accountability work that is going on basically says we need something quicker. We need some way of, if not outvoting the Board or

reversing a Board decision, at least finding a way forward, perhaps through external arbitration or something like that, to go forward. That's where we sit right now.

The Accountability Group is just starting, but there are a number of people on it who are pretty adamant that the carrot of IANA is a large enough carrot that this may be the issue that will get the Board to accept controls that it has never been inclined to accept before. That, in summary, is where we are right now.

So there are two proposals that are likely to come out of the IANA Cross Community Working Group. One is the one with external contracting. One is one with no external contracting, but with sufficient accountability that we have ultimate control.

It's not at all clear how we're going to decide which goes forward or how we address this, but we're right now at the stage where both of those proposals are going to be refined over the next couple of weeks and toss a coin perhaps at that point. No. That's a joke.

There are some serious discussions that are going to have to be held, but right now we're still at the point of refining the proposals to know what we are discussing.

With that, I have a few more minutes before I have to leave, and if anyone has questions, go for it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks very much, Alan. This is not an easy thing to explain. You've done a good job of it.

If there's anybody that has any questions or needs any clarification, I see Joly's hand up. We'll get to you in a second, Joly. But, please, this is the kind of forum where you're going to be able to learn about this kind of thing and away from the perspective of end users and At-Large members that you might not find elsewhere in ICANN. So this is a good opportunity for anybody on the call if you would like some clarification.

It's a complex issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Evan, can I add one more thing?

I mentioned the ALAC has been pushing this noncontract version, and that's been true. When we started, we were to some extent a voice in the wilderness. That is not the case anymore.

There is significant increasing support for it from a number of ccTLDs. The gTLDs have said we think we need a contracting operation, although not the same one that the Cross Community Working Groups proposing, but we wish we didn't. Demonstrate to us that the accountability group will deliver, and we may be willing to change.

So the tide is changing. Exactly, it's not clear where it's going at this point, but certainly, I am much more optimistic now than I was a few weeks ago.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Excellent. Joly, you're the first one in the queue. Go ahead.

JOLY MACFIE: Yeah, just on that last point. Are those differences between At-Large and the CCWG encoded anywhere, written down that I can say there it is and look at it rather than having to remember what Alan just said?

Two, just generally, just to re-clarify the arrangement between the accountability and the other process where I remember that in L.A. there was a lot of chicken and egg discussion about that the accountability process has to finish before the other thing can happen and timelines and so on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is this documented anywhere? Well, the CWG proposal, as it was several weeks ago when it was published, is available on the web. There was a public comment period, and those comments are readily available. We can provide you with links for all of that. And the ALAC statement of why we believe the CWG proposal was ill-conceived and what we want to see instead is all documented in that public comment process.

There are a lot of comments. Some of them are difficult to read. It's not an easy thing to grasp. This is a complex problem, which is why there's so much difficulty on it. But yes, it is all documented.

In terms of accountability in an ideal world, ICANN would have fixed its accountability years ago, and when the NTIA said it's time to give up IANA, everyone would have just said well, it's obvious it goes to ICANN. We trust them, and who else can we trust as well?

The trust is not there today, and thus the questions. Because a number of things related to both political infighting and philosophy of how changes should be made in ICANN, the accountability work did not start as early as it should have and is just getting going right now.

We've held a number of teleconferences. There will be two days of meetings next Monday and Tuesday, and it remains to be seen. But yes, there is a chicken and egg issue.

The ICG is in a position where it wants to have submitted a report within weeks, and to be quite honest, it's not going to happen because the naming function is not at the stage where we can provide our component of it, and as I just spent ten minutes talking about, there's some very strong disagreements within the naming community on whether the accountability group can deliver or not.

There are people such as the ALAC and significant other groups that believe the accountability group both can deliver and will deliver, and therefore, we should be able to trust ICANN to do this properly. There are others who say until they actually deliver something, we're not signing on any dotted line, and we're going to continue looking at the contracting model.

So yes, there are some major chicken and egg problems. We're hoping that somehow this will coalesce well enough to be able to come to some conclusion within the timeframe. The current IANA contract expires in September, and that would have been the optimal time for the transfer. It could be renewed.

There are issues related to U.S. politics that may make this more difficult if we wait too long. We don't know what the next administration will be and whether they will be likely to want to do a transition or put the whole thing on hold for another eight years. It's all up in the air at this point.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Alan. Can I make a suggestion and a request to follow up on what Joly asked for? Would it be possible to get a transcript of what you said here at the NARALO meeting and to ask you take some edits to it and post that up either as a blog or somewhere on the ICANN website or I will find some other place to locate that such that it's accessible to our members? That was actually a really good summary, and I think it would be useful to people that were not on this call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Transcripts do come out eventually, and when it comes out, if someone points me to it, I'll be glad to edit it.

I do have to leave the call in a few minutes though.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Since there isn't much time, I'd just like to raise this with staff. Typically recordings are published from these meetings, but they're not always transcribed are they?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Evan, yes. They are always transcribed.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So what I'm going to suggest, and I'm offering my help to work with this together with Alan and anybody else that might be interested, is to take the portion of that transcript that dealt with the talk that Alan just gave, clean it up a little bit for putting it up on the website, and I will ask for staff's help in finding out an appropriate place either to put it up as a blog entry or something like that. I simply think that it was useful enough and focused enough for our constituency enough to be valuable outside of this call.

                          I'll leave it at that. I think that would be a good idea.

JOLY MACFIE: I agree. Thanks to Alan for answering the question.

ALAN GREENBERG: My pleasure. Anything else? I've got one more minute.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm seeing nobody raised their hand in the chat room. Is there anyone not on the chat who has something to say?

                         Joly, go ahead quickly.

JOLY MACFIE:	He referred to the U.S. political situation, and just to clarify on that, in the big omnibus budget bill that went through, they removed the money for the IANA transition as one of the riders on the bill.
	I wondered. I put it to the policy group at ISOC. Couldn't we just crowd source the financing for it? Vince said he would go off and look into that. He hasn't got back to me yet.
	Obviously, ICANN would have enough money to say, okay, we'll pay for it. It raises an interesting concept. Thanks.
ALAN GREENBERG:	At this point, the restriction has been put on that the NTIA has to give, I think, 45 days' notice before doing anything. It's not all that onerous, but you never know how these things play out.
	In any case, I have to leave now. I thank you. If there's any other questions, then forward them to me in e-mail, I guess.
EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	Well, Alan, it looks like you've had the last word. Seeing that this topic is done and there is no other business that I'm aware of, so if that's the case, then one minute before the hour, this meeting is over. Thank you all for coming.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye-bye, everyone.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks, everyone. Bye-bye.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Thank you. Bye-bye.

TERRI AGNEW: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for attending. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Have a wonderful rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]