

# At-Large Ad-hoc WG on IANA Transition & ICANN Accountability 2015-05-13 AC Chat

Terri Agnew: Dear all, Welcome to the At-Large Ad-hoc WG on IANA Transition & ICANN Accountability call on Wednesday, 13 May 2015 at 13:00 UTC

Terri Agnew: meeting page: <https://community.icann.org/x/t4c0Aw>

Tomohiro Fujisaki: Good evening!

Yasuichi Kitamura: hi, all

Alberto Soto: Good morning from Buenos Aires!

Leon Sanchez: Hello everyone

Seun Ojedeji: Hello all

Heidi Ullrich: Hi All.

Carlton Samuels: Morning everybody

Gordon Chillcott: Hi, all

Carlton Samuels: Is it just me or there is no sound?

Terri Agnew: @Carlton, are you able to hear now?

Carlton Samuels: @Terri: Nothing at all coming over

Terri Agnew: What browser are you using? AC prefers Firefox

Carlton Samuels: @ Terri: Aaaah, I'm using Chrome

Carlton Samuels: Let me try with Firefox and see

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Hello All, sorry I'm late (traffic jam).

Alan Greenberg: sorry, had another call come in just as I was connecting.

Terri Agnew: Welcome Beran Gillen

Seun Ojedeji: not quite long...short agenda but with lots of devil in the details ;-)

Terri Agnew: Action Items 04 May 2015: <https://community.icann.org/x/sIA0Aw>

Terri Agnew: IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Issues Proposal Assembly and Finalization Process and Updated Transition Process Timeline: <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2015-01-07-en>

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Tijani +1.

Seun Ojedeji: As I read the wordings of NTIA in that letter....its also indirectly poses a challenge to CCWG/CWG to get thing done as fast as possible. (re: I wonder whether NTIA is even totally ready to transition)

Seun Ojedeji: So that CWG/CCWG proposal is not ready should not be the stumbling block to transition

Terri Agnew: finding line

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Here's the link to what I just mentioned (ICG Statement), <https://www.ianacg.org/icg-statement-on-contracts-and-other-agreements/>

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Jean-Jacques: thanks

Terri Agnew: Finding line

Leon Sanchez: where is that noise coming from?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I am 100% in agreement with Alan

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Alan +1.

Gordon Chillcott: I agree with Alan on the jurisdiction issue.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I have been dropped

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: sorry

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Did JJS want to respond?

Terri Agnew:@Olivier calling back out to you

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Olivier: yes please.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:sorry -- :-)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:back on

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Tijani +1, yes the 2 aspects are linked, and we as At-Large should insist on the 2 being linked.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Tijani +1 about escalation: GNSO and/or ccNSO cannot replace a proper body of accountability.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:dtropped again

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:back on

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Alan, my use of the word "trick" was not the most appropriate, I agree. But I would really request that you bring back the discussion, at some point, to linking the 2. Thanks.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Alan: from the global user perspective, yes, the track should be direct to PTI Board.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Alan +1, "a full functional Board".

Leon Sanchez:I rather contract with Ferrari or Lamborghini

Leon Sanchez:that would at least make the internet faster

Carlton Samuels:@Alan: Who makes the decision for contracting?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Leon: if that is paid for by the community? ;-)

Carlton Samuels:...and if the PTI is an ICANN proprietary, why would it matter?

Leon Sanchez:@Jean-Jacques if it's for the good of the community, yes :P

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Leon: a long train would accommodate more members of the community, but... ;-)

Leon Sanchez:@JJ LOL! no doubt!

Carlton Samuels:@OCL: See, you got it! So the least problematic is PTI is the 'contract company'!

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Carlton: not the same.

seun:I thought PTI is the operator and not contractor

Alan Greenberg:@Seun, PTI is the operator BECAUSE it has a contract to do that work (ie it is a contractor).

seun:my connection is really failing me in this call

seun:apologies

seun:that said, I really encourage us to use the list more, for sake of people like myself

seun:@Alan yes that's correct in that sense

seun:I think what is not clear whether indeed PTI will have the current power that ICANN has as the IANA operator

Carlton Samuels:I always start at the end game and work myself backwards. First non-negotiable end game: the IANA function must remain under the influence/purview/ command of ICANN.

seun:@Carton which is fine. So we are just creating the PTI to please some even though we know the real thing

Carlton Samuels:How we achieve that while making it appear ICANN is not in control? We find a way to separate the instructor from the instructee while keeping the instructee as a single issue ops; it can only say yes and can only do what is instructed.

seun:maybe I can live with that as well. Just like Alan said... at a cost

seun:although the cost will still end-up at end-user table

seun:I see some interesting future where the voice of the end-user may become more rant than now

Carlton Samuels:How we achieve that? Corporate structure that gives ICANN effective control. We have a choice an entity that is a wholly-owned CA PBC or a Delaware LLC. The LLC is a better one for we can make the employees directors and seconded from ICANN.

Carlton Samuels:So we control the 'Board' as well as the 'employees'.

Carlton Samuels:All neat and nicely tied up.

Carlton Samuels:Of course there will be howls. It will die eventually. And we move right along.

Leon Sanchez:audio is cutting

seun:yes

Terri Agnew:@JJS audio is cutting in and out

Terri Agnew:Apologies: @Sébastien, audio

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:@Terri -- it is Sébastien, nos JJS

Olivier Crepin-Leblond::-)

seun:WOW! @Sebastine...it defeats the essence of PTI I think

seun:I agree @Olivier

Sébastien:@Olivier let's organize demonstrations in the whole world for that ;)

Sébastien:We are the end users!!!!

Sébastien:@Alan we don't need PTI for that (separation)

seun:I think ensure ms involvement in the new structures going forward is the only thing we could ensure

Carlton Samuels:What would we be polling?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Olivier: I think this requires consulting the full membership.

seun:+1 @JJ

Carlton Samuels:@OCL: Avoid confusion with clarity of the poll question.

Alberto Soto:Sorry, I must leave the meeting..

seun:@Alan what does fully control by ICANN mean?

seun:the CWG proposal has not indicated the powers of ICANN over PTI except the awarding of contract

Alan Greenberg:@Seun Wholly owned if that makes sense depending on the structure. Or the sole Member with rights to remove PTI board in that form of structure.

Terri Agnew:Welcome Christopher Wilkinson

Alan Greenberg:@Seun, ultimately, "Control" of PTI is moot if they no longer has the IANA contract. Do we really care what it does?

seun:Ops was they what the sole member mean? that ICANN can remove PTI board? I think we need to clarify if this is ICANN board or community

Carlton Samuels:IMHO, that question will attract overwhelming derision and be savaged by people who read! Let's ask the question on stewardship properly defined!

seun:@Alan I guess control I refer is in terms of whether ICANN controls PTI management including it's board and staff

Carlton Samuels:@Sebastien: "we are trying to sell something without the reason why" +++1

Carlton Samuels:You got it sah!

seun:running AC on mobile, apologies for typo

Carlton Samuels:All matters absent context is and remains just noise!

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Sébastien about our final aim being to concentrate on the interests of the global Internet user: +1.

christopher wilkinson:Is it a problem that ccNSO delays the process.

seun:@CW are they delaying the process?

christopher wilkinson:It was just said so.

seun:I think ccTLD is the least of the problem as it concerns CWG maybe yes for ccwg

Terri Agnew:CCWG Accountability: <https://community.icann.org/x/IIMHAW>

seun:@Olivier you have not said way forward for atlarge statement to CWG PC?

seun:looks like Olivier is no longer on AC?

Alan Greenberg:@Seun, at this point, you, I and Vanda are only ones who have commented. I will take what is out there in the next couple of days, and draft text for submission, and see what comments it receives.

seun:okay thanks.... may I know the deadline to comment on the wiki? may need to add my comments later?

seun:question to ccwg: is there any indication that ICANN board may not implement( in a timely manner) the recommendation of ccwg?

Alan Greenberg: @Tijani, no. Individual people HAVE a legal status.

Alan Greenberg: @Seun. We have not set a final deadline, but if you have substantive comments, you need to add them sooner rather than later.

seun:lol

Leon Sanchez:then we would spill the Board

Alan Greenberg:And what if they refuse to leave.

seun: @Alan refuse to leave... I guess that could happen for any organisation board but unlikely

Jean-Jacques Subrenat:Alan & Seun: in that case, the one with the deepest pocket wins with lawyers...

Alan Greenberg: @JJS, ONLY if you have the rigght to sue!

Heidi Ullrich:Thanks!

Aída Noblia:Saludos a todoss,

Tomohiro Fujisaki:bye!

Alan Greenberg:ATM, we have no standing to do so.