

**IANA STEWARDSHIP TRANSITION COORDINATION GROUP MEETING  
17-18 July 2014  
Day 1 Chat Room Transcript**

Bill Drake: Thank you

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: thanks :-)

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): Thank you

Bill Drake: We will try not to disrupt the august proceedings

Seun: Hello Just to be clear, are comments/question received in this chat or by email?

Ergys Ramaj: Questions/comments may be submitted through this chat room, but the Coordination Group does not guarantee that it will be able to respond in real-time.

Michele Neylon: That seems reasonable

Seun: Hello, i like to know if comments/questions are taken here or whether its only by mail?

Michele Neylon: Seun - that was already answered

Laeed Zaghlami: Just to send my regards and wish you successful meeting  
Laeed from Algiers

Seun: Hello all, whats happening my posts are not getting displayed

Seun: although i can see that correction has been made about medium of passing questions/comment however i think tech should look into why comments are not getting displayed in the chat room

Michele Neylon: they are displaying

Michele Neylon: if you can't see them try reloading the page

Bill Drake: they are displaying. all of them

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: might be a bandwidth issue

Daniel Karrenberg: the people in hte meeting room can read you - at least I can.  
(pun intended)

Narelle Clark: Those on the con call have no clear mechanism to speak. Can that be sent to us please?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: @narelle as they will not want to open a full audio bridge in the AC room ask in email I'd they have arranged a dial up audio as well like ADIGO if not they should poste haste IMO foe deli gates like you trying to work remote

Keith Davidson: This is not conducive to full participation for those of us on the CG who are participating remotely

Narelle Clark: @Cheryl a mechanism was mentioned in the room, but unfortunately we have not been advised of that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: yes Keith you deli gates should have a dial in

Narelle Clark: @Cheryl we do

Keith Davidson: Cheryl we have dial in - but no method of indicating how to get into the queue to speak

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: hmmm OK you can raise your hand ... but I see no dial in line in the room maybe cobbled in though

Daniel Karrenberg: as a pragmatic measure: raise your hand in this adobe connect and i will bring it to the attention of alissa who is sitting right next to me

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: sorry no you can't raise your hands. sorry never seen an AC without that

Keith Davidson: Excellent thanks Daniel

Michele Neylon: they've disabled the "raise hand" function :)

Keith Davidson: We can raise hand in Adobe Connect - but there are many in Adobe Connect who are not part of the CG delegates

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: there is no raise hand option though Keith /Narelle please check

Daniel Karrenberg: i just noticed that "raise hand" is disabled. it worked earlier.

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): it has been disabled

Keith Davidson: Ah Michele is right - hand raising is not permitted

Daniel Karrenberg: in that case just type it here, i will try to monitor

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: we have no hand raised eiption perhaps you as deli gates do

Narelle Clark: We can "disagree"

Alissa Cooper: I'm in the room now too

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: :-) :-) :-) :-)

Alissa Cooper: so can see if CG appointees want to get into the queue

Daniel Karrenberg: can the icann staff re-enable "raise hand" please

Keith Davidson: Thanks Alissa

Jon Nevelt: Thanks Alissa -- hand raising feature would be good

Michele Neylon: rightio - I might log back in later, but I need to go in to the office :)

Michele Neylon: /me wanders off

Seun: Great! now the attendee chat displays...thanks ;)

Anthony Niigani (Nikickonakos): raised hand function is available now

Narelle Clark: @Daniel @Alissa - the name "Jim" was menitoned as the person we needed to inficate to that we had our hand/s up. We can do that, but a mechanism needs to be communicated.

Narelle Clark: testing hand up

Narelle Clark: testing hand down

jim trengrove: got it

Alissa Cooper: I did not see anything when narelle put her hand up

jim trengrove: i did

Narelle Clark: about to test again...

Narelle Clark: hand up as a test

Keith Davidson: Its working Narelle

Narelle Clark: now taking hand down

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): @Narelle, thanks for the test

Alissa Cooper: so for remote CG participants I know we have Narelle, Russ Mundy, and Keith. who else is on?

Jon Nevett: Alissa -- I am on -- thanks

Alissa Cooper: got it

Narelle Clark: Wave

Jim Prendergast: is there a separate link to the scribe feed or is it only available in the adobe room? thanks

Paul Wilson: Jim, we are checking now.

jim trengrove: i'm told just through the adobe room

Paul Wilson: ah. shame.

jim trengrove: i'll check to see if that could be changed

Paul Wilson: jabber is normally available from ICANN, and is useful in being able at least to cut and paste.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: with the scribe notes set up as is in the AC room it means you can only look at the current screen of words no look back... though I assume archive notes will be OK

Seun: Someone i thought AC has the option to disable certain window in other to expand another window. For instance the chat window is just too small for me and mine doesn't seem too have a side scroll

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): @Seun, I use my arrow keys to scroll up and down

Alissa Cooper: remote folks, I will begin calling on you when Mary finishes

Narelle Clark: Ok

Seun: Okay great, thats for making that adjustment @Host

Seun: now i see the scroll

Jim Prendergast: there is probably a stream text url that feeds into adobe.

Daniel Karrenberg: works

Daniel Karrenberg: Since I was the first to introduce myself I did not have a chance to recognise the trends in what people considered important to know. So here, for the purpose of full disclosure, are some additions without wasting further airtime during our meeting: Selection process:

<http://london50.icann.org/en/schedule/minutes-rssac-24jun14-en.pdf> Travel funding: My employer, the RIPE NCC, is covering my expenses. I do not represent them here. Citizenship: DE Residence: NL, for some 20 years Self-image: Netizen with geographical emphasis on Europe and surrounding areas. Been around: Supported IANA since the 1980s, before ICANN. Daniel

wolfgang: Hi Daniel, thanks for the perfect disclosure. I like "Europe and surrounding areas" wolfgang

Seun: @Keith one would expect that remote CG participants will indeed not be using the chat window but will be using the audio feed to make their contribution

RussMundy: To add similarly to what Daniel just did, I am employed by Parsons who is partially supporting my time for this work - I am supporting the balance of the time needed with personal vacation. I am a US citizen and live in the US. I have been involved with Internet operations and research since the early 80's

Ergys Ramaj: 15 minute break

Ergys Ramaj: Back in session

Ergys Ramaj: This is to kindly remind you that audio interpretation is available in the following languages: English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Russian, Arabic and Portuguese <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2014-07-16-en>

Daniel Karrenberg: transcription is not happening!

Jim Prendergast: any luck in finding a dedicated link to the scribe feed? thanks

Narelle Clark: It's up again

Alissa Cooper: milton's charter proposal is here, not sure if a link was already sent around: <https://alissacooper.com/files/iana/IANA%20CG%20charter%20-%20Milton.txt>

mariann: thx

Alissa Cooper: Jari's is here:

<https://alissacooper.com/files/iana/IANA%20CG%20charter%20-%20Jari.txt>

Keith Davidson: I would argue there are 4 communities of interest and that there is not much commonality between gTLDs and ccTLDs in terms of policies applicable to IANA - so lumping g's and cc's together as "names" is not so useful

Alissa Cooper: keith, can I put you in the queue?

Keith Davidson: sure

Seun: Thanks for the share, i wish this was shared within the community before this meeting...nevertheless breezing through it ;)

ICANN RP: The streamtext feed can be directly viewed at this URL:

<http://www.streamtext.net/player?event=17July2014Viscount>

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you @ICANN RP

Seun: I am looking at Milton's text vis jari's, it looks quite similar in process. However i think it may be important to include the part that the CG should work toward providing 2 or 3 draft proposal that will be sent back to the respective communities for discussion

Paul Wilson: Keith - I agree with you and have made the same suggestion within the group.

Daniel Karrenberg: herei si the message i sent to the cg mailing list about the latest charter draft: propose to strike the words "and consensus", "and verifytheir levels of support in the respective communities." and "In assessing consensus, the coordination group will rely to someextent on its members to reflect to the rest of the group the supportlevels within the member's own community, but the group is alsoauthorized to engage in independent assessments, such as public noticeand comment periods." Rationale: It is not for us to judge whether consensus has been achievedin a community/constituency about parts of the proposals that aredeveloped by them. This is the task of the particular community.The CG doing this is untenable and the only result of us pushing backcan be resistance and not progress.It is our task to verify the level of support/consensus for the proposalthat we assemble from the parts.

Paul Wilson: Russ, agree with you. I think we will discuss this (ie specific expectations of the responses being sought) in the next agernda item.

Keith Davidson: Thanks Paul and Jari re understanding on cc's vs g's

Paul Wilson: Russ Mundy I mean.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat 2: @ (ii), Why "Liaison Members"? Whatever the mode of designation, we're all "Members" of this Coordination Group. Isn't that enough?

Bill Drake: IGC is confusingly similar to the civil society Internet Governance Caucus

Jean-Jacques Subrenat 2: Sorry, I meant (i) instead of (ii).

Daniel Karrenberg: @jean-jaques: which doc are you referring to? i cannot find the string "Liaison Members" in the latest draft by Milton

Daniel Karrenberg: @Jean-Jaques: i agree with you that "liaison" is probably not the best word. while I personally hate the word "outreach" it may be more appropriate here

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Daniel: <file:///Users/jjs-mac-2/Desktop/%5BInternal-cg%5D%20diff%20from%20my%20charter%20version%20to%20miltons/c2-from-1.diff.html>

Paul Wilson: Keith, I think it is still necessary to clarify how the cs and gs are different, whether the CG solicits one joint response, or 2 responses (one from each)

wolfgang: Is it too late to create another acronym? Bill is right that IGC creates confusion. CG was not bad.

Keith Davidson: Paul - I think that will depend on the final charter for the Cross Community Working Group on IANA - but it would be safer to assume 2 responses required - and then when appropriate the 2nd response can be "us too"

Bill Drake: We also need to sort out whether it really makes sense to have two separate CCWGs for IANA and accountability---is there the community bandwidth to sustain both effectively? Conversely, could one group really manage both work streams...?

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: Very good questions Bill.

Keith Davidson: Bill I think there are some really big accountability issues that are not related to IANA transition, so to try and do everything in one CCWG will slow things down too much

Keith Davidson: ?

demi getschko: Agree with Keith...

demi getschko: (oops. two Keiths... Agree with KDavidson on the accountability issues)

Keith Davidson: But agree with Bill that the resourcing will be stretched to breaking point by having 2 CCWG's - in fact its 3 CCWG's as there is the existing group on Internet Governance (excluding IANA)

John Poole: Every user of the internet is affected by IANA -- why are they limiting this to certain "communities?"

Bill Drake: Keith therein lies the dilemma. Of course the accountability issues go beyond IANA. But we are running off and creating all kinds of volunteer-based groups that seemingly cannot sustain real work. The CCWG on IG is floundering, the 1NET is floundering, and we have now the proposed Alliance or Initiative or whatever, plus the IGF and all the I\*s and and...

Bill Drake: Proliferating 3rd, 4th, or n+ unpaid jobs for people doesn't seem an entirely sustainable proposition at present

Keith Davidson: HAND UP

Alissa Cooper: got it

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): I disagree that the GAC should have first right of response...for the process to truly be transparent and accountable, all parties need equal opportunities.

James Gannon: Agree with Anthony.

Bill Drake: good methodology

James Gannon: Would aalso introduce further compliaction and manpower if we had multiple comment tracks

Daniel Karrenberg: @anthony: did not hear anyone suggesting that the gac should have special rights to respond

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): That was my understanding of the GAC

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): suggestion to review before it goes to public comment



Mohamed El Bashir: ICANN accountability its an important issue , although it has a different workstream but its important that the 2 groups exchange information about work progress and outcome, not sure how to do that formally if required ?

Daniel Karrenberg: sorry, i missed that

James Gannon: There needs to be a defined framework on the decisionmaking process for what can wait and what is nessesary comment to address

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): @Daniel, thank you for noticing my comment

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: I'll type into chat rather than extend the queue further....in response to Paul Wilson's comment, I agree there should be a threshold of what's necessary or non-negotiable, but each community will need to determine their respective thresholds.

Keith Davidson: +1 re Keiths comment

Ergys Ramaj: Due to the high number of remote participants, we have to reset the virtual meeting room and increase the capacity to accommodate for an even greater number of participants. This will occur during the scheduled lunch break. This temporary reset will log out all those who are currently online. You will have to log back in. We apologize for the inconvenience. Be back online shortly.

GUest 2: thank you!

GUest 2: very helpful and interesting discussion!

James Gannon: Thanks everyone see you after lunch

Paul Wilson: It may seem fruitless in negotiation to ask a party to state what is negotiable, but I think it is an important expectation to state.

Deolindo Costa: Thak you!

James Gannon: @Paul I think thats why you need a defined method of decisionmaking, what stays in comittee what goes to community etc

*(Adobe Connect is reset. Chat continues after lunch)*

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): loud and clear;

Wale Bakare: You are right. My end here, i think audio is better after resetting

John Poole: IANA transition should not be dependent upon ICANN accountability -- ICANN may never be accountable and others have proposals to reform or replace ICANN. If you make the IANA process dependent on the outcome of the ICANN accountability process--moving away from US government oversight may take years, if ever

Keith Davidson: Jon Nevett has his hand raised

Alissa Cooper: got it

Graham Schreiber: ICANN accountability? When will ICANN, VeriSign & Network Solutions: start enforcing the RAA obligations upon CentralNic, the DOMAIN NAME HOLDER, who actively Infringe & Dilute the .com TLD. You can hardly plead ignorance, when these activities have been in the public since 2000, as per: <http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/weirds/current/msg02832.html> Don't be dotconned: Buying up domain names is a mug's game, says Jamie Doward. The Observer, Sunday 10 September 2000  
<http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2000/sep/10/money.efinance>

Glenn McKnight: Hi folks , monitoring the talk but sometimes I miss the name of the speaker . can someone post their name and organization to the chat

Glenn McKnight: Thanks

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: @Joe: support

Lynn St.Amour: current version: The IANA stewardship transition process is taking place alongside a parallel and related process on enhancing ICANN accountability. While maintaining the accountability of Internet identifier governance is central to both processes, this group's scope is limited to filling the accountability gaps created by the end of the NTIA's role as principal in the IANA contract, whereas the other process focuses on enhancing the accountability of ICANN's policy development process. Nevertheless, the two processes are interrelated and interdependent and the ICG must assess proposed solutions in the light of the of the other accountability process.

Keith Davidson: Worryingly, I find myself in agreement with Milton on this point of accountability

Narelle Clark: There needs to be a trigger from subordinate processes for the stewardship process to take action.

Narelle Clark: Ie if the subordinate processes are sufficiently "broken" then trigger "stewardship". This however is solution mode.

Jon Nevett: I would like a deletion of the clause beginning with "whereas" -- we don't need to characterize the other group's work especially in a way that limits it from what they actually are doing.

demi getschko: Not sure we can define the role of NTIA in the IANA contract as "accountability"... Looks more like "oversight" (or, even auditing)

Graham Schreiber: NTIA: You need to monitor ICANN & IANA ensuring that CentralNic are restricted from Bootstrapping their "WEIRDS" UK.com / EU.com, etc domain names into whatever new Root arises. CentralNic "induce" Infringement = Contributory Infringement with, False designations of origin, false descriptions, and dilution forbidden ~ Domain Names, posing as ccTLDs. Beyond the RAA 3.7.7.9, which ICANN et al fail to enforce, these Domain Names violate US Law 15 U.S. Code § 1125. NTIA or FTC needs to enforce US Law! Harmed by CentralNic in association with WIPO are, in part have financially "harmed" Cisco, Zippo, Coca Cola and others.

Desiree Miloshevic: I agree with demi - not certain that we can define the role of NTIA in the IANA contract as accountability.

Mohamed El Bashir: I think the ICANN/IANA function Accountability mechanisms is an important issue, for many communities/stakeholders among them Business/users whom will need to be confident that the new model than accountability measures in place

Volker: Graham, you seem to be mixing up some issues here. Third level domains are not under ICANNs purview.

Volker: Neither is use of second level domains

RussMundy: yes, Alissa, that's right

RussMundy: yes, agreed

Graham Schreiber: CentralNic "harm" Cisco at WIPO, in Case No. D2012-0563. FYI ~ Cisco should sue CENTRALNIC, the owners of EU.com the ultimate "Inducers" of "Infringement" under SUB DOMAIN > ciscosurplus.eu.com < by Matthew Archer, International Computer Purchasing Ltd.

Graham Schreiber: If ICANN et al was "accountable" and if they enforced the RAA, American & Global consumers alike, wouldn't be harmed by counterfeits & frauds inside the ".com" TLD.

RussMundy: I agree with Alissa on this change

Narelle Clark: hand up

Graham Schreiber: Volker. Anything & everything under, behind or beside the ".com" are subjects of United States Law.

Graham Schreiber: UK.com ~ Does not "fall between the cracks" as WIPO support!

Seun: @Graham thats right to some extent about ".com" and if i may ask, is there anything wrong about that?

Graham Schreiber: CentralNic to WIPO > "As a Registry we "fall between the cracks" of ccTLD and GTLD registries and outside the normal jurisdiction of ICANN "<http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/processes/process2/rfc/rfc3/comments/msg00060.html> This is not true! ICANN even Network Solutions speak against Infringement. Read the NSI Service Agreement.

Graham Schreiber: What's the opinion of CISCO?

James Gannon: Graham I dont believe that this is an appropriate forum to express your issues with ICANN.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Alissa, could you add me to the small group? Sorry I was a bit slow in reacting.

Alissa Cooper: sure

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Alissa: thanks.

Graham Schreiber: NTIA in their MoU clearly state that ICANN / IANA must not furnish "disparate treatment"

RussMundy: Narelle: how about "appropriate"

Graham Schreiber: Seun: Under the Lanham Act, which has authority over ".com" it's plainly written that one must not Infringe.

Graham Schreiber: Inducing infringement = Contributory Infringement.

Narelle Clark: @Russ perhaps - need to see the full text again. It's a bit hard to capture at present. I was thinking "effective" but "appropriate" will work.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Narelle's remark about "legitimacy": I agree that we should delete this word.

Graham Schreiber: Seun: VeriSign & NSI are "causation" to infringement because they didn't enforce the RAA, with NSI under ICANN's RAA."CentralNic's domains provide an alternative to the existing Top Level Domains (TLDs) and Country Code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs), allowing the creation of a simultaneously local and global Internet Identity."<> <https://www.centralnic.com/portfolio/registration>

Graham Schreiber: James: Sure it is. ICANN has failed and CentralNic want to do "WIERDS" "Bootstrate" of their Domain Name's into the Root.

James Gannon: Yes but it not the topic at hand. I understand your issues and your ongoing litigation but I dont feel that this is the place or situaton to air them. Personal opinion.

Keith Davidson: I would prefer to see the chat confined to the topics being actively discussed, and find other issues raised to be a distraction

Taylor: Quick question (and I don't know if I missed it): When will the CG address the proposal add more seats for the GAC?

Alissa Cooper: next session

Taylor: (Sorry Keith for being off topic)

Taylor: Thanks Alissa

Keith Davidson: Supporting Keith Drazek - yes, something about "judiciary" or "enforcement" is a separate slice of the (now) 4 x 4 matrix

John Poole: wrong to say "presumably IANA becomes part of ICANN" when proposals have already been made to separate IANA from ICANN

Keith Davidson: No problems Taylor - thats a relevant question

Graham Schreiber:

James: Thanks.

Alissa Cooper: russ, got you

Graham Schreiber: I justv want to ensure that the NTIA, FTC & FBI are well informed about the various levels of problems created by CentralNic

John Poole: Good that Milton caught the error being "pushed" that tries to "force" ICANN into NTIA role

Graham Schreiber: WIPO should've known better than to give "disparate treatment" to a Domain Name Holder, whos business platform is to Infringe & Induce infringement.

Graham Schreiber: ICANN have an RAA and both NSI & VeriSign are signed into the contract. All are obliged to enforce it.

Graham Schreiber: With an IANA transition away from US oversight, CentralNic may get their way with the "WEIRDS" "Bootstrap" process.

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: @JohnPoole, yes, I shouldn't have used the word "presumably;" I should have said "If one were to assume..." in the context of the current discussion. I was simply trying to illuminate that there are differences between the name/number/protocol structures today that need to be understood moving forward. Apologies

Graham Schreiber: Network Solutions, selling Sub Domains of UK.com isolates them from:Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Network Solutions Inc.985 F. Supp. 949 (C.D. Cal. 1997), aff'd, 194 F.3d 980 (9th Cir. 1999)Here are the NSI Rules, in the Service Agreement! Rules, which they participate in violating, with CentralNic.11. REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES. You agree and warrant that: (i) neither your registration nor use of the any of the Network Solutions services nor the manner in which you intend to use such Network Solutions Services will directly or indirectly infringe the legal rights of a third party, (ii) you have all requisite power and authority to execute this Agreement and to perform your obligations hereunder, (iii) you have selected the necessary security option(s) for your domain name registration record, (iv) you are of legal age to enter into this Agreement (or you are at least 13 years of age and have your parents' permission to apply for services hereunder); and (vi) you agree to comply with all applicable laws and

James Gannon: Can someone please moderate the chat to appropriate topics?

Seun: Good comment Joseph

RussMundy: @Joe: I think this is an excellent suggestion

Graham Schreiber: Volker > Please remark on NSI rules as applicable to CentralNic.

John Poole: @KeithDrazek - gTLD Registries: thank you for your acknowledgment and correction

Seun: @Graham, i thinkt the point of whether verisgn keeps to ICANN rule may be out of scope in this particular discussion. I would expect registrars and AC/SO within ICANN to take that up with ICANN

Graham Schreiber: ICANN's registrars apply & communicate "ICANN Accreditation" when selling Sub Domains.

Graham Schreiber: registrars, such as enom, 123Reg & NetSolCares should know the difference between a "Retail" Domain Name being "diluted" and a real TLD.

Alice Jansen: Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior:

<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/expected-standards-2008-01-10-en>

Graham Schreiber: Hi @Alice. Delighted to read that these texts are being maintained in history.

Graham Schreiber: Should make the FBI's Discovery of CentralNic et al much easier to do.

John Poole: Good to hear at least some CG members are mindful and open to receiving proposals from other than "insider" groups -- wasn't this supposed to be an inclusive process for all including those outside of ICANN?

Graham Schreiber: UK.com & EU.com etc, are not ccNSO / ccTLD "accredited".

John Poole: That's a big assumption that everyone in the world can get access into 1 of only 4 groups!

James Gannon: There are communities who are not represented but whom remain stakeholders, it needs to be defined how they will be consulted/engaged

Graham Schreiber: UK.com & EU.com etc, are Domain Names and the NTIA / FTC need to ensure they're not Bootstrapped into WIERDS and the Whois database.

James Gannon: Gramham can you please stop.

Graham Schreiber: That's why Cisco should have gone after EU.com when they were "harmed" by ciscosurplus.EU.COM of CentralNic.

McTim: +1 this is NOT th if they are informed.e place for that. ICANN Compliance will deal with it

Jennifer Chung: I'm echoing a lot of voices in the chat that find the lengthy off-topic posts distracting to the topic being discussed at hand, it is gettin hard to follow and scroll up

McTim: NOT the place for this

James Gannon: Can a host please moderate?

Graham Schreiber: All done. Cheer's Pro Se. = Rule 20.

RussMundy: @Daniel: Thanks for your last input - you said it much better than I did

Mohamed El Bashir: Proposals submission should be open to all stakeholders as long as it is aligned to the NTIA transition principles, using the required format

Keith Davidson: And it's 2.30am here in New Zealand and I am too tired to continue, so please accept my apologies for missing the rest of today's meeting

Alissa Cooper: Thanks for staying up late, Keith.

John Poole: It is obvious that there are stakeholders who are not represented on the CG -- just acknowledge that fact and commit to an open and transparent process for everyone

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: In the spirit of bottom-up, consensus-based multi-stakeholderism, the process must be open and transparent for anyone who wants to contribute. What stakeholders are not already represented or who don't have the opportunity to participate in an existing structure?

John Poole: @Keith -- exactly -- "Represented" is different from "opportunity to participate"

Alissa Cooper: got you Heather

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): @Keith, the Indigenous community, as a whole, is just finally actively entering into the Internet Governance dialogue and has thousands of years of stewardship wisdom. The recent two hundred of years have been a battle to protect an environment from governmental and corporate environmental interests that conflict with the communities' inherent stewardship responsibility.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: @Daniel: definitely, the governments shall participate in the process. The only question is about the (heavy) weight...

Daniel Karrenberg: 5/40 heavy?

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: @Anthony, thanks for the information. Are you already participating in the ICANN community?



Fausto Miranda: limit government participation would be advised.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: 5/30!

Seun: Negative on martin's conclusion, if by not accepting a 5 for GAC is what will make them call the process unfair then something is definitely wrong with GAC

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Alissa +1. We must be/remain efficient.

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: I believe they requested 5 to cover the 5 geographical regions, so there's some logic behind the ask.

James Gannon: I don't believe that the GAC seats should necessarily be seen as a cost that needs to be fought over. The gAC should be considered a party that is offered the same opportunity to represent their interests as all other stakeholders. The concern would be that the number of seats will not be representational of their place in the process. If the group is to be enlarged then the GAC should be given additional seats. Conversely if the GAC is given additional seats then the group must be enlarged to keep representation roughly equal.

Seun: @Keith its not about the logic, how about there is logic behind asking for 5 for ccTLD, how about there is logic behind asking for 5 for RIR etc

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): @Keith yes I am part of the ICANN community.

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: If the CG sticks to our role as facilitator and any decisions are made on rough consensus, the numbers and allocations shouldn't really matter. The \*real\* work on IANA transition should be done by the community in a bottom-up consensus manner.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Keith: 5 regions for ALAC too then? If the representatives on the CG are liaisons, there is no need for geographical balance. If on the other hand each representative will represent their region then of course, all for 5 regions but then the ALAC will ask for the same treatment... and then how manageable will the whole coordinating group be?

Seun: +1 @Olivier :)

Seun: @Keith you have hit the hammer well on the nail...and that message is what should go to GAC. The number within CG should not be their concern their way of engaging their community should be what counts

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): heading out to another meeting. I am so glad to witness and be part of a historic event. See all later. Ekosi!

Mohamed El Bashir: Although At-Large community, which I represent in ICG, is less geographical representative, but being politically sensitive and ensure that acceptance of the future outcomes of our work, I am supporting adding extra 3 GAC members. Participated WICT conference, There is a lots wrong perceptions regarding the ICANN Role/NTIA stewardship role especially in the developing world, GAC can create awareness among governments and ensure regional Internet government organizations ( e.g African Union, Arab League, ..etc ) are involved and are engaged in the process.

John Poole: @Mohamed agree

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Momamed +1.

Daniel Karrenberg: 5/30 i stand corrected

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): I see reason with @Oliver. We should use the semantics of Liason for the CG-

Wale Bakare: @Mohammed, are you saying from all communities or from the technical or users?

Seun: what i think we may have also missed is that ccTLD may be indirectly government so thats 6 to govt already. I just don't know what difference it will be if 3 more is added from GAC, unless you are saying the 5 will actually not be GAC but be continental union like the AU for Africa

Mohamed El Bashir: @Wala Bakare : i meant the users community

Graham Schreiber: How did the USA "GAC" miss the harming of US consumers, by false designation & dilutive employment og ".com" ?

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): Fo clarity, @Mohammed is trying to bridge the gap of acceptance by involvement. This would forestall any future discontentment that may arise from the buld up to the handing over and after.

Daniel Karrenberg: @Adebunmi: well said and he is to comended for it.

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): @Mohammed +1

Bill Drake: I'm among those in civil society who think that GAC should be give 5 slots to increase buy-in (or reduce the opposite), allow regional liaising as governments are used to

Graham Schreiber: I think GAC should be more involved.

Seun: @Bill if i may ask, would you say the current GAC actually does us the

regional liason in its normal operation. If they don't why introuce it for a non-voting CG as this

Graham Schreiber: ICANN is to closed. By example Nominet is a patronage appointment. to & with a select group of chosen few / Ilk.

Bill Drake: I don't see why that affects the issue Seun

Seun: @Bill if i may ask, would you say the current GAC actually does use the regional liason in its normal operation. If they don't why introduce it for a non-voting CG as this

Bill Drake: this is not the normal GAC process

Seun: @Bill my point is that making it 5 on the basis of having a regional Liason should be a good enough motivation. Does GAC itself actually have a regional coordinating process existing

Bill Drake: I don't want to be in Istanbul listening to governments saying that they were locked out of the process and its outcome will be illegitimate

Bill Drake: and I especially don't want to hear them saying that at the ITU Plenipotentiary

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): We do not see the process as GAC but chose to appoint representative in GAC.

Graham Schreiber: IPO.gov.uk, USPTO & CIPO etc, should represent & maintain use of "Marks in commerce" such as .com ~ .uk ~ .ca ~ etc.

John Poole: @Bill +1

Seun: okay i missed an important word i my last comment which is "not" after the should ;)

Daniel Karrenberg: but it has actually happened in the past. in the distant past i have referred some government reps that contacted me about ICANN issues to GAC reps and that worked well

Graham Schreiber: California not for profit Corporations such as ICANN are motivated by not making vast amounts of money. USPTO, CIPO or IPO.gov, etc have exclusive focus on serving the National communities citizens.

Alice Jansen: REMINDER - Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior:

<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/expected-standards-2008-01-10-en>

Graham Schreiber: By example: If the USPTO maintained control of ".com" then Cisco wouldn't have been fleeced by WIPO's bold actions to protect CentralNic. and their DILUTIVE use of the TLD - by running a Contributory Infringing enterprise.

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: FYI the Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) is forming our own internal working group on both IANA Transition and ICANN Accountability, which will support both Jon Nevett and myself as we help facilitate the community's work and our own input to the CG.

RussMundy: my suggestion for 1 person from GAC (vs. 2 or 5) was serious - I think it is more important for GAC to participate in other groups besides the CG

Seun: Just a comment, i hope the CG knows what they are about to do by deciding to put an increase in representation within CG. All the best

Graham Schreiber: That said: VaED is the Jurisdiction & Venue for ".com" Cisco should have done better study & known the vast difference between Domain Names versus TLD's / ccNSO ccTLDs and gone there 1st > closing down CentralNic. ..That's OK, a Pro Se will do the work, in DC, where ICANN is accountable.

James Gannon: Graham, again please stop spamming the chat with offtopic. Highly distracting from genuine conversation.

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: @Seun, to my earlier comments, the addition of 3 GAC reps should be meaningless if the CG does its job of facilitating community work rather than doing the communities work. We'll work on consensus not voting, so the numbers should not matter.

Seun: I agree with @James @Graham i think you may want to kindly oblige

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Heather: 5 is only "a more satisfactory" solution for the GAC?!...

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: If the GAC feels they need 5 to adequately participate, it's a worthwhile concession IMO. Better to have them engaged early and often that sniping at the end of the process.

Victor Ndonnang: Interesting suggestion @RussMundy. The GAC Chair or other member can represent the GAC in the coordination Group. All governments of the World are not participation in the GAC...

Seun: @Keith +1 and my point also however it seem CG are becoming

emotional about this whole thing and i can only hope that it won't have a future negative effect

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: The key is that the GAC representatives must recognize the limited scope of the CG and commit to participating in the community work.

Victor Ndonnang: Why 5 for the GAC? And not 5 for the RIRs?

RussMundy: That's fine - I just wanted to make sure it was considered

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): #Keith . . . following CG evolving procedure to produce the required result.

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): \*produce

Seun: here comes CG voting ;)

Victor Ndonnang: Special treatment for the GAC? No "legitimacy" without governments?

Seun: \*no pun intended\* ;)

James Gannon: Agree with Victor, special treatment seemingly for what appeared as a GAC demand.

Bill Drake: will there be ice cream for remote participants?

Alice Jansen: the Coordination Group is on 15-minute break and will be back at 15:50 UTC

Victor Ndonnang: Thanks for the suggestion @Bill :-)

Bill Drake: stop tormenting us

James Gannon: Tempting me with Icecream now and everything! #IANATorture

Narelle Clark: Where can I get an ice cream at 1:40am?

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): #IANATorture +1

Eugenie Chaumont: #IANATorture +1

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): #Narelle . . . or at 5.43pm

Narelle Clark: In the spirit of collegiality and solidarity I have found some ice

cream to eat.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: re: Ice Cream a well known taxi app firm which I won't advertise here will do a worldwide promotion tomorrow with ice cream delivery, Narelle.

James Gannon: Ah Narelle, you've become one of them #IANATorturer

Narelle Clark: ice.cream.delivery - is that a new gTLD?

James Gannon: Just pony up 185k and it can be yours =)

James Gannon: Just for information: A Malaysian Airlines flight MH17 out of AMS has just went down if anyone needs to check colleagues etc

Bill Drake: how can this be?

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): Thanks for the Introduction of the Online Participant . . .

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): Thanks @Alissa.

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): ... by @Joeseeph

Wale Bakare: @James, so unfortunate news for world. I hope there are survivors. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-28354787>

Victor Ndonnang: Nice @Narelle! Example of great commitment for the community work. All my support.

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): I believe Indigenous Nations should have one of the GAC seats, as self-governing nations....

Mohamed El Bashir: +1 Danneil

Paul W:Narelle, we could not hear you. Will you send your comments here, or try to do something about your connection?

Narelle Clark:Just been cut off completely...

Paul W: You were inaudible.

Narelle Clark: Bizarre. I could hear a dreadful echo that seemed to be reverberating through the call.

Narelle Clark: s/call/room

Narelle Clark: Simply put, I agree strongly with Daniel.

Alissa Cooper: I will relay, Narelle.

Narelle Clark: This meeting has come together beautifully, yet we have just had over 12 discrete roles articulated.

mariann: can i point out that you deal with the press already. ;) i hope that is not too shocking to you.

Narelle Clark: This puts us in danger of over-complicating things. This meeting has been effective without having formal chairs.

Narelle Clark: I support the concept of rotating chairs/co-chairs if necessary.

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): a lesson from the geese....leadership is a shared responsibility

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): @Narelle +1

Narelle Clark: I can support it being nominated in advance on a rotating basis.

Narelle Clark: Press liaison in that case needs to be time zone sensitive.

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): All information can be circulated, updated and articulated by the adopted Information Officer or Liason who handles the Press...

Daniel Karrenberg: triumvirat

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: triumvirat is too much focused on one gender

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): @Daniel +1

Adebunmi Akinbo NiRA (.ng): @Wolf It depends on the choice of CG . . .

Narelle Clark: @Wolf-Ulrich classically, yes...

Robin Gross: I agree with Paul. It would be a mistake to appoint a "spokes person" for the group. All members speak in their own capacity so it is not needed and could be chilling of speech to have one.

demi getschko: Could be triumvirate... :-)

Paul W: Thanks Robin. I agree - not good for free and responsive, trusted communications.

Anthony Niiganii (Nikickonakos): A good exercise maybe explore the thought of how this transition would impact your grand childrens' child... Indigenous communities, traditionally, plan 7 generations ahead in their decisionmaking processes. We experience today, what they decided 250 years ago.

mariann: +1 robin, daniel (don't find paul's note right now)

Jon Nevelt: Agree with James

Narelle Clark: Agree - this is a consensus building organisation and therefore press liaison is better a distributed function. We each represent our orgs or collectively produce a statement.

RussMundy: I support the idea that we're all spokespersons

Narelle Clark: As soon as you designate "chairs" the press will gravitate toward them for comment.

Laeed Zaghlami: I appreciate to have in the end of the two days meetings a detailed report, which can be a summary to grasp what has happened

Daniel Karrenberg: they can use "press repellent (tm) and re-direct press to others

RussMundy: @ Narelle: yes, that will happen

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: thanks all...especially thanks for opening this chat :- ) :- ) I look forward to more on the morrow

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: enjoy dinner

Narelle Clark: Night night - 3am here.

Yvette Gibson: Thanks

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: night @narelle