

**IANA STEWARDSHIP TRANSITION COORDINATION GROUP MEETING
17-18 July 2014
Day 2 Chat Room Transcript**

Alice Jansen: Welcome to day 2 of the Coordination Group Meeting -

Alissa Cooper: Do we have any CG reps participating today remotely who were not here yesterday?

Paul Wilson: Welcome and thanks. Could we again share the direct URL for the text transcript.

Narelle Clark: Is teh updated version in the notes on adobe connect?

Paul Wilson: Actually I guessed it:

Paul Wilson: <http://www.streamtext.net/player?event=18July2014Viscount>

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>

Eugénie Chaumont: Thank you for the welcome messages and transcript link

RussMundy: yes

Grace Abuhamad: see GAC communique from London:

<https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/Governmental+Advisory+Committee>

Narelle Clark: @Alissa - the GAC Communique from London sets out their request. Further reasoning was expressed yesterday by Heather Dryden on their behalf.

Narelle Clark: I agree with Milton also. My thinking was that the letter would be public. I understood we had consensus yesterday that that was how we were setting out our views, agreement and response to the GAC.

Alissa Cooper: @Narelle given that the CG was not constituted at that time, I'm not sure to whom the communique was directed, but it couldn't have been the CG.

Ergys Ramaj: @ Narelle, we will redial out to you

Narelle Clark: @Ergys

Alissa Cooper: Narelle are you back?

Narelle Clark: @Alissa I've rearranged my RF emitting devices, redialled but the noise is still high on the line.

Keith Davidson: Are others having problems with the audio feed? I am getting very choppy feed

Narelle Clark: @Ergys - email me for a phone number

Narelle Clark: Happy to support the letter - rechecking the draft

Rudi Vansnick: audio is very good to me (remote)

Narelle Clark: @Alissa et al - noise level is way high on the telecon line...

Narelle Clark: Russ is correct. First communication from this group should be to state our purpose and scope, ie charter.

RussMundy: I think it's fine to send something to Heather directly

Lynn St.Amour: thank you Russ, Narelle and Keith

Narelle Clark: Lynn - can I go over it later with you?

Suzanne Woolf: @joe sounds like the distinction is between "directly engaged/affected by normal operations" and "affected if things go wrong"

RussMundy: I think the defined, quoted term approach is good - I'm personally more comfortable with directly effected than operational

Rudi Vansnick: users, customers = citizens !

Lynn St.Amour: @Narelle, I'll add you to the small editing group of Jean-Jacques, Adiel and myself. I will send next draft by emial. OK?

Narelle Clark: Agree with Jean-Jacques. If you confine this to "customers" then it leaves out the fundamental requirement for overall stability from all users, even those without direct commercial relationships.

Suzanne Woolf: @narelle the distinction still makes sense to preserve, should also not assume the interests of all users are the same

RussMundy: I suggested yesterday that we might replace "and legitimate" with "and appropriate"

Narelle Clark: I'm liking recognised, also.

Alissa Cooper: I think Joe suggested "legitimized" not "recognized"

Daniel Karrenberg: thanks narelle!

Narelle Clark: "legitimised" is no better than "legitimate".

Keith Davidson: Agree with Narelle - legitimised still carries the same connotation of being legally sanctioned

Mohamed El Bashir: Recognized can be used, seems the best option

demi getschko: Good alternative, Narelle: "recognized".

Jon Nevett: let's go with recognized and move on

Narelle Clark: To cite my nearest dictionary - "Macquarie dictionary meaning 1. "According to law; lawful". We are in agreement over the _preferred_ sense of the word, the issue is what it signals externally.

Keith Davidson: "functions in an accountable and bona fide manner" ? Or does introducing latin introduce further problems ?

Narelle Clark: To cite my nearest dictionary - "Macquarie dictionary meaning 1. "According to law; lawful". We are in agreement over the _preferred_ sense of the word, the issue is what it signals externally.

Narelle Clark: @JJ - "representative of" turns the meaning into a different sense again..

Narelle Clark: I support "widely recognised" <-- ;-P note spelling

Narelle Clark: Accepted works for me, also!

Narelle Clark: Some form of rating - community defined and applied - of "consensus" according to a common scheme (yesterday's from the gNSO (?)) is preferred by me.

Laeed Zaghlami: Sorry for coming late, connection problem

Narelle Clark: Apologies for late entry..

Narelle Clark: "No-one should wait until the following stage and bring their input only to the CG."Shouldn't this be set out in the form of a process?EG"The ICG will be calling for proposals over defined time frames. Community members

should bring their contributions to their community designated representatives in order to ensure full consideration within the community context prior to consideration by the ICG."

Keith Davidson: "in addition" is superflous

Narelle Clark: Sorry - line issues still....

Narelle Clark: I was saying that the previous phrase: "No-one should wait until the following stage and bring their input only to the CG." should be replaced. It seems that it has now.

Narelle Clark: ...may be referred... works for me.

Narelle Clark: Or:

Narelle Clark: "The ICG will be calling for proposals over defined time frames. Individuals, or individual groups, should take their contributions to their community designated representatives in order to ensure full consideration within the community context prior to consideration by the ICG. While community members may bring their contributions directly to the ICG, these proposals will be referred to the constituent community."

RussMundy: I think it's better being in

Narelle Clark: Please bounce the current text out to the list...

Narelle Clark: before going off to a break.

Narelle Clark: Telecon is appalling today...

Narelle Clark: REconnecting doesn't work. We have massive echo.

Keith Davidson: Prefer the original texy

Keith Davidson: Nice work drafting team - starting to look ok

Paul Wilson: maybe we can try to fix the teleconf during coffee break.

Keith Davidson: Yes please Paul!

Alice Jansen: The CG will reconvene in 15 minutes.

Narelle Clark: It's some sort of microphone issue in the room. Makes it impossible to think and speak at the same time.

Keith Davidson: Please fix audio while we are on the break

Kevin Murphy: Does anyone know if yesterday's recording is available or if it will be available?

James Gannon: Was the issue of the GAC expecting a review period before public comment period discussed this morning? Missed out the first while?

Alice Jansen: Coordination Group's mailing list archives:
<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/internal-cg/>

James Gannon: Yes any discussions of work by the group must be public for a transparent working group.

James Gannon: Private participation, public readable.

Seun: @Alice i hope the url to that list will be visible on the stewardship website

Alice Jansen: Hi Seun, yes - the link will be added to the website.

Graham Schreiber: Yes. Public is good. ARTR

James Gannon: Agree with Alyssa, The perception of independence is important

Alice Jansen: Hi Kevin, a link to the archives will be posted on this webpage -
<https://www.icann.org/en/stewardship/resources>

jim trengrove: Hello Kevin. IT working on it now and should be delivered shortly

Seun: Thanks Alice

Graham Schreiber: Yes.

James Gannon: Yes

James Gannon: That site must also be multilingual the same with any official statements/summaries

James Gannon: Will the GAC not be an active participant in discussions then? Will all GAC input be time lagged after their private discussions?

Alice Jansen: The Coordination Group will reconvene in 20 minutes.

Seun: Congratulation to GAC and good luck to the ICANN customers as expense of CG has just increased!

Ergys Ramaj: The meeting will start shortly

Murray McKercher NARALO: excellent audio and video on my end, fyi

Murray McKercher NARALO: does anyone have a link to the document just quoted by JJS?

James Gannon:

<http://archive.icann.org/en/jpa/iic/draft-iic-implementation-26feb09-en.pdf>

James Gannon: I believe that is the document

Murray McKercher NARALO: Thank you

James Gannon: Great words Jean Jaques

James Gannon: Should community inputs not be managed by the community representatives on the CG?

Narelle Clark: Great summary Daniel, Patrik

James Gannon: Agree with Daniels second wording

Narelle Clark: Can the community have the opportunity to object/correct the summary rather than have to go through a review, check cycle?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @James Gannon: thank you!

James Gannon: Je vous en prie JJ

Keith Davidson: I'm signing off now - apologies for missing the rest of this meeting, but tiredness overwhelms...

Alissa Cooper: Thanks Keith

James Gannon: Should the group decide on what areas of questioning each CG member will respond for i.e their geographical or area of specialization/representation/

Edmon: if there is going to be a website, all the secretariat should be doing is probably to point the press to that?...

Narelle Clark: We could always do a roster to handle the press.

Murray McKercher NARALO: I suggest you definitely engage the press, silence

will not be a good approach and who will be the pony person/people?

Murray McKercher NARALO: sorry point person

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: I recommend that we generate regular, scheduled community updates. This should reduce the need for ad hoc engagement with press, particularly in-bound media inquiries. If we do receive inquiries, we could package responses into written FAQs.

David McAuley Bloomberg BNA: Stories will be important, necessary, inevitable. Reporters need informed sources that reply directly to questions in intelligible terms fairly quickly. That is most useful to readers (who want to be informed), most helpful to CG itself. The CG is involved in a process that has global impact - not all affected can follow the CG in detail - will instead rely on reportage. Most informed sources will lead to more informed public.

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: I should have made clear I meant "regular, scheduled WRITTEN community updates"

Narelle Clark: Agree Keith, however I suspect many of us will be doing regular community updates anyway.

Narelle Clark: Nearly all of these will be public anyway.

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: @Narelle: that's completely fine provided the individual updates are on an individual basis and not attempting to represent the group position as a whole (unless it's been discussed and agreed to).

Narelle Clark: @Keith - agreed

Narelle Clark: The rule needs to be that people either a) speak on behalf of themselves/their community or b) as a member of the CG and reflect agreed positions in a true way. [Human fallibility notwithstanding]

James Gannon: I dont think it should be the role of the secretariat to develop any conclusions no?

James Gannon: Ah non task

James Gannon: My mistake

Narelle Clark: Wasn't there a task to write meeting reports/summaries? [My apologies if I missed when that went.]

Narelle Clark: SShould "contact points" be "interfaces" ? ie the modern equivalent of a postal service

James Gannon: So the secretariat will be compiling and summarising the community input, not the community representatives on the CG?

Narelle Clark: @James correct

James Gannon: Ok thanks Narelle. Interesting situation in my opinion.

Narelle Clark: Agreed with Keith - it needs to be as independent as possible.

James Gannon: If possible it should be independent from ICANN

Robin Gross: How "independent" is the outside consultant if ICANN hires this consultant and pays the consultant? The consultant still works for ICANN. We need REAL independence for this secretariat.

James Gannon: @Robin, without an independent budget which doesn't seem to exist is there any other option?

Robin Gross: The group should hire the consultant (not staff) would be one way to help mitigate the dependence on staff.

Michele Neylon: And where exactly is the money going to come from?

Robin Gross: The money can still come from ICANN, but staff isn't in control of it.

James Gannon: Yeah the budget for the group is owned and managed by ICANN not the CG as far as I understand

Robin Gross: It isn't ideal, but it would be one step removed from dependence.

James Gannon: Surely the CG would need to have some form of legal entity for that to happen

Robin Gross: We better come up with some other solutions, or staff will continue to drive all key processes.

Lynn St.Amour: In any situation, I believe the CG wants clear "management control" over the contractors.

James Gannon: Could that be captured under a written MoU between ICANN and the CG on the function and control of the secretariat?

Lynn St.Amour: A good analogy is ISOC paying for the IETF secretariat yet the secretariat is completely managed by the IETF.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Lynn +1.

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: +1 Russ H. I see a difference between an independent contractor hired specifically for the secretariat function and an employee who will eventually return to his/her ICANN day job.

Narelle Clark: Excellent proposal Lynn

jjn: @Lynn - Correct me if I am wrong, but isnt the secretariat also "managed" by the IAD, who is an employee of ISOC?

jjn: MY point is that I am not saying it is a bad model...I am saying it only works because ISOC honors the independence of the Secretariat

jjn: If ICANN does not observe that same benevolence towards the secretariat as ISOC does, then issues could arise

Lynn St.Amour: The IAD is an employee of ISOC ONLY for administrative purposes as the IETF is an unincorporated entity.

Narelle Clark: @Lynn can you put that proposal? The only thing I wanted to add is that the CG must be prepared to dispense with the service of ICANN as Secretariat if it fails to work.

Narelle Clark: @Daniel is correct - if we want true independence we need to have it funded separately.

RussMundy: It sounds like there are enough perception differences and as long as the process can be done in a small number of weeks (~less than 6) then I would be okay with hiring a contractor secretariate

jjn: I agree with Lynn 100%

RussMundy: I've just lost all audio

Narelle Clark: Thanks Lynn

RussMundy: are other remote folk hearing anything?

Narelle Clark: I hear via telecon

James Gannon: Working fine here

Michele Neylon: audio works fine for me

Robin Gross: sounds fine from San Francisco

Narelle Clark: adobe is also still live

Video: Russ: If you're listening on Adobe Connect, please refresh your page.

RussMundy: okay, with audio on adobe

jjn: Can ICANN put the money into a "Trust" and the Trust makes payments.

jjn: We cannot be asked to contribute more money than the hundreds of millions being paid to ICANN already by registries, registrars, registrants, etc.

jjn: Create a community trust and make payments from there

Graham Schreiber: How about Jamie Doward, from The Guardian Newspaper. as a historian. He is well informed. >

<http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2000/sep/10/money.efinance>

Robin Gross: Going back to earlier discussion: how did the topic of "who gets to talk to the press" even get on the agenda? I've never seen that on an agenda for an ICANN community meeting before. Seems odd.

Jon Nevelt: I'm ok with ICANN funding an independent secretariat

Graham Schreiber: Firm's like Zippo, Oakley, Coca Cola or even Cisco might like to have his review scribed.

Lynn St.Amour: there is no money falling from the skies -- it has to come from somewhere - as registrants, registrars and registries we have already paid

Graham Schreiber: He wrote well of CentralNic >

Graham Schreiber: CentralNic's important-sounding 'Global domain names registry'. However, it has no official standing as a registry. Buyers of the subdomains simply have their names entered in its database. CentralNic is lobbying to have subdomain names recognised by Iann, for obvious commercial reasons, but for now this remains only a remote possibility.

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: @Tracy: How does the GAC fund and staff its own secretariat function?

Michele Neylon: Isn't the GAC secretariat staffed by ICANN?

Graham Schreiber: Funding by the 3R's is hardly going to be written objectively.

jjn: The key is not (and should not be) who pays. It is the rules about

independence. I will again throw out the notion of a trust

Jon Nevett: Not sure how to hum remotely, but I am ok with 1 or 2 -- prefer 2

Narelle Clark: @Jon I'm thinking we have to type

Narelle Clark: @Jon since the telecon is rubbish

RussMundy: hmm

Narelle Clark: HUm

Rubens Kuhl (NIC.br): Keith needs to hum twice as loud to represent your hums, Jon.

Michele Neylon: can't hear the hums remotely

Jon Nevett: humm

Robin Gross: Irrespective of which entity the money comes from, control and management must be carefully stipulated to be from the group.

Narelle Clark: HUn

Michele Neylon: so no idea if they're accepting or rejectging

James Gannon: Hum for whats its worth =)

Marilyn Cade, BC /CSG Officer: I would have thought that second entity could work.

Narelle Clark: Hum

RussMundy: Can Alissa or Daniel summarize humming?

Robin Gross: we couldn't ANY hums on remote, so please tell us what happened.

RussMundy: I couldn't understand Jari

Narelle Clark: FWIW I am opposed to establishing any new legal entity for the secretariat activity

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: Options 1 and 2 received similar levels of humming

Wale Bakare: @Russ, +1

Alissa Cooper: option 3 was silence

Michele Neylon: new legal entities + other entities = bad idea

Graham Schreiber: "Self organized" isn't that how CentralNic appointed themselves as being above & beyond the RAA?

Graham Schreiber: CentralNic are so well "self organized" they are superior to, above and outside the prevailing Lanham Act ~ so far!

Kevin Murphy: Give it a rest Graham.

RussMundy: thanks to Keith & Alissa for the "hum" summary

Graham Schreiber: Thanks Kevin. Consider the suggestion declined.

Mouhamet Diop: voice problem !!!!

Mouhamet Diop: breaking up , badly ?????!

David McAuley Bloomberg BNA: I'm getting audio well Mouhamet

Wale Bakare: May be Mouhamet should restart the Adobe Connect, that might help

Taylor: Three can give the balance in broad communities (protocols, numbers, names), but would it allow an acceptable regional/global representation?

Taylor: 5 matches RIRs, 6 matches UN regions, but does 3 match any?

Rubens Kuhl (NIC.br): 2 is better because then it makes clear there is no representation, avoiding people claiming not to be represented.

Mouhamet Diop: thanks. i recover the audio well.

Taylor: True, better to avoid opening that question all together; but how to decide which of the three main communities do not get a seat?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Adil +1.

James Gannon: +1

Jennifer Chung: Well said @ Adiel

Wale Bakare: You welcome, @Mouhamet

RussMundy: I'm supportive of Milton/Daniel description

RussMundy: I nominate Alissa if she's willing to be interim

Graham Schreiber: I 2nd the Motion

Robin Gross: committees is a separate issue from the chair issue

Jon Nevett: humm

RussMundy: hum

James Gannon: hum

Narelle Clark: Hum

Wale Bakare: Hum

Narelle Clark: @Alissa are the chat hums of CG members being taken into account?

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: 3 co-chairs received the most hums

Robin Gross: thanks, Keith!

Jon Nevett: we all hummed at 2, I think

RussMundy: I was watching & it looked like it was evenly split between 2 & 3

Narelle Clark: @Keith but they should not be considered as Naming/Numbering/Protocol correspondence

Jon Nevett: 2 co chairs

Narelle Clark: I saw at 3 co-chairs

RussMundy: 2 co chairs

Wale Bakare: option 3

RussMundy: however - I'm fine with 3

Jon Nevett: i am fine with 3 too

Narelle Clark: @Alissa thank you

Alissa Cooper: sorry I missed you guys originally

Jon Nevett: np

Narelle Clark: @Alissa - NP we need a designated 'Chat watcher', not the Co-chair

Graham Schreiber: Congress will be placing the care & oversight of ICANN into the portfolio of the FTC.

Taylor: Pardon, but is the CG mailing list open/archived?

Grace Abuhamad: @Taylor: the CG list is closed to the CG members only, but it is publicly archived at: <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/internal-cg/>

Taylor: Much appreciated Grace (as a student, greatly thank organizers for openness & transparency)

Graham Schreiber: FTC most likely to "protect American consumers from harm" such as counterfeit or "surplus" computer parts.

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>

Taylor: Apologies for all the contributions...but if useful, Rep. Greg Walden, one of the Republicans pushing through the DOTCOM act, spoke at the IGFUS anticipating that the GAO evaluation process of the Transition Proposal would be 6months to 1yr

Taylor: (the act, of course, has language that would prevent the NTIA from giving up the contact until the GAO evaluation is completed)

Lynn St.Amour: @Taylor - your contributions are helpful

Taylor: Thanks Lynn!

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: "Failure is not an option!"

Wale Bakare: My apology for humming, not for me

Daniel Dardailler: a contingency plan ?

Edmon: establishing a secondary goal post may not be a bad idea actually... i

think that would give NTIA some idea of what if a temporary bridge timeline should be (again, primary is still the primary and i am less pessimistic than daneil that we could make it, but nevertheless)

Lynn St.Amour: @ Russ Mundy - very helpful.

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: +1 Russ

James Gannon: CHinese translator is on the English audio feed?

Robin Gross: Is this a deadline? Things stay as they are until NTIA is satisfied.

James Gannon: Gone now. Strange.

Kevin Murphy: NTIA has options to extend the IANA contract remember

RussMundy: let me point out that there are two 2-year options already present in the contract

RussMundy: if the timeline, can't be met then it's the Communities need to be the ones that say so

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries: We need to put NTIA in the best position possible to be able to approve the community recommendation before September 2015. There is significant concern that the domestic political situation in the USA post-September 2015 could introduce substantial uncertainty about the potential for any transition.

Alice Jansen: the ICG will reconvene at 15:10 UTC

Narelle Clark: @Alissa - You mean fortnightly, not biweekly, yes?

RussMundy: I took what Alissa was meaning by "?biweekly" was a phone call lternate weeks, i.e., one call every 2 weeks

Narelle Clark: @Russ - surely, yes. Every two weeks, not twice/week.

RussMundy: I like the idea of shorter calls on alternate weeks rather than longer meetings once a month

Mouhamet Diop: Biweekly for francphone is twice a week

Mouhamet Diop: bimonthly is twice a month so every two weeks

RussMundy: hear, hear - I agree, remote participation "counts" in quarum

Narelle Clark: Only if the participation is meaningful.

Narelle Clark: This has *not* been entirely meaningful for me today.

RussMundy: I agree with Joe's concerns about what 'constitutes' a meeting but the SSAC has developed a good model that I'd be happy to share

Mohamed El Bashir: supporting biweekly teleconference calls

Mohamed El Bashir: hummm

Narelle Clark: Every one of these events is going to work for some and not work for others. We need to align the major milestones then pick the nearest IANA related (ICANN/IETC/NIC) event.

Narelle Clark: NEED A DESIGNATED CHAT ROOM MONITOR!

Alissa Cooper: yes, narelle, I think that should be a secretariat function

RussMundy: I support meeting at the LA ICANN mtg

Edmon: -1 could be tough for many flying into IGF who also wanted to following this meeting :-P

RussMundy: so are we saying we will meet for one day on Wed at the IGF - is that right?

Narelle Clark: If this one fails (due to room changes etc) can I put in one last vote for IETF at Honolulu where many of us will be?

Mouhamet Diop: narelle, no hummm i guess for ietf meeting ! (-:

Alissa Cooper: @Russ yes if we can find meeting space

RussMundy: tks

RussMundy: two weeks is a good deadline for charter comments

Kevin Murphy: Some reporters like detail :)

Narelle Clark: @Mohamed is correct - polishing is required if only to correct the occasional tense and punctuation issue I am keeping quite about.

Narelle Clark: s/quite/quiet

Edmon: "streamed live to observers" sounds like possibly observers are

"selected" some way... maybe just streamed live publicly or sth

Mouhamet Diop: i second edmon suggestion, put streamed live to all interested parties or public

James Gannon: All interested parties sounds better

RussMundy: suggestion on timeline - change "draft" to "initial"

James Gannon: shpuld come from chair

Narelle Clark: Yes, letter must be posted to this group's site,

Silent Majority Excluded ONLINE: <not waving hand>

James Gannon: =)

James Gannon: The chat hasnt worked out as well as it needs to for the process to work with remote parrticipants

Silent Majority Excluded ONLINE: <no comment>

Alice Jansen: the CG is on a 5-minute break

RussMundy: @Keith: I'd like suggest changing "draft timeline" to "initial timeline"

Silent Majority Excluded ONLINE: Every 5 minutes the ISOC IETF ICANN IANA Eco.System burns about \$1,000,000

James Gannon: So Graham is back then

David McAuley Bloomberg BNA: Does anyone have the names of the five (I think) nominees for the three chair positions?

Silent Majority Excluded ONLINE: What is the estimated total cost of the so-called IANA Transition to ICANN ?

Volker Greimann: probably negligible

Volker Greimann: passing a piece of paper on should not cost that much

Silent Majority Excluded ONLINE: "negligible" ? like the \$900,000 per year ISOC CEO ?

James Gannon: Volker dont engage Graham, hes a litigation troll who has ongoing litigation against ICANN

Volker Greimann: Oh, SMEO is Graham?

James Gannon: yup

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>

Kevin Murphy: Didn't his lawsuit get thrown out for being nonsense?

Volker Greimann: not very silent, is he?

James Gannon: Seemingly not.

James Gannon: @Kevin, Yes more than once I believe

Kevin Murphy: First sentence is always "who did what when"

Mary Wong: Anyone else lost audio?

Volker Greimann: sound is gone

Jennifer Chung: Not receiving the audio either

Alan Greenberg: No sound on adobe

James Gannon: Lost audio on adobe

Volker Greimann: and its back

Alan Greenberg: Back now

Mary Wong: Thx for quick fix!

David McAuley Bloomberg BNA: audio down here too

ICANN RP 4: Had a bandwidth hiccup, recovered!

Robin Gross: sound gone - video froze

James Gannon: back now

IETF RFC Archiver: <https://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3172.txt>

IETF RFC Archiver: Purchase Order No. 40SBNT067020 provides that "[ICANN]

will perform other IANA functions as needed upon request of DOC."

James Gannon: Oh hes changed his name again

Mary Wong: (speaking with my ICANN staff hat on) It's not possible in an open Adobe Connect meeting room to know who people are when they log in. However, we do ask that everyone conform to ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior (displayed before one enters the AC room) and try our best to deal with attendees who do not do so.

Volker Greimann: thank you Mary

James Gannon: Understood Mary, for future meetings is there no way to moderate inappropriate attendees?

Mary Wong: @James, my understanding is that no one is initially excluded from totally open virtual meeting rooms (in contrast to virtual meetings that are closed or that otherwise require moderator permission to join. However, I'll ask our IT folks; in the meantime, community members who are disturbed or distressed by another member's comments or behavior in an AC room can and should bring it up to the remote participation manager in the first instance.

James Gannon: Thanks Mary. Appreciate the response

Mary Wong: No worries :) Hope this is helpful, esp for newcomers to this process!

Grace Abuhamad: <https://www.icann.org/en/stewardship/contributions>

Grace Abuhamad: That is the link

Narelle Clark: I think it's: <http://discuss-stewardship.icann.org/>

RussMundy: I do NOT want to make any reference or use of the ICANN "microsite"

James Gannon: Yeah just setup the public list assap

Victor Ndonnang: Here the micro web site: <https://www.icann.org/stewardship>

Grace Abuhamad: The link to the "community input" section that Elise referred to is <https://www.icann.org/en/stewardship/contributions>

Victor Ndonnang: There is a need of having a separate web site for the #IANASTeward CG?

Robin Gross: The ICANN Community Wiki is actually useful for this sort of work.

Victor Ndonnang: The NTIA asks IANA to convene stakeholders ...So using ICANN tools and web site is not a problem for me.

Robin Gross: The confluence site, to be more specific.

Narelle Clark: applause

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Interpreters!

RussMundy: HUGE thankyou from me for all the support

Alice Jansen: Thank you for your participation!

Andrea Beccalli: interpreters thumbs up!

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks all.

James Gannon: Thanks everyone and thanks for having this as an open forum

Narelle Clark: Thanks to Alissa, also - give her a medal.

Victor Ndonnang: Thank you all!

Andrea Beccalli: remote participation was great

Andrea Beccalli: congrats!

Narelle Clark: Night night all.