

**IANA STEWARDSHIP TRANSITION COORDINATION GROUP
CONFERENCE CALL #3
26 August 2014
Chat Room Transcript**

Alice Jansen: Welcome to the ICG call #3! Please note that this call is being recorded. The chat session is being archived and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior:

<http://www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/expected-standards> - @ Observers, please note this is a listen-only call. ICG members will not take questions at this time.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Hello All!

Cory Schruth: Sounds good, Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Cory.

Mary Uduma: I am not sure my audio is working

Alice Jansen: Hi Mary - have you joined the bridge?

Mary Uduma: ai have not

Mary Uduma: Still struggling, Alice can you please help

Cory Schruth: Hi Mary, I would be happy to help. I will private message you.

Hartmut Glaser: Hi everyone from Brazil

Alice Jansen: Mary - see my private chat - please send us a phone number. We will call you.

Martin: Hi Alice, I have joined

Milton Mueller: Hello, I am a bit late but on now

Keith Drazek: +1 on Joe's suggestion.

Bladel: Do we define "operational communities" in this document?

Alissa Cooper: "those with direct operational or service relationship with IANA; namely names, numbers, protocol parameters"

Jari Arkko: +1 to what Joseph and Russ said

Bladel: Thanks Alissa. Is that it? Should we "name names"?

Jari Arkko: I'll add that the charter uses exactly this language (proposal and input)

Alissa Cooper: this text is a direct quote from the charter

Milton Mueller: Yes, we have defined it, and we have discussed it at length

Milton Mueller: "Proposals are expected to enjoy a broad consensus of support from all interested parties"

Alissa Cooper: Milton, you need not raise your hand

Alissa Cooper: feel free to say your name and then speak

Milton Mueller: oh, why not? just jump in on the phone?

Joseph Alhadeff: I would differ from Russ's construction. I think that as a group we have come to the conclusion that we believe that broad stakeholder consultation and acceptance is a requirement, not just nice to have. I do think that it's reasonable to channel the input in the most constructive manner...

Alissa Cooper: yeah we're trying this one without the queue

Alice Jansen: Guest - please identify yourself to be in the queue

Keith Drazek: all community input should initially be channelled through the 3 community processes.

Jari Arkko: Joe: agreed on that point

Jon Nevett: I'd like to point out that this is version 14 of the RFP -- wish we got this input earlier.

Jari Arkko: I think Milton's quoted language pretty much covers it

Milton Mueller: i can't hear the translator

Milton Mueller: cannot

Keith Drazek: me either

Bladel: english translation louder please

Kuo Wu: we are not in the line of french language. it is hard to understand

Alissa Cooper: maybe we can ask for a translation after he's done speaking? or is that too difficult

Alice Jansen: Jean-Jacques - please join the French line if you wish to speak French.

Alice Jansen: The interpreter cannot be heard on the English line

Joseph Alhadeff: for those who don't speak french this would be very difficult...

Milton Mueller: they ARE speaking on top of each other

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: the question is: in case one or more proposals come in not through the "operational" channel, would the ICG reject it or take it into consideration?

Daniel Karrenberg: can we put this aside soon and give other comments a chance fgiven that half our time is already past and jj says he wants to suggest language later?

Alissa Cooper: yes

Daniel Karrenberg: atleast see if there are more comments waiting?

Paul Wilson: Hi all, I am online but not able to speak.

Daniel Karrenberg: @mrapnic: welcome

Paul Wilson: thanks Daniel.

Alissa Cooper: does anyone in the chat have a different substantive issue to bring up?

Paul Wilson: +1 to Joe

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: agreed

Mohamed El Bashir: hello everyone, sorry for joining late had a work commitment

Martin: Should (in "This Request for Proposals (RFP) addresses task (i) of the ICG Charter") it read (i)a.?

Daniel Karrenberg: i have one general substantive issue that just occurred to me this morning

Adiel A. Akplogan: @Paulw, I think you need to use the phone to be able to speak.

Paul Wilson: Adiel, I am in flight 10km over central Australia!

Adiel A. Akplogan: the virtual room does not have a speaking/mic option on ...

Adiel A. Akplogan: lol

Adiel A. Akplogan: ok I see ... you may have then to type in your comment and have to stick to the voice observer mode

Paul Wilson: yes

Daniel Karrenberg: is the airplane connection good enough to *receive* audio?

Paul Wilson: agreed. +1 Alissa

Paul Wilson: i hear audio quite well.

Adiel A. Akplogan: Hello Paul Alice can help activate your mic

Jari Arkko: i'd suggest we may have rough consensus to move on...

Adiel A. Akplogan: Send her a direct message to request it

demi getschko: Will have to leave... See you in Istanbul.

Joseph Alhadeff: If we agree on the requirements in the substance, the perhaps we can forward the requirements to the communities without the chapeau text...

Daniel Karrenberg: +1 to milton's preamble: let's take a little more time to get this right. a bad rfp will generate bad responses which is the last thing we need!

Paul Wilson: makes sense, milton.

Alissa Cooper: yes, joe, that's what I was thinking

Paul Wilson: that said, we can release as "draft" no?

Joseph Alhadeff: Paul, my thought is that it's we can give them a heads up on substantive requirements in advance of published draft... that will help them formulate their process...

Jari Arkko: FWIW, I'd rather not re-open the charter. And the operational communities naturally have a different role, because they run their parts of the process.

Paul Wilson: Joe, I think we might as well release this document, as a draft, rather than, in effect, releasing another document as "heads up"...

Daniel Karrenberg: the point i want to make: IANA currently serves multiple communities and we request multiple proposals. shouldn't we ask for proposals that speak to why this is desirable or in other words if the community could live with a separate entities providing the service

guest: what is the operational community ' IETF, RIRs, BRO, ASO and ccNSO and GNSO '

guest: WHAT ARE OTHER COMMUNITIES?

Alice Jansen: If not speaking, please mute your line

guest: any one other than those mentioned above?

guest: who could reply to these questions ?

guest: Perhaps Alissa could reply

Keith Drazek: Guest, who are you?

Alice Jansen: We are hearing echo - please mute your line if not speaking

Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC): I was cut off from Adigo. Just me?

Keith Drazek: I did not lose connection.

Daniel Karrenberg: i agree with alissa on this issue

Kuo Wu: it is fine to me

Bladel: If we append "functions" to every instance of IANA, does that address Elise's concerns?

Jari Arkko: I got disconnected from Adigo. What did Alissa say?

Alissa Cooper: was supporting the current language and Patrik's email

Jon Nevett: Is Elise on and could respond?

Milton Mueller: good point Lynn

Patrik Fältström: Elise is not on the call

Alissa Cooper: she is not on the call

Alissa Cooper: Adiel, you need not raise your hand

Patrik Fältström: Alissa do you think some or the text I proposed should be added to the RFP as a clarification in the beginning?

Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC): Obviously just me. Now reconnected.

Alissa Cooper: maybe we should reference the SAC definition in this document

Paul Wilson: @milton - agree, but ths terminology should perhaps be explained.

Paul Wilson: ie what does "IANA" mean, in this document.

Paul Wilson: +1 Alissa

Milton Mueller: yes, it would be good to just reference that

Lynn St.Amour: I agree with referencing it

Adiel Akplogan: Agree with having the reference

Hartmut Glaser:)K

Keith Drazek: no objection

Hartmut Glaser: OK

Keith Davidson: Its OK

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Martin +1.

Daniel Karrenberg: From NRIA Announcement: " NTIA currently contracts with ICANN to carry out the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) functions"

guest: I RAISED HAND ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS BUT WAS LOWERED BY HOST WHY?

Keith Drazek: Guest, who are you? Alissa said at the beginning of the call that people should just speak up instead of raising hands.

Martin: I'm feeling good about the substance

Keith Davidson: Substance is fine

RussMundy: I'm good with the substance of the rfp

Alice Jansen: Guest, you have not identified yourself – cannot add you to the queue, as a result.

Paul Wilson: yes, agree.

Keith Drazek: I support.

Paul Wilson: question: is dropbox public?

Paul Wilson: i was going to ask about this, as I'm not sure.

Paul Wilson: +q alissa

Paul Wilson: +1

Alissa Cooper: yes, paul, it's public

Paul Wilson: that;s good to hear. it should be.

Paul Wilson: (not sure if the generl public is aware of that however?)

Patrik Fältström: Paul, the ones following the mailing lists have the

document (at least).

Paul Wilson: i thought we were publishing *before* istanbul./

Milton Mueller: Yes! We wanted it ready for the IGF

Paul Wilson: right.

Mohamed El Bashir 2: That's my understanding as well to finalize and publish RFP before the IGF

Hartmut Glaser: +1

Patrik Fältström: Indeed, *before* IGF.

RussMundy: yes, publish prior to the IGF

Adiel Akplogan: exact

Milton Mueller: I agree with Jari that the issues related to the definition of IANA are easy to resolve, indeed already have been resolved by adding the reference to SAC 067. It is the other issue that seems a bit more open ended

Lynn St.Amour: Having it published before the IGF would enable community engagement

Paul Wilson: i really do think we can publish as a draft.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Alissa +1.

Paul Wilson: we take early feedback from folks who want to give feedback early.

Paul Wilson: but an early release allows people to get started on the basis of a pretty good indication of what is expected.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Goodbye All!

Heather Dryden: thanks all!

Milton Mueller: ciao

Kuo Wu: see you in instambul...

Jari Arkko: I think we should look at the big picture. We are not "on the fly". I think we have six weeks of agreement, at least rough consensus if not better, about the overall approach. We should not reopen that model at this stage. I'm open to wording changes but not redefinition of how we plan to work with operational communities, for instance.

Mohamed El Bashir 2: bye

RussMundy: thanks all - bye

Paul Wilson: Bye all. Nice to join you from high altitude!

Alice Jansen: thank you very much!

Raf Fatani: just missed it

Deolindo Costa: Bye

Raf Fatani: I'll need to read the transcript

Raf Fatani: bya all

Keith Davidson: thanks

Keith Davidson: and bye