LONDON – NTIA IANA Functions' Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Meeting – FULL DAY
Thursday, July 17, 2014 – 09:00 to 18:00
London, England

ALISSA COOPER: So I think we're going to try to start, if people want to take their seats.

So hi, everyone. I am Alissa Cooper. I'm one of the IETF appointees, and you've been receiving a lot of email from me about the agenda. We're going to get started in a minute but I think the first order of business was to confirm that we're going to live-stream the meeting, and Theresa had a word to say about that, so I will hand it over to Theresa.

THERESA SWINEHART: All right. So first of all -- there. Now I'm on. Okay. I'm really good at this.

So just a couple things. One, first, really welcome everybody.

[No scribing]

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So we get that going, ICANN friends?

Okay. Great. Are we good to go?

NANCY LUPIANO: Yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Fantastic.

So for people out there joining remotely, we'll just recap for a second.

I'm Alissa Cooper. I'm one of the appointees from the IETF and we're getting kicked off here today with a brief amount of background and logistical information about the meeting.

I think all of us in this room know why we are here, but not everyone out there in the world might know, so just to recap, in March, the NTIA announced that they -- their intention to transition out of their stewardship role over the IANA function, and ICANN has run a process to convene this group here to help coordinate that effort and deliver a transition plan to NTIA next year.

So that is why we are all here, and personally I think just the brief engagement we've had over the last few days as a group has been very positive and I'm really looking forward to a really productive meeting.

Theresa, do you want to finish your intro?

THERESA SWINEHART: I'd be more than happy to.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

THERESA SWINEHART: So first, welcome, everybody, and thank you very much for participating in all of this.

As you know, with the announcement, ICANN was asked to facilitate the process and to work with the community on working to reach a proposal that meets the criteria set out by NTIA.

There's obviously been a lot of work since the 14th of March announcement, and certainly appreciate all the work by the community members in identifying their stakeholders and their representation here to the coordination group.

I think as has been noted in some of the discussions, this is also an opportunity to show multistakeholder engagement and how multistakeholder processes can work very well.

One of the key objectives, obviously, for this group is to establish a proposal that meets the criteria set out by NTIA with regards to the transition of their stewardship role in relation to the IANA functions.

Some key themes that have arisen in many of the discussions and input during this process are around assuring diversity, accountability, and transparency, so we as facilitator are obviously very prepared and have already put into place tools and mechanisms and are prepared to continue to support anything relating to those aspects.

Obviously, as the role of ICANN, we're the neutral convener and facilitator for this, ensuring that the process is running well, is open and transparent and supporting mechanisms around that.

In that context, also, the budget to help cover any lean obligations and work of the coordination group as well as obviously supporting the work around the accountability process in relation to identifying anything around strengthening ICANN accountability in the context of its changing historical relationship with ICANN.

We are providing, obviously, communications support and other tools in order to enable the community to be engaging and participating in this discussion.

The logistics here, streaming and any support that's needed, I think everybody has that information.

And then with regards to any housekeeping aspects, as this process is being streamed and interpreted, please also state your

names when you speak, and take the microphone. That will help the scribes tremendously in moving anything forward.

As we had identified, we have asked Sam Dickinson to be present to help serve the coordination group with anything that they need and wish to have, and if it is okay with the coordination group, I'd like to ask her to say a few words, if that's appropriate.

And we are paying for her time but she is at the service of the coordination group with anything you need.

So with that, thank you, and look forward to supporting you in any way.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Theresa. Do we want to hear from you, Sam? Is now a good time? Yes. I was -- I mean, the next thing on my agenda is to figure out -- make sure we have minutes being taken, in addition to the transcription, so it's probably a good time. Yeah.

SAM DICKINSON: Hi. So I'm Sam Dickinson, for the record. I've just put together some notes -- they're very personal, sorry -- for your consideration. I deal with a lot of other Internet governance issues so I'm looking from the broad picture, so this -- for me, this process has the ability to be another NETmundial-type moment where we move Internet governance forward significantly.

We have -- coming up in the next couple of years, we have the ITU plenipotentiary at the end of this year, and at the end of next year there's the WSIS+10 overall review that's being conducted by the U.N. General Assembly and that will result in a government-negotiated outcome document.

So this is a good way of showing those processes that multistakeholderism can work.

It's also at an interesting point in the development of Internet governance. We're moving from a smaller range of stakeholders interested in Internet governance to a much larger number.

So in the early days of Internet governance you had a lot of people participating as individuals.

As we have more stakeholders, it's going to be harder having 5 billion individual stakeholders participating. There is more representation needing to happen.

And so this group, as a group of representatives from different communities, is a chance to evolve that model and find ways to move Internet governance forward.

One of the challenges that this group may have is that as we look around the table, there are a number of developing country males, which for -- I mean, this is not a problem. Each community chose its representatives. But if someone wants to criticize the process, one of the easy ways to criticize it is to say this is

EN

reflecting dominant developing country male perspective, so there's a couple of ways that could address that concern and that criticism.

One of them is to, for a start, provide links to information about how each of these communities chose their representatives, so there's transparency and an understanding about why each of you are here; that it's not a conspiracy of white dominant males.

The other issue is that because this is a coordination group, it's important to then document the wider communities that you are representing. So if there is a way to show that there is diversity amongst each of those groups that you're representing. So one possible thing that you might want to think about is somehow -- or providing information, statistics, reporting on how your communities are discussing us, looking at issues about diversity within those communities, so regional diversity, language diversity, gender diversity.

This could have three potential benefits.

One, it shows how diverse each of your communities are. The other is that if you are keeping track of where there is diversity or where there's not lack of diversity, it means you can identify where you need to, perhaps, follow up.

Plus, if down the track you have some elements of communities that say, "Hey, we weren't consulted," if you've been able to track

where you've been reaching out to communities, you can show, "Look, actually, we did reach out to all of these communities and if you chose not to participate back then, well, that -- you know, we did reach out to you."

One of the challenges, actually, when I was thinking about how you could try and do the statistics is amongst many of the communities, there are slightly overlapping hats. So that's something, perhaps, you want to think about. How do you manage that.

In terms of multistakeholder processes the community tends to hold up as successes, two recent ones are NETmundial and the ITU WTPF, the world technology and ICT policy forum.

The multistakeholder community holds those up as major successes. However, there are some stakeholders who don't consider those processes to be fully inclusive.

So one of the issues to consider in this program -- process going forward is how not to fall into the trap of those two previous events where a large number of prime multistakeholder participants were very happy with the outcomes and therefore saw those processes as a success, but more marginalized voices didn't feel that they were able to participate and are still on the sidelines saying, "This didn't work for us."

That can't happen, really, with this process because when this proposal finally goes to the U.S. government, if there are still those outlying voices, that makes it very difficult for the U.S. government to move forward with the proposal.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. We did have kind of a couple of administrative and logistic issues we did want to get into and kind of launch into introductions, so is it okay if we kind of cap it there? And I'm sure we will get into many of these topics as we go through the meeting, so --

SAM DICKINSON: One of the things, I suppose, just to quickly ask is: Do you want me to tweet this meeting? Because at the moment I'm not. I've just said that it's webcast. If you want me to, I'll start doing that now.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, so I think this is a question -- oh, yeah. Sure. Go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Good morning all, including remote participants.

In answer to Sam's question, I think that we should not get into just a mode or a fashion, which is everything is tweeted. When you brush your teeth, you tweet, et cetera.

I mean, Sam is going to do something very valuable, which is giving us reports on our own discussions, so that we can reflect on them, see whether we consider them accurate, and going forward this will be a major contribution to the cohesiveness and the coherence of our discussion.

Tweeting 20 or 50 or 500 times a day, I -- I'm not sure that adds that much to the discussion. I know it's fashionable. I know in the name of transparency, soon we'll be doing this even as we do anything else. But I would just warn against this because there is a tendency, at least on the part of anyone in authority -- states and local authorities, et cetera, to consider that it's the best way to ensure transparency, but transparency sometimes can be self-defeating.

We are transparent. The whole process is transparent. Must we go that far? Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jean-Jacques.

So the question, I think, from my perspective is I believe that you are meant to be the minute-taker, so I know that we have the transcript, but in my experience, when we go to -- if we decide

that we want to put together a full meeting summary, it's actually quite useful to have minutes in addition to transcript because transcripts are really long.

So is that -- was that the plan? That you were going to take minutes in sort of, you know, note form, as opposed to transcript form?

SAM DICKINSON: Well, yeah. I mean, it's up to you what you want. I mean, the idea was possibly that I write some sort of report at the end rather than a bunch of minutes, but a report. But I mean, if you prefer minutes, I can do that, or if you want tweeting, because -- it's up to you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So then the second question before we sort of put this out to the group is: Are you able to both minute and tweet at the same time?

SAM DICKINSON: Yes, I can multitask.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Okay. So I will give my personal opinion about this and then we can hear from people.

I think it would be very useful to have a set of minutes at the conclusion of this meeting.

Personally, I would like to see us as a group be the body that formulates the meeting summary. I don't -- I don't think we necessarily need to have Sam do it. I think it's a useful exercise and we can -- we can share the load on that as we go from meeting to meeting.

And as much as I sometimes disdain Twitter as well, Jean-Jacques, having been a person who was not able to dial into the live stream but is at work and trying to follow along something, Sam's tweets from other Internet governance meetings I have found extremely useful for that purpose.

So I would say if you can minute and tweet, that would be excellent, but would love to hear other perspectives from people. Paul agrees.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel Karrenberg. I'm on -- I don't have any particular opinion about the tweeting, but I'd like to draw attention to a message that Paul actually sent this morning about not drawing up a statement right at the end of the meeting but assembling it as we go along, and I think Sam could help with that very much. If you keep a file open where you put material that you think should

go into a statement or that we call out as to be going into a final statement, that would be very, very helpful.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi, James Bladel for the transcript. I think I'm coming down closer to the side Jean-Jacques on the issue of tweeting. I'm anticipating some very dense conversations here. And compressing that into short snippets and 140 characters, I think, is -- opens us up to the potential for perhaps misunderstanding or misinterpretation. So perhaps if we could keep it to a minimum, things that are explicitly noted by the group that probably should go out or administrative matters, I think that would be the safest and most conservative approach to tweeting.

And, once again, if anyone is keenly interested in following these meetings, I think that ICANN has provided sufficient facilities to follow remotely in that regard as well. That's just my opinion. I think probably leaning closer to Jean-Jacques' position.

MILTON MUELLER: This meeting is being live streamed so anybody in the world can tweet what they hear based on this meeting. I guess if your concern is that Samantha has the status of some kind of an official meeting tweeter, maybe you have some legitimate concern about what she tweets. But Samantha is well-known for being kind of a

chronicler of ICANN meetings and many people follow her for that reason. And I would say tweet away.

We know she does a good job of it. So what's the problem? Anybody can tweet base -- I'm going to tweet, okay? You ain't going to stop me from tweeting, okay? I don't have to ask for permission. If you want to give her permission, it's fine. I would support it.

ALISSA COOPER: Maybe the compromise here is feel free to tweet perhaps less than usual. How about that? Does that seem -- anybody object to that? Okay. Let's go forward with that plan.

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: I will tweet. If anyone has any problems with the tweets, just let me know and I will try to reduce it.

ALISSA COOPER: Do you have a hashtag? Do we have a hashtag? #ianacg?

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: #ianasteward, one word.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. We will go with that for today.

My next question was about the remote participants. Did we have confirmation they are on and they can hear and so forth, ICANN folks? Yes. Okay.

And I was thinking for us today in terms of running the queue, what would be helpful if you want to get in the queue is to wave your card and then leave it standing up and then after you've spoken, put it down. But I was wondering how we want to get remote people into the queue.

Any thoughts on that?

>> (off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: The question was: When there is a remote participant that wants to get into the queue, how will we know they want to be in the queue?

NANCY LUPIANO: We have five participants on the phone. The phone line is ready to be opened when they have a request. All they have to do is unmute their phone. Those are the five specified remote participants.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

NANCY LUPIANO: They will send questions to Jim Trengrove so he will know when someone needs to have a question.

ALISSA COOPER: Who is Jim? Oh, hi, Jim. Okay. Great. Thank you. So for now I think, Jim, maybe when you get a request, if you can wave your hand or something, then we'll know to put some remote participant in the queue. Thank you.

Does he have a flag? Yes, fine.

Great. I think at this point we are only 20 minutes off of the original agenda. We have the agenda being projected right now. And we've had a little bit of discussion of this agenda on the list, but I wanted to have, in the IETF, what we call an agenda bash where people can suggest changes, other topics that aren't included.

So if anyone has thoughts there. I know, Jean-Jacques, you had a suggestion for tomorrow. So maybe we could start with that and if you want to elaborate on that a bit.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques.

Yes, I find the proposed agenda very interesting and thorough. But as someone who doesn't originate from the technical -- sorry?

ALISSA COOPER: I think the remote folks might want to mute. Thanks.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Sorry. I didn't get it. What should I do?

ALISSA COOPER: You can go ahead. I think we have background noise from remote people.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. As someone that's not originating from the technical community, I find this draft agenda very interesting and thorough. But at the same time, I think that many in the user community whom I represent are keen to ask some questions which are not on the agenda. For instance, roughly, what is the kind of transition body or arrangement which we want to arrive at at the end of our exercise? Because it is transitioning and roughly transitioning from the United States government oversight to something else which remains to be invented.

So I just wanted to ask if colleagues were interested towards the end of our two days' meeting in London this time just to broach

that subject in a careful and very open way so that we get some sense of what are the possible arrangements outside, of course, all the technical considerations. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Does anyone have thoughts about that? I think the suggestion was to talk about this over lunch tomorrow.

Seeing no objections, I will amend the agenda and we'll put that on for lunch tomorrow. Thank you.

Oh, sorry.

PAUL WILSON: This is Paul Wilson. Another point on the agenda, as I suggested earlier, and Daniel mentioned, it would make sense to me for us to be issuing a statement as soon as possible. And my preference is more or less immediately after this meeting. So if we, during the course of this meeting, are able to note points which are candidates for inclusion in a statement, I think that would be helpful. But we will need a point on the agenda at the end of the meeting tomorrow to review those points and agree on what's to be included in the statement.

So my proposal is to add a section at the end of the agenda tomorrow for that purpose. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:	Okay. So I think -- I think we should reserve a little bit of time at the end of tomorrow. We already have kind of a parking lot, so I think that should be one of the items that goes in there.
	Another question that I just got from the ICANN folks is, so right now, I guess, on the Adobe Connect the chat room is not live so we are not getting questions from the public and ICANN is getting questions about why is the chat room not open and why can't people submit questions.
	I think this was kind of more of a working session, and we didn't really intend to be responding to questions from the public. But we should decide that.
	So Kuo-Wei?
KUO-WEI WU:	Regarding the Jean-Jacques recommendation, I would suggest that maybe ICANN or Elise -- because ICANN already have some of the IANA function in the steward transition document already on the ICANN Web site. Maybe the best way is how to put that into one spot. So for the people, Jean-Jacques mentioned about, it easier for them go to the Web site because there is also a video there. It will not waste our time. For the people sitting here, we don't need to go through what the IANA transition is. It might be one of the solutions.

The people interested in what is this event, what is this coordination going on, actually there is online information. They can read it. They can see it.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Joseph Alhadeff, ICC/BASIS. I think perhaps the best way -- I think it would be a shame that if we're having something that's live streamed people don't have a way to associate comments with what we're doing. I think we have to be clear that because of the nature of this meeting, it is not a Q&A meeting for general public but that they should be able to associate comments and at, you know, various points, we may be able to look at the comments that have come in and see if there is anything we need to address that we haven't dealt with. But that would at least then give people a voice without interrupting the flow to the extent that we can't accomplish what we need to accomplish.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I put my card up earlier. It is Lynn St. Amour. I really would to echo what Joseph just said. Even if we are aren't able to address some of those comments today, they would be a useful record to go back and look at afterwards and then further direct additional work or additional documentation we might release.

PAUL WILSON: I agree. If questions are asked, though, rather than comments being made, then I think we might be able to respond but we would make no guarantee of being able to respond to every question that's posted but those questions should be noted. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: So any objections to this proposal? The chat room gets opened under the expectation that it's useful for people to comment but that we are unlikely to be able to respond to questions in real-time. Okay. So can you work that out?

NANCY LUPIANO: You want to open up the chat?

ALISSA COOPER: And maybe one of you can send a note to the effect of what I just said so people know. Okay. Great.

Other comments on the agenda? Yes.

KUO-WEI WU: Do we really need about one hour, 30 minutes for introductions?

ALISSA COOPER: So these are beefy introductions, is how I would characterize them. We have had a series of different items accrue. Theresa asked this morning about people talking about how they got here into this group. I think we also wanted to use this time to learn a little bit about each of the different constituencies, how they work, how their decision processes work, who they are, and I guess all 30 of us maybe are not here. But 90 minutes is three minutes per person if we have 30 people which actually isn't that much to introduce yourself. So I'm happy for us to finish early and people can mince words if they want to. But that was kind of the thinking there.

Okay. So with that, I think we should move on and start with the introductions. So we've had a few comments about what we want to hear from people in addition to your name. I think which group appointed you and how you got appointed would be useful information, what that group does, who participates in it, how the group does its work, what its decision processes are. Another question that we had raised is, it would be useful I think for us to understand if you as an individual are, quote-unquote, representing your constituency, actually bringing forth messages that they have agreed to or if you are here offering your individual opinions and insights.

And, finally, maybe a little bit about how you view your group's work in relation to the work of the coordination group. And I

guess one more item that's probably useful to know is your employment and funding situation for this work, if you have outside funding or if your employer is funding it. That might be helpful to know.

So, yes, go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. I would like to request that we encourage all of us to state this that first round of introduction the citizenship and dual or multiple citizenship, if that is the case, because as I am representing the interests of the general or the global end user, I think it's always interesting to see where people come from, where they live, where they work from. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Sounds good.

Okay. Shall we start? Daniel, do you want to start? Introduce yourself.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Sure. My name is Daniel Karrenberg. I'm here from the Root Server System Advisory Committee. I sent an email message about our selection process, about our group, the charter and everything, including the initial guidance that we have received

from the group and short bios of Lars-Johan Liman and myself. We are the representatives, but Liman has had a prescheduled family holiday which I encouraged him not to break for this because he has to go to Toronto this weekend. So I'm the only one from the RSSAC.

And I'm -- to answer Jean-Jacques, I'm a German by birth and nationality. I live in the Netherlands, and I consider myself an Internet citizen.

And about representation, I don't think we have been selected, both Lars-Johan and me, to be marionettes of the group that selected us. We're going to be here and act to help this group to success primarily. That's our primary objective. And the secondary one is to watch that no harm comes from it for the root server operators.

And if you have any questions, I'm quite happy to answer them, and I encourage each one of you to send a similar message to the one I sent to the group for reference.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Russ Housley. I'm currently the chair of the Internet Architecture Board, usually called the IAB. I'm an independent consultant.

EN

And in that capacity, I have taken the travel reimbursement from ICANN and have found a sponsor to help cover the time. VeriSign has agreed to sponsor my participation. That relationship is public. However, I want to be clear that I'm here representing the IAB, not VeriSign. VeriSign has their own person in the room, Keith. And so if you have a question about any position about VeriSign, please talk to Keith about that, not me.

So the Internet Architecture Board is the oversight body for the protocol parameter IANA registries, among other things. And the 13 people that make up that -- the Architecture Board perform that. We also have a program on IANA strategy. And so in selecting the people to participate in this, IAB grew from its 13 voting members and from the people that have been recruited from the overall community to participate in that program. And Lynn St. Amour was one of those people, and I'll let her speak for herself.

And to answer the other question, my citizenship is the United States.

MILTON MUELLER: Milton Mueller. I'm here on behalf of the noncommercial stakeholders group, which is a stakeholders group within the GNSO, which is the acronym for the domain name policymaking organ within ICANN.

I was selected by the policy committee of the NCSG after an open call for nominations and some discussion.

What we do is basically develop policy positions.   Our membership consists of nonprofit organizations, civil society groups, and individuals who are concerned about individual rights, civil liberties, and public interest issues within domain name policy.

We've had some discussion about my status. To some extent it's a mix of whether I am representing that group and whether I'm representing my own views.

I was appointed probably because I am one of the most well-informed members of that group with respect to the IANA functions and so on, but for the most part, I'm here to represent the views of the noncommercial stakeholder group and consult with them as actively as I can before I take a major position. I'm sorry. I'm an American.

JARI ARKKO: My name is Jari Arkko.   I was named here by the IETF, the representatives from there.

In the IETF system, our steering group, the IESG selected the two people, me and Alissa, to come here.

At the IETF, I'm also the chair of the organization, and I'm -- as with everyone else in the IETF, we're all volunteers so we have day jobs. My day job is with Ericsson Research and I'm based in Finland, and my background is engineering, although I've been on this IANA topic for quite a while, since maybe 2007 or so.

And with regards to our approach from the IETF in this group, I think all of us that come from that system have kind of the background that we have a fairly well-running system with regards to IANA and relatively clear idea of how the IETF wants to organize the IANA matters. You know, the descriptions and running -- running code and that.

And then I just wanted to say a few words about the IETF, just to -- because, you know, sometimes people will ask, you know, "Well, you're the representatives of the IETF. Why can't you decide for the IETF?" Or, "You're the chair of the IETF. Why can't you say what the IETF should do?"

So the IETF is sort of the ultimate bottom-up organization. All the proposals and specs come from the communities and there's some management structure that looks at those results and finds out if there's some grave errors. But other than that, we basically operate based on our community opinion on all matters, including IANA topics, and we also operate based on -- or there's the saying that we operate based on rough consensus and running code, and so that means that, you know, the real impact to the Internet and

running systems is important. And the rough consensus part is that we always, of course, try to reach full consensus but if that's not possible and we have a disagreement situation, we at least try to understand all sides of the matter, and if we can't resolve it, we at least must have an opinion that, you know, we -- we have understood the objection and believe that we can -- we can move ahead and we have understood the situation, at least.

There's a recent RFC, RFC-7282 if you want to look at the details on rough consensus. I know we've had some discussions about consensus and what this means in this group and elsewhere.

And the final thing I wanted to say is just a little bit about -- information about the IETF process going forward.

So we obviously have a history on this. We have developed various RFCs and agreements and systems, processes. We're continuing that. We have continued that this year.

We have -- as Russ noted, we have the IAB that is formally in charge of this topic. We have an IANA program. We have had recently an extensive discussion about this matter on our mailing list, and that probably continues in the upcoming meeting which starts on Sunday in Toronto, Canada. We'll have a -- one session dedicated to this topic called "The IANA Plan," which is hopefully also going to be a working group later on, so that's the main place for us to develop this -- these matters or provide a proposal to this group from that working group.

So that's it. Thank you.

Yes, I did specify my nationality, which is Finland.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: And I'm Lynn St. Amour. I'm here as an IAB appointee. I was formerly ISOC president and CEO, and in that role, I actually served as a liaison between the Internet Society and the IAB, so I am not currently serving in the IAB in any capacity, but given my long relationship and history with them, and I continue to be a part of their IANA strategy program as well.

In matters of sort of other points of transparency, I am the CEO of a small Internet consulting company called Internet Matters, and I also work with Don Tapscott, who has a program called Global Solutions Networks that looks at large networks for problem-solving, taking advantage of new technologies and things such as the multistakeholder model.

Neither one of those have any relationship or financial contribution to this effort. That's -- this is purely a volunteer effort, and as such, I did actually also take -- take advantage of the ICANN travel support to attend this meeting.

Other matters of transparency, I guess, I am American. I spent 26 years in Europe and just moved back to the States about two years ago. And I think that covered all the critical details.

I think Russ covered all of the activities with respect to the IAB and their decision process, which has a lot of similar elements to the IETF as well with respect to community support and consensus processes.

HARTMUT GLASER: Hartmut Glaser. I was appointed by the address council of the ASO. The ASO is the supporting organization for all matters related to the Internet Protocol address policy.

We are 15 members, three from each region. I am board member of LACNIC and LACNIC appoint me to be one of the members for the address council.

I work as the executive secretary for the CGI in Brazil, one of the organizers of NETmundial last April.

I am part of the ICANN community since '99, from the very beginning, so probably I am an old-timer.

And the selection process for the only seat that we have on this decision committee was internal for -- for the address council. We have three candidates and the selection process appoint me. So I am here representing the address council and will be reporting back and forward to my community. There's not a strong decision that I need to ask every time for every position, but I need to report, so I will do it on a regular basis.

I live in Brazil. My background is German but I have a Brazilian citizenship. I grew up in Brazil. And if you ask me if I was in the World Cup in favor of Germany or Brazil, I was for Brazil.

[Laughter]

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I'll state two things.

First, what does ALAC do and how does it do it. And then I'll say a few words about myself and what I'm doing here on behalf of the ALAC.

We have two representatives of the ALAC here, Mohamed El Bashir, who will be speaking after me, and myself.

So the ALAC thinks of itself as the primary home, as it were, of the global Internet end user, and what we do -- our processes, our decision-making, our voting, our consultations -- are really all based on a very wide sensitivity and care for the public interest. It's really a bottom-up process and it's based on the consensus culture.

Perhaps what I should underline is our representation is really quite wide across the world. We have about 160 ALSs, or at-large structures, and we realize in our meetings in our various manifestations that this is really the case.

EN

For instance, at the ATLAS II summit in London just a few weeks ago we really had a very wide representation.

Now, the question then was, am I representing the ALAC or am I speaking more in a personal capacity.

Well, it's quite obvious that because of the process which was followed in order to designate Mohamed and myself, it's a completely transparent thing which is documented and which you can find on-line.

We were required -- all the candidates were required to send in statements of interest. A special subcommittee was formed in order to designate the candidates or the representatives. So I consider myself clearly as a representative of the at-large community.

At the same time, if I was chosen, it's perhaps just a little bit because of my personal experience, my background, and that's where I feel I should say a few words about that.

First, I was on the board as a member of the board of ICANN from 2007 to 2010, and to make it brief, during that period actually I did have two experiences which were related with transition. Not specifically IANA transition, but transition.

When I was on the President's Strategy Committee in those years, we developed and drafted the Improving Institutional Confidence report and recommendations, some of which, by the way, were

later taken up by the AoC, and also, I noted with pleasure a few months ago, by the new CEO of ICANN, for instance, when he announced that he had set up an important ICANN office in Geneva which, in fact, was one of our recommendations in 2009.

Another moment of transition was when ICANN board was deciding on the transition from the JPA, the Joint Project Agreement, to the AoC, Affirmation of Commitments. I was on the board then.

And finally, on the ALAC, I was the creator and co-chair of the future challenges working group of ALAC which produced, among other things, one document known now as the R3. The title was "Making ICANN Responsive, Relevant, and Respected." And in that document we did bring up quite a few of the themes we will be discussing during the next two days.

So my citizenship is French only, and I live in the Paris area. I am completely independent in the sense that I do not get any stipend. I'm living on my pension as a former French diplomat and former ambassador.

My presence here in London is being paid for by ICANN constituency travel, hotel and hopefully travel, because all this was done in such a rush that I had to pay for my train fares and all that. The airfare is being paid by ICANN, but I do hope to get my train fares reimbursed as well. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Good morning, everyone. My named is Mohamed El Bashir. I'm coming --- community. I have participated in ICANN since 2001. I was a founder -- one of the founders of the AFRALO, the current regional structure for the At-Large community.

At the day, I work managing a technical affairs department in a regulator that involves Internet numbering, managing ccTLD and IDN ccTLD, include other technical issues related to telecom.

I have been selected by the At-Large community in an election. I can say I'm a passionate Internet user. I'm originally from Sudan in Africa, currently based in Qatar. Doha. Funded by ICANN to -- to come to the meeting representing the At-Large community. And I think just lastly, maybe, besides representing the Internet community or constituency, definitely I will be contributing with my own experiences to the work of the group. Thank you.

KUO-WEI WU: This is Kuo-Wei Wu and I appoint by the ICANN board as the liaison, and basically as you know, ICANN is the over looker of the ICANN institution, the operations, and all the board members is appointed from the, you know, different constituencies like ASO and GNSO, ccNSO, At-Large, GAC, also the nomination committee, and also we have liaison member from the, you know, technical

group such as IAB, IETF, you know, ITU, WC3. And I personally actually appointed by ASO.

And basically this is -- I'm looking forward to the possibility of the success of the coordinating group. I think it's -- we want to make it work in time. I think it's very important for us to overlook what is -- what is the scope and what is the procedure we want to reach, and I think there will be making this coordination group meeting getting time to, you know, finish our goal.

Finally, just like people are asking, I'm a citizen of Taiwan and I study and work in the U.S. for 15 years and I back to Taiwan to work since 1990 till now.

In my daily job actually I run a nonprofit organization, NIIEPA. Actually it's doing the Internet policy research at the same time we do the information security compliance, you know, like ISO 27001. Also the personal data management system stuff for the company and, you know, for the government too.

So that's it. Thank you.

JAMES BLADEL: Good morning. I am James Bladel. I am a citizen and resident of the United States. I'm one of the three non-registry representatives from the GNSO specifically appointed and sent by the registrar stakeholder group.

As many of you are aware, the GNSO is a very large and diverse group, and registrars represent one side of the commercial or contracted party house of ICANN, which is commercial entities that have entered into service contracts with ICANN.

I like to think of registrars as the point at which all of this governance and policy meets the consumer markets, because I believe fairly strongly that when someone chooses to register their first domain name is the moment when they stop consuming the Internet and start creating and contributing to it, and I believe that registrars serve as a vital role in that function.

I was selected by registrars a few weeks ago and a few meters above us at our meeting in ICANN 50 and would not consider myself a spokesperson for the registrars and I don't know that anyone, in fact, could be. It's a very diverse stakeholder group with a variety of business models, geographic locations, and markets served.

So I -- I do my best to attempt to consider all of those positions and bring all of those viewpoints to this group. However, it will probably most likely become necessary to take certain issues back to that group for further consultation as well.

So I look forward to the -- to the work.

I would potentially recommend that in addition to these introductions, which have been great so far, that everyone

perhaps could submit a statement of interest and keep that on file at a community wiki. I'm sure that the staff folks could help us set that. Mine is there and it's fairly -- fairly comprehensive and it would be great if -- if we had that on file for all of the coordination group members. Thank you.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. Can I be allowed to catch my breath?

ELISE GERICH: My name is Elise Gerich. I work for ICANN. I'm the vice president of the IANA functions, so I'm here representing the IANA functions operator. The role of this coordination group, I think, is to provide information, if you have questions about what it is that the IANA functions does as well as what the relationship between the IANA functions and NTIA is.

And I look forward to the outcome. Obviously, it will impact the IANA functions operator. Thank you.

Oh, I'm an United States citizen and I do live and work in the United States.

MARTIN BOYLE: Good morning. My name is Martin Boyle. I'm with .UK, Nominet and, therefore, from the CC community. I'm a Brit, as presumably you can all hear from my accent. And have been fairly heavily

involved in ICANN and ICANN issues since 2003 where I served as the U.K. GAC representative from 2003 through 2008. And also in my misspent youth, I was heavily involved from the U.K. government in the World Summit on Information Society process.

I've been selected by the ccTLD community through a process that was run by the ccNSO, and there is a report of that process that has been produced and published by the ccNSO.

And I can provide the link to that. There were 11 applicants for the four posts. And the people that were selected include Mary who has only just come into the room so she's trying to catch her breath as she put it. Xiaodong Lee who I believe is expected to arrive tomorrow from China. And Keith Davidson who said he was going to be on remote participation, I don't know whether he's there or not, but from the New Zealand registry.

The group, the ccNSO, the CC community, the only area of policy that is covered within the ICANN field is that which is associated with the IANA function. It has a membership of over 150 now, if I remember correctly, ccTLDs from around the world. And the CC community is a very diverse community.

We have a national focus predominantly rather than one that sets the sort of general operational policy -- policies via any ICANN process. So with all things associated with the operation of a ccTLD registry, that is a local decision.

Sorry, excuse me.

And that, I think, is something that we do need to bear in mind as we go through this process that the ccTLDs with just very few exceptions are not contracted parties to ICANN. A very diverse bunch, as I said.

But the other affiliation that I have is that Nominet is a member of the European registry association CENTR. And the reason I mention that is that I do not see my role here as being to represent the ccTLD community but rather to try and identify how to build a consensus that working with the ccTLD community we can find that that is something that will then be an acceptable approach, an acceptable way forward.

And, therefore, I see an awful lot of my role as being to try and make sure that the CC community understands the process that's going on here, understands the issues that are being raised, and the direction of travel that we are going in is something that is going to work for that rather diverse bunch that is the CC community.

Just looking down that list as to whether I have missed anything, no, I think that probably is it. So thank you.

And, oh, yes. Perhaps I should mention, the path of the process for selection in the CC community included a request for us to put in statements of conflicts, statements of what it was that we were

hoping to do. And as far as I am concerned, the documents I prepared for that process I'm quite happy to share with the group on the Wiki. Thank you.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Good morning to everybody. I am Demi Getschko. I'm from Brazil. I was born in Italy, but my home citizenship is Brazilian.

I was one of the two members selected by ISOC to be in this committee. ISOC selected Narelle Clark from Australia and myself from Brazil. This was an open process after the ICANN 50th meeting.

And we had already some conversations and exchange of ideas via teleconfs and via other ways, electronic ways. And, unfortunately, Narelle is not here but is following the meeting via the Adobe connection. And, of course, we will be in contact with the community all the time.

As my personal information for the sake of transparency, I work for the Brazilian Network Information Center, .BR. I have been involved with the Internet since the end of '80s, beginning of '90s.

And I have also been part of the Brazilian steering committee -- Internet steering committee. Have had an important role in the NETmundial in the beginning of this year.

I was also a member of the ICANN board two times, elected by the ccNSO community. But here I am through ISOC selection process, not the CCs.

Anyway, I think this is an important point in the Internet history. I think this is more or less a concept or has its roots in the events at the end of '90s, '98 probably. And I hope we can go through this process keeping the stability and the reliability and making better accountability of the process.

But from moment now to keep these services going on as always, it is always important to look at all the ICANN functions in a very rationale, simple, and unpoliticized way. And, anyway, I'm here trying to help on this.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Good morning, everybody. My name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. I'm a German citizen. And I was appointed -- I'm one of the members of the GNSO representing here in this group.

Actually, my personal history is coming on the telecommunications business. I was more than 30 years with Deutsche Telekom, the German telecommunications provider.

And now I'm working with eco, the Internet business association in Germany, and doing consulting work for them.

I am a member of the GNSO and based in the GNSO as my colleagues mentioned. We have a diverse structure which comes down to stakeholder groups --- and the stakeholder groups to constituencies.

And personally, I'm in the Commercial Stakeholder Group which combines three constituencies: The so-called business constituency and the intellectual property constituency and the Internet services providers constituencies where I'm personally allocated to.

Now to the process of nomination, and it happened also here in this hotel just four weeks ago during the ICANN meeting where we had the opportunity to have face-to-face meetings in the Commercial Stakeholder Group. So the process was fairly open. So members of the Commercial Stakeholder Group who were interested to do that job have been asked for -- to put their names forward. And there were several candidates from all the constituencies. And in the end, I got the job.

Do you want to hear more about that?

[Laughter]

Okay. So -- as I said, it is a complex structure and not to say that my colleagues who appointed me are nervous about that but in order to support me, we decided that in the background of myself, there will be kind of a supporting group consisting of

members of the different constituencies. So I have already established an email list with those colleagues from the business community, constituencies, the ISPs and the intellectual property constituency to communicate with them with regards to what we are doing here. So this is a real bottom-up process. And it means for the future as well that I'm -- I will rely on that as well when I'm going forward and hearing more discussion, that I'm really representing opinions which are gathered by the community of the Commercial Stakeholder Group.

So just to add something with what Milton already mentioned with regards how the decision-taken process is going to be done within the GNSO. And this is my behavior as well, and I expect to work here as well. So the GNSO, we have these different stakeholder groups. And, on the other hand, we have a GNSO Council who is supposed to be the manager of said policy development process. To understand that fully, that doesn't mean that the council is at the top of the GNSO community and taking decisions on behalf of the community, rather than that the council is the facilitator and is coordinating, is gathering, collecting the input from the different communities, constituencies. And these constituencies are working on so-called working group model which is consensus-based. The word "consensus" means, we have to just conflate on what's in this group.

That's where it comes from. From the basis, it comes by consensus up. And the council is going forward and putting it forward by voting. So there is a voting scheme in the council. And before recommendations are put forward to the board, to the ICANN board, it's done by voting. So that's the principle how decisions are taken there. And that's also my history as I'm accustomed to do so, so I wanted to discuss that.

Last, but not least, my traveling is sponsored here by ICANN. And that's it. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Good morning, everyone. My name is Keith Drazek. I'm the vice president of policy and government relations at VeriSign, the registry operator for .COM and .NET gTLDs and the root zone maintainer function.

I am here appointed by the GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group. I am currently the chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group. The GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group is comprised of generic gTLD registries or generic TLD registries. And as such, we are direct customers of IANA and also new gTLD applicants.

So I am here representing the gTLD registries, and I'm here to facilitate a bottom-up consensus-based community input into the development of a recommendation to NTIA for the transition of the IANA functions -- sorry, the IANA stewardship.

The Registry Stakeholder Group operates on a consensus basis. We vote when necessary. And in the context of the GNSO Council deliberations, our representatives are directed. We basically have a process to advise our representatives on the council as to how to vote, when voting is necessary.

I am from the United States, and I did not request travel funding. Thanks.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: My name is Joseph Alhadeff. I'm here on behalf of ICC/BASIS. Just a little bit about ICC/BASIS for those who might not be familiar, it is -- it was formed after the end of WSIS. It is -- it has picked up where the coordinating committee of business interlocutors had left off, so it was formed in 2006. It has had the business action to support the Information Society. It's coordinated by the International Chamber of Commerce. The International Chamber of Commerce consists of hundreds of thousands of member companies of all sizes and associations across 120 countries.

My role in ICC is that I chair the Digital Economy Commission of the International Chamber of Commerce, but my day job is for Oracle where I'm the vice president of global public policy and the chief privacy strategist, which means I'm responsible for Oracle's global policy positions.

The ICC/BASIS ran essentially an open call for volunteers. It had been requested -- it had been asked if they would submit a volunteer into this process. We went through a process whereby I was the nominee. ICC/BASIS operates on a consensus-based process. I'm here to facilitate representation of those members. And while some of the actual participants in some of the ICANN functions are also members of ICC and ICC/BASIS, the representative role here is more in what I would call the third-party beneficiaries of IANA. Those people who use the Internet to conduct commerce and who need its proper operation in order to accomplish those commercial functions, even though those other groups are members, they are represented here in other capacities. And so our main focus is the folks who were probably less well-schooled in how to identify and translate the IANA functions.

From a historical perspective of mine, I've been working for Oracle for 16 years and prior to that I worked for a trade association in the United States which had been involved, among other associations, in the discussions that helped create ICANN. So I may have -- I was involved perhaps in the first transition from Jon Postel.

That being said, my citizenship is U.S. My office is in Washington, D.C. But I live on a plane.

In terms of what the bottom line for the membership I represent is, it is really the Hippocratic oath of IANA transition which is, first, do no harm and to focus on what is needed to accomplish the transition and not to start becoming the wish list for one might want to see as something new to do.

So those are really the bottom lines that my constituency is interested in promoting. And happy to provide the statement to the Wiki as requested once I know where to pop it.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I'm Adiel Akplogan. I'm the CEO of AfriNIC and representing the NRO in the coordination group.

The NRO represents the five RIRs which AfriNIC is a member of. I've been the CEO of AfriNIC for the past 10 years, so the founding CEO.

For -- and also I'm here representing the NRO with Paul Wilson, and as many of you know, each RIR, we have our own stakeholders and community through which our policies are defined.

So our participation here is to make sure that we have a link between our different communities and what this working group or coordination group will be doing.

We have -- and we are working to refine our own process, consultation process, at the regional level, so each RIR will have their own process, and our role here is to make sure that at the end of the day, we have a coordinated proposal for the transition of the IANA function from NTIA.

We are one of the customers of IANA operation, of course, in terms of number resources. Policy used by IANA to provide that service is defined, once again, by our different communities through our bottom-up policy development process, which is a consensus-based process as well. So consensus will be something that we will be trying to work on in this group, making sure that all of you are taken into consideration and ensuring that smartly we get into an agreement.

I will -- oh, my citizenship. I'm a Togolese national. I live in Mauritius and my family live in Canada, so I'm (indiscernible).

[Laughter]

PAUL WILSON: Good morning, everyone here and on the webcast. My name is Paul Wilson. I'm the head of APNIC, the Asia-Pacific network information center, which is the RIR for the Asia-Pacific and a member of the NRO as Adiel has just described.

The two of us are appointed by the NRO. That is, effectively by the boards of the five RIRs.

I think it's -- I think it's fair to say that we are here to represent views and interests of the RIRs. We are one of -- we are customers of or interested parties in one of the three critical legs of the IANA stool. That is, the numbers leg, as opposed to the names and the protocol parameters.

And so we do have strong interests to represent here on behalf of communities which are primarily the ISPs of the world, and there are a good 40,000 or so ISPs, network operators, who are represented by the end users of RIR services.

For an example, I did just recently publish in CircleID a statement, a fairly straightforward statement of position, which is my own account of what the RIRs have already pretty much said in response to all these issues.

I am an Australian citizen and resident. I'm employed in Australia by an Australian organization, funded by that organization, APNIC. I did accept partial travel support from -- as offered by ICANN for this trip. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Mary, are you ready?

MARY UDUMA: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to come back.

Yeah, my name is Mary Uduma. The group I represent is -- the community is the ccNSO community, just like Martin said, and the process of nominating a representative from the -- representatives from the group was transparent. There was a NomCom and we were asked to submit a statement of interest and a short CV, which I did, and there were two of us from Africa and I was nominated by the group.

And in terms of the work here is to be part of the -- the multistakeholder consensus-building group that will be able to present a workable and acceptable proposal for the IANA transition.

I'm a retired person. I come from Nigeria. I live in Nigeria. I was born in Nigeria. And I have worked -- in terms of work, I've worked with the telecoms regulation in Nigeria for over 17 years, and I did some banking work, I did some other work in Nigeria.

But the interesting thing is that I have been part of the ITU. While I was in NCC, Nigerian Communications Commission, the regulatory authority, I was part of the ITU council meeting. I was part of those that saw the WSIS 2013 and WSIS 20 -- WSIS 2003. It's not 2013. It's 2003 and WSIS 2005.

I convened the IGF in my country and we have just finished our African IGF which I hosted. We ended it on the 12th and I had to rush here.

I'm here sponsored by ICANN, my travel and my accommodation, and I hope I will get reimbursement for other things, other expenses I incurred.

But seriously, I know this is a very serious group and a group that is expected to do a good work and come up with what the ICANN -- or the community will say it is good for the community and send in the proposal, and I know that though I represent my community, but consensus is the best way to go and I am here to make sure that I put in my effort or my contribution in such a way that we will come to consensus when taking a decision on what ends up on the proposal.

I also want to say that having worked with people from everywhere in the world, I won't find it difficult to have you as my friends for the period we are going to be here and we'll work as a team.

I think teamwork is the best thing that would happen to this group. That it is not a question of -- of what my community wants or what my country wants, but what is good for the -- for the last person, the consumer, the last man on the street. What do we do here so that they -- they -- the Internet community would progress and move forward and will see that the work of ICANN or the work of the multistakeholder group would be fully and efficiently and effectively done.

I don't think there's anything I'm missing, but I'm here with you for the period. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So we're going to go to the remote participants. If I could ask Narelle to introduce yourself.

NARELLE CLARK: Hello. I'm Narelle Clark here. I hope you can hear me effectively. Can I have a quick (indiscernible), to be sure?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you.

NARELLE CLARK: Looks good. Thank you.

So I'm here with Demi Getschko representing the Internet Society, that wonderful society of which I'm sure many of you are members that is here for the betterment of the Internet as a whole.

We definitely see this as one of the most important things taking place in our Internet community today and into the future, and I think Daniel made a comment recently, in my hearing, but -- oh, no, it wasn't Daniel, it was someone else -- that said we're not trying to boil the ocean or solve world hunger here, but actually I

think if we can get this right, we will actually do something along the lines towards solving some of the fundamental problems within the world today.

But let's stick to solving some of the fundamental transition and stewardship issues for now, I hope.

Anyway, I was selected as part of an open process within our membership, and that was conducted by calling for nominees right throughout our full membership community, and Demi and I were appointed by the board of trustees. I also hold a seat on that board.

I will be liaising extensively with the ISOC membership before taking any positions, if at all I can, and I will at all times attempt to do so before any position is taken, as we have, of course, well over a hundred chapters in locations across the world and many organizational and individual members, and, of course, a wonderful board and staff that we can -- we can draw on.

I am an Internet and telecoms engineer with well over 20 years experience predominantly building and servicing large-scale consumer broadband networks, not to mention content and servicing systems always well.

My current day job is that of the deputy CEO in Australia's peak consumer organization, an organization known as ACCAN. Not ICANN but ACCAN, just to keep the confusion going.

And that organization is responsible for representing consumers within the Australian telecommunications and Internet area.

My employer is supportive of this journey that we're about to go upon, but of course I will also have to take leave to support that -- support this time, because they're expecting it probably will take more time than my employer can allot and that will, of course, be at my own expense, as this is a volunteer thing.

I'm also the president of the Australian Internet Society chapter, and both ISOC AU and ACCAN are both ALS members of ICANN.

I'm an Australian citizen and resident of Australia, and of course my work closely here is with a broad range of consumers, many with disability, many indigenous communities, and consumers of all ages, cultural, and linguistic groups.

I'm happy to submit the statement of interest also into the future, and I look forward to working with you all. Thank you. Go ahead.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Narelle.

Could we hear from Jon Nevett?

JON NEVETT: Yes. Thanks Alissa. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

JON NEVETT: Great. My name is Jon Nevett. I am a cofounder and executive vice president of Donuts, Inc., which currently is the registry operator for over 150 TLDs. I'm a U.S. citizen, and as Keith Drazek mentioned before, he and I were elected by the registry stakeholder group to work with the group here.

I'm also on the board of the Domain Name Association, and will report back to them as well.

I'm a U.S. citizen and look forward to working with everyone in the group and apologize for not being there in person.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Jon.

Russ Mundy, are you there?

RUSS MUNDY: I am.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY:	Yeah. I'm Russ Mundy from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee. Some folks are familiar with it. That name of the committee, in a way, really is -- gives the focus of -- of what we do, which is to address technical issues and create reports on a -- very much a consensus basis for security and stability issues affecting the entire Internet.

There was -- beginning in 2001, when it was established, there was a big emphasis in the beginning related to DNS security. DNSSEC is still an important part of what the SSAC does, but it does many other aspects besides.

One of the things that we've been working on since the announcement in March is to try to present and create, through our internal process, information that should hopefully be helpful to the broad community and hopefully this group that will describe the technical aspects of what it is that IANA does and what the NTIA relationship to all of those are, and I'm thrilled that Elise is part of this because she's the one with her feet on the ground every day with this, but part of what the SSAC is -- tries to do is to give explanations that are fairly widely useful to folks that help with complex technical issues.

Now, Patrik Faltstrom is the other person from the SSAC and he is not able to participate at least today. I'm not sure if he'll be able to call in tomorrow. But he and I were selected through the normal SSAC consensus process. Patrik happens to be chair. I

happen to be one of the original members. So both of us have fairly extensive SSAC background and experience, although since SSAC is truly a consensus organization we will not be speaking as SSAC, we will be speaking as individuals doing our best to represent the views that would likely come out of SSAC. But SSAC really only speaks, if you will, officially through our report and advisory generation chain. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Russ. Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Hi, this is Keith. Can you hear me okay?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Okay. My name is Keith Davidson. I was born in Jordan but I have lived most of my life in New Zealand and am a New Zealand citizen.   I'm contracted by Internet NZ, which amongst other things operates the .NZ ccTLD.

In terms of funding, I'm -- I will be relying on ICANN for funding in the future for attending some of these meetings, but due to the

late appointment of the ccTLD representatives, was unable to make arrangements to attend in London on this occasion.

Martin Boyle has already reported substantially on the process that was gone through within the ccNSO to select the four ccTLD representatives, and so I won't comment any further on that.

Within the ccNSO, I'm the vice chair of the ccNSO council, and also within ICANN I chair the framework of interpretation working group, which is a group that's been looking at aspects of delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs, and its work is just coming to a conclusion now.

And some of the aspects of delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs is very pertinent to the topic of IANA and its stewardship going forwards.

The ccNSO has not yet developed its scope for what the four ccNSO representatives will be able to do in terms of its participation in this group, but it would be fair to say that we would see our role as being liaisons and that decisions will have to be made by the ccNSO itself.

The ccNSO has strong independence from the ICANN policymaking policy development processes, and it is committed to bottom-up consensus-based decision-making and it's really important that we recognize there is no one-size-fits-all solution in most of the methods that affect ccTLDs. You know, we have

some that are -- some ccTLDs who are represented in the top 10 registries in the world, in terms of numbers, and some emerging with a handful of names or yet to start populating their ccTLDs.

In the interest of complete disclosure, I'm also a member of the ISOC board but am not representing ISOC's interests in any way, shape, or form and am committed to representing ccTLDs and liaising with ccTLDs to bring about consensus. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Can we have Heather?

HEATHER DRYDEN: Good morning, everyone. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Okay. So let me first introduce myself a little bit.

I am a Canadian public servant. I work for the Canadian Department of Industry and I am chairing the Governmental Advisory Committee to ICANN currently.

As far as some general information about the GAC, as we call it, the membership is comprised of about 140 governments and 30

or so intergovernmental organizations that participate in the GAC as observers and they lend a particular regional perspective or expertise in a particular policy area.

So the reach of the GAC extends quite far, and quite far beyond what you might see day to day in terms of the GAC's activities.

The GAC is a consensus-based committee. And only ICANN has something like the GAC, certain terms of the size and scope of the work that the GAC carries out and, in fact, has particular expertise to offer on the public policy aspects associated by the --- carried out by ICANN.

In terms of our approach to the meetings today and tomorrow, I'm attending today's discussions. And one of the vice chairs of the GAC will be attending the meetings tomorrow.

And we're doing that on an interim basis pending resolution of the GAC's nomination of five members in total to participate in the coordination group. So Tracy Hackshaw, who is the vice chair from Trinidad and Tobago, will be covering tomorrow's discussions.

It is important, I think, to point out that the GAC concern or the GAC issue about participation in the coordination group is not just about numbers. The GAC is keen to engage within the IANA stewardship transition process and has already given some

thought to substantive issues, for example, the security and stability and the interests of developing countries.

GAC members, in fact, see the transition process -- stewardship transition process as having a political as well as an administrative or tactical dimension. And I think the NTIA would probably agree with those perspectives.

It is also important, I think, to point out that formal GAC consensus views may not be possible through the final stages of this process being coordinated by the coordination group. But the GAC does at least want to keep dialogue open and have the capacity to contribute public policy perspectives. Or principles is not, in fact, agreed views.

And I think it's important to put a lot of emphasis on information sharing as a way to support government participation and contribution to this process in general.

The five nominees that the GAC has identified or put forward to participate are formed within the GAC as what we are calling a content group. So that's also including the vice chairs in addition to those nominees.

And the idea is so the vice chairs and the nominees support the chair of the GAC and to coordinate communication to and from the broader GAC membership. The emphasis here is not on advancing individual country perspectives. And much like Keith

Davidson was saying, the role was really envisioned to be operating with a liaison with decisions to be made by the GAC. However, that does not exclude individual governments making direct --- to the process and commenting on the proposals as they are put forward. And public comment is sought on those proposals. However, it's not envisioned that the nominees themselves would be on the coordination group to put forward an individual government perspective.

So the proposal for five places in total need not have a flow-on effect. In fact, it is only more than one of the places that they are allocated to the ccNSO. I also think it can also be seen in the form of early engagement that will help, head off political problems later in the process. And there will also be better clarity sought via internal GAC discussions as the process moves forward. So we're very much mindful of outlining what the expectations are for the nominees to the coordination group and to ensure that things are working as smoothly as possible.

So I guess my final comment is really to find a way to address this question and address it early because it's going to be beneficial to have that early involvement of governments in the GAC so that the process is seen as being legitimate and placing value to the views and roles that government play in relation to such matters. So thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Heather.

I think we have hit everyone who is remotely participating. If not, you should speak up right now.

Okay. Thanks.

So I guess I am the last person to introduce myself. I'm Alissa Cooper. I'm one of the IETF appointees. I don't think I really need to add anything to explain the IETF beyond what Jari already said. So my personal details are that I work for Cisco in our collaboration technology group. I'm a distinguished engineer focused on privacy and policy strategy for things like WebEx and telepresence voice and video.

I have been participating in the IETF for a number of years and am also part of the IESG, which is our steering group. I'm one of the area directors for real-time applications. So I was appointed by the IESG as well. I am a U.S. citizen. I live in Silicon Valley, and Cisco is funding all of my travel and participation in this group.

So I think we should go with our scheduled break. We're only 15 minutes behind and we only started 15 minutes late which means we are on time. Let's start again at 11:15.

Thanks.

[BREAK]

ALISSA COOPER: It is 11:15 now so if people can start wandering back to their seats, that would be great.

JARI ARKKO: Okay. So I believe this is one of the key discussions, what is it exactly that we are here for? and what is the output of the group, the definition of the group, the charter.

This is, of course, something that has not been decided by ICANN. They are just the facilitator of the process. It is up to us. We can decide here, although, of course, exists in a vacuum, this topic has been discussed already, quite a bit actually, when the whole process for the NTIA transition was being discussed. We had lots of contributions in the public comment period about this topic. As an example, IAB had a contribution that talked about it.

The London ICANN meeting just a few weeks ago, we also had a discussion about the NTIA transition. And as part of that, we talked about the role of the coordination committee and role of the community. And the feeling there, in my view at least, was that the coordination committee is for coordination obviously and the roll of the community is actually coming up with the substance of the transition.

So we've had some discussion about the charter already on our initial mailing list. Just a couple days ago I posted a version. Milton posted another version yesterday. And we've had some

debate and some issue brought up. What I was planning to do is was to give you -- given nothing wrong was involved in the email discussion and we have a fair bit of audience also in the outside world, so I wanted to give you a brief view into the initial charter proposal, some of the rationale behind that, and then go into Milton's version which I think is the most current one. It is not perfect yet. We'll still have to work on that, and then we will open it up for discussion. So -- this is also on Adobe Connect, the screen you see, the charter version, the first one. And people have that email available on their computers.

What I thought would be more interesting to talk about behind this particular text is the rationale. And the rationale is, of course -- there was a view from fairly -- lots of numbers of people that coordination group should be for coordination and most of the work happens in the community. So that's one thing behind the particular version that came out first from me.

Another thing is the communities are likely somewhat different at least so it is probably not okay. If exactly the same solution is working for everyone, details matching exactly, they'll have to fit into the same system; but there will be differences like the CC world has somewhat different issues, protocol parameters community as an example.

Another thing that's behind the submitted proposals was that in some sense, the customers of IANA really have to agree because it

is difficult for anyone to provide a solution for someone who doesn't want that solution. So those who really need it, let's say the RIRs, they have to be happy with the solution.

Also, one more thing that was behind the first version, I at least felt that there is a need for us to figure out how to make a decision that this is ready to move forward and given that the coordination group is fairly large and heterogeneous, I think it will be reasonable to think about this in terms of rough consensus or consensus but not necessarily unanimous opinion as long as the communities that are receiving the service are reasonably happy, then that should be enough. And the coordination committee, if they have rough consensus, then that should be sufficient for moving forward. So this was the first version.

Then we sent also a second version or Milton -- we had a discussion on the mailing list -- has probably explained that some of the things that were going on in the discussion. So one of the concerns was that maybe, okay, it is not the case that everyone, if we think about IANA as three or four parts or different types of parameters, then it might be some of those communities or one of those communities would not be able to come up with a proposal. So is there a way for the coordination group to come up with -- to be able to help that community to come to a conclusion?

Some of us were also concerned that if we would not allow that to happen, then it would not be a good situation if the coordination group were actually to override community's opinion. Let's say we at the IETF came to the conclusion we will do it this way. We already have these 5-year-old or 10-year-old RFCs and then someone else will tell us, "No, no, you can't do that, you have to do something else," then we would probably be a little bit unhappy about that.

So we have been discussing that. I think Milton's new version is actually quite, quite reasonable. Has some issues still. Just try to protect that.

Okay. You have that as full text on email as well from yesterday I think. I have a couple of issues with this. Most of it revolve around exact consensus and who measures it. But I'm not sure I want to insert myself so much into the discussions as yet. So maybe this is the place where we would open it up for discussion or do people need time to read the version that Milton sent?

If you need more time, raise your hand. Okay. Okay. One person needs more time. I will give you a couple minutes to read it. And then the rest of you can think about what you want to say and provide your thoughts on the mic queue.

ALISSA COOPER: They are posted in the chat. I will email them, too.

JARI ARKKO: Alissa, if you can post their DIF as well. If you would like me to send that to you. There is a DIF also. Do you want me to send it to you?

ELISE GERICH: Just to be clear, are we using the one that says "use this draft" that Milton sent? Okay. Thanks, because all of us have that in our email.

JARI ARKKO: So the key tasks of the coordination committee are liaising with the different communities that are relevant here, assessing the results, assembling a complete result, and informing the rest of the communities and the rest of the world. I think we are probably ready to move forward.

Milton, you were first.

MILTON MUELLER: All I wanted to say at this point was that Daniel Karrenberg had made a suggestion for an amendment which I found to be a friendly amendment which was he was uncomfortable in the "assessment" function with using the word "assessing consensus." So we could replace under Item 2 the word "consensus" with "support levels" or something like that in two places.

The first mention is when I have enumerated the tasks. Number 2 says, "Assess the outputs of the three communities of interest for workability, compatibility, and consensus." I would say assess them for "workability, compatibility and support levels."

And then and then further down when we are describing --

And then further down, when we're describing in more detail the assessment, there's another use of the word "consensus" which I think is what Daniel suggested should be replaced.

Is that -- am I understanding your proposal correctly?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: My proposal was quite concretely to strike some language, and that's all the language that has to do with our assessing of the other groups' processes and results. I think we should -- if somebody comes back to us and says, "My community has agreed on this," we should not have a role in assessing whether that's correct or not, period.

I'm all with you in the practicality, compatibility, and all that stuff, but the process of the other groups should not be the subject of our assessment, and that's why I made a very concrete proposal to strike certain words to the mailing list.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So --

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, sorry. I thought you were done. Go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: -- are you suggesting also that the group is not authorized -- would not be authorized to have a public notice and comment period, let's say, about the --

DANIEL KARRENBERG: No, no. This is just in the -- at the stage where you are at.

I think when we then collate all this into a final proposal, then of course it's our job to make sure that it has the support. Yeah. But not at the earlier stage. That's my point.

And the language that you suggested quite clearly has this as a two-stage rocket, and in the first stage where we collate all the input, it has -- it proposes that we assess whether the processes in the groups that make -- give us the parts ran correctly, and that's what I am objecting to.

I am absolutely in support that when we do action on it, when we actually collate this, then it's our duty to assess the support that the collection has, you know. That's without question.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So I'm not finding the language where we assess their processes. I'm just finding language that says "assessing consensus, the group will rely to some" -- go ahead.

JARI ARKKO: So if I can try to help resolve this.

So I got a little bit of the same reaction as Daniel, and I think the reaction is on this group, the coordination committee sort of second -- kind of second-guessing the consensus evaluation of another organization.

So we should get a report from them that, "Yes, we have consensus on this proposal," and that should be enough. It should not be we who go in and recheck whether they actually do have consensus.

But of course the whole, when we put the parts together, that needs to have -- that is something that we can and should measure if it has consensus.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. I'll have to think about that.

I agree that pretty much we should -- I guess I'm not entirely comfortable with just three people coming into this room and saying, "Oh, the entire X community agrees with this," and -- however, I don't think we should be poking around in their

process. I think we -- we should say, "We've had a public comment period about this and we've discovered, you know, there's six or seven little communities here that are screaming about this even though this group says they have consensus." I think we would have some reason for questioning whether the -- a particular proposal had all of the support that, you know, it was claimed to have.

ALISSA COOPER: I have a queue ready, so if we want to run the queue or -- yeah.

Okay. You can put yourself back in the queue, if you would like.

JARI ARKKO: Are we still on the same topic?

ALISSA COOPER: If you have more to say, go ahead.

JARI ARKKO: So I think the issue is that some of these communities have very extensive processes and, you know, some membership structures and whatnot and it will be difficult for us as the coordination group to go in and have another opinion about their process or what result it came to. That -- that, I think, is the fundamental thing that Daniel is raising.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So in the queue, I have Russ Housley, Keith Davidson, Russ Mundy. Daniel, are you still in the queue or are you done?

Okay.   Elise, Martin, Joe, and myself, and Wolf-Ulrich, and Mohamed. Okay. So Russ Housley.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I'm concerned in the part where through the public consultations that we might have -- or what it calls public notice and comment periods -- that the proposal might get changed with insufficient coordination with the source of that text. I think it's really important that we, instead, send the comments in raw form back to the community to produce the proposal text and let them decide whether they can or should accommodate those changes.

We will have to make the assessment whether there is the entire broad Internet community support for the proposal to go forward, but I don't think we should be altering text that was provided by the communities. Leave it to the communities to do so.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Hi. This is Keith. Can you hear me okay?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Oh, great.   I think we probably need to seek a little bit of forgiveness within the ccTLD community due to the late appointment of our group. We're probably quite a long way behind in terms of assessing and evaluating the constitutions.

But I do have one specific point I'd like to raise. That is, in the preamble of Milton's proposed charter, he's saying that the coordination group has four main tasks. One, act as liaison to the three communities of interest: names, numbers, and protocols. And I would suggest that there's potentially four separate groups and that names are two discrete groups in gTLDs and ccTLDs. They both are separate support organizations within ICANN. The gTLD community are bound by contract to ICANN and use ICANN as its policy development process and are bound by ICANN policies, whereas ccTLDs are independent from ICANN, create their own policies within the ccNSO, and sometimes that will involve issues of subsidiarity and local government and so on as well.

So they are quite discretely different and it's a bit of a long bow to draw to have both Gs and CCs grouped together as a single community, in my opinion. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Just a quick response that that was also raised on the list and there seemed to be some agreement that that's -- that's a reasonable point of view. There might be some linkage between the CC and generic name communities in terms of like having to live under the same rules, but your point is well taken. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ Mundy?

RUSS MUNDY: One of the things that I'm concerned with in both of the -- excuse me, I still have bad congestion here -- in both of the proposals is there does not seem to be a requirement that the constituent groups, the multistakeholder groups, identify as part of their proposal fairly strong context about how IANA, and in particular the NTIA function associated with the IANA activities, impacts their particular group.

I think that is a very important part of all the inputs we get or we're -- we will end up trying to evaluate apples, oranges, bananas, and camels.

ALISSA COOPER: Elise?

ELISE GERICH: Thank you. The benefit of speaking after others have is that I can respond to all those questions without getting back in the queue.

So I would like to support Daniel and Jari about the striking "assessing consensus," and I think the offending language, Milton, that I see is that the committee is authorized to engage in independent assessments of other groups' consensus building.

It seems to me that we need to be able to trust the representatives that they've selected to be able to represent their communities.

Next, I wanted to ask a question -- that's my first point.

Second point is, it says "meet intended criteria under assessment," which is -- I mean, "under assembling and submitting a complete proposal." That's the Number 3 bullet. And I wondered if meeting the intended criteria really isn't part of the assessment part, which would be the second bullet.

So it's more of a question to the group.

Do we wait until it comes to assembling before we meet -- we assess whether it meets the criteria, or should that be part of the assessment part of the paragraph?

Third, I think -- this is to Keith's comment about the communities of interest. I make a friendly amendment that we just delete the word "three," so it's "act as liaison to the communities of interest" and then that same, "names, numbers, and protocols," and that way we don't have to go in and distinguish all the different communities that might be impacted. Because there are many communities for all of those things: Names, numbers, and protocols.

And finally, it's just a nit. It's one of my own personal, like, soapboxes.

In the first sentence, it says "the IANA transition coordination group." However, the title says "Draft Charter of the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group." I'd like to be consistent and say "IANA Stewardship Transition" instead of dropping the word "stewardship."

I won't quibble about whether it's ICG or some other acronym. I don't really care. But I think it's important to say "IANA Stewardship Transition."

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you. Yeah, I would certainly echo Keith's point on the separate processes, separate thinking between the G and the CC spaces, but I would flag that there is now a cross-community working group and that is currently, in its own right, working on its charter, and I think that gives us perhaps an entry into what I think is actually quite important in this process. That we start looking at shaping the discussion and we start linking between the different threads and we start doing that fairly early on.

So essentially what I'm trying to get over is the fact that a lot of the communities are actually starting this in different places, and even within some communities people are at different places in trying to assess what they see as being the things that are going to be important for any eventual solution, what the risks of any new regime might be, and I think those things have to be considered before we get too involved in starting to talk about solutions.

The reason I think we need to do that is that there has to be some sort of linkage between the different names and the different numbering and protocol areas, to make sure that we are catching all the specific, you know, sort of what does "good" look like and what are the threats, the risks that might come up against us with any eventual solution, because that will then help us identify whether a solution is actually addressing real problems or not.

The other bit where I'm sort of feeling a little bit nervous -- and I strongly take the point that we should not be second-guessing communities' identification of consensus. I think that would be unreasonable of us. But I would actually sort of throw a question into this discussion about at what stages do we go out with the straw men for a very much wider consultation, essentially to make sure that overall people are understanding our direction of travel. And it would seem to me that, you know, if we -- if we look in the early days at having, you know, sort of a basic starting point and then go out and try to make sure that people are on board with us, then if we do get a consensus in the community where there are quite clear outriders -- and that might be, for example, within the ccNSO community, there are ccTLDs that are not members of the ccNSO and therefore might well come in with things that are not being picked up because they are way back from ICANN -- that that is something that we want to know that earlier in the process and not when we've got a finally assembled proposal.

JARI ARKKO: If I can just quickly try to respond on that particular point.

We had some discussion of this when we were talking about the time line, and it, at least to me, seemed pretty evident that we can't have a waterfall model here where, you know, the last day we produce the whole and then think everything's fine. We

actually have to iterate a little bit. So I think that's in line with what you're saying, that we have to show early versions early.

I don't think that's yet reflected in the charter text so much, and that certainly is an issue.

MARTIN BOYLE: Well, he interrupted me just as I came to the end, but, yeah, certainly that would be welcomed that, you know, as we go through -- and this is what I mean by can we see part of our role as trying to shape that discussion, of making sure that we get the various steps in and understood and generally agreed.

Because then when we get to the really difficult job of saying, "What model fits all those," at least everybody will be starting from a common position. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks.   When I look at this and when we first had the introduction and I think about the origin of the charter, I'm a little concerned because I've heard the term "customers of IANA" used. And the idea is, yes, I completely agree there are customers of IANA who are the direct participants in the operational functions of IANA or directly linked to those operational functions.

I'm here on behalf of a group that is one step further removed from the customers. We are the beneficiaries. But we are also a stakeholder group of IANA because what happens to IANA directly impacts us.

So I think we need to be very careful, as we modulate our language, not to limit ourselves to just the operational elements, but also to those people who rely on it, and that's companies, that's end users, that's a whole range of actors. And I know there was no intent to exclude them, but I think we have to be very careful, as we use language, to make sure that we specifically include them.

Now, they will have different roles in the process, so we would not see ourselves, necessarily, as creating a formal input of the community because the formal inputs are much more what the customers of IANA should be developing.

We may have comments on those inputs. We may have formal inputs on the process. We may have formal inputs on the principles of operation. But that's a different type of input than what I would consider the formal inputs. And then I think transparency helps address the formal inputs because if the formal input is made public at the time of its creation, then people will comment on that and if there's a large set of disagreement that this is representative of that community, that

will surface in the natural order of business without having to question whether or not that consensus process was effective.

It will be demonstrated as effective or not by the comments received in relation to it.

That being said, I think the charter went into very practical and operational aspects before, perhaps, setting forth some of the things a charter should do, which is, I don't read a sufficient definition of what the scope of our operation is. Especially when we consider that there's going to be another group working on accountability issues.

So where do we start? Where do they start? Where is the boundary between us? I think it will always be a little bit of a moving target, but I think a better scope definition in the charter would be useful. I think some principles of operation like "first do no harm" would be important to lay out. And then, you know, a clear set of objectives and then get into processes, and I think one of the things we have in processes is a defined section on transparency, exactly what we mean by transparency.

And then the last thing is, the one place where I think the coordination process of an individual group is important to keep in mind is as we think about our consultation process and time line. So those people who have a lot of moving parts to their constituency may not be able to come back to us in two weeks, so that's the part where I think we need to take into account what is

their consensus-building process, just so that to the extent possible, we accommodate the time necessary for that constituency to do a consultation and bring back some point of view to us, because that was one thing that -- and it was no one's fault, but the NETmundial process was a compressed process just because the timing was very short and there wasn't the luxury of saying, "We can give you three weeks before you come back to us" because we had to have the next iteration immediately.

So -- but I think that's one of the places where the way in which constituencies self-organize should inform us, to the extent practicable, about what's an appropriate time for consultation. And so that's why I think that's relevant for us to take note of that. Not to comment on whether it's effective or not, but try to accommodate timing that's necessary within constituencies.

JARI ARKKO: Yes. A couple of quick responses.

So first of all, on the issue of the customers versus others, I mean thank you. You said it better than I did.

My intent was definitely not to ignore the other parties. The consensus of the whole, or at least rough consensus of the whole, is needed for the different communities. The business community is screaming. That's a big, big warning sign for us. So obviously that is very important.

EN

And about the scope, yeah, I'm kind of conflicted a little bit maybe there because we might spend a lot of time writing down the exact details of the scope, so I'll just describe, as an example, what I was thinking that would be useful to do from an IETF perspective.

As you know, for background, there's a document by ICANN and NTIA on scoping and some people have had some concerns about that.

Now, from an IETF perspective, what we would probably do is exactly describe what works for us and not pay too much attention to what, you know, some other persons have -- may have said somewhere about the scope.

And what works for us includes a description of, you know, the things that we already do and some of the mechanisms that exist in our documentation, including things like selecting the IANA operator, which is -- was kind of outside the scope of -- in the scoping doc, but it's there and it -- for us, we need to explain the full package of "This is how IANA works for us, this is how we resolve the issues that might come up." You know, we hope we don't see issues ever, but we need to describe that. And for us, it would be easy to come up with a document like that, but for this group to write the scope in a few paragraphs of text in the charter, I think that might be challenging.

EN

ALISSA COOPER: I'm actually next in the queue.

I have four items that I want to touch on.

I think generally speaking, the charter text we are looking at is very good and going in the right direction.

On the issue of assessment of community consensus, I think maybe one way to strike a middle ground here might be to ask the communities when they send their proposals to us to describe the consensus level for themselves. This is actually something that we do in the IETF when a document gets sent up for its final review. We ask the document shepherd to explain the strength of the consensus in the working group. So I think having that description for us might be useful insofar as we are going to then assemble things and send them to the NTIA. So it would be good to reflect that support level back to the NTIA as well.

But I agree that I don't think it makes sense for us to make any judgment based on those descriptions. I just think it would be useful for us to have them but not that we should act on them really in any way. And I don't -- I don't think we can go back and tell a particular community that they got their consensus process wrong or that they don't have sufficient consensus. I think they either get it or they don't. And if they don't, we should tell NTIA that. But we can't fix that ourselves.

The second point about -- which is about consensus within this group, I agree with what was said before. I think for us, for any decisions that we have to make as far as when we think the final draft is ready, I think we should strive for rough consensus and not full unanimity. I think that will probably be the most workable.

A little bit about this, I think we should think a little bit about the numbers of these things. So Elise had said, well, let's not talk about three or four communities. Let's just talk about communities. I actually think having the number of items that we expect to receive would be very helpful. If it is four, if we agree that CCs are separate enough from Gs that they will produce two separate proposals for their own oversight, then we should say four. And if we think it is three, we should say three. But we should actually state what the number is and we should have an expectation around how many components of a final proposal we expect to get back and who we expect to get them from.

And along those same lines, I would like to see in this charter a statement that this group will not be choosing among separate proposals that cover the same function. I think that is explicitly not what we should be doing, and that is something that the communities need to get sorted out. Again, if a community can't get that sorted out, that is a problem for the transition. But it is

not something that we should try to solve in this small group of us.

And then, finally, I think there's some wording in Milton's version of the charter that talks about us assessing the workability of the proposals. And that raises some red flags for me as well because I think the word "workability," you could probably drive a truck through it. And I worry about, you know, how we would start to interpret that if we thought that was actually our role. I think again it is up to the communities to produce something that they think will work for them, and it is not really our position to be saying that -- going back to the community and saying, "Well, we don't think this is going to work." It is such a (indiscernible) for them to do. It is not something we should be doing.

JARI ARKKO: Do you have a replacement word?

ALISSA COOPER: I would actually strike it. That would be my proposal. I don't think we should be doing that kind of assessment, so...

So that is all that I had.

And next is Wolf-Ulrich.

EN

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich for the transcript.

In principle, I agree to that approach going along these three lines set out in the charter. As long as these so-called community of interests or communities of interest are very clear described. What is it behind it? Because at the time being, we are being representing communities which have a certain structure and which are not just focused on what we are doing here on the IANA, but others are. And there shall be overlaps as usual.

As was mentioned, for example, the names community is going to organize themselves at the time being, maybe together with GNSO and ccNSO. There -- as I could see, there have been sent out invitations to others as well who groups that are represented here in this group as well.

So there might be a kind of duplication to some extent which we have to think -- to take into consideration as well and to set out a frame which avoids duplication so in this sense.

These interest groups, communities of interest are organizing themselves, they may have their own behavior of including the public in their process. So like public comments and so on as the GNSO is used to do so in that. So we have to take that into consideration in our concept, how we are going to approach and to communicate to the outside world.

Another item I would like to talk about is the consensus as well. If I got it right, right now, I was not clear, so we have -- we are going to differentiate between several processes of finding a decision or a consensus. The one is -- which is a bottom-up by the respective communities which we are not going to argue against. So we are just accepting what is going on, what's coming in from those communities as their consensus.

But in the end, I understand this coordination group is supposed to present a proposal to the NTIA. That's in the first part of this charter as laid down. So that means this group has to find a kind of consensus at the end for this package which is going to be sent out.

So -- and, therefore, as you, Alissa, mentioned as well, if it comes to those kind of consensus calls in this group, I would also be in favor of a rough consensus we could find because unanimous consensus is a really hard one to find.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So the queue that I have right now is Mohamed, Paul, Milton, Keith Drazek -- did you want to in the queue? No -- and then Heather and then Joe and then Daniel.

So, Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL-BASHIR: Thank you. Mohamed El-Bashir for the transcripts. Also, one of the comments using the word "groups" and "communities" interchangeably, I think we need to have -- we are talking about the communities here.

I'm also concerned about three assessments, a comment period, a consultation, another consultation period for submissions. There is also a process that includes comments as well.

We can request from those communities maybe a description of the process procedures that produce this proposal, which is in general, it will be open. But we need a way to understand how to reach their decision other than review and assess (indiscernible) their decisions.

Also, on the preamble, I think there's -- I hope there is an agreement that we need to remove the specific mentioning of the three communities. And they include direct and indirect communities affected by the transition or IANA function. That might be useful.

So on assessment, I'm in favor of removing the part which is clearly said that we are authorized to engage in the community assessment of the proposal. I think that's my comment for now. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Thank you. It's Paul Wilson here. I think -- I'd like to be clear on what we're aiming for in the discussion of the charter. I really think we need to be able to sign off on a charter by the end of this meeting, and it might actually be useful to start getting -- I almost hesitate to suggest it. It might be useful to actually start working on this document here in the group. It is a painful process, but it might be necessary to do that to really get close to that.

But a few comments. I'm finding the target of this exercise a little bit difficult to pin down in the charter at the moment. I mean, "the deliverable of a proposal regarding the transition" is extremely vague and needs to be -- it needs to be qualified. And it is qualified in some ways here. There's references to transition plans being required. And, again, this is vague.

So I think we're going to get into this in the next section of the agenda where we're really talking about the expectations of the communities in our approach to them. But I hope that the charter itself will be a bit more specific about what's really required here.

I take Joe's point that this group here is made up of representatives in some form or another of a whole state of communities and only a minority of them are actually customers of the IANA. And I think it would be useful for us to be treating

the communities inclusively and soliciting from all of the communities something of their expectations, their requirements, their -- their view of elements of this new arrangement.

I would use the term a "new model" or a "new set of arrangements" as being the thing we are targeting here. We don't need to just talk about a transition. We need to talk about what that new model and set of arrangements is going to look like. And we need to talk about, to the extent that it is necessary, a transition plan towards that which may in some cases may be trivial. It may just be a matter of putting that in place.

It is the new model or the new set of arrangements that we need really to focus on. Again, it is about our expectations or our requirements of that new model or about specific elements that we actually propose to put into that new model and so forth.

And I think every one of these communities represented here can -- can and should be asked to contribute to that.

As for the customers for IANA, I certainly have the sense that there are more three distinct groups. And Keith Davidson and Jari as well, I think, have supported the idea that so we can subdivide or we should possibly subdivide the names community into the subcommunities which have really quite separate requirements, quite separate modes of interaction with the IANA. This is not my area of expertise by any means, but I think if we're going to have a successful outcome here, we can't kind of rely on a -- delegating

to that kind of theoretical single names community and expect a single answer that might not ---.

In any case, when we have an idea, an agreement on which are the distinct communities of IANA customers that we're going to be dealing with, I think we can really ask for details of what is expected or what is proposed. So it's got to do with as customers, what are the transactions they have with IANA? What are the service levels they expect in terms of those transactions? What's the source of policy actually which will actually dictate how those transactions are undertaken by the IANA? What's the dispute resolution mechanism, if there is a problem, with the delivery of those services?

In other words, I mean, what is the agreement that's going to be in place between that group of customers and the IANA in order to fulfill what their expectations are? As I say, I think we can drill down into these things much more and we need to drill down into them much more and probably in the next agenda item. But I guess that discussion in the next agenda item will help us to refine this charter more and to be quite clear about really what we're aiming for here.

So maybe to kind of modify what I said before, maybe we don't wordsmith this document in the current session of this agenda but I think by the end of this meeting and maybe in some of the space we have got left over at the end of tomorrow, we need to

really aim to have this charter nailed down and become very specific. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Just one note on the agenda, we do have 45 minutes blocked out tomorrow morning to come back to the charter and a few other items from today. In addition to the other undesignated parking lot items, we have a specific one to this.

JARI ARKKO: And we also have a capability to edit also live here. I think some of the editing should go into evening. But we can do some of it, hopefully we can actually do some of it during this session. I'm taking notes of what the proposed changes are.

One thing about the actual substance that you mentioned, taking input from not just the customers but everyone included here and even outside, I think it's great. We need to do that. I do want to have one word of caution, or can we arrange it so that we seek for input and requirements or opinions people have on this topic but not sure that we will -- the coordination group should not become the sort of focal point of coordinating all inputs, as an example, that the governments would send their requirements here and then we would send it forward to the ccTLDs as an example. I think a better, more scalable model is that if you have input, then you should go -- by all means send it to us but also go straight to

the relevant communities where input is possibly being taken into account.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So I think -- I agree with Paul, we should be able to come up with a charter document. And from what I have heard of the disagreements, I don't think they are that substantial. So let me just address scope first. I'm -- I don't think the charter needs to address the scope except perhaps in an extremely generic and simple way. One of the issues I've noticed about definitions or debates about scope is that they tend to become an attempt to limit or control outcomes. People end up debating outcomes as being in or out of scope and they end up really having a debate about outcomes rather than a debate about scope. And I think we could waste a ton of time about that.

The only serious definition of scope that I would support if we wanted to include it -- and I'm not convinced that we need to -- but there is -- it is clear that we are not dealing with the accountability of ICANN's policy process. We are dealing with the accountability of IANA in the absence of the NTIA. So if we want to have a sentence about that, that would be fine with me.

The issue of the different groups that Keith Davidson rose, I understand why people want to assert the differences and their identity within this process. But what I want to hear from them is: How does this difference actually affect the operation and accountability of the IANA?

I mean, from my point of view -- perhaps I'm overly simplistic here, but the DNS root is the DNS root. The only distinction between a gTLD and a ccTLD is a bunch of policy stuff. But in terms of IANA, I just don't see the difference. So unless this difference can be articulated, I think that groups -- I agree with Alissa that we want to specify and limit the number of groups working on these proposals as much as possible. And I still see the fundamental division as being names, numbers, and protocols. And I would like to stay within that framework as much as possible.

On the issue of consensus, being mindful of Martin's comments about identifying problems as soon as possible, I don't have much disagreement with your concerns about second-guessing. I think that Alissa's middle ground is a perfect solution that when these groups submit something to this group, that there should be a documentation of their consensus and what level of support they had, and I would be satisfied with that. As long as we have at the meta level or the higher level this public comment period in which people are free to voice their disagreements with what we are

actually coming up with and we have to deal with that and take that into account in what we do.

I don't agree with Alissa on the workability issue. I think, of course, the proposals coming into us will have a presumption of workability, but I don't see how it hurts for us to look over them and say, you know, is there anything that they missed? Especially for the DNS part, I suspect that the proposals will be complex, political compromise among a very complicated grouping of interests. And in the process of making those compromises, it is possible that they might overlook some workability issues. So what does it hurt for us to say, Hey, did you think about this?

And I don't think -- this group, I don't think, we can go off the rails here and start messing around with things because all of these different groups are well-represented within this group. So if we start messing with the protocol stuff, then I'm sure that Jari and Russ and everybody is going to, you know, put their foot down if we're going off the rails.

And same with the DNS stuff, if the DNS has reached some carefully crafted compromise and our questions about workability are threatening that, then, you know, Keith and the CCs are going to speak up. I would hope that we could keep a workability check in there.

ALISSA COOPER: Next we have Heather.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you, Alissa.

So I have just a few comments on the draft, and it's only in this discussion that I have seen the draft charter, so I'm trying to provide quite a quick reaction on the basis of reading it in the last few moments.

Which means, of course, that the GAC hasn't seen it and there hasn't been an opportunity to consult with colleagues in the GAC.

But it does touch upon some issues where we have had some discussion and I do have some guidance available to me that I will try to share here in my remarks.

So in terms of this being an iterative process, I think it's important to -- and useful to keep reminding the community and to keep this as -- as a focus for the efforts of the coordination group, and it's clear from the GAC's discussions when we met in London that the GAC sees a need for the opportunity to comment on any final draft proposals that come out of the coordination group based on the efforts happening within the community, and to -- to be able to provide comment before it goes to the public comment working period.

And I think this -- this particular discussion or outcome from the GAC is related to the time line that was published on this matter.

As far as having clarity around scope, I agree with Elise that we need to be quite disciplined and keep referring to the stewardship transition and be very clear about what that means. And even though Milton's unconvinced that we do need that clarity, I wonder whether it would actually be helpful to keep emphasizing that.

And to have the three components identified clearly I think is important and a good way to structure the charter. And it's clear from -- from the comments that other colleagues have made, particularly on the G side and the CC side of things with the domain names part, that there needs to be some flexibility for those groups to work with each other and not simply be trying to only feed through the coordination group. I suspect Jari is correct that that would become cumbersome to us.

But I do need to flag there for the GAC and for governments that we see a great deal of importance in terms of the country code side of things, and so we would want to work closely with the ccNSO or the country code operators because of the importance that governments place on how their country codes are affected, potentially, by looking at the stewardship issue.

At the same time, I think it is generally accepted that governments do not have a role in day-to-day operational

matters, so it is a matter of finding an appropriate role, drawing on the expertise of governments, and certainly in terms of where their interests lie, and as I say, that's first and foremost with the country code side of things but that certainly does not bar the generic aspect of how things are handled from things of interest as well to governments.

As far as consensus, in terms of the language that's there, I'm not sure that there's an issue, but perhaps it is a matter of drafting language that more carefully navigates the role of the coordination group in assessing relative to the consensus that may be found in different parts of the community. Clearly, the GAC and I think others would not want to have the strength of consensus being questioned, once it has been formally reported as being achieved.

So like I say, I don't think there's an issue there and I don't hear that people want to go down that path, but we do have the opportunity to work on the charter further tomorrow, and so I'm optimistic that we should be able to finalize it and address these remaining issues.

But on the whole, I think it's a good draft and I hope these initial reactions are useful and bring us closer to being able to finalize the charter in our meetings today and tomorrow. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Heather.

So in the queue, I have Joe, Daniel, Keith Davidson, myself, Keith Drazek, and Adiel, and that will probably take us to roughly when we should be breaking for lunch, I would say, or people starting to get hungry. So is there anyone else who wants to get added to the queue?

Paul. Okay. So Paul will be the last person in the queue and then I'll hand it back to Jari.

So Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. To Milton's point about the scope, that's exactly the type of scope definition I wanted to do because I think there's some confusion between what the accountability group may be doing and what we may be doing. It's not the scope of what are the operational elements of each of the functions. That would be nothing that I would ever want to suggest that we do.

So I think that the scope is exactly that top-level scope limitation so people understand what is within our remit related to that transition process.

Perhaps one of the ways that we can deal with the concerns about how we define communities is to talk about operational communities of interest, and those are the people from which we

will request some formalized input, and as you said, you know, you're going to want to know who's going to contribute what, and to that end, maybe we could have each of those communities talk about the review they have done to the workability of their proposal, so that what comes out is something that is transparent as to how they have evaluated the workability of their proposal within their group. Because if that's an element of disclosure, then people can review that and if questions arise as to what they've said, then the questions can be posed back to that community about, "Gee, this doesn't make a whole lot of sense. Did you really think about this issue?"

And so when we look at the concept that we might have operational communities of interest and then communities that are impacted by IANA, which is that broader stakeholder group of communities which may be providing inputs on operational processes, transparency, things of that nature, but are not necessarily expected to be coming up with a proposal of how the naming function should work because that is perhaps beyond where they are, but they might want to comment on the proposal when it comes in. But they won't be asked for a formal input on that. They may be asked if they have a more general input to come in. That may be the way we differentiate across what we're asking communities to do because, you know, we recognize that we have a different role than the operational communities and we are not looking to get in the way of the role of the operational

communities and what needs to get accomplished in this process from them, but we do want to make sure that we are part of the process in the evaluation and the discussion of the proposals.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Daniel Karrenberg. I'd like to speak to several points.

Maybe first about the workability because Joe just referred to it.

I think -- I agree with you wholeheartedly. I think we should strike "workability" from the language in the charter, but we should actually do exactly as you suggest: ask for information about it.

I think compatibility and interoperability should remain. Those are the things that we should be concerned with.

Second, I'm very supportive of the subdivision of names into ccTLDs and gTLDs if that's what they want. You know, if they want -- if they want to proceed like this, then I think we're not in a position to tell them how to organize things.

And as to concrete language there, I would encourage us to use language that does two things. First of all, it enumerates the inputs that we're definitely expecting, so we expect to hear from these and these and these groups, but it should be open language

that does not exclude any other input and we shouldn't be afraid of any other input from, you know, John Doe, if necessary. You know, if they feel that they need to provide input.

And thirdly, about consensus, this is not so much about the language of the charter but I'd like to make a point that whether we like it or not, the important criteria for final consensus on anything is that there's no --- that NTIA cannot ignore. And it may be the elephant in the room, but --- the way this process works is that they have to take action and the only way they take action is that we give them a proposal that nobody is --- ignore --- satisfied about and we should just face this --- charter but we should be cognizant --- helpful when the time comes we have to evaluate the results. And that's all.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith Davidson.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Hi. It's Keith.

Milton asked specifically to sort of highlight the differences between ccTLDs and gTLDs. I think firstly, it's probably appropriate to reflect on the -- on what is the same, and I think things like the cross-community working group on IANA will be able to look at a lot of the things that are approached in the same manner between the Gs and the CCs in relation to the IANA

database so --- of, you know, your IP address for your --- server or, you know, technical contact phone number or something like that is handled in pretty much the same way, and that's not the issue. But the major --- points of difference arise primarily because gTLDs are contracted parties to ICANN and are subject to ICANN's contractual obligations --- are responsible not to ICANN but communities they serve and that's a very different master, and ccTLDs are, therefore, subject to the potential of redelegation. And that redelegation --- at any time and --- requests are made --- from -- parties and, you know, re-delegation --- without the consent of the incumbent operator --- so this is quite a delicate matter that's beyond the scope of the --- and --- local Internet communities --- also common issues that can be attached --- single community. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So I am next.

There were three points that I wanted to respond to --- I'll let you into the queue.

--- respond to. The first one is on this question of workability. I really like the suggestion of asking the community to --- the proposal will work. I think that's --- I also liked --- I think that's --- for us to do. I think if, you know, we look at the whole thing together --- limited in that way to other things missing, as opposed to, you know, we don't think your proposal will work. I

think on --- One other thing to flag, I think something Heather said, I'm not sure I caught it properly, which is this question of when we assemble a final proposal, it goes out for public comment. For me, that would be the time when anyone in the public could comment including governments. And I hope that governments would be engaged and the GAC itself would be engaged in all the community processes up to that point as well.

I am not sure exactly what the suggestion was in terms of a sort of GAC-specific process. But I would rather see that all of the communities and anyone who wants to participate in any of the processes can do it separately in the communities, can do it in the public consultation period, and that we not have kind of separate processes for different groups. I think we would have too many groups and not enough time probably to get that done.

So that's all I had.

Next was Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Alissa. Just two points. One, I wanted to I think follow on to Keith Davidson's comments about sort of the differences between Cs and Gs, ccTLDs and gTLDs and his comment about the difference between gTLDs have contracts with ICANN. We have a policy development process that's within ICANN. ccTLDs are very different in that regard.

And I think that that actually sets gTLDs apart from not just ccTLDs but maybe from the other components of the IANA functions in that the gTLDs are dependent upon a policy development process and contracts with ICANN, the organization, that no one else has. The various groups otherwise have your own policy development processes. You do your own policy development. The gTLDs are a little bit unique in that regard.

I think that's one of the reasons to the gTLD community -- and I'm not necessarily saying the CCs don't share these views, but we have serious concerns about ICANN's general accountability. And I completely understand that this group is focused on the IANA stewardship transition and the areas of focus really need to be on the IANA functions themselves.

But there's been an acknowledgment that there's some interrelation or interdependency between the IANA transition process and the bigger or broader ICANN accountability process.

One of the things that Fadi said at NETmundial was that the processes will run in parallel but they will inform each other. So I think the question is we, as the IANA transition group, need to make sure that we are providing a mechanism for that informing, if you will.

So if there's an ICANN accountability process running in parallel, then we need to, I think, establish some mechanism or some

structure that allows us to remain informed between the two processes.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah.   I think at some level, at least from some of the communities, I think we'll have to specify these are the accountability mechanisms that are necessary and sufficient for us to work in the new -- either in the existing or in the new environment.   And some of those mechanisms actually exist today.   So I'm not overly concerned at least as far as our own parts go.   But I understand that there is more concern in some other areas. Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Thank you, Alissa. I wanted to add my voice to two points. The first one is the workability issue. I think we need to find a way to add something related to that into the charter. I would support what Daniel has suggested about interoperability and accountability, if that will help us achieve that, because we have this coordination group to be able to assess what the different community and different people propose and ideally to go at the end of the process with a single mechanism that will replace the NTIA oversight of stewardship today. That's the ideal solution.

For us to achieve that, we will definitely have to look at the different proposals to look at what works, to look at what is common in them and allow people to comment. So we will have to do some very thorough assessments of the workability, of the practicality of the different proposals. It is critical for this group.

The second thing that I want to maybe add on is the ability for us to give room to people beyond those three key functions or three customers of IANA to input the process.

That means by definition, we know we have those three or four groupings, the which numbers, protocol parameters, CC and G TLDs. But after receiving their input, it may be good to have a period for people who want to comment on those specific proposals may be able to do that in an open manner so that we as a group can try to collect all of that.

My worry is that people may miss the opportunity to participate or contribute directly to this grouping process. We need to give them the chance at the coordination level to do that, although we may have all the justification that there have been open comments, et cetera. Then we need to have that built into our process as well. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, I just wanted to comment quickly on that. One of the tasks outlined for this group in the charter proposal was "informing." I

EN

think that falls into that -- or what you are requesting falls in that category, that we try to make even -- I mean, if a community is working on a proposal, we should be making the rest of the world aware that that's happening. It is ongoing now. And then when they come up with a version they're sending to us, the first version, then we should, again, inform the world that this is -- this is -- has come to us and make sure that this -- everyone has seen the proposal. And I think that's natural.

ALISSA COOPER: Paul?

PAUL WILSON: One of the things that I've sort of sensed and feared with this process is that there is every opportunity to make -- for any individual community or individual to make demands of the IANA or of ICANN which are not strictly related to the transition at all but which could be -- which could be, you know, quite unrelated and which could only be demanded at this time because it is sort of an opportunistic approach.

I liked Jari's reference to "necessary and sufficient" criteria or expectations in this process. And I really think we should clearly express an expectation that what we want and need to see here, those things that are necessary and sufficient and for there to be a real distinction between expectations which, you know, to put it

bluntly, can wait until -- until after the transition that are not prerequisites for the transition.

Whether it is a question of accountability or other aspects, I mean, perfection will never be obtained and if someone wants perfect and complete accountability, whatever that could possibly mean before the transition is to be undertaken. That's simply not going to happen. It's a show stopper essentially.

So, again, I think that's going to be an important part of this discussion, an important part of the scope, to focus, to challenge communities to be clear as to what is actually necessary and expected firmly and non-negotiably, if you'd like, for this transition process.

I had another question which is one that I think needs answering. And that is what is the authoritative channel of communication between this group and the communities? I mean, I wouldn't like us to be in a situation where we had competing claimed representations from different members of different communities saying here is the -- here is this community some answer. And I suppose the simplest thing would be to say if it is the members of this committee who are representatives of these respective communities, then the members of this committee themselves are the authoritative channel of communication with each of those communities.

Now, there may be some flaws with that theory. But if that's not the answer then, I think we do need to be very clear about exactly who we are receiving these inputs from. Thanks.

JARI ARKKO: I think that's a very reasonable point. It makes sense to me. I think we should put it in.

ALISSA COOPER: Kuo?

KUO-WEI WU: I think basically when I listen, I do agree the CCs and the Gs have some differences.   But I really try to understand regarding particularly for the IANA operations, what is the major difference? Of course, you follow the different procedure. We follow the different guideline of the process of the G and CC.

But regarding for the IANA transition, I really would like to know: What is the real key of your concern from the CC or the G? I think the key point is coming back to what is this meeting for. We are trying to talk about the IANA transitions. So we definitely know the different community have different rules and their interests or the process. But I think key point we should be coming back to see what the different stakeholders attitude to the IANA transition is.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari, that was the end of the queue.

JARI ARKKO: Right. So my sense of it is actually that we are fairly well-aligned. I think the room is converging. We're not quite there yet in terms of actually having the text that we're happy with. I noted ten plus different issues that we need to fine-tune the charter text for.

I don't think we actually had a major disagreement that we need to really seriously hash out. So maybe the next step would actually be to try -- some of us take some time offline and try to come up with some text to propose for addressing some of the issues.

Yeah. So the biggest thing that I kind of feared a little bit was this discussion of scope but some of the discussion that went on between Joe and Milton here, for instance, I think that seemed a reasonable path forward. And I think we kind of heard relatively clearly from the group where we want to be in terms of what this group's role is versus the communities', trying being to be careful not to step on the communities' toes.

And there is a fair number of clarifications and issues around how we inform and keep everyone in the loop and assess the customers.

Does anyone else want to make concluding remarks at this stage or shall we have lunch?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Do you want to ask if that's a fair summary?

JARI ARKKO: Lynn correctly notes, is that a fair summary?

Hmmmmm...

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: Explain that's a hum.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. So if anyone disagrees with that summary, speak now. Otherwise, I think we can go off and do some work with Milton and others and come back, I believe, tomorrow morning was the time.

Do we have some information about the lunch arrangements? Are they here in this room?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, I think lunch is in the corner. Lunch is in the corner. We had -- we should just have open lunch. We were going to keep talking about the charter. But people might work on the charter during lunch. Otherwise, we don't have a specific discussion topic.

And for people who are in the virtual meeting room, during lunch, it's going to disconnect so that the capacity of the room will be augmented because there's so much interest in this fascinating meeting that we're having that we need to make the room bigger so that everyone can participate. So just a heads-up that people will be disconnected and then the room will come back up sometime during lunch.

Thanks.

[LUNCH BREAK]

NANCY LUPIANO: Okay. We're about ready to get started with the program. If you want to bring some coffee and some desserts or some tea back to the table to help you through the next process, we'd be happy if you do it. And otherwise, we'll be beginning in just one moment. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. We can't compare to you. Our microphone voice.

[Laughter]

Okay. So I think if we want to bring the agenda back up, are we -- are we back to streaming and everything?   We're all good? ICANN? Yes. Okay. Thank you. Great.

So if we pull up -- pull back up to the agenda, we're still on our on-time 15-minute delayed schedule.

The next session is about the transition scope and expectations about what work will be done by the communities, which obviously we have already started discussing a little bit but wanted to continue, and Paul is going to lead that session.

Do you want me to run the queue or do you want to?

PAUL WILSON: Thank you very much, Alissa. Alissa just offered to run the queue and I've said, "Yes, thank you very much."   So please try and

attract Alissa's attention if you're wanting to speak on this agenda item.

The agenda topic as it's described here is "Transition scope and expectations about work in the communities," and the note is it would be clarify to clarify the CG's understanding of the scope of the work of the transition, what the community processes need to produce, and where/how areas of overlap will be handled.

We will want to communicate this publicly if we get agreement on it.

There seem to be a couple of different questions here which are -- which may be quite distinct, but we'll see.

One is transition scope and whether we have actually said enough and discussed enough yet to clarify that in the discussion about the charter. And then second, I think the question is -- or the questions are, what are we actually asking for and who are we asking. We've spoken about different communities represented here in this room or -- and different communities of interest in the situation overall, and we've distinguished between the communities in this room who are effectively IANA customers and those who have a broader interest but not as -- and a definite interest but not as IANA customers.

So the second part, I think, is who are we asking, what are we asking for, are we asking for the same things from the different

classes of communities that we have to consider here. But let's start off with the question of transition scope.

Do we actually have more to discuss about that?

Kuo?

KUO-WEI WU: Yeah. I'd like to clarify a little bit about the scope. If I'm wrong, you know, any of you can correct me.

For me, the scope is basically -- first of all, of course is the contract between NTIA and ICANN. That is the IANA contract. And that's the first thing.

And the second, regarding, you know -- and, you know, maybe some other people would like to extend to other parts. I think it's fine but I think we still need to be very focused on the IANA contract. I think that is number one regarding for the scope.

The second one I like to point out is the IANA office. Regarding for the IANA office, I think there is a couple things we need to, you know, discuss. First of all, of course, is IANA office performs particularly serving for, you know, the stakeholder like CC -- CC and G or, you know, RIR and others of the parties. Is there performance acceptance -- their acceptance level, is it agreeable or is there any, you know, potential to improve the service or something like that. You know, I think this is important because in

the last 10 years the IANA office is running, we'd like to know, you know, if this is generally accept. Then maybe it is much easier. But if we have some things to improve, I think it might be a good point to talk about it. So that will be the second topic for the scope.

The last one, because this is -- we're talking about IANA transition and stewardship, this means maybe we need to focus on what is the body we eventually will be developing out? How is the new institutional body -- eventually will be generating accountability to the whole community?

You know, it's not just we're developing a new institutional new body. How this new body can generate accountability to the whole community, you know, the Internet Society -- Internet world. I think this is the three major scope what I'm thinking about is maybe the focus we need to be talking about.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: On the question of scope, I came up with a short paragraph which I sent to a few of you. Joe and Keith and Jari. But I'll just read it now. So again, trying to keep this as short as possible, here goes.

"The IANA stewardship transition process is taking place alongside a separate but 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 the ICG must assess proposed solutions in the light of the findings and outcomes of the other accountability process."

ALISSA COOPER: Joe and then I'll go.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. I'm fine with that phrasing. The only thing is, the very end of it sounds like the only time there will be coordination is when there are findings and outcomes of the other process and I just think it's an ongoing process of coordination between the two groups, not just after there are findings and outcomes.

ALISSA COOPER: That -- that sounds good to me, too, roughly. I like this idea of -- that we focus on we thought we are filling the gaps that may be created by the end of the NTIA contract.

And further to that point, I think building on what Kuo was saying, I feel like there's been sort of two concepts of this. One is you look at the exact language of the contract that exists today and then you could say, "Okay, we need to go replace all of this," and to me that doesn't quite make sense. There's lots of stuff in that contract that I don't think necessarily needs to be represented going forward. There's these -- you know, there's other requirements on the IANA staff and all kinds of things.

So I think actually focusing on the accountability aspect is the right thing to do, as opposed to the complete contract.

And then -- but the other thing that you said, Kuo, that I find a little concerning is this idea of, you know, talking about the -- "a" or "the" new oversight body. I don't actually think that would -- that's an appropriate way for us to set expectations for the community or that we should say anything about a new oversight body. I think, you know, for the different functions, that may or may not be something that arises in this process. I certainly don't think we should expect it, necessarily, for any of the functions, so it's not a -- it's not something that we should set out at the beginning, I don't think.

Yes. Daniel, and then you can get in the queue.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Daniel Karrenberg. Thank you, Milton.

I suggest to strike the words "findings and outcomes of" in your little paragraph there because my concern is that we might have to wait for any findings and outcomes.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Sorry. I think that gets to -- that gets to the problem of findings and outcomes, but I -- the other thing is, I think -- I just wanted to take a look at the language once more because I think we need to speak more in terms of mutual cooperation just than "we assess them," because I think they will, to some extent, perhaps be an input to us just as we will be an input to them and we're making it sound a little bit like we assess their work and there's no kind of mutuality.

MILTON MUELLER: It was just meant because I felt strange describing what they would do because this is our charter.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Right. No, but I think in the charter it talks about -- I think we should just say that there's a needed appropriate coordination between the groups as they work on the accountability processes, and then that coordination will be agreed to by the groups as a process.

MILTON MUELLER: I just sent the language to the list, so you can play with it.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah.

PAUL WILSON: I should probably look at that language before making these comments, but I didn't particularly like the -- what seemed to be an exclusive focus on filling accountability gaps, Milton. It seems rather specific and exclusive of other aspects, and also potentially confusing with the other accountability process.

I mean, again, I'm thinking simply and practically, but to me, it seems that we are in the business of determining a set of arrangements which will be sufficient and necessary for the continuation of IANA services after the expiry of the IANA contract.

Now, that could be, you know, not limited to or not -- it could certainly be including accountability, but I think there are logistical and very practical aspects to those arrangements as well, and to say that this is simply about filling accountability gaps to me seems to be slightly off target to me.

ALISSA COOPER: So in the queue, I have Jon, Jean-Jacques, Joe -- is not in the queue. Milton, are you in the queue? Okay. So Jon Nevett.

EN

JON NEVETT: Thanks, Alissa.

So in response to Milton's draft, I just want to raise some concerns about accountability as well.

I think many of us believe that accountability issues are inextricably intertwined with these issues.

And then the other accountability issue that Milton raised that -- drawing a distinction between public policy accountability and nonpublic policy accountability, there are many decisions that ICANN makes unrelated to the policy development process that have a large impact on the community, and so I'm not sure if Milton's language alone is sufficient because he draws that distinction between, you know, policy development and nonpolicy development, and replacing the IANA contract accountability issues versus the policy development issues, and there's a third category of accountability issues that he doesn't deal with in that draft.

So I think we should -- we need to amend that a bit as well. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. Two remarks. The first one is about what Milton read in his draft.

I don't see really a compelling reason to establish in writing in this at this stage a link between accountability and what we are doing. Of course there are links. There is a logical link. But should we put it in here?

Because, look, if we step back a bit and consider that we come maybe not from the United States but from a completely different part of the world, it is striking to note that all this movement -- for instance, the declaration by the U.S. government that it was willing to contemplate the transition of this function -- you must situate it in a certain time frame, and it so happens that that was March 2014, meaning many months after the Snowden revelations.

If it had not been for the Snowden revelations, why didn't this disposition arrive five years ago or eight years ago or one year ago? It happened just at that time.

So in order to avoid complications, I would simply avoid making any specific reference to the huge task which has been ongoing for years now with ATRT and ATRT2. We have a specific task.

My second point is the one brought up by Paul a moment ago, which was to say we should be careful in the wording, of course, but I very much like Paul's suggestion that we would simply speak

about arrangements -- I don't -- I'm afraid I can't quote you, Paul. Maybe you could come back to that. But arrangements appropriate for the transitioning of the IANA functions.

Paul, could you read that again? Thanks.

PAUL WILSON: I just sent it to the list, actually. Let's see if it's arrived.

Sorry, because it's disappeared out of my mailbox I don't --

\>> ---

PAUL WILSON: I don't quite have it yet but it was along the lines of determining arrangements which will be sufficient and necessary for the continuance of IANA functions after the expiry of the IANA contract. The USG -- the NTIA/ICANN contract, obviously.

And it's come through the mail now.

ALISSA COOPER: You are in the queue now. Okay. Joe and then Milton and then Paul.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. The -- I don't think -- I think for me, the importance of the scope definition is to clarify and differentiate between what we're

doing and what the other group is doing, because I think there is a confusion at the external level as to what these two groups are doing and how they are working.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. When you say "the other group," you mean the accountability process?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. Sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: From now on, defined as "the other group."

[Laughter]

So, you know, I think that -- I think we need to be clear because I think we -- you know, we're not just talking about what the usual suspects understand this process to be but what those people who are observers of the process outside understand it to be and giving them some more grounding.

Because in many ways, the charter needs to be a document that stands on its own two feet, not only if you cross-reference it with a lot of knowledge about processes outside of this.

So I do think that is important.

To the point of perhaps the way we phrase it is this is not the scope of the project but this is a -- a scope limitation as to the accountability work in relation to the other process going on, so that it -- and then we -- we can define the objectives of this group in the broader term that's not just limited to the scope on accountability.

So the objectives can be kind of the necessary and sufficient, which is a broader definition that can go beyond accountability, but we have a definition just in relation to our group related to the other group because that may cause some confusion.

And, you know, maybe that's something that can be done outside of a charter, but it needs to be done somewhere because I think that's a reference point that people outside of this process will be confused by and then all of a sudden people are going to be providing the wrong inputs to the wrong process.

So I do think we need to have that clarification. I'm not wedded to any magic words in the clarification. It's just that I do think it has to be a coordinated, ongoing process between the two. How that is coordinated and the process of that coordination I think

can emerge because it's difficult to say how we're going to work with another group that isn't constituted yet.

So I -- I don't think we can prejudge what that process of coordination is, but there does need to be a process of coordination between the two.

ALISSA COOPER: So next in the queue I have Paul. I do have a question really quick.

Does it -- would it make sense to try to get this text up, projected, and so that all the remote people can see it, if we're going to kind of bang away on it a little bit, instead of on the mailing list?

PAUL WILSON: I suppose it would. I'm not sure how best to do that.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, you start talking in your queue position and we'll work on that with ICANN.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. And I actually wasn't in the queue, so I'll skip.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, you're not in the queue. Sorry. Okay. So Jon Nevett is next and we'll work on that.

JON NEVETT: Alissa, I already spoke. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I guess he was not in the queue.

Russ. Is Russ Mundy in the queue?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, I am. Thanks, Alissa.

So the point that I wanted to make is that in terms of the charter documents here, we need to look at the wording also from the perspective that we don't necessarily infer that everything that's in the current IANA contract documents -- and I happen to have taken some time to read basically all of them -- is necessary, going forward.

Certainly some parts of it are, but we don't want to say just by definition that everything that's in those contract documents has to be replaced by something out of the community.

Part of the challenge becomes what should be included and what should not, going forward.

ALISSA COOPER: Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I was actually going to make a suggestion along the lines of what Paul just put in the email. I do also think that just focusing on filling gaps and accountability is misleading and that it's not complete enough, and it really is much more than filling gaps. This is just the next evolution in a transition of administrative and operating responsibilities. So I could actually support Paul's suggested sentence being put in place of that phrase that talks about -- need to pull it up again here -- but the accountability gaps.

PAUL WILSON: So the wording that Keith suggested just now on the list and the words that I posted are up on the screen at the moment, and we can do some -- we can do some editing right now.

                       So, Lynn, your suggestion is specifically?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: To take your phrase "determining arrangements which will be sufficient" and to put that in -- having a hard time reading the screen there, "this group's scope is limited to determining arrangements which will be sufficient and necessary." Again, the

rest of your sentence and all the rest of that previous phrase up there is deleted. Use your full sentence and insert it after "This group's scope is limited to." Paul has just stepped away and is working to get that text reflected up there, I think.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, I'm not going to accept -- and I know that my stakeholder group would not accept, and I think most of the GNSO stakeholder groups would not accept a statement of scope that does not specifically call out the word "accountability." This is not about the continuation of the IANA functions. We never needed the NTIA contract to do the IANA functions. It was always a form of oversight over ICANN.

And so, you know, the idea that this is just about continuing the IANA functions is simply wrong. It's about the only major form of accountability -- external accountability we had on ICANN was the NTIA contract. And now we are removing that.

We have to -- I agree with what Alissa said earlier. It doesn't necessarily mean a new oversight body. But whatever we do has to provide -- deal with some question of how this IANA function is accountable. That's the problem we're facing.

PAUL WILSON: Can I just ask, Milton? Would it be sufficient to say, "The group scope is limited to determining arrangements including

accountability arrangements which will be sufficient and necessary" or "scope is limited to determining accountability and other arrangements," et cetera?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I was just pointing out to Milton the text we are actually discussing now is a combination of what you started with, Keith's addition, and the insertion of Paul. So does that get -- does that help with your concern?

ALISSA COOPER: Can I just follow up on this a little bit, Paul? What is it besides accountability that you want to have included here?

PAUL WILSON: Well, it is the sorts of issues that I mentioned earlier such as the services received, the specific service levels, the adherence to policies, the dispute resolution, and such alike.

ALISSA COOPER: Maybe we are talking past each other a little bit. You don't want the actual -- or maybe you do. You want the actual SLA to be part of the transition plan? Or you want the mechanism by which IANA is held accountable for its performance?

EN

PAUL WILSON: Mechanisms, yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: Right. So I guess maybe we need a different word or something. But to me all of those things are part of the accountability. What is IANA being accountable for? Well, it is being accountable for performance, for following the policies, for being a partner in resolving disputes, right? So I don't know. Maybe we need different words, but...

PAUL WILSON: That's good to hear. I think "accountability" is a very overloaded term. The fact that the accountability is being seen to come from the NTIA in some sense is leading to exactly the assumption that Kuo expressed before, which is that source of accountability after NTIA is gone needs to come from another organization equivalently.

So I think however we do it, it is worth drilling down and being a bit more specific than just simply using the term "accountability" on its own without quite a bit of an extrapolation as to what it meant.

ALISSA COOPER: Adiel and then Keith Drazek.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I just have a question of clarification for people outside who may be reading this. When we say "which will be sufficient and necessary," what does it mean "sufficient"? What is "sufficient"? I think we have to be precise here, and what we are talking about is more kind of legitimacy in that process or in that mechanism so that everybody can find themselves comfortable. So I'm not sure if those two words are too much subjective.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton, were you in the queue?

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, I am. So I think we could modify this language a bit. "This group's scope is limited to proposing arrangements which will be sufficient and necessary for accountable" -- if you put the word "accountable" in there as a modifier of IANA functions or continuance of the IANA functions in an accountable and legitimate manner, something like that, I would be happy.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I have solved the small flag problem.

And if we can scroll down, just my edit to the last part of the sentence would be the two processes, it would be, "Nevertheless, these two processes are interrelated -- "these two interdependent and interrelated processes should appropriately

coordinate their work on accountability." So that would remove the tail end of that sentence. "Coordinate their work." Do you want me to read that at dictation speed? I'm not sure who's making the edits. Period after "work" would be fine.

I was thinking that would take out that last sentence, too, because then that last sentence is no longer...

ALISSA COOPER: Elise was next.

ELISE GERICH: This is Elise Gerich. I guess I usually agree with Paul Wilson, but I'm a little concerned with the additional bit about sufficient and legitimate manner. I think it's made the scope more complicated and less straightforward. And I think I go back to what Alissa said earlier, that accountability is what is kind of the umbrella term for all the things that you were talking about as sufficient. And we are, I think, talking about the gaps that will be left. We're not talking about reinventing the wheel. It is just to fulfill the gaps.

I'm a little concerned that we've made it more complicated, but obviously it's the work of the group to decide if it should be a broader scope there.

ALISSA COOPER: So we have no more queue right now. Folks are reminded to state -- oh, sorry. Well, you can be first "state your name" before you are talking. The remote people are having trouble following who is talking.

JAMES BLADEL: No problem. This is James Bladel speaking for the transcript.

I think the conversation has passed me by somewhat here. I wanted to try to find a way to shoehorn in a descriptor or the function of "oversight." And I think that we keep coming back to this word "accountable" or "accountability." And it feels -- I think, Paul, you said it was overloaded. And one of the things I think that will be missing from the new regime is this very real or even symbolic oversight that's provided by this external body and how is that going to be provided for in the new -- in the new proposal? So is there any way to get that into this modification? Or is that just making it really, really ugly?

PAUL WILSON: If I can respond, I think "oversight" is overloaded with the idea of someone being there to oversee a specific party. So I'd really want to see that explained quite clearly, what "oversight" in that context meant.

To be honest, I would prefer to see "oversight," not "appeared." But possibly a new word, "undersight appears" because we are

talking about accountability to communities rather than to a higher power.

JAMES BLADEL: Well, but when we -- this is James speaking again. I heard the term "SLA" put out as one mechanism potentially. But then the question begs: Who's on the other side of the SLA? You know, certainly ICANN is not entering into these agreements with itself. So I'm trying to understand how that works if the assumption is that this is all going to be happening in the same organization and in the same structure because right now we have two separate entities playing off of each other.

ALISSA COOPER: Jon Nevett and then Russ Mundy.

If Jon is not there, we can proceed to Russ. Or maybe we're having audio problems.

RUSS MUNDY: I heard Jon for a little bit. Is Jon there?

JON NEVETT: Yeah, can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

JON NEVETT: Okay. Sorry about that. I put in a suggestion in the list to delete the clause starting with the word "whereas," where we describe what the other group is doing. I think we're -- we don't need to describe what the other group's doing. And we're describing it in a more limited fashion, and I think their scope is a little broader.

So if you scroll down a little, it is in red where it says "Whereas, the other process focuses on enhancing the accountability of," I would delete that through the period. Yes, that's my suggestion. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Do you want to see if people have comments? Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy for the transcript. One of the concerns that I have in the wording as we are working it here, it sounds as though this group is going to come up with the set of things, including the accountability and so forth. I don't think that really should be our charter.   I think that the groups submitting input to the coordination group need to provide and the coordination group should look at it, examine it, identify conflicts and so forth, but not be the creator of it and having a description of this sort from

the respective stakeholder groups I think should also include how that particular group sees their relationship with IANA and the current NTIA functionality and how it both is today and somehow it should change in the future. But I don't think the coordination group should create these things.

PAUL WILSON: That sounds like a suggestion for a wording change, Russ. So if we can just scroll back up to the top of the document, then I think the words -- applicable words there are say, "This group's scope is limited to proposing the arrangements." Is it limited to coordinating the development of these arrangements? Something along those lines?

RUSS MUNDY: I think what I had in mind, Paul, was that the -- this group would do the coordination of the results of the arrangements proposed by the stakeholders.

PAUL WILSON: Any suggestions there?

ALISSA COOPER: Well, I will go in the queue. I was next in the queue. I will try to make a suggestion. I think maybe what Russ has identified is that instead of talking about what this group's scope is, we're talking

about what this group is asking of the communities, right? The scope of what we're asking of the communities is limited to development of the arrangements. So that would be my suggestion there.

Do we want to continue this? I had a few other things I was going to say, but if we want to try to wrap this one.

PAUL WILSON: Maybe we could put something that's sort of sufficient into the wording for the time being, to do with coordinating the development by communities of arrangements, "limited to coordinating the development by communities of arrangements." I'm suggesting not to keep going into wordsmithing but to sort of put it into a state that's approximate and then move on.

But, Milton, you want to --

MILTON MUELLER: You are overlooking the fact the entire rest of the charter talks about how we ask the communities for input. And we do -- at the end, we do make a proposal. So just leave the word "proposal" in there. Don't get all bogged down in more precise and very picayune language about how we do it in this. The whole point of that paragraph is to talk about the two different accountability processes and then the role of accountability in our scope or to set the scope.

We've made it very clear in everything else in the rest of the charter that we are getting proposals from these other communities. So don't ask this one paragraph to do -- to be a microcosm for the whole charter.

PAUL WILSON: Point taken.

ALISSA COOPER: Got you.

Just to respond to a couple other items that were brought up, James, the SLA -- I mean, the IETF has a SLA with IANA. That's what I was thinking about when we were talking about the accountability over the SLA.

And also just the suggestion that Jon had made not describing the separate accountability process. I think that's fine. I think it may have already been deleted. I think that deletion is fine.

Next we have Mohamed, Milton if you are still in the queue, and then Lynn.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mohamed El Bashir for the transcript. It is my understanding that as well after submission of the community proposals, we're going to develop maybe a new proposal even or even after getting the

feedback. So taking that into consideration, accountability is definitely an important issue for many of the stakeholders in the communities involving here on the table.

And if you put context to the big picture and what was happening globally in terms of Internet governance, even from a political point of view, there was lots of concerns being raised about accountability. And this is a chance really we do take concerns about accountability seriously. Although, yes, it is a different work stream that's within ICANN. Coordination will formally need to happen between the two working coordination groups. I think it is important for us that we don't limit ourselves to the outcome of the accountability work only. So it is important that we should have -- I think we have the mandate to also to propose and develop maybe mechanism arrangements. But we shouldn't limit our role in that area because we might be looking to more arrangements to ensure there's accountability in place.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton, are you in the queue or are you done?

Okay. Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: It's a relatively minor point, but having seen groups come really close to closing on something and then leaving it close enough and walking away and not having effectively closed on it, I

thought it was worthwhile just to come back to the text one more time.

I think we've still got the "including accountability" phrase in the middle there that we determined wasn't necessary when Milton suggested some accountability text at the end of that paragraph, so I think we'd agreed earlier to delete that.

And I think Milton made a suggestion that we not over- -- kind of complicate this paragraph and that we take out the "development by community" sort of language and I thought his proposal was to go back to the language that was there immediately before that, which was "developing" -- something or other.

But as the text didn't change, I just thought we shouldn't walk away and not leave that a little more clear.

So I guess we delete the "including accountability" from there, and was there support for taking out the "coordinating the development by communities"? I'm not actually insisting. I think I'm really just trying to figure out what we think we all walked away from.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah.   If you replace "coordinating the development by communities of the" with "proposing," I think you have a much cleaner statement.   "Proposing arrangements," not "the arrangements." There you go.

PAUL WILSON: Any final advance on those?

ALISSA COOPER: I think -- so I --

PAUL WILSON: Thanks, Lynn.

ALISSA COOPER: Let's do a round on this really quick. So anyone, I think, who wants to respond on this.

I would be more comfortable if it said "this group's scope is focused on the arrangements," because we aren't really proposing. Someone else is proposing. So that's all.

Yeah.

Mary, did you have a comment on this, in particular?

MARY UDUMA: You've got charted well what I wanted to say, and also I want to say that I think we should still retain that the proposals are coming from the communities because it's what we get from the communities that we'll coordinate. It's not just what we are proposing here. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So getting back to the queue, the queue that I have is Adiel, Paul, Kuo, Joe, Wolf-Ulrich, and Narelle.

So Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I think the last change -- the last change captured part of what I wanted to say, but I want to come back again on the "sufficient." I would be more comfortable if we removed the "sufficient" and keep the "necessary," at least, because "sufficient" for me -- either we add something sufficient or linked to the bottom-up part of the process so that gives a sense of the fact that what we come up with is sufficient because it has the legitimacy of all the stakeholders, it comes through the bottom-up process. But just "sufficient" like that for me, I would be more comfortable if we remove it and we can keep "necessary." Yeah.

PAUL WILSON: I had my name down really as a checkpoint to see whether we were coming to a conclusion on this -- on this scope topic, because we do need to also be looking at the other questions of what are we -- what are we actually asking for from communities, and from which, and so if it's okay, I suggest to close the queue off with the names that Alissa has now and then to finish this off and then move on, which -- move to the next part, which will start with a brief presentation from Jari when that time comes. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Kuo?

KUO-WEI WU: I started thinking about the accountability regarding for the outcome and regarding to this group. I think it's a little bit different. Because eventually the institution to pick the new body is not this group. We just generate a process for, eventually, for example, NTIA to pick the new body. So that is accountability for the NTIA, not for us.

I think the accountability for this group is our process, our criteria, we define it. And this criteria is to generate accountability to our community to see about our group.

So I think that is a little bit different between what we're talking about, accountability regarding for the outcome or regarding for this group.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks.   I want to go back to Milton's point about we're asking this paragraph to do more than it was ever meant to do, and I think this paragraph needs to be the paragraph that follows the general statement of the objective of this group, why we were chartered, and then this can be the scope of the work of the group.

But we're trying to shove the -- the charter of why we were formed, how we were formed, what our operating process is and what our scope of work is all in one paragraph by adding one sentence to what was meant to be a paragraph that differentiated the scope of work between one committee that is established and one that will be established.

And so I -- I think we're doing injustice to this paragraph by trying to get it all done in one paragraph, and so, you know, something like the group -- this group is chartered to develop a steward -- a stewardship transition proposal in consultation with a broad stakeholder group, whatever, and then representing a rough

consensus of that group. Something like that. Which is then our broad objective.

Then we go to the scope of the work of the group.

And then from there, there's a natural flow on to the operational processes of the group, which then become a lot of the elements of the charter that exists.

But that then sets it up in a way that you've defined the objective of the group, you've indicated the scope of work of the group, and now you're going to talk about the process, and in the process I think it's where you can get to some of the sufficiency and some of the detail elements that Paul wanted to more highlight in exactly what we're asking of the communities, and that's a natural flow of the events, so it reads in a way that people understand, "Okay, this is what the group is meant to do, this is the scope of work of this group in relation to another group that's doing similar work, and then these are the processes of this group."

And I think if we set it up in those three chunks, it will be much clearer than trying to shove everything into one paragraph.

PAUL WILSON: Do you have a proposal as to how to do that?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I can monkey with some language that I had sent around earlier, which was too long for this purpose, but I can try to do the chapeau paragraph while other people are talking, if that's helpful.

PAUL WILSON: I wonder if, by the end of the day, we'll have a number of things that need to be polished up and made consistent and whether a small group of people could get together and do that after the end of today's meeting so that we can look at it tomorrow.

So who would be -- who would like to be involved with that?

Jari, Alissa, Joe. Anyone else? Excellent. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. Yes, two points. One is a smaller point from the formulation we had from Milton here before.

I had some reservations.   The formulation was the ICG, the coordination group, must assess proposal solutions in the light of the other accountability process. So the "must" is definite, if it's written that way. That means, for me, there's an obligation to do so unless we will not come to an end.

So that's what it says, so that is a question. As the other accountability process is also a process and it's an ongoing process, so we really can't wait until that is -- that is over, to my understanding, so I would be happy if we find a formulation to take this into consideration, to limit that. And I -- my suggestion was just to put the two words "as available" at the end of that phrase. Just as a suggestion.

The second point, I'd like to come -- to come back to what James was saying and also what I was hearing from Kuo-Wei with regards to the question how we should deal with the -- with the solution. That means with the structure, the future structure of the oversight, the stewardship, what does it mean.

So to my understanding that's my question. So I would also see some discussion about that starting from -- from the present, where we have a situation (a) and we will have a situation (b) in future, and this (b) has to be outlined. Not -- I understand it's not a final decision to be taken about that, but it has to be outlined. It could come from the several communities as proposals as well, but it should be under our scope as well. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Narelle.

NARELLE CLARK: Can whoever is using the presentation screen just scroll up through the text for a minute for me, please, so that I can just pick out some words here?

I'm having a little bit of an issue with the word -- further down -- "legitimacy." Sorry. "Legitimate manner." That's the word there.

So "in an accountable and legitimate manner."

The word "legitimate" is giving me a few problems because it invokes certain, well, uncertain legal schemers and frameworks and begs the question of, you know, which -- when you say "legitimate," which legal framework are you invoking here, and I don't think we really are. Or maybe we are.

[Laughter]

Perhaps it should be "a manner acceptable for the stakeholder communities." I haven't been able to come up with a better form of words yet but I think there -- a little bit of attention needs to be given to that word there.

The rest of it, I'm getting increasingly comfortable with, especially after it gets more wordsmithing later. Thank you.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. Thanks, everyone. That seems to be the end of the queue on the scope topic, so the next part of this agenda was expectations about work in the communities.

To clarify, what the community processes need to produce and where/how areas of overlap will be handled. Something that we need to communicate publicly.

So Jari's got a short three slides, I think, about this, so we'll start with Jari and then start the queue from there. Thanks.

JARI ARKKO: Okay. So this is just an example, really. I thought it would be useful to talk a little bit about what someone is thinking about in terms of what they should do for the transition in their own community. And I'll obviously use the IETF as one example.

We don't have official positions on this, yet we've started the discussion, and I have three slides. I just wanted to start from the very top-level question: What is it that you're expected to do in these communities such as the IETF?

And I guess the -- the main expectation is that you're supposed to describe how will we perform IANA stewardship going forward. And that could be one of many things. It could be a description of how we already do it, if that's sufficient, or it could be some enhancement of that if -- I mean, this would be, you know, in any case, a good opportunity for good enhancements or it should be something newer.

We at the IETF often tend to think of this in terms of continuing with the existing mechanisms, in large manner, and I think I've

said somewhere a while ago that, you know, people are often searching for, you know, what is this NTIA stewardship that people keep talking about. And from my perspective, it has been more about that they allow the communities to grow and develop the mechanisms that are actually needed to handle all the tasks than about any particular thing that the NTIA was doing that needs replacement.

So it's that they allowed this to grow and develop. That's the good thing.

But we'll probably end up doing some enhancements.

The other thing that I wanted to show is that it's probably helpful to think about this in terms of the 3-by-3 model or 3-by-4. There's a couple of different versions, but I'll just use one here that is in the 3-by-3 style, and here we divide between the names, numbers, and protocol parameters and then we also divide according to who is setting the policy, who is providing oversight, and who is implementing.

And the IANA functions really is about the implementation part only, and there's quite a lot of other efforts in the other parts.

The policy machines, in particular, are quite large. IETF has thousands of people discussing, you know, policy for various things. And ICANN as well.

Whereas the implementation part, Elise I think your most recent count is 12, so I hope thousands and -- thousands of people and hundreds of governments that are giving you oversight are sufficient to track you all 12.

Anyway, so what -- what is it that we should actually do? And this is just a straw man proposal for the IETF that I wrote out.

So in order to have a proposal for the transition of the stewardship, we should describe -- or a proposal on how we handle the stewardship is to have a couple of definitions. One about the entity that sets the policies. You know, these guys here in the IETF, it's the IETF community as interpreted by our steering group.

Then we need to know who is the entity that implements the policy, and in all these cases, it's IANA.

We need to define the relationship between the two, and exact roles.

We need to define oversight. And when I say "oversight," I actually mean it in a relatively broad sense. So it means oversight as in, you know, some kind of body -- which in the IETF system is the IAB -- that is looking, you know, how this is working, and it's different from the policy body but it's tracking the situation, understanding what's going on, taking care of some of the definitions here, and acting if something goes wrong.

But it's also about things like how does the community at large get to see that everything's running. Like, you know, can I access audit trails. Which is something that we're implementing now, or Elise is implementing, in the coming year for public access to how well the -- the policies have been followed, and if they have been followed well.

And then we also need to some answer to a failure situation. What happens when something fails on the policy side? Well, in the IETF, we have, you know, well-developed nominating committee procedures and appeals procedures where we can reconsider a decision or we can select new -- new leaders or we can even get rid of the current leaders if they fail badly. And also, you know, what would we do if something fails on the implementation side? You know, we have groups that are tracking this operationally and we have discussion channels and, you know, we can use those when something happens or we can escalate to higher levels, to -- to IANA leaders or to ICANN board. And ultimately, of course, there's a contract between the two entities and if there's a breach of contract, then we have to think about assigning that contract elsewhere.

So it's -- but it's fairly basic. It's not rocket science. It's doable. And this is what we were thinking of doing, not in terms of let's write some text from scratch but in terms of these are the things we believe are needed for the stewardship and, you know, here

are the pointers to the RFCs that describe how this is done and, you know, possibly also add on some things that we'd like to do in addition.

So that's our take or my take, at least, on -- on what the communities need to be doing. Thank you.

PAUL WILSON: Thanks, Jari. So do we have some -- some speakers?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. I have Martin and Keith Drazek in the queue.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks very much.

Yeah, I find that quite a useful analysis, but I did have one problem on this slide which is probably more to do with my understanding of the IETF policy process. It's the last but one bullet, and I think one of the things I've always liked about the statement of work as a basis for the current operation of IANA is that it clearly specifies the separation of policy, and this particular line appears to put policy back into the mix, where it is actually, if the IETF policy goes wrong, that's for something -- something for IETF and those engaged in IETF to put right. I don't think it's something I would like to see going into the IANA. Thanks.

JARI ARKKO:

And you are completely correct, of course, and it was just my sloppy definition or language here.

So the key here is that you have a clear definition of the roles of different parties in the system and these guys do that and those other people do this other thing. And in our case, policy clearly is on the IETF side and IANA does the implementation. Although there is some -- I mean, if you dig into the details -- and this is all in the RFCs -- we actually use IANA to sort of pretest the policies that, you know, we've -- we're thinking of publishing this RFC with these policies. Is this implementable? And then they say, "Yes" or "No, we have this issue," and then we'll go back and forth.

But yes, as long as the -- the roles are clear, then I think we should be okay.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thanks, Jari. I think this was very helpful, a very constructive set of slides. I think they look a little bit familiar, maybe from the London presentation. I thought they were good then as well.

Could you go back to the first slide, I think, that had the 3-by-4 or the 3-by-3? Yeah. Perfect.

So I'm curious whether it would make sense to have another line item or another row that talks about enforcement.

So I know oversight is one thing. Maybe it's one and the same thing. But the question of how are the relationships enforced. And one of the reasons I think it's important is if you -- obviously if you look under protocols, you've got really three distinct groups providing the current three structures. Under numbers, you've got three distinct groups. And under names, particularly if NTIA goes away, IANA becomes part of ICANN, presumably. At least that function. And so you've got the ICANN community, ICANN, and ICANN/IANA all being sort of lumped in together under one construct. And I understand from what you said that, for example, IETF has the ability to possibly assign a contract to a different party, to someone else.

That's not available as a redress or recourse mechanism to gTLD registries, for example, or probably ccTLD registries in the context of the IANA functions. So I guess what I'm trying to say is I think it might be worth noting in this particular slide just for everybody's thought process that there are other -- beyond oversight that there may actually be enforcement mechanisms that ought to be considered.

JARI ARKKO: I think that's a good point. It probably points to some of the different areas. And I also will point out in any of these boxes on

this diagram, you can actually see -- I mean, this is one abstraction level. You dig down. You will see that there is many more detail. So even the implementation, there may be different aspects of the implementation like publishing and then checking that we were talking about earlier. The same with oversight.

And that's why I talked about oversight as a generic term. I mean, we want the public to be able to access things. We want a group to track what the situation is and that group may need to have some strength to actually do something about the situation, not just complain. It is called the enforcement function, or it is part of the regular business contracts as it is today. That is up to the particular situation. But, yes, I think we need something like that.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, I'm going to be even more hard core than Keith was, and I'm going to tell you that this diagram is just wrong on the names side. It is wrong.

If it is meant to be a description of the status quo?

JARI ARKKO:	No. Let's say that I'm very happy with our column -- or the IETF column in this diagram and the rest of this is, you know, some possible names.

MILTON MUELLER:	So on the names side, if this is meant to be a description of the status quo, what it should be is policy, ICANN. Okay, the GNSO develops policy. It is part of ICANN. It is written into its bylaws. The GAC influences policy. It is part of the bylaws.

Oversight is the NTIA, okay? It is not ICANN. Oversight is -- and what separates policy from implementation is currently the IANA contract, which is enforced by the NTIA. So for this diagram to be right, the NTIA has to be there in the middle as the oversight and then implementation would be IANA.

And this makes it abundantly clear that if IANA is simply folded into ICANN without any kind of structural separation or some kind of oversight or some kind of arrangement that deals with the oversight function, then it is just ICANN, ICANN, ICANN, okay? That's what the change would be.

JARI ARKKO:	Yes. To emphasize, I did not want to specify the desirable outcome that we should get out of this process, at least not for the other legs of the IANA system. And the main goal -- so the content of the boxes is not so important as the fact that there are

boxes and they perform different roles. As you correctly point out, we have to think about how they work together.

ALISSA COOPER: I think this is approximately what I was going to say. But it is amazing when a group of engineers get together and make a diagram with nine boxes how controversial it can possibly be.

But, yeah, I guess to me the utility of looking at this thing for this conversation was to identify which box are we talking about or which row are we talking about in terms of what we're asking the communities to do and so the point here is we are in the middle row and perhaps there is an additional row that is a part of that.

But I think when Keith was talking about enforcement, I started thinking about something which is maybe not exactly what you were saying with regard to enforcement but just to re-emphasize the point. I think an important piece of this is not just to identify who has this role or these oversight and enforcement roles but also how those people interact with the community.

And so in the IETF case, we have -- you know, all of the people who are part of the IAB who perform the oversight function can be recalled by the community. They are put there through an open NomCom process. And I think describing those aspects is vital. You know, just kind of saying who is going to do this isn't really enough. And Jari had sort of a bullet in his list, I think,

about that somewhat. But I think that's really important to call out, that it's -- you know, how are the people who are providing oversight held accountable as well, is an important piece.

I have Elise, Russ Mundy, Kuo and then Paul.

ELISE GERICH: My question is actually to Keith explicitly to understand. You said something about then the contract would have to not be with the IANA but with ICANN. And I wanted to be clear that the IANA has no independent contracts. The IANA operator is part of ICANN. So the MOU that we have is with the IETF. That's with ICANN. It is between IETF and ICANN. The contract is between ICANN and NTIA. And the NRO document, the MOU is between ICANN.

So I just wanted to clarify because I thought I heard -- and I think you know that as well as I do. But for the record, the IANA function doesn't have any contracts. It is ICANN that has the contracts.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Elise. I probably misspoke there. Thanks for the correction and clarification.

I guess the point I was trying to make is that the IETF has a contract directly with ICANN for the services, and that's different than what exists in, for example, the gTLD space.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ Mundy.

ELISE GERICH: Thank you.

RUSS MUNDY: -- I noted in particular as I was reading through the contract document, is how many things there are contained in those documents today that talk about things such as dashboards and reporting to the community and taking input from the community. And so a lot of the structure for doing the kinds of things that I think I was hearing especially Milton talk about a little bit ago and to an extent Keith, a lot of those, in fact, are present currently in the contract. So much of this may already be available. People might or might not -- in the communities, might or might not find it satisfactory. But there is, I think, a very reasonable starting point for how you would go about looking and measuring and assessing how well the IANA function is actually being performed based on tools that already exist.

ALISSA COOPER: Kuo.

EN

KUO-WEI WU: Yeah. Actually Elise already mentioned what is the relationship between ICANN and also the NTIA. And actually receiving the contract is ICANN. So when the chart said ICANN oversight, I kind of agreed with what Milton said. I don't think we are in the oversight role.   Actually, we are more like doing the implementation stuff. And particularly actually, if I remember in the last final NTIA contract, actually NTIA have a very clear -- ask the ICANN board, should not go into the detail of the -- for example, the ccTLD delegation/redelegation stuff.

All we can do is just make sure it's following the procedure and administration, nothing more than administration and follow the procedure. We cannot say anything about it. So I would just like it clear what is the situation in the last contract what we did between the ICANN board and what the IANA office is doing.

PAUL WILSON: Yeah, I think this presentation gives some interesting hints to how we might go about expressing a set of questions, a sort of questionnaire for each of the three communities. And if each of the three communities -- and if it becomes four, then that's what it would be. If each of them are asked to complete the matrix in detail with policy oversight and implementation, it may be a useful exercise to have two versions, current and future, current and preferred. That, of course, is not up to IETF to guess what's going on in the names world, et cetera. It is actually up to the

names to specify how it works now for the exercise and then how it needs to work in some detail. I think that actually becomes a useful structure for going out to each of those custom communities and saying -- IANA customer communities and saying, "Please complete this."

I don't want to forget the other communities, and I think they should be invited to comment along the same lines. But there may be some other questions, some other information that we are seeking from them. And I think we should think about that.

The other thing I think we should think about is what the NTIA has said it requires, the four particular points about multistakeholder model and security of the DNS and needs and expectations and openness of the Internet.

Those things need to be addressed. And it may be that it is actually up to the coordination group to document with the final proposal how the proposal actually answers or satisfies those four criteria. But we might also want to put those out to the communities to have them also address how every four of those criteria are going to be addressed at every step of the way. Thanks.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. Joseph Alhadeff. Just on the last comment, I would perhaps just be a little tight around the phrasing of "current and

transition proposal" because the concept of future or preferred gives one a concept that this is a time to be open-ended in your thought process. And the answer is this is not a Greenfield's development process.

PAUL WILSON: I agree.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I go back to the fact that the folks around this table are immensely well-steeped in the documents that are the architecture of the accountability and responsibility that exists today. Outside this group, that knowledge quickly narrows to the point of, in some cases, not existing.

And one of the things which I think would behoove us is to ask the communities to rather than just reference as a shorthand well, it is in this document, it is in that document, to actually set forth today's accountability processes and how they see the transition process accomplishing the same thing so that the community that is not the experienced community from inside can actually take that information into account because there are a lot of processes that exist today that are not recognized by a lot of people who have suspicions about how the process may work. And the more we can do to lay those out in a comprehensive and comprehensible fashion, the better we will serve ourselves in the

process as a whole. Having, I think, the community's articulate the elements of those processes, not just a shorthand which everyone around this table may know, would be, I think, something that's valuable. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So I just have a question about that actually because -- and on the IETF side, we have, you know, a good seven or eight source documents that are relevant to this, and they're long. So one idea that has been bounced around a little bit is that we try to summarize in a paragraph or two or three the salient points from each of those documents and then -- and provide a reference and have that be essentially the plan, right?

Do you think something like that would be sufficient? Or does that sound too cursory? Or is it too hard to judge because you haven't actually looked at the documents?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I think that would be useful, but I think the concept is if there is no concept that anything has to change in order to transition, then the concept is that can be the plan. But there may also be the concept of we're doing these things now. With the loss of NTIA, we think these additional things may be appropriate to take into account the role they play, that they're not going to play.

The question would be to then show what we're doing now, what we propose to be doing that would take up slack, if there is any, or gaps as Milton would call them in accountability that may be caused by NTIA's lack of presence.

The issue then of if someone wants to scratch the surface of the details, you've provided the links to the underlying documents. Have a nice day. Read away.

But at a minimum, I think, you know, people don't understand the level of external review that exists. People don't understand the input opportunities that may already exist within the process. People don't know the scope of the accountability functions that are in place. And, you know, I think that level of clarity would help some people at least have comfort that the process is functioning. It functioned in a much more self-sufficient fashion than we ever thought it did, and this transition is not as threatening as we thought it was.

I think that -- the more we can do that in plain English without shoving it into the form of the documents that it's currently in, so that extract function, I think is tremendously useful. And those who want to do the deep dive have the document to do the deep dive with.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. That's helpful. I just had one other item to bring up.

So it sounds like to me in terms of the things that we are asking from the community is, taking stock of everything we talked about today, one is a plan that answers the following X number of questions and just kind of the way they phrased it. That sounds to me reasonable. We can define what some of the questions are. Some of them might be on the slide right now. We have sort of talked about some others. But have it be: We want you to deliver a plan that answers these questions.

And then from this morning, I think we also wanted to have an assessment of the workability and a statement of the consensus support. So I just wanted to kind of set that marker down, that it seems like there's at least three of these components and we're getting some clarity on what they are.

I also -- so we have eight minutes left before we are supposed to go on to the next session. And I think we should try to stay on time, but we didn't talk too much about the "who," who were we asking for these things. And at least from my perspective, not in person, it would be great if we could understand a little bit better who is the "who" on the name side and what do we think of the cross-community working group and that sort of thing going forward, who are we actually asking. Just wanted to flag as something to be discussed, although we maybe don't have enough time to get to that in this session.

I have Daniel and then Keith Drazek. And, Paul, are you still in the queue still? Yes? No? Okay.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Daniel Karrenberg. First of all, I helped you with a flag to be more visible but not to give you more speaking time.

[Laughter]

In a very friendly way.

But I agree especially the last point that you made, Joe. I think it's not only asking the communities to specify and explain the current situation, not only helps to inform the general public as you say where the knowledge about the current state is quickly diminishing, but it will also help the communities to focus because, first of all, they have to agree on what the status quo is, which hopefully will be easy.   But also then you know your starting point and you agree on your starting point.   And that actually may help to focus their own discussions in some way. So I think this is a splendid idea.

And then I have a really minor point, is actually the root server operators also use a very tiny bit of the IANA. And it is not really something that's controversial or complicated but you should expect also from us to come with a little bit of a part of a proposal. And the thing I'm referring to is when operationally the service addresses of the root name servers change -- and this

happens not very frequently, but it is part of the root zone. It is an IANA registry. So just a marker. And I don't want to have a big discussion about that.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. This is Keith Drazek. To respond to the question who are we asking, certainly within the naming side and the GNSO, I can address that. And then I would welcome any of the other folks around the table who'd like to jump in.

Since the announcement in early, I guess it was, March, right, march 14th, and the subsequent conversations at the ICANN Singapore meeting a week or so later, there has been an effort underway among the naming side, I guess, within ICANN specifically the gTLD registries in the GNSO, ccTLD registries in the ccNSO, and a couple other groups, ALAC, to try to come up with a draft charter or a cross-community working group charter. So I think the idea would be for the community and the naming side to come together and to work together to try to come up with a joint recommendation that would feed into this process.

It remains to be seen to Keith Davidson's point earlier whether the ccTLDs and the gTLDs will have enough agreement or sufficient agreement or agree on everything that there might not need to be more than one submission or more than one track on the naming side.

But I think there is a general sense that the community wants to work together, to come together in a cross-community working group which is a traditional structure and to come together and to work on that.

If it would be helpful, maybe later or tomorrow, I could walk everybody through the structure of sort of the ICANN community and get down into the details of what groups are represented in the G -- the GNSO and others, but at a high level, I think that's certainly the group that's going to be looking at the naming track.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Just a quick follow-up on the question of, you know, describing, you know, in an understandable way the mechanisms that already exist which you guys are talking about for a bit.

Another way of saying that is that we don't just have a design problem, we have also an education/communication problem. We all have to worry about both of those parts.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. That is the end of the queue. Thanks very much, Alissa, for helping with that.

I guess we've got plenty to go on from that discussion, and plenty of food for thought for the documentation process that's going to be -- going to be happening.

Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I'm just wondering if we went through a quick exercise to say, "Are there any other communities that we think we would be expecting some sort of formal input or proposal from or they might be expecting to have formal input or proposal from?"

And I guess the one that comes to mind is what the GAC might or might not be considering in that instance. I think that could have a bearing on the next discussion as well.

But do we think that the list that we just went through of "who" is complete?

PAUL WILSON: That's a good question. Any answers? Jari? Jari, Adiel, and Keith.

JARI ARKKO: Okay. So just following up on what Lynn said, I think the question is do we -- I mean, if we classify contributions as coming -- as required, that we need to have these things, and then optional in the sense that we may get, then of course we're open. So we may

get plenty of other things. So I guess I'm expecting that we get a lot of input overall at multiple levels, but do we have more than the ones that we've heard so far about these absolutely needed contributions from these and these communities?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: My view is that we have identified a few groups from which we need to have contributions from, but I think we need to maybe design the input process so that contributions could come from anyone else, so we know that we are going to expect from those four groups for sure and it can be -- can be done, you know, in a form so that you choose which group your contribution or which group is represented, but I think to make it transparent and smooth for everybody, the contribution period will be open to everybody during the same period of time and we know that this group, that this is their contribution, and the others are coming from the GAC, from the user community, from the business community, et cetera.

But maybe -- yeah, my suggestion would be to open it, the contribution period, not limiting it to the group that we have identified in this charter specifically.

PAUL WILSON: Thanks, Adiel. I'm not sure which Keith it was on the -- on the list. Davidson, was it?

Keith, are you there?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Yeah. Thanks, Paul.

Just Lynn's comments resonated a little and we did comment earlier. I think Martin Boyle commented earlier that, you know, there are about 150 ccTLDs who are members of the ccNSO, leaving about 100 ccTLDs who are not members of ccNSO and have no other contact with ICANN other than their entry in the IANA database. And while we will be deliberatively looking to communicate with them, that's not to say that they -- that that group of ccTLDs might not have a firm alternate position to anything the ccNSO comes up with.

So, yes, I think we do need to recognize there are communities outside of ICANN who actually have entries in the IANA database.

ALISSA COOPER: So one note is that we are just about out of time.

I guess the last couple of comments I find a little bit concerning because if we go back to the chartering discussion, I think if we start to have multiple different proposals that all cover the same function, that's going to put us in a position that we don't want to be in, which is picking one over another or trying to meld them together or something.

So I would actually prefer that we define that we're asking for one proposal from the IETF, one from the RIRs, and one or two from the cross-community working group or whatever that is, and the -- assuming that the processes that each of those entities run are open to anyone who wants to participate, then we will have all the bases covered. Because even if a ccTLD is not part of the ccNSO, if they're able to participate in that process, then we're covered, right? And that's certainly how the IETF works. There's no membership at all.

So that would be my preference as far as expectations of who we're getting proposals from. I'll caveat that however the names works is not really my specialty, but it sounds like that there's a structure there.

PAUL WILSON: If I could speak here, I think -- I think we've got three separate cases here.

We've got the identified three or four IANA customer communities. We have other communities who are represented in this room. And I think we may have agreed that the channel for those communities which are represented in this room are the representatives in this room. But then I -- and I wasn't sure whether Lynn was talking about a third case, which is, in fact, probably the same as Keith was mentioning, that there are organizations and individuals outside of this room who may not

be represented at all by individuals in this room, and I think we've got to actually have a clear answer for all three of those, and I hope it's a -- although I take Alissa's point very much, I think we need to have a very permissive approach to at least receiving and noting and having on record contributions that come from almost anywhere.

I would hope that we have -- we are able to strongly state an expectation that contributions that are going to be assimilated, whether it's by the first group only or the first and second, for instance, those contributions, if we're going to use them, need to follow a format that we have -- that we've tried to -- we've tried to define here in terms of a list of questions and issues to be addressed, and we're just simply not going to be in a case to field proposal suggestions from everywhere in whatever format and whatever -- with whatever content people might want to submit and we are going to have to be quite clear and disciplined about that, I think.

Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. So I -- I think it's -- you know, maybe if we could just say that we -- we expect the three or four proposals from the customer communities and we -- or we require them, and in addition we are open to all input from, you know, either, you know, members of -- you know, whoever the people are,

represented here or outside, but we also highly recommend that anyone who has input on these topics will take it at the earliest possible stage to the relevant community.

So if you have an issue with, I don't know, DNS root or -- or names, then hopefully you'll take it to the cross-community working group and ccTLD and so forth, rather than wait until it hits here and then expect us to coordinate.

PAUL WILSON: Yeah. The expectation that inputs be channeled through existing -- existing channels as much as possible, or if we want to be hard about it, in every case. I'm not -- I'm not going to -- to advocate that kind of exclusive approach, though, myself.

JARI ARKKO: I mean, we don't have exclusive process in the sense that at the end of the process we will have to see if there is community consensus on the whole, so at that state at least we will have to accept input from everybody.

PAUL WILSON: Yeah. Okay. We have Russ Mundy, I think, Adiel, and Mohamed and Daniel, and then we're really going to have to stop this -- wind up this session. Thanks.

Russ, are you there?

RUSS MUNDY:

Yes. Go ahead. I was just going to make a short suggestion.

Russ Mundy, for the transcript.

And that is for our working hypothesis, if we get what appear to be conflicting inputs from a particular stakeholder community, that our first choice would be to send the -- both or three or whatever the number is stakeholder communities that we as a coordinating community -- committee don't try to solve them; that the working hypothesis is that if we get them directly and we -- we will send them to the communities individually to work on.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yeah. I want to echo what Jari said and also add that the work of this coordination group has to really reflect the very first comment that the community has put on when this whole NTIA process started.

They clearly said that this process is not an ICANN process, it has to go beyond ICANN stakeholder and ICANN constituency.

So we in this room, our role goes really beyond that, and we have to show in one way or another that we accommodate community or inputs that are outside that very specific scope.

So the way we do it practically is up to us, but I think we need to clearly send that message out.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I definitely support opening the submissions from outside the community. We're supposed to be within the borders of the format we're requesting, within the principles of the transition that currently we have. We have a document that clearly states what exactly are the principles of any proposals that need to be submitted. So I don't see a reason to limiting those submissions.

The ccNSO case definitely might be unique, where you can have CC managers outside the ccNSO as an organization, but I think it's to send a positive message to everyone watching this process that we are open and we're accepting submissions within this format, accepting those principles.

PAUL WILSON: Thank you. Daniel, a follow-on?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yes. Daniel. I'd like to reiterate that the worst thing that can happen to us is that we are afraid of -- of input from anywhere, because if we're -- if we're not encouraging it early on, it will hit us later on, and if we encourage it early on, then we have a defense against someone coming at the 11th hour because we say, "Hey, this was open for input from the start and we were very open."

And I think also that if we receive input from an unexpected side, then we should see where it fits in the -- the major contributors that we have identified and tried to refer those people to the appropriate community. And several people have said that.

And they may accept it, they may not accept it, but it -- it must be very clear that we said, "We think this fits here. Join this process." If they choose not to, it's documented and we can deal with it when the time comes to actually make a -- compile a proposal and it will speak to the credibility of the people.

So I think we should -- we should project actively and very clearly that we as a coordination group are open to any input. We prefer people to go to subject matter communities and that we have specific requirements for -- for the form and content of the input.

PAUL WILSON: Thank you, Daniel.

Okay. To wrap this up, I think what we're going to need to do is to take what's been put forward, I'd suggest based on Jari's initial proposal and what has been suggested since then, and create what's going to be the initial draft solicitation, if you like, for inputs.

And that's another drafting exercise for after today, I think, and before tomorrow.

So are there any thoughts about that as a process? If not, any volunteers?

>> ---

I will volunteer, yeah.

[Applause]

Not alone, I hope.

[Laughter]

>> ---

Keith? Thanks. Wolf? Okay. Thanks.

Back to you, Alissa. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So it's now 3:30 and we are meant to have a 75-minute session on coordination group participation which is going to be facilitated by Lynn, so this is the one where we're talking about who's here, who should be here, who's not here, and so forth, and so let's try to end this about 4:45 and then we'll take a break.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Thank you. I said to somebody earlier that I was chairing this session. I said volunteered and they said, "Actually, voluntold."

[Laughter]

Which is a new word that should be firmly entered into our volunteer culture here.

I also -- just a quick comment on the last discussion that we just finished. I think there was a possible tendency to confuse kind of input and public consultations with the formal proposal, and I think we just need to keep some of that clear as we go into this next discussion as well.

And I'm also recalling Martin's comments earlier this morning where he said it would probably be helpful to start to show people the general direction or the general road, I think you said, we were traveling with respect to an endpoint, so that people understood that clearly.

And I can certainly testify from other processes I've been in that even if you think you're stepping logically through a series, when you get to the end, it will strike a fairly significant number of people as something new. They will have thought they were on a different journey or trying to get to a different endpoint. So I'd just like to keep that in mind because I think that would be really -- really clear and I think that also has a resonance back with public input and who we're expecting formal proposals from.

So with that as an input, there was one -- one general question, I guess, and one specific question, and the general question and

the intent behind this item was to give us all a moment to reflect and think about the work that's in front of us, now that we've gotten actually quite a high degree of clarity on the charter, quite a high degree of clarity on the scope, and a fairly high degree of clarity on the expectations on what the input and who that input should come from as we proceed through that.

So with all that as context -- and I realize it's actually quite a lot and I moved quite quickly -- how do we feel about the representation of this group? Is it adequate? Are there, you know, communities that we feel aren't fully represented here? And I guess I would keep in mind that, again, the charter of this group -- because there's a -- obviously a very clear expectation that we all go away and work back very robustly within our own communities, and of course those communities should beget other communities that they're actually working with as well, that's key to actually making this process both understood and successful.

So let me just leave that first kind of open question here.

And again, it was posted in the agenda as "good to verify that the composition of the committee is suitable for its tasks," and then I will come to the second open question about concerning specifically the GAC representation, secondly.

I can't believe it's quiet. So maybe I was either too confused. The question that's on the table right now is specifically: How do we

feel about the composition of this CG? And is it suitable for the tasks ahead of us? I see James and Jean-Jacques in the queue. And Wolf. Sorry.

JAMES BLADEL: This is James speaking for the transcript. I think we've got a good start. One of the comments that registrars submitted was that each group or community would need to determine what its own representative number should be and not have any necessarily external limits imposed on its delegation of this group. But it should be encouraged to keep it small, to keep the group manageable.

However, I do believe if we do our job properly that the number won't matter that it will essentially be a question of maybe optics and legitimacy of the outcomes.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks. This is Jean-Jacques. Of course, when this was discussed in the At-Large community, there was some questions about the fact that certain areas of the community were being represented by four or five people and the At-Large community, which

arguably is, as its name indicates, widespread and diverse geographically would have only two representatives.

But here I venture to give you my personal view which is that that's not the main thing. It is the process by which each community has designated its representatives which was really important, I think.

In the case of ALAC, there was a very stringent set of rules which were set out and also criteria for the choice of the individuals. And there was a voting process, and all that has been made public.

I sent a link to Alice, and she kindly put it online. So I think it is this process which guarantees that Mohamed and I are accountable to our own communities. And for the sake of efficiency, I think that two or five but certainly not ten representatives does make it more palatable and perhaps more efficient.

So to sum up my intervention, I'd say that for the sake of visibility and perhaps symbolism, five would have been nice because we have five geographic regions, et cetera. But for the sake of efficiency of a group part of whose task will actually be drafting or refining some drafting, then I think somehow we must keep it within a certain numerical limit. I thought 27 seemed already fairly large. Do we want a group of 40 or 50? Thanks.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Wonderful.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking.   We discussed these in the Commercial Stakeholder Group of the GNSO.   And we had an extended discussion on that on different points.   The one thing is in principle we wouldn't like to open the bottle for discussion that others are starting to have how to increase their membership in that group.

And, secondly, there was the question as well if the group is going to be enlarged for some other members, specifically from the GAC are added, couldn't that be the wrong signal towards the NTIA with regards to their principles that this process shouldn't be governmental driven?   That's an --- question.

The major question we discussed was a question because it was not clear how we are going to take decisions here in this group with regard to finding decisions and whether there is a voting or not in this group.

And then after it was clear that this group is not going to go for votes rather than to work on the basis of consensus, then this argument was not that strong.   It means from that point of view we said it really doesn't matter.

So whether we put the (indiscernible) to this group to increase the membership, but it has to be clear how those groups who are going to increase the numbers here, like the GAC, are going to work together. It must be very transparent. What is their behavior with regards to consensus -- a consensus-driven process?

I think it has been outlined as well today by Heather so, therefore, we are open well to allow them. Thanks.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. Well, like the business constituency, the noncommercial stakeholder group did have time to consult about the question of GAC seats in particular. I would say that in terms of the general composition of the group, our stakeholder group has, like many, feels that civil society may not be as strongly represented here but they are willing to accept the group in its current composition and are generally not favorable towards opening Pandora's box.

However, we entered into the question of the GAC pretty negative. And through deliberation and discussion, our positions on that softened quite a bit.

There are people who think it is a good idea, and there are people who talk about the drawbacks. I think an email from one of our members from Egypt summarize our concerns very well. If you don't mind if I read that.

So, if they are to act as representatives of the GAC, then I would oppose the increase. But it would be my hope that they are instead acting as liaisons to the governments of regions and trying to communicate the many and varied views of government rather than GAC consensus. If that is indeed their intention, that they are asking for more representation as the intent to liaise in a way that goes beyond normal GAC processes and directly represents a broad range of government inputs into the process rather than a single GAC position -- which I think would be healthy -- then I think asking for five is not outrageous.

So you can put a squirrely in the "not outrageous camp."

The other positive aspect of that was the idea that there might be more buy-in in the results if, indeed, these people -- additional people were sitting here with us and learning from what's going on here.

Of course, the drawbacks have been articulated as well. Is there a mentality behind this that this is a decision-making legislative body and they are representing and voting on it? Is that their mentality? If so, it is a bad idea. And then the size of the group, there are many concerns about the group just getting too big and unwieldy.

LYNN ST. AMOUR:	I just want to jump the queue for a moment to let everybody know that Heather Dryden had been on the call. She had fallen off. She is back on now.
	Heather, when I opened this session, I think you had already fallen off at that point. And we starting with respect to the general question is the composition of the group adequate to the tasks we have taken on as defined by the previous discussions on charter, scope, and expectations.
	But, as I'm sure will come as no surprise to you, we quite quickly slipped into the discussion on the request for the GAC to have five representatives. But we literally had just started that with a comment by Wolf and then that was Milton Mueller who was speaking.
ALISSA COOPER:	So in the queue, I have Joe, Daniel, Martin. James, are you still in the queue? No. Okay. Myself and Jari.
	So, Joe.
JOSEPH ALHADEFF:	Thanks. Joseph Alhadeff. For us I think the composition is acceptable. In the way it's formed now, we would have similar problems of the group becoming unwieldy if we opened it up. I think the one question we had was at the moment, it does not

look like we are going to necessarily be physical meeting intensive. We are going to try to do things electronically. But if we get to the point where we have a number of physical meetings, the concept of -- because of the pressures of other meetings and things like that, we would like to then explore the concept of having an alternate who would be able to physically also be present because we think it is more meaningful if someone can be physically present. But we think it is optimal to have the same person in the room, where possible, to get continuity. That's why I just said it depends how much all of a sudden we start having a lot of physical meetings which would be a question.

The other thing is, as we look at the concept of rough consensus which we support, when you start having groups that are represented by four or five people, then we want to make sure that the concept of rough consensus is rough consensus among the groups not rough consensus upon a spartan number of people because that can become exclusionary to groups when you start looking at it that way.

What we are looking at is the rough consensus across the groups, not just across a specific number which would get back to being something more like voting.

The final thing is just -- I didn't mention it in my introductory comments related to the ICC. As part of the NETmundial process,

we had actually done outreach beyond ICC/BASIS, and we plan on doing outreach beyond ICC/BASIS as part of this process as well. So we will be reaching out to other business associations that have similarly situated businesses to make sure that we are covering an even larger breadth of geography and size businesses.

ALISSA COOPER: Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. Daniel Karrenberg. We haven't discussed this in RSSAC, so this is my personal opinion. I think we have to come back to what our goal is. And our goal is to engage as much as possible with all the relevant -- I hate the word but, okay, stakeholders and to reduce disagreement and resistance. And I quite consciously use the word "resistance" here.   And I think if we agree that increasing the number of designees of certain communities, it would help to that end. I'm all for it. And I think specifically in the case of the GAC, I see definite potential there, and in the direction of your Egyptian colleague, Milton.

Also, I think it maybe sends an important signal and that is that this group takes the prerogative of finding its composition formally in its own hand where some of the criticism that has been launched is that this has been -- what's the right English

word? Let's use the simple word -- done by ICANN. And if we take it, I think that might diffuse some of that criticism right there.

And I think the drawback obviously is -- of a bigger group, is being unwieldy. But it could be actually addressed in the way that Joe just said. When it comes to the final consensus, let's not -- let's encourage the different groups to not speak individually all the time. So I think it can be managed.

Personally, whether I think it is 37 or 50 doesn't make a difference at all. But, okay, that's my opinion.

And then finally responding to -- I haven't heard the NTIA saying there should not be no governmental influence in the process. What they have said quite clearly is the solution or the proposal cannot be to replace them by a government body. I have not heard them say we should not involve governments. Quite to the contrary, I believe. And that's all.

ALISSA COOPER: Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks. As Daniel said, I better say it as well. This isn't something we have discussed in the ccNSO, so to some extent I'm just talking on my own basic and peculiar little hunch.

I particularly like the quotation, though, that Milton read out. I think actually that is really quite important starting point because I was sort of jotting down the idea of we're looking for criteria for inclusion in this particular case of a larger inclusion of the group.

And it seemed to me that going around the communities and getting them to identify people is actually sort of quite a good process particularly because the representatives in this room can then go back to those communities and shape the discussion in those communities and, therefore, it becomes a very healthy job of widening that discussion, widening that buy-in.

And, you know, I can certainly look at in my mind what is actually quite spectacular with ALAC, as to how they do get out to an enormous community very, very effectively.

But, of course, when we get to the GAC, the GAC is a sort of group of governments all with their thoughts and ideas and views. And bringing them on board and helping them understand the issues, helping them believe, see that they are part of that, I think, does come in with that wider understanding of the regional diversity that the GAC -- that the GAC has and the sorts of the governments there are around the table.

So I can certainly see that bringing in five GAC representatives because that's what they do see as being necessary to ensure that they are coming out with getting that buy-in, that engagement

that Milton's Egyptian colleague flagged, I think, would be well worthwhile.

Essentially, we are helping all the communities to understand and shape the issues in the way that when we get to the end if it costs us five GAC representatives to get a GAC saying yes, it has been a good and fair process. Then it's going to have my vote.

ALISSA COOPER: So I'm next in the queue. I wanted to respond to a couple of different items and bring up some new ones.

So I think I agree generally on the point about rough consensus. It has never made a whole lot of sense to me that, you know, particular groups want to kind of stack the deck. If we're operating under rough consensus, that's not really relevant. It's the value of the objections that matter, and not the number of people who support any particular objection.

So if that's the motivation for adding people to the group, then I think that has been kind of nullified by the fact that we seem to have agreement that we are going to operate by rough consensus.

Having been involved in various different committees of different sizes, I think that the size of the group actually does matter in terms of getting the work done. I think it's a lot harder to get work done in a group of 50 than in a group of 27, and a lot harder in a group of 27 than in 13.

So my concern here is that although -- I didn't really hear it from anyone yet, so maybe it's misplaced -- but my concern is with a snowball effect, that if we open this back up and say, you know, "Anybody who wants to come can come," then we will end up with a coordination group whose own internal coordination becomes very difficult to manage.

And at least from my perspective, you know, we don't have, as we've talked about in the charter, a tremendous amount of work that we in this group need to get done, but it needs to get done on a particular time line, and expanding the group, I think, too much bigger potentially threatens that because it makes the coordination of our work internally much more difficult.

And lastly, I think one option that we might be able to consider as kind of a middle ground is if we had two tiers of participation.

So if we were to, say, stick with the numbers that we started with from ICANN, but then we had another set of participants who, you know, joined the meetings for whom we have a section of the meeting agenda whenever we meet or whenever we have a call for them to provide their input, I think that could be reasonable.

I mean, Wolf has already talked about how he has kind of a support crew that he's working with, and there might be others of us who, you know, have other parts of our community or other designated people who we would want to have, you know, be

more involved but not be among the people with whom we have to coordinate and identify rough consensus and so forth.

So just throwing that out there as a -- as a possible middle ground.

So I have left in the queue Jari, Paul, Jean-Jacques, Heather, Keith, Milton.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. I -- I want to specify exactly what I think, although I don't have an opinion yet on exactly where this should go, this particular question, but I wanted to make an observation about some aspects of it.

The -- if a request is made for an increase in the number of people because someone believes that more votes or voting power is needed, that's probably a bad idea, given that the NTIA requirements, to begin with, were that there should be a broad consensus in the community for whatever solution that we have come up. So if we have to vote, where voting blocks actually matter, then we probably fail the NTIA criteria anyway, so it's not so useful.

So whatever we do in terms of increasing or decreasing or keeping the group composition the same, let's not have that have a big effect on -- or it can't really have an effect on voting, but it should also not be -- not have a -- if we make an increase, for instance, I don't like the idea that it would actually change the

voting procedures, and with rough consensus, I don't think we have a big issue with that, actually.

PAUL WILSON: The RIRs haven't discussed this -- this question. Having conferred with my colleague here, both of us, I think, would advocate to accept the GAC's request. It seems harmless enough, and yet well enough justified, to go ahead without too much ado. And with all respect, I don't think two tiers of our membership is really called for.

I also wouldn't exclude similar requests from others.

I'd say from my point of view, though, I would not be asking for more from our particular constituency. I think what we need to understand here is everything that's already been said about the function of this group, but we also need to understand that -- that the buy-in and support from people who are -- whose primary task actually is to be going out actively from this group to communities and -- and where that is being seen as facilitated by having extra participation, I just think we should respect that and do so in a fairly easy and relaxed manner. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Jean-Jacques?

EN

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques.

Following on what I said earlier, but also on the remarks by Martin about the way the ALAC is organized and really gets feedback, I wanted to bring this additional information to you.

When I said that it's more the process than the numbers which seem -- in our opinion which really count, I'd like to refer you to one of the links which was sent to you by Alice, and that is the existence of the at-large ad hoc working group on the transition of U.S. government stewardship of the IANA function. That's what it's called.

And there are 16 people who are on that working group and they represent all the five geographic regions.

So I mention this simply to underline that here again I think it's really the process which is a guarantee of fairness, of proper representation, but also of efficacy. Because as you said, Alissa, earlier, there has to be somewhere a tradeoff between proper representation -- I mean, numbers -- and efficiency.

So I think Mohamed and I feel very confident that although we would, of course, find it more fair to have perhaps a slightly larger number, I think we can manage with this, especially thanks to the existence of our correspondent group, as it were, this working group within ALAC, which will be our prime correspondent and

which will give -- give us feedback but also instructions if we give them the impression that we are erring. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Heather?

HEATHER DRYDEN: Hello, everyone. Thank you for letting me come in.

I'm sorry about dropping off the call. It's happened a few times. So I'll quickly make my comments.

I don't want to repeat the comments I made at the start of our meetings this morning about the GAC, and I hope that that was sufficient explanation about how the GAC is approaching participation in the meeting.

And a couple of things that I didn't comment on was just to simply say that the proposal to have five participate is really just about how the GAC organizes itself.

We've heard a few times in the discussions already the importance of communication and information sharing, and this is a way in which we believe we can do that, and to have the best possible engagement from governments, who need to understand what this process is and hopefully then contribute and participate fully in the process within the terms of reference or within the charter that is laid out.

EN

And so I did want to emphasize that.

I don't know where the number two came from. The number two just doesn't work for the GAC. You can have one. You can have perhaps four or five or more. But that's just been a problematic proposal from the beginning and I haven't been able to confirm precisely where it came from or what the rationale was behind that.

So as I say, the number two is challenging.

I won't belabor the next point, since I'm hearing from colleagues that they are essentially supportive and perhaps would agree that the best thing is to have five on the coordinating committee, so that we can move on and look at some of these other issues about how the coordination group works and really get into the substance with that.

But I am a bit concerned that other parts of the Internet technical community and other parts of ICANN are actually now sitting in judgment about how the GAC organizes itself and how we have determined is the best way for us to be participating in this process.

I do not recall the GAC talking about how other communities -- about their working methods, about how they work, and the particular numbers that they came forward with other than an observation that the ccNSO had four.

So with that, I hope we can move on from this and just have very clear expectations within the coordinating group, within the community, and certainly within the GAC as well, about the role of the nominees from the GAC and from other parts of the community.

I think that's really the answer here.

And I do appreciate you giving me the opportunity to make these further comments on this matter and appreciate the support and thoughtfulness from other colleagues in the coordinating group. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you. This is Keith Drazek. Just a couple of short comments.

One is, I think that it's important for us to make sure that the GAC is engaged in this process and participating in this process and that we have an opportunity as a coordinating group to benefit from their perspectives early rather than late.

And if that means it's five, then -- you know, then I'm okay with that.

I think what we're seeing here is the result of a -- you know, a construct of 27 slots that were selected sort of in a top-down manner, and this isn't the result, necessarily, of a bottom-up process where everybody got together and said, "Okay, yeah, this makes the most sense."

So we're reacting a bit to the decision that was made, and that's okay. Here we are.

But I think that we ought to take this opportunity to be inclusive in that regard, but frankly, if the coordinating group -- if we do our job and we simply act as a facilitator of the community inputs, then this really ought to be a boring place to be, and that the real work ought to be done in the community, in the trenches, in a bottom-up consensus-based manner, and that's where the excitement ought to be taking place and where people ought to feel like they can influence the process.

Now, I also recognize that the GAC has a challenge and has an historic challenge in terms of its organizational structure and its ability to participate in those community-based processes. In PDPs and various working groups, it's always been a challenge to engage the GAC early in the process. And we're going to continue to invite the GAC and members and representatives of the GAC to participate in the cross-community working group, and I hope that they'll accept that opportunity or take up that opportunity, but my feeling right now is that if we do our job as a coordinating

group, then the numbers really shouldn't matter that much at this level.

Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah.   Keith provided a very good segue into my comments because I had just heard from the -- one of the co-coordinators of the cross-community working group in ICANN about the names, that they have been invited -- the GAC has been invited to be on that cross-community working group but has not responded yet.

And this is just to reinforce what Keith was saying, is that that -- you know, if they want to have their voices heard and be influential in the process, that is actually where the work will be done and there's this tendency among governments to look at things as -- as if they were intergovernmental organizations and to go to the top and -- where most of the power is supposed to be concentrated.

And I think a lot of the resistance to the initial GAC request came from the perception that that's -- that's what was going on.

And of course if that's not what's going on, there's absolutely no resistance to including them, but we would also want to see

active GAC representation in the early stages of the cross-community working group developing a DNS proposal, because again, that's where the real work will be done.

I would just make one more sort of broader, more philosophical comment about the reason this relationship with governments is so knotty is that -- knotty as with a "k," not with the other way.

[Laughter]

>> Not with an "n."

Maybe it is naughty but I haven't, unfortunately, been unaware of anything naughty going on with the GAC.

The reason it's so troublesome is that governments are -- in one sense, they're a stakeholder user like the rest of us. They have domain names. They have networks. Okay? In that sense, they're no different than a corporation.

But in the other sense, governments are not stakeholders. They are an alternative system of governance.

National governments are institutions for making policy and developing governance. And in that sense, they -- they cannot be treated as just another stakeholder in the system. If -- it is always a danger that an intergovernmental system of governance replaces and crowds out the multistakeholder system.

So when -- again, when there's resistance, when Heather senses this special kind of scrutiny being offered to governments, it's because of that. It's because they're not really ordinary stakeholders.

And indeed, it sometimes rankles those of us in civil society who are often at the receiving end of governmental repression to hear governments complaining about how weak and powerless they are. It really -- it really rankles. I mean, I'm not being funny here. Governments have a lot of power. They have too much power in many countries. They abuse that power frequently just as, you know, anybody abuses power.

So let's not be, you know, naive about this -- this kind of representation.

ALISSA COOPER: Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I would like just to support everyone. This is a golden chance really here to engage governments and also build awareness at an early stage.

I'm sure many of you were in Dubai for the WCIT conference and there was lots of wrong perceptions about ICANN role and NTIA stewardship role, so the more the government stakeholders are

involved and I think the more the GAC are playing a role to ensure that different governments and also different intergovernmental organizations in other regions of the world are participating and involved, the more I think we will get buy-in and also a credibility in the process from the stakeholders specifically.

ALISSA COOPER: Wolf?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich speaking.

As I pointed out before, the decision we are taking within the commercial stakeholder group with regards to the membership of the GAC members here in a positive way, it was not easy. It was not just saying, "Okay, we accept it." So we discuss very hard about that. And we came to that conclusion at the end to accept it, because it's -- we saw it as a specific situation, then, with regards to the GAC.

However, what I would like to say is this doesn't mean that we would like to open the bottle right now and invite others, and say, "Okay, that's the best situation you have. Just raise your hands and ask for more members."

Since we also -- we were surprised from the -- from the beginning how this group was set up here, and the figures, and we were also

not satisfied from the beginning because we have diverse structure, as I tried to explain before.

So what it then did is, so we created this internal supporting group with covering all the constituencies behind me to give me support and to keep them informed about what's going on here, and I would like really to request all the others who are thinking about to have more members here available, that they should think about how to organize in similar way. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So I'm next in the queue.

This is kind of a -- of a meta comment, but I -- as we're probably about to make a decision here, I think it's important to establish that, well, whatever the decision is that's made doesn't really reflect a -- an opinion or a criticism or a praise of any particular group. I think the original numbers came from ICANN. The revised numbers came from ICANN. None of the people at this table had anything to do with those. They came from somewhere else. And so whatever is decided about two versus five is not really a -- you know, a criticism or a vote in favor of saying, "Oh, I thought originally that two was the right number." None of us chose the number two originally, and I think it would be a sort of unfortunate foot to start on to think that, you know, any of us is looking at any of the other groups and saying, "Well, that one doesn't deserve it or this one does." That's really not, I think,

what we're talking about here. So I just kind of wanted to set that out because we are probably going to make a decision and I don't want it to be imbued with any kind of extra judgment about one group versus another. And Lynn, you're next.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: So I'm going to try and see if I can summarize where we are and see if we can get a final decision. I think a lot of this discussion is actually pivoted on some assumptions, one assumption on being that the GAC really understands the role of this committee and buys into the charter and the scope of the work. I hope Heather is still on the call because I would like kind of confirmation that she understands the work and the role and that would be made clear to the GAC representatives, frankly whether it is two, three or five going forward.

I also heard from some of the other points that -- and it was largely from what Milton read out from his community that I would simply summarize as if the expectation is that they liaise, if the GAC is using this to allow them to better liaise beyond the normal GAC processes, I think, Keith -- Keith Drazek, that was some of what you were saying as well. If it was facilitating that, then there was support for a higher number. If it was other than that, then I think you were pretty clear then there wasn't support for it.

I also thought ALAC and a couple of the other communities were being very generous and saying that they, too, could make some fairly plausible arguments looking for more representatives but would not, that the strength of their own processes stood well on the selection processes you used. And I think Martin said something similar as well for his part of the community.

I think another strong point that I heard from a couple of different people said we would benefit from their perspective early in the process. I think that's true. Frankly, I think that's true from anybody and everybody, but I think that's probably particularly true here given some of their earlier positions.

And I think we also need sort of an explicit assurance that they need recognize -- this goes back to my first part -- that the work is largely done elsewhere. It is done in other communities and other processes. So we'd hope to see GAC representation and things at the cross-community working group as well, that increased participation list does not supplant work and support in other groups.

And then one of the other points I heard that I think was really important, I'm not too sure this is settled as much as I think what some of the other points were, it was more around how do you judge consensus. And Alissa had some great words which is drawing heavily from a lot of the IETF activities which is rough

consensus is judged on the value of the objection. It is not the number of objections.

And I think we've still got a discussion to be had on consensus. If we're sort of okay leaning towards that as opposed to more of a voting mentality, then I think that probably gets over one of the other sort of streams of concerns I actually heard in the room.

So before I call kind of the question here in the room, I guess I would actually like to hear from Heather whether or not anything we just said is contrary to that because I think we're all trying to work this together and we are trying to be accommodating. And I think there was an awful lot of accommodation from other communities in the room with respect to not stepping up their numbers. So maybe one of the things I should be explicit about is I think this is the last request this room should entertain with respect to changing the numbers of representatives in the room. So when I call the question, it would be with respect to whether or not this room would support adding three more GAC representatives but recognizing that we draw the line then at those sort of requests and we continue forward with, I guess, it would be third on this community. So, Heather, if you are on the call, I mean, I'd really like to get some comments back.

RUSS MUNDY: While we are waiting for Heather, can we get one more?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Sure, Russ. And to give Heather some time to think about it.

I was surprised at some of your comments, Heather, I guess, in terms of how they were directed. I think we are all trying to be really accommodating here and understand and nobody is trying to dictate to the GAC. That's not what we are about. I do think our responsibility is to try to come to agreement and how this room can work together effectively to meet the very large task in the short time that we have. And I think that's all we're trying to do. So I guess we had Russ, Mary is looking to be in the queue and then we will go to Heather and then call it.

ALISSA COOPER: Jean-Jacques -- well, I don't know if people wanted to speak before or after this. But Jean-Jacques and Kuo were also in the queue.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. One remark and one suggestion. The remark is take it from a former ambassador, there is no way that two people can represent all the governments in ALAC. I understand that. Three perhaps not.

The only rationale for that is that there are five geographic regions in the ALAC -- in ICANN so it does make sense we should accept the five. I will be in favor of such a solution.

My suggestion now is that we be quite careful about the wording. I think in the wording in accepting this solution which has been debated this afternoon, I think we should say following on the request of the GAC, because it should not come out as seeming to be a spontaneous idea entertained by this particular group. It is subsequent to the request of the chair of the GAC that the discussion took place and I would add another element which is that conscious of the working methods and problems of representation within GAC, therefore we accept it, et cetera. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: So, sorry, Lynn, are we going down the queue or are we with Heather?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I think we should go down the queue. And if there are any other comments or any other assurances this room would like from Heather, we can give her a chance to respond then.

ALISSA COOPER: So I think Kuo was next.

KUO-WEI WU: I think I have no particular -- thinking about how many seats for the GAC. What I'm thinking about is the very beginning is, I think, from the ICANN team when they set up the number from the different constituencies based on the summarized input. And I think this is the first step, and I need to explain a little bit.

And the second thing is, I think it is fine for us to discuss how many seats you give to the GAC. But at a time, I think it is a very important -- hopefully this is the final -- to finalize the size of the coordination group. Not here, get more, and then another constituency come and say, Well, we want the same thing. And then eventually this group will be no end, you know?

I think we have to be very careful just like Jean-Jacques mentioned about how the process to make this whole thing -- first of all, it met the requirement.

And another point is to make sure this coordination group begins into the process. I think we should not -- in this stage we are in forming the group. I think we have to be very careful about what we are going to do for the decisions maybe sometime day or whatever.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: That's, Alissa.   One of the things I thought I heard Heather mention in her last discussion was that the number two did not work for the GAC but the number one would. So is that a possible consideration?   I had not heard anybody else say that, but I thought I heard Heather say that one would be suggestion. So I think we can put that question back to Heather when she's up in the queue.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Russ.

[Laughter]

Mary is next.

MARY UDUMA: Putting on my hat as formal GAC member, the GAC -- the spirit behind whatever the GAC does is at the end of the day, you represent your government.   You are not coming as a constituency or a community. That's one thing. So in the spirit of AoC, don't you think that USG will be happy that we had more GAC members here to join us in crafting the proposal?   That's what I want us to consider.

Then the next thing is that it should be made clear that the work here is not the new arrangement. It is not the new institution. It

is trying to craft a proposal to the government of the U.S. And for that reason, I think engaging GAC early enough would help get it -- because we could do all the work we're doing here and when we come up for -- at the point of tidying up and wrapping up, the GAC will say, Well, those two people represented their governments, that they've not gotten consensus from the rest of them and drag the work back. So I would go for support for allowing them to join us. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

I'm next in the queue. I got in the queue just to suggest that, Lynn, I thought your summary of the points was excellent. And I'm wondering if as part of this decision-making process, I guess building on what Jean-Jacques said, if we could clearly communicate all of those things that you said including that -- the work takes place in the communities and that's where everyone is expected to participate, including the GAC and including in the cross-community working group; that we judge consensus based on the merits of the objections and not the volume of them; and that this is the end of the group formation and that there won't be any further amendments to the composition.

I think it would be important to actually make that statement as part of this decision and not just have the decision by itself.

Paul and then Daniel.

PAUL WILSON: And I wanted to just check one thing, which is whether there have been any other requests, formal or otherwise, for larger representation on this group.

I think it's important to say that we are making this request in response to a formal -- we are making this decision, if we do, in response to a formal request from the GAC. But it may be difficult if we've had umpteen other requests along the same lines which we're not considering.

Second thing I don't particularly see the need to rule out considering requests in the future, but that's something that we can discuss.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Keith is asking Theresa now if there are any other changes.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. So I asked the question of Theresa. And Theresa said there have been no other requests for increased seating or increased representation from any groups.

THERESA SWINEHART: Correct.

KEITH DRAZEK: No formal requests.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Daniel here.   I would recommend that we don't make the statement that we will never consider any requests in those absolute terms.   I would use language like "strongly" -- we consider that we are finished in the interest of practicality or whatever and we strongly discourage others to take this as an opportunity to reopen that debate rather than the absolute terms that you are using.

I think that the perception of that would just be too bad. We can make our point strongly without using the absolute terms.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Anybody else in queue? No? Then I think Heather.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ Mundy is in the chatroom and said that his question was serious. So yeah.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I assumed it was. Let's hear from Heather first.

HEATHER DRYDEN:	Okay. Thank you for letting me speak again on this topic. I do want to emphasize that what I'm hearing colleagues comment on, it's very constructive. And I hear a lot of thoughtfulness. In the discussion we're having about the numbers for the GAC to appoint to the coordination group. So I do appreciate that.

Just to explain a bit about the numbers I mentioned, the reason why the number one can work for the GAC is because we have a process of electing a chair. And the chair is really the one person that is able to speak on behalf of the GAC or put forward a GAC view, determine where there's consensus, and so forth. And that position is accountable to the full membership in the GAC, and that's how the accountabilities work around that particular position.

I mentioned four, and that's because we have a chair and three vice chairs that are all elected officers in the GAC. So that's how we get to four. However, there's quite a strong sense in the GAC that a total of four elected officers doesn't help us get the regional balance that we really ought to in the community represented. And so this really brings us to five.

And we have gone through the process. We have identified a total of five, which is the chair plus four nominees from the membership. And we have submitted those names. That is done. And that process is one that the GAC considers concluded on.

So now we have this question of whether, in fact, we can have five nominees and the subsequent discussion flowing from that.

It probably also bears repeating that the GAC has set out expectations. There is agreement on some points within the GAC about the four nominees plus the vice chair, plus the chair, and how they will work within what we're calling a contact group. And there is agreement the function is really to act as, liaisons and it allows them to draw on regional perspectives wherever possible. But at the moment, "region" is loosely defined. But, anyway, five is certainly a more optimal number for ensuring a degree of -- a satisfactory degree of regional balance.

So, there we are. We do have a bit more work to do regarding the precise modalities of the contact group. But the request from the GAC is very clear that we are seeking five nominees to participate in the coordination group.

And just one last point, that there is some work to do in understanding the nature of this process and really understanding that the work happens in the community. Governments, like anyone else, are seeking ways to influence this process. And there is an expectation among governments about being able to contribute and, as I say, influence things. And this is expected. This is precisely what we should expect governments to be doing. And as we meet today and tomorrow and things become more clear along with clear expectations being set out, then I hope this

will be to constructive participation by all and certainly from government colleagues.

So I hope that is helpful. And I hope this allows us to settle the matter and move on to discuss the many other issues about organizing the coordination group. Thank you.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: So let me see if I can close this down now. And, Russ, I did recognize that you were serious because I know you --

[Laughter]

-- and I think that question is still on the table.

I think Heather partly responded to that one specifically by saying the formal request from the GAC was for five. You know, she was trying to explain why two was a problem, as opposed to suggesting that one was an alternative.

But I can certainly look around the room at our colleagues and see if there's any support or appetite for opening up a discussion on the GAC going to one representative, as you put that sort of specifically on the table.

Okay. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Lynn. This is Jean-Jacques.

Well, it's true that in the United Nations, the secretary-general of the United Nations is one, and when he speaks it is for the whole of the United Nations, but that being said, as I'm not a native English speaker, perhaps I misunderstood, but I found the tone of Heather's reply not entirely encouraging when she said five is more satisfactory. I would have thought that after the large discussion we had today and the, quote-unquote, concessions from some of us, five would have appeared to her and to all the GAC as a wonderful solution. Thank you.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I will point out that Heather is on vacation and if I'm not mistaken, she's, you know, missing a significant parental birthday party to participate in this, so I think we need to recognize that as well.

So let me -- going back to the question of one, I just need nods of heads or something from around the room. Does this room want to seriously entertain a position of one GAC nominee?

So Russ, I'm seeing lots of heads shaking "no" quite vociferously, so that should be seen as quite positive to Heather and the GAC as well.

The next question I'm going to call is a question of support for moving to five and I think one of the things I'd like to do, Heather, is we should probably talk a minute or two about how we actually communicate this.

One of the things we could do would be to, from this room -- I'm not quite sure what the room is -- or from the to-be-nominated chair, we send a note which says, "Following on from the GAC's request" -- and we'll word it appropriately, you know -- "under these sort of assumptions or operating conditions" or something, you know, "we're happy to have five GAC representatives here." And we would -- again, this is sort of presupposing but I want to make sure we've got kind of the, I guess, conditions -- and I know that's a hard word, but some of the conditions that are behind some of this discussion, because a lot of them are very important to people in this room, particularly the fact that the work happens in communities and that there will be significant support from the GAC and government representatives in the work of the communities, and I'm not sure that was really addressed fully in your remarks, but I think if there was a strong response to that, then I would call the question and we can figure out how to communicate that, coming out of this room.

So Heather, I mean, are you comfortable with -- again, I'm just trying to think of a different word -- not conditions, but with some of the assumptions on participation that we're working here and communicating that back to the GAC?

HEATHER DRYDEN: Yes. Thank you, Lynn.

Well, I think what we're trying to do here is set expectations for the coordination group generally, for all participants and for the community, and certainly the GAC is a part of that, so -- so I think that's the right initiative and it would apply to the GAC as well as all other participants and members of the community. Thank you.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I think that was well said and certainly better said --

[Laughter]

-- than the words I was coming up with.

So we have a request for five GAC representatives on the table. Are there any objections to moving forward and supporting that?

And we're not voting so I'm not looking for heads. It really is kind of consensus and body language and heads and...

And any other comments from those CG members that are remote?

Then I think we can move forward and thank Heather again for her time and support here, and obviously for everybody's support for this discussion. I think it was really well done and certainly shows good positive intent on everybody's part. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. I just saw -- I thought Russ was typing in the chat window but it looks like he's gone.

Thank you, Lynn. I think we should go to a break, which is what we had planned next. We're close to back to being on time, which is exciting, so why don't we come back at 10 of 5:00. At 4:50. Thanks.

NANCY LUPIANO: Just wanted to let you know your Ice Cream is coming out, so your coffee and tea is ready on the side. Thank you.

The Ice Cream is out on the buffet for all of you that are interested.

[BREAK]

ALISSA COOPER: Let's start again.

Okay. I think we're going to start again. Pretty much everyone is back. Everybody's technology is ready to start?

This is a session about self-organization, which is being led by Joseph.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay. Thank you. And just from a visibility perspective, since I can't see anybody to my left, can I rely on you to be the handler of the queue? Thank you.

So in terms of self-organization, the agenda item listed a number of concepts in terms of how we might organize ourselves. Do we need a chair? Do we need kind of a subcommittee-type format?

And I thought what are all of the possible roles we might need, with no prejudices to the fact that many of these roles can be done by one person or they might be done by many or we might think there is a committee that can do them.

But in no order of preference, functions that need to be addressed in a self-organized group are agenda development; issue coordination -- and by that, I mean that when you have an agenda item, who takes coordination of that specific issue on the agenda -- meeting coordinator. A polite way of saying the cat herder among us for the purpose of the meeting.

There are Web feeds going on and people are interlocutors or at least watching those Web feeds, so who may be doing that role. At some point, we are likely to get external questions --

ALISSA COOPER: Hey, Joe, sorry. The transcript is apparently not active.

>> ---

Okay. Thanks.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: The transcript has been derailed by ice cream.

[Laughter]

Do you want me to wait or keep on going?

ALISSA COOPER: Is this going to be a long delay of our transcripters? Transcribers?

>> ---

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, there they are. Oh, got it. Okay. There we go. We filled the void.

>> ---

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay. I'll --

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, transcription service.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Now fortified by ice cream, we will start at the top of the list of possible roles that we may need.

One role would be the development of the agenda for the meeting. One role, coordinating the issues on the agenda, so who will be the presenter for a specific agenda item. Who is coordinating the meeting, which is making the trains run on time and doing the herding of the cats that's necessary.

When we are talking about looking at the Web feed that's coming on and the interactive nature of that, is there a person or persons tasked to help keep an eye on that as it's going forward?

At some juncture, we are likely to be getting questions externally and perhaps from the press, so is there someone who will have that kind of interlocutor function.

We are looking at a more formalized secretariat. How do we liaise with that secretariat or is that a group function?

There will be an accountability working group. Obviously, until they are fully functional, deciding how to liaise with them is difficult, but there needs to be a liaison function of some kind with them.

And then finally, as we near the end of the process or as we get to inflection points in our process, we have this concept of consensus, and at some point we will have to determine when consensus is reached, because otherwise, we will do that thing where you go half the distance to your endpoint and that half the distance never ends because you can go to an asymtotic infinitesimal space. So we will need, at some point, to find a way of finalizing what is consensus and do we want to put that in the concept of a chair or a steering group or something of that nature.

So those are essentially the elements, and I'm happy if someone has thought of another element that I have missed along the way. And as I said, I don't believe there is any magic as to whether a person can play more than one role or these are functions of a role, but I think all of these things have to be captured if we are to function efficiently, and with that, I think it's appropriate to open it up to the discussion.

The mistress of the queue is the first in the queue, I believe.

ALISSA COOPER: So I think Russ Mundy is actually first --

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: -- if he still has his hand up or -- I don't know if that was from before.

RUSS MUNDY: It was an old hand. Sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Put your hand down, Russ.

Well, I was just going to add one other role, which you may have said and I may have missed, but fielding external communications requests. Did you say that?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. Okay.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I call that press liaison/external relations.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, okay. Sorry. Just missed it.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: We were -- just so that people aren't confused, apart from thinking of these concepts as roles, we are also looking to associate human beings with these roles to fulfill them --

[Laughter]

-- so -- and I'm not sure what the voluntold process is for filling these roles, but we would hopefully have the volunteer process to fill them, once we figure out which roles we need.

If you comment on the roles, I'm not suggesting it's volunteering yet.

[Laughter]

The first round of comments is free. After that, you might be considered a volunteer.

[Laughter]

Go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK: So this is Keith Drazek.

Without speaking specifically to the list of roles but the bigger question of how we structure ourselves, I think that it might make sense to have sub-teams or working groups based on the three -- the three tracks, the three categories of naming, numbering, and protocol parameters, so that each of these groups has a sub-team

that can accomplish work and, you know, do the outreach to our respective groups, and then be able to report back to the bigger group for interaction and, you know, sort of coordination.

I raise this or suggest this at the risk of it appearing divisive or segmenting us into, you know, groups unnecessarily, but I do think it will be more efficient, if we have folks who are interested in one particular area versus another, have the ability to have off-line conversations or working sessions together, but that these various groups would be open to anybody, not restricted, necessarily. Just a thought.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: And can I -- can I ask you how -- so we've talked about the constituencies related to those three groups kind of self-organizing themselves and do you see this as a layer on top of that or merely a more accessible way to get into that self-organization?

KEITH DRAZEK: Certainly not a layer.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay.

KEITH DRAZEK: I think more of a targeted outreach mechanism or a targeted opportunity to engage with the communities that we're here representing.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari and then Martin.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. Just a couple of comments. One is that in some of the roles you talked about, I think we can see a distinction between sort of the coordination group person's part of that and then some function that the secretariat or ICANN or staff or someone is performing.

For instance, if we have to talk to external media, then we need someone from here to actually do the talking, but there will be other people to help you with the practicalities of that.

The other thing is that I don't think we should make this too complicated. I think we're seeing a charter and goal for the group that is kind of like a thin-layer approach, in my mind, at least, and we should not overcomplicate our own process because of that. Let's build on -- let's build structure where we actually need structure. And I'm sympathetic to the idea of creating subgroups, although I would probably delay that until we actually need one.

So for the particular case of people doing outreach to, let's say the IETF community or to some of the other communities, isn't it kind of obvious already that like the IETF and IAB persons somehow need to be involved with that and if anyone else wants to join, that's great, but -- I don't know if we need structure for that. That seems a little premature. But there might be something where we actually have to create a subgroup and then we should just create that.

I hope the whole list in this setup is not going to be hugely time-consuming because we also need to go do the other work in the communities.

Yeah. That's it.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Was it Martin? Who's next in our queue?

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay. Thanks. Martin Boyle.

Yeah, I'd certainly echo a little bit of concern about having quite so many roles in place, whereas, you know, I think perhaps for some of these, it will be more a matter of something is happening and somebody steps up to take on a role, perhaps in an ad hoc way.

But then having said that, I actually have got a question about, as you were going through the list, Joe, that you talked about the accountability working group liaison.

I wondered whether -- you know, for example, we've heard about the cross-community working group being established. That's a fairly meaty chunk. Do we need to have a specific liaison there? In other words, somebody who perhaps we're suggesting would be sitting in the room metaphorically or literally during the discussions of that -- of that cross-community working group, where I do see there being a significant and major role? Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques.

I'd like to put a question about the -- I think what Joseph called public communication.

Is it something that you see as an ongoing task or is it, rather, preparing the general public, our communities, but also the outside world, to receiving significant steps whenever we reach those steps?

Because I think that if it's to be something like a press attache giving all the details all the time, that's one type of task which

requires less, perhaps, high-level reflection and coordination with all the members of this group.

If, on the other hand, it is something which requires a perhaps more thoughtful approach in formulation, in making some ideas or suggestions usable by the wide world community -- in other words, not language- or culture-specific -- then that's something we could do maybe once every two months or something, depending on the circumstances. And certainly, for instance, in the middle or towards the end of any face-to-face meeting this group would have, including in the press. So that it would be yet another way of engaging our worldwide community in words and with -- with a tone which would try to show how deeply, actually, we are considering the preoccupations of all these communities.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I completely agree, and for instance, one of the things that we've already discussed for the purpose of this meeting is the concept that we would keep track of things that might be appropriate for a press statement at the end of this meeting.

But I think we will also -- and I don't really see this as a full-time press attache, although perhaps when we discuss the role of ICANN as a secretariat, there may be a role of providing some, you know, text related to what we're doing in a kind of canned capacity so that people -- that becomes a way for people to be aware of things but they're not substantive pronouncements.

But I also think we're going to start at some point, especially as we start to get into the substance of the matter, seeing requests for someone to be interviewed, and I think it's useful if we have thought about if there are people who want to undertake that role on our behalf and then understand what the ground rules are of when you are a representative of the group versus a representative of yourself or your constituency. So I just think that that's something we should probably think about and talk about. That role doesn't have to be established today because in all honesty, there isn't a pending request for the function. But it is a function I think we will need to think of in due time.

As to a number of the other functions, for instance, an agenda was developed for this meeting in a collaborative fashion across a discussion list, and I don't necessarily know that we need to have a different way of doing that. But it turns out that that's a -- something that we need to think about. If we're all comfortable doing it the way we've done it, that's great. But it's just a question of all of these things are elements of a meeting or all of these things are elements of our process, and at some point we just need to come to closure as to how those happen, because, you know, backing into them because someone was nice enough to take the time to do them at some point is not the best way to do self-organization. That's, you know, emergency organization.

ALISSA COOPER: Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. I thought there might be more people in the queue. I was still getting my thoughts together.

[Laughter]

But maybe a couple of comments.

We talked a little bit about press, but I think there's a larger outreach responsibility that this room has, and I think obviously within each community and all the circles we all individually move in, we will all represent or interface in those communities appropriately, but one question, I think, for the room is, is there a task for this room to consider the kind of completeness of what we're doing in terms of communications and outreach and messages and -- as opposed to either putting it to a secretariat -- and I think we still need to talk about what the role of the secretariat is -- or just assuming that all the right things are being done individually by the community.

You know, we have an NTIA stewardship or IANA stewardship Web site up now, and I think having a sole repository, wherever that might sit and whoever oversees it, is good, but then that implies that somebody is actually spending some cycles to ensure that the right information is up, that if we're going to put something up, that it represents something which the CG is

coalescing on, that we've actually driven an appropriate coalescence process, and that's more than just press release or PR or press contacts.

ALISSA COOPER: I think what I have to say is kind of consistent with that. I think we can kind of categorize the tasks that you described, Joe, and maybe start to boil them down a little bit. So I think there is a set of tasks related to keeping the train moving, the agendas and the issue coordination and the meeting coordination. I think there's a set of tasks related to communications, both in terms of interfacing with the secretariat, making sure what needs to get posted publicly gets posted, and also interfacing with the press.

And then I think the -- the sort of liaisons to other groups potentially are each separate. And I would probably actually put the consensus calling in with the agenda and train moving kind of thing.

So to me the agenda issue, meeting coordination, consensus-calling role is sort of the typical role -- maybe only in the IETF. But in the IETF, that's typically like a chair role. So we have co-chairs of the working groups. That's what they do. They make the agendas, and they call consensus.

And then I can see the communications role as being separate and the liaison role as being separate.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So what Alissa said makes a heck of a lot sense from someone who has done the IETF. So I wonder if there are people with a different view with a different work process that would like to speak up and share their different view.

But I think that running the meeting also includes another piece which is looking at the action items from the last one before you get to the point where you are about to report out, maybe halfway between that and say, Hey, where are we? Are you going to have it done on time? Just management 101 stuff. But it needs to be done.

And usually I have found, at least in the IETF, if you delegate that to somebody to nudge people, they're ignored. If someone with the title of chair nudges them, it makes a bigger difference.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: So we have a proposal on the table. Sorry, are you in queue?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Fully in line how you structured the issues and what is it about. What I would like to underline as we are also working in the GNSO and the council in these kind of structures, the chairs, the vice chairs, they have to be a strong team. Really they are setting the agenda and they are the ones

doing this organization work. So I don't see any other ways to --
like we did here in this meeting, it is just one time after you --
going on and we are supposed to work for one and a half to two
years or more, we have to come to a routine with regards to the
organizational things. And that's going on just with these kind of
organization.

Fully support.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: So I think there's no question on the idea that the agenda
development, issue coordination, meeting coordination, all of the
train run on-time things are the logical purview of a chair with
whatever support is necessary for the chair to accomplish that
because we shouldn't just dump all of this on one person. So it is
the chair plus whatever appropriate support is for those
elements.

The one place where I'm a little concerned it goes down to one
person is when we say we have called it that consensus has
occurred. That, I think, deserves a little discussion because I think
that's little different than the other elements.

Making the trains run on time and deciding the train's journey is
over are two things of a different nature. That doesn't mean that
a chair or vice chair group or small group can't be responsible for

doing that. But I also think we don't have a process defined to say when that is done.

So that was an issue that I think, yes, we have all been in groups where we figure out how the group calls this. But there are also groups that have a greater unity of interest across themselves in some cases when they call this.

This is a case where we have a lot of disparate interests sitting in a room and we have to make the same call across all of those disparate interests. So I'm not sure the same level of fluidity when it comes to calling consensus can happen in this group. I think we have to have a way of finalizing that concept because otherwise we will go into a never-ending suggestion of everyone will want to say something else and add something else and we won't know -- we need a process related to finality but I don't know that it's someone that calls when the process is final. So I would like to open that part up for discussion and also at some point go back to the liaison questions.

ALISSA COOPER: I will put you in the queue. I'm in the queue.

This maybe doesn't get all the way to where you wanted to go, but I think that actually that whole set of tasks including the consensus calling would benefit from co-chairs. So I don't think any of those -- I don't think we should really -- something as

important as keeping the trains running on time, it is good to have a backup and work in teams. So I would say that you could have multiple people in that role. And that also, I think, helps with the consensus-calling issue because you are not just relying on one person.

I think we -- I think it would be reasonable to have co-chairs be the consensus callers. You know, sometimes you want to have people who are completely neutral and have never expressed an opinion about that topic themselves. That is a little tough because I think we all have opinions here, so then you would be looking to some sort of external something or another which doesn't really appeal to me either.

So I think, you know, having co-chairs be the consensus callers is a reasonable compromise.

Jean-Jacques is next and then Russ.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. That's exactly the question I wanted to bring up, Alissa. Do you see ourselves, yourselves as benefiting from the structure which would be more subtle such as a sort of Executive Committee, whatever you call it, or is it really designating people such as chairs and vice chairs? That's a question.

Now, there's a remark I'd like to make which is that often in groups I've worked in with international whatever, is that there's often a need to have a sort of person with a very strong legal sense of what the rules are and replying to Joseph's concern about when we reach consensus or when especially we think we reach consensus but we're not there, we need one person to say, "No, hold on. Considering the rules and the expectations of the community," et cetera, et cetera, "this is what should be done."

Ideally, of course, it could come to the chair or one of the vice chairs to do that. But in the heat of action, sometimes the chair and even vice chairs don't really have time to give sufficient consideration to that.

So my suggestion is that coming back to Joseph's point, I would very much like to have someone either chair or vice chair or Executive Committee to actually have that role singly or in addition to other roles.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you. Russ Mundy here. One of the suggestions -- oh, I'm sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: It is okay. Go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: [Laughter].

Russ conflict, sorry.

One of the things that I think we've seen in various groups where it's likely to be serious contention is to have an odd number of people engaged in joint chairmanship or a chair and two vice chairs. So I guess I'm suggesting that having three people involved, especially when it comes to the hard job of deciding if consensus has been reached or if it hasn't, what has to be done to get there. Because if it is two, then it sometimes two people just can't decide amongst themselves. Where with three, even though you have got three people involved, you can at least have a majority conclusion of some sort there between the three of them.

ALISSA COOPER: So I have Russ Housley, Daniel, and then Narelle. And Paul or Adiel? Adiel, okay.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So earlier today we made the decision to change the number two to number five for a headcount, and getting to consensus was

pretty easy. The decision was pretty much decided: Does anyone object to X? No one did, so we went and did it.

I think we're going to get to a very similar question: Does anyone object to something this current version, forward to NTIA? And that's really the most important consensus call we're going to have. So I don't think we do need a really complicated, you know, voting procedure.

We will get to a place where we have to say if some people are objecting, you know, are they in the rough in the rough consensus or in the "we're going to do it anyway"? That's the hard part. And we will talk about that at length, so we all understand why we are doing it or why we're not.

So I think co-chairs sounds like a good way forward to me.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. This is Daniel. There are a couple of roles that chairs traditionally have. And one of them is sort of to represent the group to outside entities, persons, press, and so on. I think we are not discussing that, just to narrow it down. We are really looking for a chair role that actually, as people put it, keep the trains running on time, organize the meetings, and preside at the meetings.

And I think we should -- and presiding at the meeting means facilitating the group to have an orderly discussion and, if

possible, to come to conclusions. And I think we're doing ourselves a disservice if we overload such a role with making decisions about content, like calling consensus, stuff like that.

Specifically, speaking to what Jean-Jacques said, having someone who understands the rules and knows to apply -- how to apply them and to convince people that these are the rules and they have to obey by them only works if there are rules. And we don't have them, and we kind of consciously are avoiding this. So I think the only role I would -- role, not rule, role for chair I would accept is basically keeping the trains running on time and helping us have an orderly discussion.

And overloading it with anything more would do ourselves a disservice but most importantly the chairs a disservice because they have no frame of reference other than their moral compass which might not be enough.

So personally I would be quite happy to actually have an ad hoc chair selection. Say, okay, you keep the trains running on time and chair us for the next one or two meetings and not institutionalize this too much.

And while I have the floor, I'd like to also comment on the liaison issue. I think to the groups that actually selected us to be here, they're natural liaisons. That's us. If there are other groups that we feel we need to liaise with, and the inter-constituency -- what is it -- cross-constituency thing, let's discuss that when they

constituent themselves and we know who we are talking them. Once we know who we are talking to and we know what their charter is, we can develop a liaison relationship if we think that's important. And let's table that until then. And if there is other groups, let's proceed likewise.

As to the press, I think we should all take that role. There shouldn't be sort of designated people who are spokespersons. We are not a structure that lends itself to having spokespersons. I think we should all communicate outwards to all the outreach including press, and we should base it on agreed statements that we made and our own perception of what's happened in this room.

And what we should augment this with is, of course, each -- observing how each other -- how the other people are doing it and calling them on maybe biases or deficiencies but also to have some staff support from the secretariat that actually reports regularly on the reflection of what we're doing specifically in the press so that we have something that we can refer to and identify shortcomings or biases. And if we identify them, deal with them rather than building a large superstructure. Sorry for taking so long.

ALISSA COOPER: Narelle.

NARELLE CLARK: - I think -- I wanted to say -- just very effectively by -- unfortunately, I have a terrible -- it seems to me some 12 -- articulated here -- and we're in great --

ALISSA COOPER: We've having a lot of trouble hearing you, Narelle.

Maybe you can type -- you could type what you were going to say or maybe we can continue down the queue and come back to you if you -- because your audio was great before so I'm not sure what the issue is. Maybe you can look into that a little bit and we'll come back to you.

Adiel was next.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes, thank you. I wanted to comment first on the consensus-building part and then come back to the presentation and speaker aspect as well.

On the consensus-building part, I believe that if we have a group of chairs, co-chair or chair and vice chair, I think identifying the consensus or non-consensus, that responsibility must fall on them. So that will be part of one of the criteria of selecting people who can understand and work through consensus properly

for the group to work. I think we are not a so big group to have issue there.

So my support is to have that role to be given to the chair and co-chairs and the suggestion to have three people in that group is something that I will also support.

However, I am a bit worried about leaving the formal representation of the group, speaking representation especially to the press, to everyone.

I'm separating us talking for our constituency or expressing the view of our special constituency. Where are constituencies are coming from to the press is one thing. But talking to this coordination group to the press is something different as well.

And our role is a very, I would say, tricky role. And everything we will be saying will be scrutinized by the press in all the detail.

So if we go the way that each of us can play that role, which is good because it gives a very wide scope, we need to have a very precise talking point and things defined ahead of time so people know exactly what to say. Because when you deal with the press, you know that they can take to the very wrong side very quickly.

So I guess we have to be very careful on that and maybe give that responsibility primarily to the chair who has a big picture of the thing, and his co-chair, and have kind of a talking point or

framework that all of us can use whenever it happens that we have to talk for the group. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. Just a couple of quick responses to what people have raised here. So, yeah, on the spokesperson, I think I agree with Adiel for various reasons, including the fact that when there's someone who contacts the coordination group, who do we send that request to. And that's going to happen, likely.

The other thing is that the liaison, I agree with Daniel that that's -- we already know who the liaisons at the particular communities, and when it's somewhere else, I think -- you know, first of all, if we want to send a particular message, then we do it by -- in writing and maybe some set of people will join the meeting. I don't think that needs a particular designated person in addition.

And the other thing is that I kind of like how we organized this -- this time that there's someone who's running the meeting, but then the session leader -- or the sessions are led by particular volunteers, and I think -- I would hate to lose that aspect of the process.

But I do think that we do need some structure, some co-chairs, or whatever you want to call them, for running the meetings, and I don't think we're big enough for steering committees or some such, because a steering committee would be, what, 40% of this set of people and that would be kind of silly.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Let me do a stock-take at the moment because I think we've closed on a couple of issues and have a couple of issues open, so it's useful if we can perhaps close on --

ALISSA COOPER: Can I just relay Narelle's comments --

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Oh, sure. No problem.

ALISSA COOPER: -- she was unable -- she's been typing into the chatroom.

So she said: "Simply put, I agree strongly with Daniel. This meeting has come together beautifully yet we have just had over 12 discrete roles articulated. This puts us in danger of overcomplicating things. This meeting has been effective without having formal chairs."

Can I respond to that for one second?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Sure.

                          [Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: So I was appointed by the IETF a long time ago. Actually before the ICANN meeting. Which means that I have seen this coming for several weeks and knew that we would need some organization of the agenda and that some of the people would probably not be appointed until late.

                          So that's part of the reason why I put the agenda together and worked with the IETF and IAB folks to do that. But I think not having a designated person for that would be a mistake, for sure, because I don't think you can -- you can just rely on someone to do it every time of their own volition, and we're all really busy people, so that has just been brought up a couple times.

                          And I think it's actually a little bit the same story with the incoming press requests.

                          Outgoing, I think, you know, we might be able to handle, but I've seen being in a group before where you get a press request that comes in and it's on a deadline and in theory this is something that we would want to be responding to but nobody responds because there's no point person.

So at the very least, I think it would be good for us to have a backstop that says, "This is the person who responds to press if, you know, we put it out to the group and no one else is available," or something like that, because otherwise, I think those things will get dropped on the floor.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay. Let me just do a status update and then let the final round of comments go through.

So everybody believes we shouldn't have over complexity. I don't think there's anyone who said, "No, no, please make it more complex." So over complexity is a collectively defined not good thing.

There was a suggestion which no one rebuffed that we should consider what a strategic approach to external relations would be, which would include the Web site and things of that nature. We haven't defined if there's anyone responsible for it, but that this is a necessary and good thing has been identified.

The number three is our magic number. Not one, two, four, or five. The number three has been anointed as our magic number of representatives. We don't know because we've called them vice chairs sometimes, we've called them co-chairs other times. So I call it the three-person chair group. People can figure out what their title is. I don't really care.

There is the concept that we should liaise on an as-needed basis. Potential points of liaison or communication are obviously with our own secretariat, to the extent that it's formed, and then also the accountability group could be one, when it's formed, but these -- we'll wait to develop that liaising function as needed in its process.

The place where we probably still have a little bit of discussion is in calling consensus. There was an agreement which, if I put my non-moderator hat on, I found attractive, which is consensus will organically evolve, and in the process of our discussion we will begin to understand when consensus is ready, and it will be along the lines of the question will be raised, "Are we all happy to transfer this to the NTIA," and that will be the triggering point for that process and it will be a more organic process and the sense of the room will begin to emerge.

I think if at that point we run into a problem, we then need to discuss what that problem is, but perhaps that organic system is the way to go, although there has been a continued call for that being a chair function to call consensus.

So we should come to closure on which of those two processes is something we think is appropriate.

The last part, which has a -- a bifurcation of opinion, is, do we designate a spokesperson or is everyone a spokesperson, and if everyone's a spokesperson do we have to then tightly define what

is the comment you are going to make, which becomes more difficult when you have someone who's asking you interview questions which may not fit nicely into your answers that you've been given to use, since most of the time you won't get the questions in advance.

So the two real issues that we have that we haven't come to closure on I think are the organic development of consensus versus the chair calls consensus, and do we think a spokesperson is necessary or do we allow that more organic "everybody is a spokesperson," but then we do have to answer Alissa's question of what happens when the press calls you up and asks for a specific person.

And Paul, you are the beginning of Part 2, I think.

PAUL WILSON: Just very briefly, I think it makes sense to have three equal co-chairs. Those chairs, I think collectively, are responsible for judging consensus, which hopefully will be obvious in every case, and hopefully a lack of consensus is obvious in every case, but where a judgment is needed, I think the chairs are the -- represent the appropriate place for that to happen.

I think there are a lot of tasks that fall on the secretariat and I think we're going to talk about that later.

For media, I feel fairly strongly that each of us are here in our individual capacity and should be speaking in our individual capacities as members of this committee, and that the -- that the committee does not need and shouldn't really have a spokesman. Spokesperson, I mean.

I just think that's the -- both the most responsive way, the most flexible way, and the -- and probably the most workable way to go into media relations.

I mean, as a coordinating committee, I mean, we have got things to report which are minuted which are fairly uncontroversial, I think, and public. I don't see that we, as a committee, have got positions that need to be carefully messaged at all. There might be some conventions about confidentiality of discussions that have happened elsewhere, for instance, but that's sort of more about just conventions than messages, as such.

And I'd just prefer to keep it simple, simply understood, along those lines. Thanks.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Can I make a hybrid, then, on the last point, because it seems like we might have the bridge concept that in some ways everyone can be a spokesperson, but if there's a call that comes into a secretariat function saying, "We'd like to interview someone," then we send that do one of the chairs?

Because then at least -- at some point or another, the secretariat needs to know who to direct a question to, and unless there's a specific regional characteristic of someone saying, "Well, I'd like to make sure if any of your representatives can speak to an African viewpoint," then okay, then we would try to find a person who can speak to an African viewpoint. But if it's a generic question about "We'd like to know what your group is doing," then one of the chairs would seem to be a logical, but that doesn't preclude other people from gaining individual contacts.

And I think we've got Adiel and then -- I'm not if you have anybody on line. Okay. So 1 and 2.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. Thank you. That brings to my mind that question which I briefly discussed with a few people, is the identity of the group itself. And that will help us in how we frame the spokesperson or the -- our ability to speak for the group.

My view is that as a group, we are here to make sure to work beyond our different representations, which means we collectively have the responsibility to come up with a proposal for the transition -- for the IANA transition to the NTIA.

So that is a collective responsibility that we have in this group, and that collective responsibility, in my view, goes beyond the constituency or community that appoints us. Although we are

here to -- appointed by those communities, our responsibility, collective responsibility, is to coordinate a solution or mechanism that will replace NTIA.

The worry when I was talking is about how our personal position, the position of our group, can have interference with what this group can be doing.

Because the position that our constituency, like for a RIR, we can have may not be the same that this group will have after the different consultation period.

So we may find ourselves in the position where we're talking about our position less RIR, which is not obviously the direction where this group is going.

Exposing that to the press can be interpreted as, yes, this group is working but there is divergence within the group, which is not the image we want to give, and that happens several times on even small issues.

So maybe, you know, identifying or making sure that we all have the same understanding that as a group we represent the success of the process of the IANA oversight transition, so as such we talk for the good of the Internet when we are talking about the group, and we have different hats. That is what our community thinks about the -- about the issues. Because until we reach the end, we may have diverse views on that.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I'm not -- so if we consider the fact that we're going to hold our meetings in transparent fashion and there's going to be Web streaming of the discussions, I'm not sure that the fact that there's a difference of opinion will be a very well-kept secret.

I think it -- it actually may enhance our ability to get more communication with the communities that are having an issue.

Now, I don't think we should go out of our way to make sure that divergences are promoted in the press, but I also am not sure that there's a problem if they are.

I think the problem would be if a person speaking in the individual capacity of their constituency attempted to represent that as that the agreed position of the group, then I think we have a big problem. But if a person is saying, "We are looking to work constructively with all the others but we have these couple of outstanding issues," I think that's an organic part of the process and I think we're all big enough to deal with that and I don't see that as being a problem.

It -- you correctly point out it needs to be done in a constructive, not a destructive fashion, in the way that you phrase it, but I don't think pointing out that disagreements exist is, in some way, detrimental to the process.

But I'm not -- now, Paul, are you still on queue or that's -- so we've got Jean-Jacques and then I'm not -- oh, and then -- okay.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Sorry.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Joseph. This is Jean-Jacques.

I'd like to come back to this discussion mainly between, I think, Daniel and Adiel, two different positions.

Through my own experience over a number of years, and dealing with all sorts of cases and subjects and media, I would say that there is a risk that in addition to the attraction, Joseph, of being able to show how different we are, and sometimes our different opinions, I understand the attraction of that. But still, if there is to be any communication with the outside which is not community-driven or destined essentially to the community, then it's another question.

I agree with Daniel that we will all be naturally the interlocutors of whoever in our community is interested in knowing more about this.

On the other hand -- and someone made the point earlier -- if there is a request from the outside world, as it were, or from the global -- or from --- from -- and formulation but there's no sense

in just going all out and saying exactly where we are, giving all the details of a certain discussion --- communication, so I notice I -- I sound like a -- an old civil servant who hasn't gotten over yet --- but really I think that there should be a difference between speaking to one's own community --- process we are engaged in, on the one hand, and on the other hand speaking for the wider world or to the wider world. So I would say that considering the way this discussion is evolving just now with three co-chairs, I would suggest that one of the three co-persons -- co-chairs, sorry, be more specifically entrusted with the task of dealing with communication.

That doesn't mean that she or he would do all the relating with the Twitters and doing all that stuff, because there is a wider community and a wider group of people capable of doing that, but at least a person who would have an overview of the internal communication and the external communication, and if and when there is a request coming from outside, that would be the normal person to whom the question would be addressed.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel. Can I operationalize my -- my earlier comment and make a concrete proposal on how to proceed?

I think the best way of dealing with requests for communication and press from the outside world would be to entrust the secretariat with just relaying -- pointing the -- the press to our

public statements. You know, our Web site and all that stuff that we agreed on. And tell them that if you -- if they'd like to speak to someone, to select one from our -- from the list. Basically, "Here's the list of" -- what is it now, 30 people? "Take your pick.

Talk to one, talk to two, talk to three."

I think we should have -- and I agree with the gist of what Jean-Jacques has said, but I think we're all grownups and we know how to deal with this.

I see a much bigger danger in -- in bad press if we have a spokesperson and they misspeak, because then everybody is going to be -- who doesn't agree with them is going to feel obliged to contradict them, and that's exactly where the press latches on.

So it's much better to tell the press, "Here's 30 people. You know, this is not a representative structure, it's a consensus-building structure, so if you want to know more, here's our formal statements. You know, these are our records. It's all very transparent. And if you want it analyzed or explained, here's a list of 30 people. Pick one or two or three or four to help you with that." I think that's much better and much less risky.

ALISSA COOPER: I have James and then Kuo.

So the bus for dinner is leaving at 6:30 and we have a couple of wrap-up items to discuss before tomorrow, so I think we should try to wrap this session at 6:00, which is in five minutes, take 5 or 10 minutes to wrap up, if that sounds okay to people. Okay.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks. James speaking, for the transcript, and I agree with the last speaker and I'll be -- I'll be blunt and brief.

I think that we are making this very complicated now and I believe that it would be much simpler if we simply say that all individuals participating in the coordination group are speaking in individual capacities or on behalf of their respective communities and that there is not a single unitary voice from the -- from this group unless, you know, it is indicated as such, either through some written communication or through some official channel, and leave it at that.

Because I don't know that we can correctly anticipate all the different scenarios or downstream implications of trying to centralize a single channel for -- for those types of media relations.

So I just think that we should ask everyone to be on their best behavior and to clarify that they are speaking as individuals and -- and that there is not a single authoritative voice for this group. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. Kuo.

KUO-WEI WU: Let me just add a little bit to follow Daniel's saying. I think I agree upon that. First of all, I would suggest it is a basic -- we have a secretary that can summarize, for example, this two days' meeting and come up with a very short statement, what is accomplished -- achievement or accomplishment during these two days and then draft a very simple statement and come to this coordinating group and then we can go through this statement and if you want to change any wording or whatever.

Once that statement is agreed upon the group members, then we can have secretary to publish to the public. In that sense, the statement would represent the different groups instead of different voices coming to the outside. And this is much easier to communicate and also is a better way to communicate to the outside world.

And, of course, if the people want to get more detail about a statement, then we can talk about, for example, maybe the chair or one of the vice chairs can handle -- to answer the question. And I think the group, we have to have a trust to the chair or the vice chair who would be choosed by us and to explain further

explanation about a statement. We publish it on the Web site to the outside world.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Let me try to do a very quick wrap-up. I'm not going to review the things that were in the previous wrap-up which seemed to have consensus. The last two items which didn't have complete consensus seemed to be moving in a direction that's not unanimous but in a direction of perhaps people act as individual spokespeople. That actually got a lot of body language approval in the room without getting any kind of vocal hands up or anything.

There is still a potential request that there still be some kind of role for one of the chairs to have a function related to the press, if needed. But perhaps that can be something that we organically determine over time based on the type of requests that come in. And then finally there's still a little bit of lack of certainty related to whether the consensus organically evolves or is called. Perhaps a hybrid solution of those two concepts is we believe that a consensus will organically evolve. If it doesn't, we will would ask the chairs to lead us through the final consensus process, in which case we hope the organic evolution is the solution. But if not, we have a fallback to using the chairs to get us there.

The last thing was there had been a suggestion of three equal co-chairs as opposed to a chair and two vice chairs. And I think that

makes people who can't make any one meeting less irreplaceable than another. So I think that covers us for now.

What we have not accomplished is obtaining any name for any of these positions, but we're going to revisit this topic tomorrow so none of you are off the hook yet.

[Laughter]

The one thing I would like to ask people to think about is since we will be joined by a few more people that are not part of the process, do we want to take names but delay perhaps a finalization of that concept until perhaps everyone has an opportunity to throw their hat in the ring if they're so interested? But we can figure that out tomorrow.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I think that makes sense. And maybe those that are potentials for some of the roles can even declare so on the list tonight. We can put a note out saying this is where we are in the process so they have got a heads-up rather than walking in midmorning tomorrow and try and at least kick it off on the list that way.

ALISSA COOPER: That sounds like a good idea to me, if you don't mind. Would you mind sending a note to the list to that effect?

Okay. I think we are done with that topic.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I will do that after dinner.

ALISSA COOPER: Whenever, yeah.

So we have come to the end of day one. We had 30-minute parking lot here that we have blown right through. But I think we made a lot of really good progress today so I'm not too concerned.

I was talking to Sam and she had requested that we just quickly review the list of action items that came out of today which I think is probably useful for all of us.

So we had basically four discussions today. The first one was about the charter. I think we had broad agreement about the outlines of the charter, but there is a subgroup that is going to bang away on the charter. And we will revisit that in the morning.

We talked about expectations towards the communities and scope. I think we got pretty close on that scope language and a little bit down the path for expectations towards communities. And we have people who are tasked to work on that tonight as well. And we will come back to that one tomorrow, too.

Then we have the conversation about participation in the coordination group and the GAC request. And I think Lynn has the

token there to write up the statement of assumptions about that decision and get it out to the list so everyone can see it.

And then the last item that we just discussed was about self-organization. And, Joe, you have the token to send a mail to the list about the conclusions from that one.

So I think we are kind of at a good stopping point.

Tomorrow we have 2 1/2 hours of parking lot, so I think we can usefully use that. We'll come back to the charter and then we will come back to the expectations bit. And then we may or may not need to come back to the letter, probably not I hope. And then we can come back a little bit on this -- self-organization actually has its own spot to come back to. So I think we are in pretty good shape as far as the agenda.

The other items on the agenda for tomorrow are internal/external communications needs. So actually talking about how are we going to communicate and mailing lists and Web sites and all of that, the secretariat tasks and selection, and obviously those two things are related. And then the two kind of timeline and scheduling sessions, one about the overall timeline and one about the -- our personal meeting and conference schedule. So those are the new topics tomorrow, and then we'll add in all the parking lots from today.

I think we can get it done. But if anyone thinks we need to rearrange, just say it now or let me know and we can work on the agenda.

I think that's all that I had as far as wrapup.

Oh, so we were going to take a photo, right? A group photo tonight. Although, I guess I was wondering, Theresa, are there people coming -- there is more people coming tomorrow. Should we wait until tomorrow? We don't have him tomorrow. Okay. We'll do it then. Let's do it right now. And then the bus is meeting us where?

NANCY LUPIANO: The bus will meet you by the side entrance near the tower elevator tonight at 6:30. You are going to eat at Galvin's Restaurant on the Park Lane. It is an extremely gorgeous view of all of London. So I think you will enjoy it.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, voice from the heavens. All right. Mr. Photographer, where would you like us?

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]