
ALISSA COOPER: Okay. This is Alissa. I think we should get going. Thank you everyone for joining today. As we did last time, Alice will be compiling the list of attendees. She has started already, in the note panel of the Adobe Connect meeting room for those who are in the meeting room. And we'll confirm it on the mailing list afterwards of those who were in attendance and those who are not.

But if there are people who are not in the Adobe Connect meeting room, but who are on the audio bridge, if you could say your names right now please.

THERESA: Theresa.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Theresa.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [?]

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you [?]. Is there anyone else who is not in the Adobe Connect meeting room but who is on the audio bridge? Okay, great. Thank you all for joining the meeting room. I think unfortunately that means that Paul Wilson was not able to join from the airplane, which he was hoping

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

to do, but that's okay because he sent us an updated document ahead of time.

So the agenda for today is to try to finalize the community's request for proposals. You should all have it on the screen in front of you. I think the Adobe Room is working now such that anybody can scroll up and down in the document independently. We don't all have to be looking at the same view all the time. So we'll start with that and see how that works.

I think the other that we might try today is to not run the speaker queue, we might just have free-form discussion and see how that goes. And if people feel that is not working, or there are not having any chance to speak, please type into the chat room, but it seems like this one, we might be able to get away without managing the speaker queue and just having a conversation.

So if you have something to say, feel free to speak up. And if you collide with someone else, I'm sure we'll manage it in the normal matter of human beings. That is all that I had. I think you have the document in front of us of, Paul sent, the most up to date version. I think we have a couple of issues from the mailing list. In other words, one that I wanted to highlight related to a comment that Elise made about the IANA service relationships, but we should start with comments from folks on the call, any items that they want to talk about today.

So, the floor is open. Please say your name before you speak. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I see Jean-Jacques has raised his hand.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, Jean-Jacques, go ahead. You can speak freely, you don't need to raise your hand.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Right. Thanks Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. To point out something which poses a problem for the At Large representatives, and that is, throughout the text there is two strong distinctions between the operational communities or entities and the rest on the other. In fact, there is even a contradiction between the title of the paper which is called, "IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group: Request for Proposals." And in the title is the word proposals.

And then right in the first sentence of the introduction, it says, "operational community," and under small 1a, and then under small 1b, soliciting the input. So on the one hand, the proposals, and two of the input. And that contradiction is reproduced further down in the text. So my point is this, what was the whole purpose of bringing together a coordination group if it is, right away to establish a differentiation, and that's a soft word, right from the start?

I know that of course there are operational responsibilities which are different from those of the user company, that I accept. But from the input, right from the start, such a strong distinction being made, seems quite curious to me, and in fact, quite unacceptable. The proposals which will be made by the whole of the ICG, should be part of the

proposals of the operational communities, and of other affected communities.

That is for us to decide internally, what is valid, but the validity of a proposal does not depend on its point of origin. It's simply on its validity. In other words, on its being able to stand criticism of the whole community. So I would like some clarification on that please.

JOSEPH ALLAN: Alissa, maybe I could provide another...

ALISSA COOPER: Please say your name.

JOSEPH ALLAN: Sorry, it's Joseph Allan. Jean-Jacques, I think maybe what we're, what you're highlighting is perhaps an insufficient definition of the timing, because I don't think the question is whether or not the broad group of stakeholders will be participatory in this function, but rather when is the most appropriate time for there to be participatory with us.

So I think the concept is, it is best for stakeholders to work through the operational communities in the creation of the operational proposals, but when you get to the second step, which is the creation of a proposal from the operational proposal, then the broader group of stakeholders can also directly input to us.

So I don't think it's an attempt to say the input shouldn't come, but it's perhaps an attempt to channel the input so that there is the least duplication and the redundancy, while still creating an opportunity for everyone to comment.

RUSS MUNDY:

Jean-Jacques, this is Russ Mundy. I would like to add a little bit more to that if I could. And that is, the 14 March memo from NCIA, basically directs that we must have input from the operational community. In other words, we cannot be responsive to their request that we're handling, without having the input from the operators of the Internet. The broader community, clearly, there is a need, a desire, a strong will to incorporate those things, but to be responsive to the 14th March letter, it's not an absolute essential that we have to have that input.

And it's not, the other input is not really essential to keeping the Internet operating, which was one of their security and stability concerns. And so I think the differentiation in terms of having had this input from the operators, and wanting to have the input from others, is also a factor here.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Hello, this is Jean-Jacques. I'd like to answer to both Joe and to Russ. And thank you both for your clarifications. To both I would say that you're right, I understand that the NCIA requires, that that's quite logical, the compulsory input of the operational communities, but that does not in any way exclude the contribution of the other participants to the coordination group.

Otherwise, as I said earlier, why include anyone but the operational community representatives in the ICG to begin with. Who, there is an expression in French, I don't know the English equivalent, but the gist of it is, who can do more can do less. So, if the instruction from the NCIA is to have, in any case, to make sure that the contribution of the operational entity is there, that does not and should not the participation and the input of the others.

So I think that, to make it simple and clear, I consider that to be formulation, both in the introduction of this draft, and further on in the rest of the text, is not to the spirit of inclusiveness, which seems to have presided over the initial formation of the ICG. And I would like to see this corrected. Thank you.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Jean-Jacques, this is Daniel. I don't [?]. We had discussions in London, quite clearly, where we said want proposals from the operational community, we want anyone who has input specific to these, to participate in those processes, and we do not want to be [?] ourselves and general text or adjudicate between texts that we get from different places that deal with the same thing.

And I see that it's quite clearly reflected in this report for proposals. Please note also quite specifically under section one comments, it explains also quite clearly that we're also, how should people participate and if they do not get anywhere in the specific communities, to come back to us. And I think this reflects what we had to do in London, and I quite frankly don't see a problem.

And if you have one, I would suggest or would ask that you propose specific changes to the language that's before us.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello Daniel. This is Jean-Jacques. Thank you for that suggestion. It will be taken up, but I cannot do this within the hour. It takes a bit more time than that. But to your point about what was agreed in London, of course, the tables as [?] were set in London, as it were, but unfortunately we were not all up to the same speed.

To be more specific, I was not up to the same speed as you Daniel, for instance. So I recognize that and there have been discussions in between. And since then, each of our communities, and in my case, I feel that there is a degree of discomfort with the thing as it appears now, which makes too much harsh difference between the, as I quote, proposals from the operational communities, and on the other hand, the input of the broad group of communities affected, etc. Thank you.

MILTON MULLER: This is Milton Muller. I'm having trouble understanding what Jean-Jacques is talking about in terms of his objective, because we discussed this issue, at great length. It has been the main issue for the past two weeks in the development of the RFP, and we have come up with language that squarely addresses it. Let me just, I mean, I'm wondering whether you're actually referring to the document we're working on.

We're talking about the RFP, right? So, we're asking for complete forward responses from the operational communities, which we then

define. Then it says, in the next paragraph, proposals are expected to enjoy a broad consensus of support from all interested parties. During the development of the proposals, the operational communities are requested...

Actually, I propose putting the word required in there, but we have requested, which is strong enough, to consult and work with other affected parties. Likewise, in order to help the ICG maintain its light coordination role, all other parties are strongly encouraged to participate in community processes.

Communities are asked to adhere to open and inclusive processes in developing the responses. So what exactly is missing here Jean-Jacques? I don't get it.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: [FRENCH] ...soliciting proposals from the operational community...
[FRENCH] ...soliciting the input of the broad communities, etc.
[FRENCH]....

ALISSA COOPER: Jean-Jacques, I'm sorry to interrupt. But we are having difficulty hearing you. I think Alice is saying that you need to join the French line if you wish to speak French. It sounds like you and the interpreter are speaking on top of each other, and I don't think any of us are actually catching it.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques, no problem. So I was saying that, as my English is so lousy, I was referring to, I was using French through the interpreter, but because of the technical problem, and because I'm currently on the English line, as it were, I would have to go on with my very poor English.

Milton, I got your message, and I think I understood it. My response is that, since London things have [?], and there has been clearer awareness of the part of third communities, including the one I represent, in the implications of all of this. So yes, if it pleases you to find out that there is, there was a lack of total understanding on my part in London.

I'm willing to agree to that. Now as one of the two representatives of the ALAC, I want to make clear, and this is not alone. I'm doing this in consultation with the chair of the ALAC and others, that this is not satisfactory. Now if you require an immediate reply with an immediate drafting proposal in the next five minutes, I'm afraid I cannot do that.

So we will come back to you, as soon as possible, with proposed language. But I did want to register, and have notice, on the scribing of this call, that we can sort of, this is not satisfactory. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: This is Alissa. I just have a follow up question for you Jean-Jacques. The language of the first paragraph of the introduction here, the four bullet points that are numbered, some directly from the charter, and we had a direct quote. So, and we have several weeks of comment on the charter, and ALAC submitted comments, and then withdrew comments.

So I'm just curious about, if you could of sort of speak to that, is it acceptable in the charter and you just don't want to quote here? Because it's quite obvious, I think that ALAC spent a good deal of time considering the charter and that's where this language comes from. So I guess my question, is it...

The problem seems to be supporting this language into the RFP is where the problem is created, or is the problem created in the language itself? Because I, personally considered the charter to be done. We have the week of open comments, and everybody seemed happy with it last time. And the thing is pretty much finalized, and I think we're going to try to push that out this week.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Alissa, I find... And this is [?] for the record. If I may make an observation and suggest to Jean-Jacques and others on the RFP that we have discussed, and it's really a document that goes, or a request that goes to the operational community saying, "Hey guys, we need you to do something." And I think that's actually a little bit of a disconnect here because Jean-Jacques is trying to tell the other communities and the rest of the world as well, "Hey, this is important, and you should also care, and your opinion will also be heard."

I think we all agree with. But it's kind of appearing in the wrong place, if it goes into this document. I wonder if it would be worthwhile to, you know, maybe Jean-Jacques or someone else could craft a document that sends a message to the other ALAC and government and so forth,

and highlighting their need to be involved in this process, and pointing to them to the ways that need to be involved in the process.

And telling them that this is important and that their opinion won't matter, particularly in the course of the community pages. Maybe that might be a way of resolving this.

JOE ALHADEFF:

This is Joe Alhadeff, if I could follow up on that. As those of you who have been involved in the conversation on this document know, I've been posting comments on exactly this topic for two weeks, and this is the kind of solution we came up with because it was the general consensus that the non-operational communities are not creating formal positions.

And so we want to channel their input into formal positions into the operational community. I think perhaps what isn't clear, because we don't know the exact process ourselves, is that when we as the ICG are then collating those proposals, we will open that up to a broad stakeholder conversation, that is not limited to the operational community.

And I would differ from Russ's opinion that while the NTIA may have said that only the operational communities need to have, I think we have collectively come to the conclusion that the broad stakeholder consultation is needed. So I think there will be that opportunity. So Jean-Jacques, you have a two stage process.

In stage one, the formal proposals are not open because there is a process to participate in the formal proposal, which isn't outlined yet because each of the groups has to setup their own process. Once the formal proposals are in, then we will have direct stakeholder input into our process. I'm not sure if that clarification gives you any comfort, and if some language clarifying that process would be sufficient for you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you Joe. That's an interesting proposal. Whilst you're speaking, I'm already preparing my answer to the previous speaker before you. I was looking again at the text, and what was rather jarring was to see that, as it stands, the text says, "The task consists of, small a, soliciting proposals from the operational communities; and small b, soliciting the input of the broad group of communities affected by the IANA functions."

You see here, why not put that this is simply at this stage a proposal, to put the task will consist of soliciting input from small a, the operational communities; small b, the broad group of communities, etc. And then putting further along, a bit further away, on its own line, explaining that all of this input will be vetted or sorted out or something, in the preparation of the proposal.

That, I think, would be closer to the spirit of collegial responsibility with which our coordination group is entrusted. It creates, right away, a very clear distinction of, on the one hand, the operational communities which have a certain set of responsibilities and the others who don't

have those responsibilities. And that's not at all the way the At Large community view the task and the composition of the ICG.

So, again, I'm not in a position to propose, within the next few minutes, a really well thought out alternative, but that will be done. I simply wanted to give you the spirit in which we find this difficult to accept. And just as a starter, I have just given you an indication of one possible solution, which is to tailoring just a little bit, so that the proposal would appear to come from all the interested communities, which all represent the ICG, and make it clearer on the other hand, that there will be two steps at the same level of responsibility. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

This is Alissa. I think, you know, we've spent half the call on this topic and we have a few other topics that we would like to get to. So for me, what's important at this point, I think, is to understand what the task forward is. And one thing I think is very important that I, maybe is not [gaining?] on this conversation, is assuming that we get through the other issues that we have to discuss this morning, if people, if there are any objections, to at the very least publishing what we finalized today so that the operational communities can begin the work of formulating proposals.

Because I know that some of them are very ready to do so, and extremely anxious to have something of a stable draft here so that they can work based on that draft, and have that be published, even while we are sorting out this issue. And I might ask for perhaps Jean-Jacques, and Joe, and [?], who have all, I think, made good suggestions and acted

[?] to try and take this off line and sort out a solution that is amenable to the group...

MILTON MUELLER:

This is Milton. I would actually, I don't think it is a good idea to publish as if it were the actual RFP, and then keep tinkering with it. And I don't think that, you know, it shouldn't take us more than a week to work this out. So I don't think that the impatience of the protocol community is really going to justify that kind of a hiccup in the procedure.

It seems to me that we could address this in a very simple way. As I understand it, frankly I think most of the material and the openness that Jean-Jacques is asking for, is already in there. However, the difference might be that we treat the operational communities as the conveners of the process rather than limiting the idea that they are the only proposers.

And that the proposals come out of the process that these operational communities convene. Obviously, any proposal that comes out of those would have to have the consensus and the agreement of the key figures in the operational community, but in some ways if we say that the proposal comes from the operational communities per se and not from the broader group that we're asking them to consult with, and work with, and get consensus from, then, you know.

I think that is just a language difference that we can clear up very quickly.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello. This is Jean-Jacques. Alissa and Milton, I would like to reply to those input, by saying this: thank you Alissa. I think it's a good idea to convene by email or some other method, perhaps by Skype, the people you mentioned, certainly Joe, [?], myself and others interested. We [?]... It will be done over the next two days, to come up with a formulation which is more acceptable to the At Large community.

Now in response to Milton's remark about the idea of a convener as opposed to some other term, I think it's interesting but on the other hand, it could be misleading in that, here again, making the operational communities as the only conveners seems again to introduce a sort of inequality between those operational communities and the rest of the ICG, which is precisely one of the points which triggered my reaction in the first place on behalf of the At Large community.

So, setting that aside Milton because that's a more abstract notion, I think, I would go along with Alissa's suggestion and within the next two days, send to the list, proposed on behalf of the ALAC. Thank you.

MILTON MULLER: Jean-Jacques, the distinction... This is Milton Muller again. The distinction between the customers or the operational communities of IANA and the other people who are only indirectly affected by IANA through these operational communities, is built into the charter and it's something we already agreed on. So if you're rejecting that distinction, I think you're kind of out, or off the chart and you're making it basically impossible for us to agree.

Because that distinction is vital to what we're doing. I think it's completely invalid to suggest that, let's say, you know, a random Internet user, which I might consider myself, as the same kind of relationship to the IANA functions as TLD registry who has to, possibly weekly update their data in the root zone.

I just think that's just wrong. And it's not an [?] distinction, it's a factual distinction.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. This is Alissa, thank you Milton. We need to move on, I'm sorry. So I'd ask the small group of...

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I just want to respond to that very quickly...

ALISSA COOPER: I'm sorry, we...

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Just to say, I agree with Milton on this....

ALISSA COOPER: ...already, so we need to move on. I'm sorry...

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Well, I suggest you spend another 30 seconds. Hello, Alissa? Alissa, I'm sorry I must insist. This is just to say that I'm not invalidating Milton's point, it's just a question of wording. That would be part of our task in the next few days.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you. So one thing I think is important is that, you know, you have to say, Jean-Jacques, that you will have text in two days. So, we'll be needing agreement from the group, not just agreement from the ALAC. So what I would like is for the subgroups to go off and try to find some resolution to this issues, and in the meantime, I do think that if we can say that the substance of this document, we start from the second section and not from the first one, seems fairly stable, then I think we can get to a happy place where all the communities can proceed with their work, whether this issue gets resolved this week or not.

There are some other people that have substantive issues, I think Daniel was one of them, I have one. So Daniel, would you like to proceed with your topics?

DANIEL KARREBERG: I'm not a diplomat, but I will start again with thanking Paul for the work he has done, and of course all of the people who have commented. I think the substance of the document, that we just referred to, I think it's quite solid. One thing that occurred to me when I registered again this morning, and that is currently the IANA supports a number of operational communities.

And they are in fact asking for input in the form of proposals from those communities which they have identified. But shouldn't we also ask in the RFP that the community spend some time, telling us through the proposal whether they consider it still desirable to have IANA, or have one entity, let's put it that way, which serves different communities, or whether it would be acceptable to them to have different entities actually doing the work in whatever consideration?

I hope that was clear. And yet, I can propose text towards this if there is no immediate total opposition to this.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: It would be certainly...

ALISSA COOPER: Please say your name.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Sorry, Joseph Alhadeff. It would certainly be useful to see proposed text on this, but I would suggest that one of the things that some of the user communities will always be concerned about was, the more change we introduce into a process at this stage, the more complexity and the greater potential for issues to arise. So we would treat significant changes to operational functionality in a way that would be very cautious and would need to be validated and tested substantially.

So that would just be a reservation I would put other, so I guess it's different than an objection, but it would be a very high concern.

ALISSA COOPER:

This is Alissa. Daniel, I'm wondering if that consideration is something that may come after the proposal, the separate proposal components are in, have been submitted, and whether we see if any such changes are being proposed. And then that's the topic that the, I guess the world will have to grapple with and take up, as opposed to having to kind of [pre-sage?] that, whether the communities are proposing anything along those lines or not.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Don't get me wrong, it's Daniel again, to respond to both of you. Don't get me wrong, my intention is not to suggest proposals for submitting IANA, my intention is to get the communities to consider this consciously, and when and if we get to the point that this comes to the table, at least they have considered this and they also have some input on it as the ICG.

So, this is not... And I certainly agree with what Joseph said about operational continuity and all of that, but still it would be useful to have some information about this, and not to have another round, if that seems to be opportune, to go and ask this question again and run through the whole consultation process again which cuts a lot of time.

And so the intention would be to instigate some premeditation from the community, and also to get information about that, what the communities think about this.

RUS HOUSLEY : Daniel, I'm trying to... This is Rus Housley. I'm trying to figure out how this would impact a proposal. If a particular community has a solution that they're putting forward for the transition, that does not involve any kind of splitting, then how would they say it?

It leads to kind of a... We want your opinion on this thing, but it may not impact the proposal you're providing. And yet, if the proposal comes forward that does involve splitting, it would be very obvious what that community thinks.

RUSS MUNDY: This is Russ Mundy. Also, I think it's good to at least think about it. I'm not sure that the RFP is the right place to think about it, but if there are a set of words that go in there, perhaps the phrasing could be along the line, if the community desires some type of separation or splitting, would they undertake to coordinate with the other two major operational communities as to how it might impact them.

Would that be a way to include or address such an aspect as this? In other words, ask the communities to work together before the things actually reach the ICG.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Russ, just to wrap this up in the interest of time. Since we already formed a subgroup to do some more work on this, let me take it upon myself to propose some language, considering the input that I just got from the four of you. And I do that within the next two or three days, and then we can discuss it on the mailing list. Is that acceptable?

RUSS MUNDY: I think that would be good.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. This is Alissa. Go ahead.

DANIEL KARREBERG: I was just asking, since there was silence, any more comments on the subject? If not, then I'm done.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you. This is Alissa. So I wanted us to talk for a minute about the comments that we got from [?] concerning the use of the term, service relationship with IANA. And I can put the email up on the screen if people think that would be helpful. Maybe I'll try to do that. I don't think I can actually do that.

But hopefully people saw this email. So the least we're saying is that, you know, we have it phrased at the beginning of the, in several places, in the document where we talk about those with direct operational or service relationships with IANA. And her comment was that no group actually has a service relationship with IANA. The service relationships are with ICANN as the IANA functions operator.

She was offering to make an edit to that phrase. I saw a response on the list, I saw one response I think, which was from Patrik, which I think I broadly agreed with, which was that we are, I think, talking here about

IANA in a sense of the authorities, as opposed to IANA in the sense of the department of ICANN.

Thank you very much, Elise, for, or Alice, for pulling up Elise's email on the screen, and now everybody can see it. So, of course, anybody should speak to this. Patrik, I would be interested in hearing you sort of reprise your response to Elise. But I wanted us to at least discuss this. Elise is unfortunately not on the call. Personally I think that this text, again, which comes from the charter, is accurate.

If we think about IANA as the authority and not the, you know, subdivision of a corporate entity. So I'm comfortable with the way that we have now, but want to make sure that we have consensus on that. Because Elise made the point a couple of times and we didn't really get to discuss it on the mailing list.

MILTON MULLER: This is Milton. Is Patrik there?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes, I'm here.

MILTON MULLER: Okay, go ahead then.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes. So what I wanted to have clarified is that we all understand what we mean by the term IANA, first of all, and then we can discuss whether

we believe that the current text is according to that agreement or not, and whether something has to do with it, something has to be changed. I felt that moving ahead, starting to just change the text might be a little bit dangerous if it was not the case, that we first of all just agreed what it is. That was my point.

MILTON MULLER:

Okay. This is Milton. I also answered, although pretty recently, so Alissa probably see it, but I really don't understand the point of Alissa's statement, because the NTAA currently awards the IANA contract to ICANN. That's the only reason no one has, that people have service relationships with ICANN.

And since the NTAA and the IANA contract are ending, and that's the whole point of this process, I think we have to treat the IANA in the sense designed by Patrik's definition. So I don't think... I agree that we don't need to change anything in the RFP based on Alissa's comments.

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

This is Lynn St. Amour as well. I think there is a strong analogy between the IETF and the Internet Society, where obviously the Internet Society is the legal home and the contractual home for many things that the IETF does. And yet, we never made, or they never made that distinction.

I mean the IETF was its own entity, with its own sets of procedures and responsibilities, and its own commitments. And, you know, we never... IF and IETF weren't [?] aside, tried to put this contractual relationship

first and foremost. It was always the responsibilities of the organizations involved. And I think that analogy actually holds here as well.

RUSS MUNDI:

This is Russ Mundi. I'd guess I like to take slight disagreement with what Milton said, and just, in as much as the reason... At least I understood is that he was saying the only reason that organization have a relationship with ICANN is because of the NCIA contract. I think that is not an accurate depiction of things, because especially some of the relationships have existed for a long time with the IANA, and it just happens to migrate over time to being in ICANN.

But the less important than that, I believe, is that we have a way to clearly define the understanding that Patrik, I think, put forth in response to Elise's email. And the function that is being described really is the IANA function that currently just, you know, it has been there for a long time, but it just kind of happens to be at the ICANN corporate entity. Somehow we have to make sure that that is well described and easily understood by the broad community.

Otherwise, I think the risks exist that Elise points out here.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Hi there. It's Keith Davidson. I'm a bit concerned with Milton's worry over this. Having chaired a working group that has looked at aspects of what IANA is doing, I think we need to be very, very explicit about what we mean when we use the word IANA. I think like the, you know,

referring to the IANA database, or the IANA function, or the IANA function's operator, can actually provide clarity over what it is that we're describing, whether it's the entity, or the function, or the actual database itself.

I think if we have more particular, we'll avoid confusion later.

MILTON MUELLER:

Yeah this is Milton. I don't think either Russ or Keith are actually disagreeing with me. My point is simply the import of Elisa's comment was that we should go in and replace the word customers of IANA with customers of ICANN, I think that's not what we want to do. We're talking about the IANA functions operator, and that is going to be considered distinctly from ICANN because, you know, the NTIA contract which awards it to ICANN is going away.

And so that's precisely what we're discussing here in trying to come up with a transition plan is, you know, what happens to this IANA functions operator? We have to discuss IANA in a manner that does not presume that it is linked to ICANN, or that there is a NTIA that writes a contract and gives it to ICANN. That's all I'm saying.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Keith Davidson again. And thanks Milton for that clarification. Now I understand. I full support you.

ALISSA COOPER: So, this is Alissa. I had asked Alice... Alice is working on coordinating Patrik with [?], for this email in the window so we can see it. I'm wondering if maybe we should just reference the, sort of, definition of IANA that is provided in the SSAC document, which is again, sort of the broad definition. It goes beyond the single contract with NTIA and kind of looks at all of the different arrangements that are involved.

And we can footnote that, so that everyone knows when we're talking about IANA in this document, that we're talking about it in a large amount of a small space. There it is.

So we could just reference that, you know, in a footnote or something, so that it's clear the first time we use IANA what we mean.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: This is Patrik. Let me just let people know that it's not difficult to find this, in fact 67 in our document from SSAC because it's actually the beginning of section one in the document. So this is how the document starts.

RUSS MUNDI: This is Russ Mundi. I have to admit to a slightly prejudice view, but I think that SSAC document, as speaking as a SSAC rep, it does provide a good clarification and would be a good solution to this where we wouldn't have to change any significant wording in the RFP.

ALISSA COOPER: Any objections to adding this definition of IANA to the document?

DANIEL KARREBERG: This is Daniel. We can use this of course. I'm just wondering if it would be preferable to refer to actually the NTIA announcement and documentation, rather than to a derivative. So if they have, since we are generating proposals to answer that, if we can spend the 10 minutes and find anything there, then I would prefer it, then if not, this works.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I think you just volunteered 10 minutes.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yeah, this is [?]. Patrik speaking. As the chair of SSAC, let me just say that this document is created by SSAC in isolation, which means that I think referencing sort of the whole document, I presume, is not what we're talking about because I find that might be a little bit dangerous. But referencing the document for this specific definition, which means these paragraphs that I just quoted, I think is something that I feel comfortable with.

RUSS MUNDY: This is Russ. I'd rather extract these, Patrik, than reference a piece of a document that has a completely different context right.

ALISSA COOPER: This is Alissa. I guess what I was thinking was that this text that we see here would be footnoted in the RFP, and then there would be links to the SSAC document so we knew where it came from.

RUSS MUNDY: That's fine with me.

MARTIN BOYLE: It's Martin Boyle here. I need a little bit of a certain [?]. While I find the definition, as written here, very useful, when I look at the NTIA announcement, it does then specifically use the term of the IANA functions contractor. Having been on the same committee that Keith Davidson mentioned, I do have this sort of general feeling that if we just spell with one or two extra words, what it is that we're specifically referring to, and I think it's quite easy through this take, because where...

You know, Keith's turn through IANA [face to face?] the IANA functions, and the IANA functions operator, and in an awful lot of these cases we're actually talking about the managing of the IANA function by the IANA functions operator. So I would just feel a little more comfortable with that.

ALISSA COOPER: This is Alissa. So just so I understand the idea here from Martin and Keith is that we would go through each instance where we use the term IANA in the document, and determine whether we needed to add functions or functions operator. Is that the proposal?

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle here. That is what I understood what Keith was saying. And that's what I was supporting.

ALISSA COOPER: And in addition to referencing this definition or in [?], just to be clear.

MARTIN BOYLE: Could you say that again Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Sure. The question was, would going through and adding the words functions or functions operator, be in addition to also referencing this as a general definition in the first page of the document? Or in view of making that reference?

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle. If people find...

ALISSA COOPER: Sounds like we lost Martin's audio. Okay. So I think maybe what makes sense is, it sounds like we have a strong consensus to add a reference to this document, so that's one action item. I think if Keith and Martin want to go through and identify where they think the language isn't clear about IANA, and maybe send notice about those to the mailing list, then we can sort that out on the list.

It shouldn't be too difficult. So those are the two next steps there. Otherwise, we are coming up on the hour. I will note one thing. Is there anyone else who had a substantive issue that they wanted to bring up in the last 60 seconds? Okay.

So I want [?] which is that we didn't actually discuss the substance of this document, which I assume means that we are pretty well agreed on the substance, which I think is fantastic. We have, I think, a plan for going forward and progressing on the various issues that were brought up today. I would say that, again, feeling the pressure from my own operational community, if people are feeling good about the substance that we should, I mean, unless people object, I would like to share the substance, at least with the IETF community, so that people know roughly the direction that this is going in, and hope that we can finalize a draft by the end of this week.

Any objections to that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I think we're all consulting our own communities, so how is that different?

ALISSA COOPER:

That's true. We didn't talk about that. We didn't talk about public comment, and yeah, so I know we're at the hour. So let's spend one minute on that. So I think the place that we got to on the mailing list as far as, are we going to solicit public comments on the RFP itself, was that, rather than sort of doing the big call for comment that we did with

the charter, using the email alias in the forum, that we were each just going to take the document back to our communities for consultation.

And you know, get a week or two and see if there are any, you know, edits that come back from the community consultation, and incorporate those if necessary after the IGF. Does that sound like a reasonable plan to people?

Do people feel like, you know, whatever text we have in the 24 hours after now or after this has been sorted out, and you know, the language about the IANA functions, people see that that text is stable enough to go out and take it to their communities.

RUSS MUNDY:

Alissa, Russ Mundy here. I sent it, it should be available right now. All of these things are in Dropbox, the public, and perhaps just the status report from the various representatives to the communities saying, "Here is where we are. Please look at it there." They can see exactly where we are right now, and they can see the changes as they happen.

You don't have to formally say, "Here is a draft." You know, they can watch it as it goes along.

ALISSA COOPER:

I guess I was asking because, not everyone is paying attention to every edit in the Dropbox. And so sometimes it is helpful to send an email and say, "Go over here and look at this thing if you're interested."

RUSS MUNDY: Personally, I don't have... [CROSSTALK]... But I don't know that it is explicitly necessary, but I wouldn't object. Russ, I'm sorry.

DANIEL KARREBERG: This is Daniel. Can I have a clarification. At some point we publish this and it becomes fixed. And then the communities can work to that. Of course, before you can share drafts or, as we've always done. But my impressions was that we were to publish, to just finish this and publish it as our RFP at our next meeting in Istanbul. And then if the communities then come back with comments, then we can decide to publish clarifications.

I mean, that's what you really do with RFPs, right? I think I would assuming that that was the modus operandi here.

ALISSA COOPER: This is Alissa. I thought we were trying to publish it before the IGF, that's what we talked about last week.

RUSS MUNDY: I thought that was the whole reason for having this call, was to achieve that.

ALISSA COOPER: Right, yes. Right. Well, it may still be capable, it's only Tuesday, right? So I guess that's kind of why I was asking if people feel that this was roughly stable enough that they can least, we can sort of proceed with

the further edits that we need to make based on today's call, in parallel with ICG participants going out to their own communities and saying, "This is a fairly stable draft and we want to get your feedback on it."

MILTON MUELLER:

This is Milton. And we already were asked to send it around to get feedback, and I've been doing that. I have no objections, by the way. And what I'm concerned about is the wording changes that we're now talking about, go to the very core issues. You know, what is IANA? What is its relationship to ICANN? And what is an operational community? And where do the proposals come from?

And I think those issues can be fixed in a couple of days, but I would not feel comfortable with sending a draft around that might change those fundamental definitions. You know, I'm impatient, I want to get this out there as anybody else, it's just that if we're fiddling with who turns in proposals, I think that's pretty fundamental.

We don't want... If we can just avoid any confusion by waiting two days before we circulate it, then we should do that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I have no problems with any of us circulating this, or any other version indicating the correct [?] so that whether it's in progress or fixed or final. And I think that we all know the status. The one additional comment that I would like to make, based on what Milton had said, was that I think there are two separate things, the definition of IANA. I think that's a definitional issue, and had no substantive effect.

I'm happy with the suggestions, I'm happy with the document even as it is. The other one about where proposals come and so forth, I would actually propose that that's a closed issue that we have already discussed, since the beginning of the ICG, at length, and comes to the conclusion in the charter and elsewhere. And we should recognize that it might be possible that we already have rough consensus on that, even if perhaps full consensus, everyone, but I think we should move on.

MILTON MUELLER:

I agree with you substantively, [?] that we did discuss this. I thought we had completely resolved it. And I thought that Jean-Jacques was indicating that his concerns could be washed with a few wording changes. And so if that's true, then let's make those wording changes in a couple of days, or even one day before we release anything and call it a RFP. That's all I'm saying.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Yes. I'd like to [CROSSTALK]... This is Jean-Jacques. Hello? Yes...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

If I could quickly respond to that first, which is I think we should make wording changes, if those can satisfy the concerns that Jean-Jacques raised. I just....

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. I'd like to respond to both Milton and [?] and say thank you for the suggestion. Within the next two days then. Thank you.

DANIEL KARREBERG: This is Daniel again. I don't, I have a strong objection against trying to finalize this on the fly with the changes that are maybe substantial, one and a half weeks before we have a physical meeting. And the RFP is going to largely determine what we are getting back, and what kind of problems we have with the quality of what comes back.

I think it makes... Since we have the physical meeting in less than two weeks' time, I think we should take the time to finalize this at the physical meeting. We do our work beforehand, and it will be a no brainer, fine. But let's not wing this while, which is the RFP is the most important document that we're producing, short of the proposal.

So I have an objection against doing this on the fly.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Daniel, this is Jean-Jacques. I have a question. Is doing this on the fly, sorry. My English is very poor. I don't understand whether doing this on the fly excludes what I suggested and what others have suggested, meaning give us two days to bring our input more up to date. Thank you.

DANIEL KARREBERG: No, it's definitely finalizing the document. You know, the sooner we get the input, the better.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I agree, so give us two days.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, that's what I was going to say too. I think, I mean, characterizing this as doing this on the fly is a little bit of a stretch because we've been working on this thing for many weeks, and a lot of people put a lot of time and a lot of effort into this. And I guess what I'm seeing both on the call and in the chatroom is a very strong desire to get this published before the IGF, as we discussed last time.

So Daniel, I think you might be a little in the rough on this particular issue. What I would suggest is that we, is that as I think [?] and others said, we make a very strong effort in the next two days to get a point where everyone is comfortable with publishing the document. Perhaps it has a version number, or it says draft, but we publish the document as a stable reference.

And if we need to make tweaks, we would certainly be continuing to collect community feedback about the document itself. We can make tweaks as we go along. But as I said, the substance of the document is pretty stable. We have a couple of outstanding issues that, you know, could be substantial, or it could not be depending on how they get addressed.

And I think people should keep that in mind that, you know, we had a fairly strong consensus to get something stable published before the IGF. So keep that in mind when you are making your suggestions to the list, what we can actually resolve before Thursday.

And on Thursday, we'll see what we have and hope that we can get something out on that day or on Friday, when I guess some people might be travelling and so forth. But, you know, make a very strong effort in the group to get it done at the end of this week, that was what was suggested. I think we have fairly broad support from the group for that.

JOE ALHADEFF:

Alissa, this is Joe Alhadeff. I just wanted to say that I posted a draft of what might be compromise text to see perhaps if we can jumpstart a solution, and on a related note, I posted to the list earlier this morning, some proposed, what might be consensus talking points, slides for IGF.

So reactions to both will be welcome.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Joe. So we are now 10 minutes over the call. Just probably let everyone go, let the interpreters go. But if people are fairly comfortable with that plan, try to get something out by Thursday and make a strong effort over the next two days and we'll see where we are next Thursday. I think that's a reasonable plan.

Okay. Thank you very much to everyone for your time today. Alice will, again, send out the attendance list. So check that and make sure that

your name appears in the appropriate category. And we had Samantha again taking minutes, and she will be publishing minutes for us to the mailing list. So look for those as well. Thanks everyone. See you next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]