
ALISSA COOPER:

...Call for public comment. My name is Alissa Cooper and I am the chair of the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group, also known as the ICG. Presenting here with me today will be one of the ICG vice chairs, Patrik Falstrom. We also have numerous ICG members who are present and who will be helping us to answer questions today.

The webinar is being recorded and the chat sessions are being archived, so please keep that in mind. Livestreaming audio in all six UN languages and Portuguese is available for this webinar. The details are available at a link provided in the Adobe Connect room in the session information window at the top, so please check that out if you want to follow along in another language.

We're going to begin with about 45 minutes of presentation material followed by about 45 minutes of question and answer. We ask that you please reserve your questions for the Q&A portion in the second half. If you are dialed into the audio line, your microphones will be muted during the presentation portion.

When we do get to the Q&A portion, we will accept questions either by audio or questions written into the chat. The instructions are in the session information pod in the Adobe Connect window and we will go over them again when we get to the Q&A session.

With that, I think we can get going. Looking at our agenda for today, we'll be doing a brief overview of IANA and the IANA stewardship transition. We realize that not everyone has been following along in all

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.

the details and not everyone is necessarily familiar with IANA and the surrounding institutions, so we'll be talking a little bit about that.

Then we will go through the transition proposal and I'll turn it over to Patrik to talk about some of the components of that. Then we'll talk about the questions that the ICG has set out for public comment, how to submit public comment, and then we'll open it up for Q&A.

So to begin at the beginning, we thought it would be important to just set out a baseline of what the IANA functions actually are in case not everyone is familiar with them.

If we think about the way the Internet works, the technical functioning of the Internet relies on some databases, or in the parlance of IANA and ICANN what we would call registries of unique numbers and names that all computers use to connect to each other on the Internet.

So when your computer connects to the Internet, or when you surf the web or send e-mail, the software on your computer is using these numbers and names to communicate with other computers that are also connected to the Internet.

There are three main categories of these registries. One is domain names, or listed here as names. One is numbers and one is protocol parameters. We're going to talk about each of these in more detail later in the presentation so that you can understand what these registries are about and why they're important for the Internet's functioning.

But what's important to understand here is that the administration of these different categories of registries – the [active] administering the

registries is what is known as the IANA functions. This is really a set of administrative and clerical functions – basically, the maintenance of these registries.

The setting up policy about what goes into the registries is outside of the IANA functions. It's not part of what is encompassed when we talk about the IANA functions themselves.

If we look a little bit at the bigger picture in terms of how does IANA fit in with the roles of other entities in the ecosystem, we have to go back a little bit in time.

If we go back to 1998, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, also known as ICANN, was created to maintain the IANA registries under contract with the US government.

ICANN actually has an internal department, which is known as IANA. And the government agency that holds the contract with ICANN is called the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, also known as NTIA. Luckily, we have acronyms for all of these things because they're a mouthful.

So NTIA holds the contract and provides oversight over ICANN. Historically, NTIA's role has been one of stewardship and has been largely symbolic. It does not have an operational role. It does not initiate changes to any of the registries itself. It has primarily been in this role of stewardship. That's briefly about the roles of many of the entities that you will hear about throughout the presentation.

Then we come to the present day, or almost the present day. In March of 2014, NTIA announced the transition of its stewardship role to the global multi-stakeholder community, and NTIA asked ICANN to convene a process to develop a proposal for the transition.

In making the announcement, NTIA set out a number of criteria and expectations that they expected to be met as part of the transition proposal. The criteria were that the proposal needs to support and enhance the multi-stakeholder model, that it needs to maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet domain name system, also known as the DNS. That it must meet the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA services, and that it must maintain the openness of the Internet.

Furthermore, NTIA stated that the proposal must have broad community support and that it must not replace NTIA's role with the government-led over intergovernmental organization solution.

So since March of 2014, the work that has gone into the transition proposal and that you will see presented here today has been geared towards creating a proposal that meets these criteria and expectations.

If we look in more detail at the timeline, it's helpful to understand what is the proposal that is at issue here today. So NTIA's announcement was made in March of 2014. Following a consultation that was initiated by ICANN, the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (the ICG) was formed in July of last year.

The ICG is comprised of 30 members and two liaisons who represent a very broad array of stakeholders. That includes stakeholders from what

we call the operational communities. These are the communities that exist around the different categories of IANA registries. You'll hear people talk about the names community, the numbers community, the protocol parameters community.

The ICG also includes members from a variety of other stakeholders – business, governments, user communities, and so forth. In September of 2014, the ICG issued a request for proposals that went out to the operational communities and we asked the operational communities to develop a transition proposal component for the set of registries of interest to them.

Since then, we have received the proposals from each of the operational communities and the ICG has combined them into the single transition proposal that is now available for public comment.

The public comment period, which opened last Friday on July 31st, is really just the next step in what has been a very long and vigorous process to develop the combined proposal. Each component from each community has already been subject to extensive public scrutiny to lengthy mailing list discussions that have been conducted in public to multiple public comment periods to I think hundreds of conference calls perhaps.

But the call for public comments that the ICG put out last week is focused on how the proposal components fit together. Do they really work as a combined proposal, and furthermore do they meet the NTIA criteria?

So we're not so much focused on the very nitty-gritty details of the individual proposals, as those have been rather thoroughly vetted already to date. Suggestions that we as the ICG may receive as part of the public comment period for substantive modifications to the operational community proposals will be referred back to those communities. So issues that have already been discussed in those communities are not going to be [re-mitigated]. We're really looking at the proposal as a whole. We'll talk in more detail about the specific questions for public comment that the ICG is looking for feedback on at the end of the presentation.

With that, I will turn it over to Patrik Falstrom who is going to talk about the names portion of the proposal.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much, Alissa. I hope that everyone can hear me. Can you confirm, please?

ALISSA COOPER: We can hear you.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Okay, thank you very much. We start by looking at the names proposal. If we look at what the names proposal actually entails, we are to think about the complete name space itself and the name space that is used in what we normally call the DNS.

We have – the name space is hierarchal, and at top we have something that we call the root. Below the root we have the various top-level domains. And under each one of the top-level domains, which are managed by various registries, we have the second-level domains or third-level domains or otherwise, depending on the [inaudible] each one of the top-level domains where the actual registrations can be made.

But the interesting thing here is for the names operational community is the management of the coordination of this name space, and specifically the coordination of the domain name system itself.

So if we look at the IANA functions that are related to names, we specifically look at various [inaudible] requests that the community members of the names community can request by IANA. They can specifically change all different kinds of things regarding, for example, who is the operator, who are the contacts, what is the technical consideration and what is the meta data.

And for the actual operation, the most important thing of course has to do with the technical [consideration] which says what are the name servers that are used for looking at domain names for each one of the top-level domains.

But we cannot forget, for example, the contact information for who is responsible for the top-level domain itself, which means that who are the contacts.

So if we look a little bit more on the different kind of changes that can be made, what kind of functions [are related to] names, we have, for

example – and this is just sort of a subset of the various requests that can be made. We have, for example, the change request management of the root zone itself for the WHOIS server for the root zone itself, where the information about the top-level domain [inaudible]. We have various delegation and re-delegation of TLDs when the top-level domain is changing from one administrator to another one, for example.

All of those are requests that are coming from the domain name holder, the TLD holder itself or the registry, but we also have various operational issues, which are managed by IANA itself. For example, we do run now something called DNSSEC, which is electronic signatures on the DNS [inaudible] itself.

And for the DNSSEC, the [signature to work], the root zone itself is fine. And for that to work, we have to have a key management system for the root zone. That is also managed by IANA.

It's also the case that the TLDs that use international top-level domains, which implies that you use other things [inaudible] A-Z and 0-9 in the domain name. [inaudible] by the way you can blame me for. Call me if it is the case [inaudible] complains. And yes, I do get phone calls.

Anyways, to be able to coordinate, for example, various TLDs that use the same language, it might be the case that there is [inaudible] for the different TLDs to use the same kind of policy for what characters you are allowing for each one of the languages.

So what IANA is doing is that they have [repository] of the practices for international top-level domains for various languages, and that is something that IANA is managing as well.

Then there are a number of other root zone related activities, which has to do with actual operations which we don't have to go into details here.

I can summarize that IANA is doing a couple of things which are on request from the registries, and then there are a couple things which are just what they have to do just because of operation itself.

So if we look at the situation today, and if I remove everything that has to do with the operation itself and we only look at the oversight – and this is really, really, really important is to make this pictures that you see on the screen [inaudible], this is only about oversight. Please remember that.

Under the current contract between NTIA and ICANN, NTIA is the entity that do have the contract with ICANN that requires ICANN to operate the IANA function a certain way. First of all, the IANA function [can] be separated by ICANN and that is displayed by the very, very, very small square down to the right, which [should] say IANA. And on top of that IANA is also having the oversight.

So certain operations as stipulated in the contract itself, NTIA is the one that is the oversight for those operations. So there are actions that the IANA functions of ICANN cannot do without NTIA giving an explicit okay. There are other things which IANA is doing, the IANA functions of ICANN is doing, which NTIA is just looking for statistics and just ensuring that things are going right.

There are other things, for example, that complaints and other things regarding IANA operations, if there are any, which there have been

extremely few actually, which is kind of surprising, that actually goes to NTIA as well.

So that is the current contract. Given that the contract with NTIA is going away, the question then has been how to handle the situation post transition.

The question is not really if I personally try to look at what is the actual question that has gone to the multi-stakeholder community itself. It's not so much who is going to replace the NTIA with the contract. It's more the contract is going away, what has to be done, if anything? Let me pause that a little bit and let people think.

When the CWG stewardship has been in ICANN – I've been thinking about this – what you see to the right, the post-transition situation, that is what their conclusion is.

So their conclusion is – and their suggestion is – that we have ICANN, and instead of just having IANA as a sort of a function inside ICANN, their conclusion is that what is needed is a legal separation between ICANN and something that is called PTI, or Post Transition IANA.

The Post Transition IANA do have a board just like an board, just like an organization. There's a contract with ICANN that stipulates what PTI is supposed to do, and customers communicate with PTI and not with ICANN, which also [inaudible] of course complaints on the operation.

But the oversight is then not managed by ICANN so much as with PTI because ICANN [inaudible] is requesting PTI to do whatever they are supposed to do, but for the oversight, we have two different functions

which I will talk a little bit more in detail shortly. The IFR (the IANA Functions Review) and the Customer Standing Committee.

These two are looking at the Customer Standing Committee. It's something that is looking at the day-to-day operation of IANA, while the IFR, or IANA Function Review, team is looking at how ICANN and PTI, how the relationship between the two work.

Specifically, there is a special IFR function which actually makes it possible for IFR to make a decision that PTI is to be completely separated from ICANN. Let me go to the next slide.

If you look at them one by one – if we look at the PTI, first of all, the mission for PTI is that it is established to perform all the existing and also pre-transition IANA functions.

So everything that the IANA function operator is doing, IANA function ICANN is doing, all of that is done by PTI. So everything that IANA is doing, PTI is taking over. So operationally, it is very, very simple.

If we then look at the next body, the CSE, the mission is that it is established to ensure continued satisfaction performance of the IANA naming function. This means that CSE is the party that takes care of and discusses day-to-day operations, complaints, whatever might actually occur. This is the day-to-day oversight over ICANN.

The next body, the IFR, is established to provide periodic reviews of PTI's performance. So IFR is looking at the contract and ensuring that PTI is exactly fulfilling everything that is described in the contract to satisfaction of course of the members of the IFR.

The special strength and power that IFR has is that IFR can act, if it is the case, that a complete separation is needed before ICANN, between ICANN and the IANA function itself. So the difference between IFR and CSE is really that IFR is doing the periodic reviews while CSE is looking at actually the standing committee that is looking at the performance itself from day-to-day operations.

If we look at – one thing that, of course, people involved in this business know about is that there are a number of things in specifically the CWG names or CWG stewardship proposal that is dependent on what is done in the CCWG accountability.

From an ICG perspective, the various [inaudible] are listed on the site itself. It has to do with the actual, the rights regarding the budget. It has to do with the rights regarding the ICANN board and the ability to appoint and remove members, and to recall the entire ICANN board [inaudible] PTI.

It is related to the IANA functions review, that is to be incorporated by ICANN bylaws. It is the CSE and also the IFR that also has to be incorporated [in the bylaws]. It is the empowerment of the [inaudible] and many other accountability issues that simply have to be incorporated into the accountability mechanism, because as you understand, both the IFR and CSE have to do with the accountability. And because of that, many of the issues related to accountability which actually is where these bodies are kicked in and operation, and their power and their ability to act and also the requirement for ICANN to act on requests from these bodies are actually dealt with very much in dependency with the accountability proposal.

Many of these kind of changes, which is kind of important to remember, is that many of these [inaudible] are provided in something that is called in ICANN as fundamental bylaws as compared to the bylaws. The difference between the two is that fundamental bylaws are much harder, for example, much harder to change than the bylaws themselves.

Of course there's a big question how the public comment period for the ICG is synchronized [inaudible] public comment period. First of all, in the ICG, the comment period and the questions which we are dealing with now on this webinar, we do request people to look at the questions, first of all, as if all of these dependencies were [resolved]. That's something that is really important to make clear. Please respond to the questions as if these requirements and dependencies were solved in a positive way.

If it is the case that you would like to give comments, which is a [inaudible] themselves, can you please make it really, really, really clear what kind of things actually have to do with the dependency itself and what things have to do with actual ICG documents. It's important for us to be able to evaluate the responses.

If we move to the numbers proposal, it is of course a little bit different. First of all, if we look at where the IANA functions are related to numbers, IANA functions are allocating the blocks of IP addresses, IPv4 and IPv6, and [AS] numbers to the regional registries.

To start with, of course the various overarching allocation of the blocks and [inaudible] numbers are done by the Internet Engineering Task

Force (IETF). But the IETF releases numbers for IANA to, in turn, release to the RIRs.

So when the RIRs require more address space, they go to IANA and request the address space. The policy for how this is allocated is developed by the RIRs themselves and managed by the ASO in ICANN.

There are also of course some DNS related special purpose zones. For example, they look at host names based on the IP address and that is something that also IANA is running. For example, if it is the case that an RIR [inaudible] IP address [inaudible], the actual DNS related issues that have to be changed based on that allocation is also managed by IANA.

If we look at the situation to the left, which is the current situation, it is in fact the case that NTIA do have a contract and also an oversight of all the IANA functions and reviewed the functions. The [inaudible] reviews the performance.

IANA is then doing all the numbering services and allocates the address space and hands it out to RIRs [inaudible] like I mentioned before.

In the post-transition when NTIA is going away, there are a couple things which are changing, and there are specifically three which we have mentioned below.

The first thing to notice is that ICANN is to continue as the IANA function operator just like today with the IP address and AS numbers and others, DNS and all other kind of things that IANA is doing. The difference, though, is that there is service level agreement with the RIR. The RIR is to come up with a service level agreement with ICANN.

The second thing has to do with the intellectual property rights. It's really important from the RIR perspective that the intellectual property rights provision of IANA services is [inaudible] with the community. So the ability, for example, to use various IP addresses and other kind of things is to be in the public.

The third thing that is added by the RIRs or CRISP which is the name of the group that the RIRs created to develop this proposal is that a review committee is to be created, because when the NTIA is removed, they can review the performance. Something is needed to actually make sure that IANA is doing what it's supposed to do. So what is suggested is to create a review committee with representatives from each one of the RIR communities, and that advice of the RIRs on the IANA functions operator's performance. And of course matched with the service level agreement that it's already agreed upon.

If we look at the review committee and how that is set up – we can have a look at it. Let me try to scroll correctly here. The proposal is like this, that you have the various RIRs that have each one – the five RIRs – and each one of them have a bottom-up multi-stakeholder process.

What they're doing is that they are reviewing the performance and the RIRs then also have representatives from each one of the five RIRs that form the community based review committee.

The review committee itself is then giving advice – receiving advice on what the performance and how that should be measured. The review committee is then reviewing the performance of the IANA function of ICANN.

This is something new, but on the other hand, it's something new but also not new because the RIRs together already create various different kind of groups like the ASO inside ICANN to handle the coordination. It's also the case that policies are managed in a coordination way between the RIRs.

They also have, for example CRISP that created this proposal which is in coordination between the RIRs. Yes, it is a new body, but it's not something really, really new. It's not something that's surprising.

If we look at the service level agreement principles, this is also something that is not surprising to people that have been working with the SLAs in the information technology realm. You have various different kinds of requirements that are listed, which are important to ensure that they are living up to, for example, description of services, security performance and all the requirements, reviewed operations, continuity, [inaudible] resolution dispute, etc. All of these things are things that must be and will be listed in the SLA itself.

The next thing which has been discussed and some of you know it's discussed quite a lot at the moment has to do with [inaudible] property. It is the expectation by the RIRs, by CRISP, that the number resources registries are in the public domain, that non-public information related to [the] be managed by IANA operator and transition to [inaudible] if need. This is really important regarding the transition.

It's also the case that they request the rights of non-public information related to them to be transferred to the RIRs. They got a little bit step further here and say that the [inaudible] is that the ownership of the

IANA trademark and domain name be transferred to the IETF Trust. The IETF Trust is something that is a specific organization that holds some IPR related to the Internet Engineering Task Force. And the RIR, through the CRISP process, came to the conclusion that the [end] suggestion of the ownership and all IPRs is moved to that trust, [where] also the IETF has some of their trust, or [inaudible] all of them.

It's also the case that, of course, the CRISP team came to the conclusion that all relevant parties must agree to these expectations as part of the transition. It has been a lot of work within the RIRs to come to the conclusion that the IPR and domain name issues is something that [inaudible] and this is where have a very specific proposal.

With that, I would like to hand back to Alissa to talk about the protocol parameters.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Patrik. We have one more component of this proposal, and that's the protocol parameters. To understand the protocol parameters proposal we first need to understand what is a protocol and what is a protocol parameter.

On the Internet, protocols are standardized patterns of communication that computers use to be able to talk to each other. The ones that you may have heard of include HTTP or IP. Those are very common ones.

When we're using protocols on the Internet, or when we're designing protocols, we often need numbers or values to be chosen and published

so that two different computers using the same protocol can communicate and understand each other.

The example of one that you may have encountered yourself is if you've ever visited a website and received one of those 404 Page Not Found errors. That number 404 is a protocol parameter. It is a number that has been chosen and published that allows my computer when I'm visiting a website, and the website when it's trying to send content back to me, to tell me that there has been an error and that the page is not found. That's just an example to illustrate.

As Patrik mentioned, the Internet Engineering Task Force is a standards development organization where many of the most important protocols that make the Internet work were developed, and as a result, we consider the IETF to be the operational community of interest related to the protocol parameters.

The protocol parameters are published on the web on the IANA website. There are more than 10,000 registries and they contain hundreds of thousands of protocol parameters.

The last important thing to understand about protocol parameters is that they are not referenced in real-time generally from the IANA website. They are referenced by software developers and other engineers who are, when they're in the process of building software, need to code a particular value into their implementation.

So that's what protocol parameter are themselves. Now if we look at the oversight model for the protocol parameters registries, again we have to go back in time. The IETF has had an agreement with ICANN

going back more than 15 years that governs the relationship between IANA and the IETF. That agreement is known as the Memorandum of Understanding (or MOU).

Within the IETF, or adjacent to it, there is a leadership body known as the Internet Architecture Board that provides oversight to ensure that that relationship between IETF and IANA remain healthy and that the MOU is being executed as appropriate.

The MOU has been supplemented over the years by service level agreements that get updated on a continual basis, and those service level agreements establish performance targets for IANA to meet and there are IETF participants who provide the oversight to ensure that IANA is meeting those performance targets.

If we look at the difference between that state of affairs, which has been in existence for many years, and what we would view in the post-transition phase, there's not a lot of difference. You can see in the visual under the current contract, NTIA has its contract with ICANN, and in the post-transition phase, it will no longer have that contract. But it's the opinion of the IETF community that no new organizations or structures are required as a result, and that over the years, since the creation of ICANN, the IETF and ICANN and the IAB have together created a system of agreements, policies, and oversight mechanisms that already cover what is needed for the transition. This system has worked well without any operational involvement from NTIA.

The IETF also expects that the IANA protocol parameters registries updates will continue to function day-to-day just as they have been

doing for the last decade or more. The IETF community is very satisfied with the current arrangements with ICANN.

That is, in a nutshell, what the IETF is proposing. No new organizations or structures.

However, in the absence of the NTIA contract, the IETF did state in its proposal that a few new arrangements may be needed in order to ensure that the IETF community's expectations continue to be met. And those expectations are, first, that the protocol parameters registries are in the public domain and that all relevant parties acknowledge that fact as part of the transition.

Then, second, it's possible that in the future the operation of the protocol parameters registries may be transitioned from ICANN to some subsequent operator. In that case, it's the preference of the IETF community that ICANN acknowledge that it will continue to carry out obligations that are currently spelled out in the NTIA contract that have to do with achieving a smooth transition to subsequent operators should the need arise.

Furthermore, in the event that a transition occurs away from ICANN, it's the IETF's expectation that subsequent operators will work together to minimize disruption in the use of the protocol parameters registries.

So those are a couple of further expectations that the IETF community spelled out in terms of potential future scenarios.

With that, we have covered all three of the components of the proposal and wanted to take a look at how they all work together. This slide and

this graphic is also included in the proposal itself. This shows the oversight component in the combined proposal. Again, the operational interactions between the communities and the IANA functions operator are not pictured. Only what is pictured here are the oversight components. This basically brings together the three diagrams that you've seen throughout the presentation.

Just to briefly review, what the combined proposal puts forth is that ICANN would have established the post-transition IANA (the PTI) as an affiliate, also known as a subsidiary, with legal separation from ICANN. ICANN would subcontract the IANA functions out to the PTI. Looking at the names portion on the right side, this would include escalation paths for complaints from customers up through the Customer Standing Committee, which would be providing oversight over the day-to-day performance, and then you would have IFR for periodic review of the overall performance of the names functions.

Looking at the numbers community on top, the RIRs would establish their SLA with ICANN, as Patrik described, and the review committee would be created to monitor performance and provide advice to the RIRs.

Then, finally, on the left side, on the protocol parameters section, the IETF would maintain its MOU with ICANN and would continue its current activities to monitor the performance of the protocol parameters function.

So that is how all of the proponents come together in the combined proposal.

Moving on to the questions for public comment, what the ICG is going for in terms of having a public comment period is both breadth and depth. We're looking for a variety of commenters to provide their input into this process. Those may include people who have been participating in the process all along and those who may not have. But we really want to understand from as broad a perspective as possible what people think of the proposal. That's the breadth part.

But we're also interested in depth. We want to know not only what your opinions are of the proposal, but why you hold those opinions. You'll see not in the slide deck, but in the specific questions we put out for public comment, you'll see us asking a question and then we'll say, "If your answer is yes, please explain why. If your answer is no, please explain why not and what modifications you might suggest to rectify the issue in the proposal." We really want to understand fully the rationales that people have provided for their comments.

I will also just reiterate something that Patrik said, which is that there are two parallel public comment processes happening right now. Ours is about the transition proposal, and there's a separate one about the proposal to enhance ICANN's accountability. So if your comments are about ICANN accountability, they should be directed to the other process. If they are about the transition proposal, they should be directed to this process. Our secretariat can provide the link to the accountability public comment if people need it.

Just stepping through quickly in terms of the questions we've asked, we haven't put them all on the slide, but the key ones are covered here. The first set of questions are about the proposal as a whole. We've

asked: is the combined proposal complete? Do the operational community proposals work together as a single proposal? Do they include appropriate and properly supported independent accountability mechanisms for running the IANA functions? We ask about workability and whether the results of the workability evaluations included in the proposals conflict with each other or raise possible concerns when considered in combination. So that's the set of questions about the proposal as a whole.

We also asked a set of questions about the NTIA criteria. It's very important for us from an ICG perspective to understand whether the community of commenters believe that the criteria has been met. We ask a question about each of the criteria and expectations, whether the proposal supports and enhances the multi-stakeholder model, whether it maintains the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS, whether the people believe that the proposal meets the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA services. In particular, if we're hearing from some of those customers and partners, we'd like for you to identify that you are one of those people.

We'd like to know if you think the proposal maintains the openness of the Internet. If you have any concerns that it's replacing NTIA's role with a government-led or inter-governmental solution, and if you believe the implementation proposal will continue to uphold the NTIA criteria as we go into the future.

That's a summary of the questions the ICG has for the community of commenters. If you want to submit comment, we're accepting comments until September 8th at 23:59 UTC. We have our website set

up for public comments. You can go visit it. It has more information about the proposal and also it has instructions for how to submit public comments.

We have two options for how people can submit comments. We have a web form for people to provide structured input with boxes to answer each of those questions. We also have an e-mail submission option for people who would like to provide freeform input or who do not want to use the web form. We have produced a Word template that also includes the questions in case people want to submit that via e-mail.

When submitting via either option, commenters will receive a confirmation e-mail and they will need to [put] the link in order for their comment to be posted to the public archive, and all comments will be publicly archived. That's how to submit comments.

I think with that we are ready for the question and answer portion. We have people who have been keeping track of the questions a little bit, but let me just reiterate how we are going to take questions. You have two options if you want to ask a question during the webinar. One option is by audio. You can raise your hand using the raise hand functionality in Adobe Connect. There's a button to do that across the top bar of Adobe Connect, and we'll take your question by audio. You can also type your question into the chat box.

If you have a question that you want us to respond to via voice as opposed to just chat in the chat window, then please preface it by using uppercase question in angle brackets and ending it with forward slash uppercase question in angle brackets. The instructions are in the session

information in the Adobe Connect. We'll take questions from either way.

If you are dialed into one of the non-English bridges, you can ask a question on your line and it will be interpreted and read or spoken aloud on the English line and answered in English. You have that option as well.

With that, I think we are ready to take questions, so feel free to raise your hand if you have one or put one in the chat. I think I see that we have had a couple of questions already put into the chat.

The first question that I see is from [Chip Sharp]. Is that correct, secretariat Is the first question from [Chip Sharp]? I think so. Yes, okay.

The first question is: "How will the global policy development process, if at all, for numbers change post-transition?" I believe we have Alan Barrett on the call from the numbers community. Alan, are you able to answer that question?

ALAN BARRETT:

Yes, I can answer that question. The global policy development process for the numbers community will not change at all. It will continue as it is today with global policies being discussed in the five RIRs. [They're more] reaching agreement on common text and then it's being ratified by the ICANN board. There are a few more details to it, but that's the essential process and it will not change at all.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. Thank you, Alan. We had another question for you I think from [Chip Sharp] which was: “Will the RIR’s SLA be with ICANN or with PTI?”

ALAN BARRET: Okay. The RIR’s SLA will be with ICANN, not with the PTI. We’ll make sure that ICANN has the right to subcontract the actual work to PTI, but ICANN will be responsible for ensuring compliance with the terms of the SLA.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Alan. Are there other questions that people want to raise either in the chat or with the hand raised and audio? Well, I think Patrik and I have just summarized a 199-page proposal in a short amount of slides. I see we have a question coming in, so I will take the question from Bob. I should have said at the beginning please identify yourself when making an intervention, if possible.

The question from Bob is: “Has the ICG looked at how the money would flow? That is, who pays for the PT IANA and how the money flows? Money can have a controlling effect.” That is the end of the question.

I will give just a brief answer, but if folks who have been involved in the names community – perhaps, Wolf Ullrich or Keith Drazek – if you want to add on after this, please feel free.

The ICG itself, obviously, only looked specifically at whatever was provided in the operational community proposal. There is a discussion of the IANA budget in the names community proposal, so to the extent that there are provisions in the names community proposal that create

accountability requirements in terms of empowering the community to be able to consider the IANA budget, we certainly reviewed that portion of the proposal. But that, I think, was about the extent to which we looked at budgetary matters. Are there ICG folks who would like to add on to that? Okay, I see in the chat – sorry, I’m going to read aloud answers because we want to make sure we have an audio transcript of all the questions and answers.

I see Keith Drazek also responding to the question from Bob. “There are no current fees or payments associated with the performance of the IANA functions and there are no new fees or payments anticipated.”

I think we can move on to our next question, which is from Avri Doria. The question is: “Will the ICG have a role in resolving pending issues like the [disposition] of the IANA domain name and [various marks]?”

Good question, Avri. As we have set out in the proposal itself, and I think as Patrik mentioned, we have one of the communities has established requirements as they relate to the intellectual property related to IANA, and that’s the numbers community. The numbers community has proposed that the trademarks and domain name be transferred to an entity that is not the IANA functions operator and has suggested the IETF Trust.

The other two proposals are silent on this topic, so effectively, when the ICG did its analysis of the three proposals together, we didn’t find any incompatibilities because we had just a single community that had expressed any requirements around the IANA IPR.

At this point, we consider it to be an implementation issue. Now, if in the intervening time and if as part of the public comment period we come to find out that the proposal on the table, which is the one from the numbers community, is viewed as not workable by any of the other communities or by public commenters, then I think it is certainly a topic that we will need to address in our analysis of the proposal and the public comments. I think we certainly do continue to have a role in terms of ensuring that the proposal as it stands has broad public support, and also in helping the communities to coordinate with each other as we have been doing all along.

Any other ICG members want to speak to that topic? Okay, yes Avri I can confirm that the numbers proposal is the [reference solution].

I do not see any further hands raised or questions in the chat. Okay, I understand from the tech folks that we may have had a participant on the French line with a question, so let us await and see if we get the question from the French line. If the French interpreter is ready with the question, feel free, go ahead.

FRENCH INTERPRETER:

Okay, thank you very much. French interpreter here interpreting for the French speaker. He's not saying anything; I apologize. Okay, no questions from the French. Sorry about that.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay, no problem. Thank you. Any other questions, either in the chat or via audio? I see there's a lively chat going on in the chat window, but I

haven't seen a specific question posed for audible response. Daniel Karrenberg, go ahead. Daniel Karrenberg, did you have your hand up? I thought I saw it up. Daniel might need to try one more time. Okay, if the tech folks can try to resolve the audio issues, that would be good. I don't believe that we have any other questions in the meantime, however. Shall we try again with Daniel? Can we hear you, Daniel? Are you speaking? Apparently not. Feel free to type a question into the chat if you so choose.

We're still trying to resolve some of these audio issues and waiting for people to perhaps type their questions into the chat. Are there any other questions from people? Either raise your hand in Adobe Connect or preface your question with the word "question".

I now see Daniel's question which is: "Has the ICG noted that any of the other operational communities have taken note or made statements about the IPR solutions proposed by the RIRs?"

Again, I'll give an opening and if other ICG members want to chime in, then please feel free.

After we received the IETF and RIR proposals some months ago, we did inquire with both of them whether they felt that their proposals were mutually compatible on that point, and they responded in the affirmative. That is because, although the IETF had not expressed an opinion on this topic, they did not believe their proposal was incompatible with the numbers proposal. In the meantime, the IETF Trust also expressed its willingness to hold the IPR, as was suggested by the numbers proposal, and the IETF community expressed its

willingness to have the Trust do that. That was in the first round of communication back and forth between the ICG and the communities about this topic.

We also, upon receiving the names proposal, inquired about a similar question and got confirmation from the names community that their proposal was indeed silent on the issue, but that they are now in the process of formulating a position on the topic with the understanding that the current combined proposal essentially is represented by the numbers community, since their proposal is the only one that speaks to this issue.

Do other people from the ICG want to add on to that? Hearing none and seeing no further hands, we can go to the next question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Avri does have a question.

ALISSA COOPER: I was going to move on to Avri's question. Is that correct? Okay. Question from Avri: "Has the IETF Trust been asked whether it is willing to widen its fiduciary responsibility beyond the IETF?"

If I understand the question correctly, I think the answer is no, but it's quite possible that there are other people on the call who know the answer to that better than I. perhaps Jari, if you are on the call? Okay, Jari is not on audio. Jari, if you would like to answer in the chat, that would be helpful. I can read your response if you would like. Let's just hold a minute for Jari's response so that we can finish this question. It

doesn't appear to me necessarily that Jari's response is forthcoming, at least at the moment. I don't see a chat indication from Jari. So Jari, if you want to type – oh, there we go. There it is.

Avri, just to further respond to your question from Jari, "The details of actual agreements and arrangements regarding IPR and domains are to be determined. However, in my view, there has to be agreements where specific responsibilities and rights are assigned to parties, the operational communities, and the IANA operator. So in short, yes." He says that he was speaking as one trustee and not representing the trust officially. Thank you, Jari.

Next I think we have Kavouss with a hand up. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

A useful, productive presentation. Just reminding of two issues. One is any actions as a result of MOU [inaudible] in IETF and/or fit in ICANN are subject to community empowerment, judgment within the IRP, independent review process. So they should not think that what they do is totally independent. There is a direct and [inaudible] in parameters protocol, numbers, and names. Therefore, we should not make it totally separate because names and DNS is under the total review and community empowerment indirectly, any actions interrelated are dependent on that from [inaudible] also subject to community empowerment. That is one point to be very clearly mentioned.

The second is perhaps for tomorrow's session, you may kindly consider to further clarify the relation between Customer Standing Committee which monitors the activities of the PTI and the IRP, the review panel,

[inaudible] IANA function review. IANA function review, an independent review panel on one side; CSE on the other side; and PTI. There are four entities interrelated and it should be quite clearly mentioned how the system works for public. I don't have any problem. I understand what it is. It is clearly mentioned in the CCWG and CWG, but it has to make it clear because the question has been raised by colleagues. Thank you very much.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Kavouss. We will certainly take your point about the presentation for tomorrow under advisement as we review before tomorrow's session. I would just say on the first point what I'm understanding you to say is that this IRP, the independent review panel, concept from the accountability work applies to all of ICANN's activities. That's my understanding of it. Thus, that would include ICANN's activities as they relate to the agreements that they have with other entities, including the IETF and the RIRs. If that's a clarification on the IRP, then that certainly makes sense to me. Although the IRP is not really – the decision about the creation of the IRP and its details are in the accountability proposal.

Anyone else from the ICG want to follow on or have responses? Any further questions, either in the chat or audible questions? Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, just a small perhaps point of clarification. The dependency of the IANA transition in relation with CWG and their interdependencies with

the CCWG is an issue that you have raised or we have raised in our [inaudible] that everything is conditioned under the workability and implementation of those issues. If some of those issues is not properly reflected – implemented – there will be some review of the situations.

However, currently, there are several areas that still CCWG is considering and perhaps out of the public comment, second public comment, there might be some revisions or some amendment that might have some impact. That should not be excluded. This is the issue that is still under the considerations, i.e. CCWG today best knowledge that they had, they did whatever they could and they did a great job. Nevertheless, it is subject to public comment which might have some impact to review of the situation which indirectly might have an impact on the CWG names which has again [inaudible] impact on IANA transition. This should be kindly observed and considered by the community listening to the webinar. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Kavouss. That is a good point. Just to reiterate, as Patrik noted, after we have received public comments and the CCWG has received public comments and after the CCWG has finalized the accountability proposal, the ICG has committed to seeking confirmation from the names community that the accountability proposal meets all of its requirements. That will be an important step for us to ensure that the transition proposal is complete and carries out all of the wishes of the names community.

Further questions either in the chat or by raising your hands? Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, once you finish the webinar, under any other business, as I mentioned two times, I have an important point to raise for your consideration. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, let's see if we have any further questions. Kavouss, if your further business, is it ICG business or it's for the broader the community attending the webinar?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, ICG business. It is ICG business. Yes, Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, so perhaps we can close the webinar.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah, okay. Once you're finished, okay. I [inaudible]. Once you finish webinar, then ICG. Okay, thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, great. I just wanted to thank everyone for joining the webinar today. I think we can consider it concluded. Thank you for your questions and comments in the chat. The chat transcript and the audio

recording will be made available on the ICG website after the close today so people can review them if they would like to.

I would just say as a final parting takeaway the ICG wants to hear from you in the public comment period whether you have concerns over the proposal or whether you support it. Demonstrations of support are just as important as raising questions and concerns. So please consider commenting even if what you have to say is primarily supportive comments. We will certainly accept those and benefit from their receipt as well.

Thank you, everyone. And Kavouss, if you want, we can end the recording and if you want to stay on the line, if the ICG members want to stay on the line for a couple minutes of any other business, we can do that.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I'm waiting for your green light.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Okay, Kavouss, I think we can move to your issue.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. The issue is that during the ICANN 53 we have ICG, CWG, CCWG, and GAC and so on and so forth, but [inaudible]. It's finished. But now I understand that people are planning for CCWG at the same time as ICG. I do not—

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]