SINGAPORE - Joint Meeting of the ICANN Board and the NRO/ASO
Wednesday, February 11, 2015 – 10:00 to 11:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	This is the audio test. Testing.
	This is, it's February 11, Bras Basah room. 10:00 in the morning. Joint meeting of the ICANN Board and the NRO.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	Thank you for calling the conferencing center, may I help you?
	Thank you for calling the conferencing center, may I help you?
	Callers, if you can hear me, I cannot hear you. Please call back.
BRUCE TONKIN:	Okay. Let's, if we can get everyone's attention, we'll get kicked off. This is a joint meeting between the I guess NRO/ASO and the ICANN Board. My name is Bruce Tonkin and I'm standing in for Steve Crocker, who is just briefly in a DNSSEC session, but he will be here shortly. And I will hand it over to the chair of the ASO for the topics you would like to discuss.
AXEL PAWLIK:	Good morning, my name is Axel Pawlik, I'm the director of the RIPE NCC, and this year I'm the chairman of the Numbers Resource Organization, as well, which is a position that rotates us among us, so

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.

EN

it's me this year. Get used to use to it. Should we do around the table quickly? Yes?

KUO-WEI WU: Kuo-Wei Wu, ICANN Board, and selected by ASO, and two years to go.

TIM [MCGINNES]:   Tim [McGinnes], interested bystander.

WILFRIED WOEBER: Wilfried Woeber, on the ASO for the RIPE NCC service region.

BRUNO LANVIN: Bruno Lanvin, ICANN Board.

TONY SMITH: Tony Smith from APNIC.

CRAIG NG: Craig Ng, APNIC General Council, and a member of the CRISP team.

LESLIE NOBILE: Leslie Nobile with ARIN.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE: Chris Buckridge with RIPE NCC.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] a member of the CRISP team.

MARKUS KUMMER: Markus Kummer, ICANN Board.

WOLFGANG KLEINWÄCHTER: Wolfgang Kleinwächter, ICANN Board.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Gonzalo Navarro, ICANN Board.

JONNE SOININEN: Jonne Soinnen, the IETF liaison to the ICANN Board.

JOHN CURRAN: John Curran, ARIN president and CEO.

DMITRY BURKOV: Dmitry Burkov, RIPE NCC executive board member.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Siranush Vardanyan, APRALO Chair, ICANN At-Large.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] RIPE NCC executive board.

ASHA HEMRAJANI: Asha Hemrajani, ICANN Board.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good morning. [Inaudible], [AC member] from APNIC.

RICARDO PATARA: Ricardo Patara, ASO/AC for LACNIC region.

ALAN BARRETT: Alan Barrett, member of the ASO/AC from the AFRINIC region, also member of the CRISP team.

PAUL WILSON: I'm Paul Wilson, the head of APNIC.

RON DA SILVA: Ron da Silva, also ASO/AC from the ARIN region.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby, ICANN Board.

BRUCE TONKIN: Bruce Tonkin.

AXEL PAWLIK: Right. Very nice. We have a couple of agenda points that we would like to raise, but before we start that, I would like to say thank you for giving us the opportunity to present ourselves. In the opening session, we did

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

talk about more exposure for the RIRs, the SAO, the NRO, within the ICANN surroundings for a while.

And we are very happy with the way it panned out that our recommendations were taking seriously, and we had an opportunity to do this. I couldn't be there, this time, myself, but from what I've heard, it was quite a nice session. So I would hope that we continue with that. Thank you very much for that opportunity.

So, the main thing these days, IANA stewardship transition. As you have seen, we've brought quite a number of the CRISPys, as we call them, lovingly. Those guys that were responsible for gauging the input from the RIR communities, and working very hard over Christmas and New Year, and then postponing their holidays, to hit the deadline on the 15th of January, and come up with a good proposal.

I'm happy to say, at least in my view, that's what they did. And we have a nice proposal out there. I don't know how we want to do this. You probably have read it, if you have any questions, I would invite you to voice them.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It seems on the ICANN Board liaison and the ICG group, first of all, many thanks for the [inaudible] SOs coming out with the, you know, the proposal. One of the very first two proposals of the ICG. I think that it is a very important contribution, at least the people can look around the differences of the communities, because in the moment, we saw the two proposals. One is from the SO and another one from the ITF.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

And I think the people in this community really, from these two proposals can figure out the difference, the organization, operation difference among the different, you know, communities. And I think as an ICANN Board liaison really thanks for your contribution in this ICG process. Thank you very much.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you. Ray?

RAY PLZAK: Thank you Axel. One thing I noted about this proposal, the philosophy behind it is exactly the same philosophy that we had in 2002, when ICANN went through its reform process. And the one thing that amazes me is that no one outside of the ASO/NRO understands that, and which is a really, for lack of a better term, a big shame.

So, if you… If everybody else understood what the basis was, and what the attempt was, I don't think you'd see so many disparaging comments about some aspects of the proposal. I'm also curious amongst the CRISPys, who is snap, crackle, and pop.

AXEL PAWLIK: All right. Anybody else?

WILFRIED WOEBER: Yeah, Wilfried Woeber here. I don't know whether it is appropriate to raise this issue in this round, so please feel free to stop me at any time. One of the things that worried me when I was following the comments

ICANN | 52
Singapore

and the procedures for coming up with this proposal, as managed and organized by the CRISP team, is that obviously some individuals in the community seem to have a different interpretation for the term bottom up.

And I'm a little bit worried this different attitude toward the architecture, might put some sand between the cog wheels eventually. And I'm not really conceived that it's worth the effort and worth the time to detract the process of the CRISP team and everyone else, in really speaking up and sort of making it part of the overall goal of discussion.

But I am worried that, in my interpretation, and my perspective, some people think that bottom up means that everyone in the street and their dog, has to talk to the top level of the structure. And in my books, this is not bottom up. In my book, bottom up is regional organization, regional mandate for an organization or team members in a team like CRISP.

And I am sure, from my experience, it's 99, or something like that, in our region. If any of those individuals, or the group itself, would do something which is not in the interest, and not compatible with the points of view for community in that region, they would speak up immediately and do that very, very loudly.

This has not happened, and so just my personal perspective and worries to share with you, and that's about it. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you Wilfried. I would agree with you. And I think if you look at the discussion items that turned up on the various mailing lists, of course there were a couple of opinions that were different from the majority overall, but I believe all of those comments were taking into account and discussed quite extensively, and maybe some of the CRISP would like to talk to that.

I've seen a couple of mails coming out of the CRISP team to various mailing lists, explaining what has happened into quite some detail. For my part, I'm quite satisfied with the way it went. Craig?

CRAIG NG: Thank you Axel. I think from the CRISP team, we are very proud of the effort that we took to address every single item. So I have never seen a process that is so transparent and so comprehensive. Every single point that were raised on the mailing list was addressed in a spreadsheet that very carefully tracked what actually happened to it. And as frustrating as it is to get, may I say, involved comments, I think we feel that it is in our role to explain to those people the differences in opinion that that bottom up process means, what consensus means, and I think if we do that carefully and comprehensively, then the rest of the community can understand that our process is up to scratch and beyond criticism.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you. I have Ray.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

RAY PLZAK: Thank you Axel. It's not often that I agree with a lawyer, but yes I agree with you. [Laughter] And I would like to echo Bill [Fritz's] comment, unfortunately when people interpret bottom up, meaning that every single person has to have access to the top, it goes counter to developing consensus. Bottom up means is that everyone gets together and works out their differences, and makes their compromises and so forth, so it's given to the top is a well thought out thing that represents the entire community.

And what we continue to be faced with, are proposals that when one part of the group doesn't agree with it, they go to the top with it instead of trying to resolve it inside the body. And so, Wilifried, I really, really agree with you.

AXEL PAWLIK: Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, thank you. Just, might help me because I'm not sure [inaudible] as close to this area as I am inside of the naming community. But has the ASO itself formally then endorsed the report, or effectively, because the way I would look at it is that the ASO would look at that report and say, "In their view, this represents the sort of consensus in our community when…"

I don't know whether they approve it, or whether they endorse it, or something, but is that step happening? Or has happened?

AXEL PAWLIK: Wilfried?

WILFRIED WOEBER: Sorry. Wilfried. To my knowledge, we have not gone through this exercise to formally endorse it or [inaudible]. If and when sort of the community thinks this is a good thing to do, I would say we are probably, or naturally, in a position to do that. But we have to be conscious of the fact that the formal mandate of the ASO does not include that.

So we can do that, no problem at all. I guess I will get consensus from all the other ASO members, but it would be sort of an informal endorsement, and just sort of the group's position, but I don't think it would be a formal contribution.

AXEL PAWLIK: We did discuss how we would deal with this in the beginning, and we exactly that the ASO/AC in the sense, doesn't have the mandate. They're looking out to build the policies. This is not a global policy, so this is off-limits. We have obviously published a report on the various mailing lists, and there was quite a bit of, not discussion, but support for the proposal, as such from the communities which through the process leading up to the drafting of the report, for instance, in the RIPE region, quite a number of principles that they would like to see there as well.

I have Kuo-Wei.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

KUO-WEI WU: I don't know if this is a right time to raise this one, or a bit after. If you think that would be the last one, I'm fine. This is kind of related to the IANA transition, as you know, is a CCWG talking about accountability. And as I know, the RIR is actually also participating in the CCWG, and what is the AO/SO point of view regarding accountability and also the relationship between the CCWG accountability to the IANA stewardship transition stuff?

AXEL PAWLIK: Does anybody want to speak to that? John?

JOHN CURRAN: John Curran. So, the… I want to make sure I understand the question. The question is, what do we see as the relationship to the community accountability effort versus the activity going on with respect to the CWG and the ICG development of the stewardship transition proposal?

So, we focus predominately on the activities necessary to support the ACG in development of stewardship transition proposal. That's been our primary focus. It is true that we have formal liaisons to the CCWG, which is meeting across the way, and they're in there now, and I'm watching it.

It is, the CCWG is a very dynamic environment with a lot of participants who have strong feelings about issues of ICANN accountability, predominately based on their experiences within ICANN, which is predominately related to DNSSEC activities. So, the, we actually had some discussion of this, this week. We are going to be paying attention.

Particularly we're going to make sure that the mechanisms that are being proposed don't create uncertainty for what we rely on ICANN for, which is for ratification of global policy, for example, but we don't think that's the case. So we're mostly monitoring and making sure that we, that ICANN is just as stable and productive at the end of this process, as it is today.

It's hard to really do a thorough analysis of the risks involved in the accountability measures being created, because the CCWG hasn't gotten to that point, to have a firm draft document to review.

AXEL PAWLIK: Kuo-Wei.

KEO-WEI WU: Actually I'm more interested with following with this one. I think among us, I think we understand that there are people outside of the ICANN community, or even inside the ICANN community, actually happy to see the value of the ICANN community governance, right? So, in a sense, nobody in the CCWG or ICG, we see that people keep challenging this kind of mechanism, and looking for an alternative of the possibility to create so-called, another mechanism to [inaudible] that.

And of those, it depends on the person, you know? For my personal opinion, this is another very healthy way to see the Internet goals in the future. And so, I'm asking this question, it's kind of related. What is in our SO, allow people to see this community, the ICANN [inaudible], this mechanism. Are you pleased to see these mechanisms? Do you continue to maintain and how we can help this ICANN community go

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

into a healthy development in the future, and make sure that the Internet is running secure, you know, [inaudible].

I think, in that sense, we might have the same kind of understanding about it.

JOHN CURRAN: If I could respond. So recognize that all of this has been instigated by the NTIA announcement regarding IANA stewardship, and because the RIR community has very good forcing functions to build consensus, and we work on building consensus policy separate from ICANN, and we rely on ICANN for review and ratification, and we have a contractual relationship with ICANN in understanding.

When it came time to talk about transition of stewardship, that's a very straightforward discussion for the number's community to have, which is why the proposal was produced in a timely manner. Our understanding is that in the name's community, they didn't have the ability to as clearly understand how their consensus is distinct from ICANN's consensus, and don't have the clarity that comes with having a separate organization.

And so, they indicated that required forms of ICANN's accountability and kicked off the CCWG effort. The numbers community didn't kick that off, but we are paying attention to it. We have had no issues. If there was an issue with ICANN accountability, we would have been coming to the Board talking about that long before NTIA did anything.

So the point is, we've worked very well together. Obviously we want to pay attention to the CCWG because we don't the output of that to make

ICANN | 52
Singapore

things less predictable and accountable through our community, and there is always a potential for that, depending on what mechanisms are created and how they operate. Does that clarify?

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you John. I have Paul, did you want to talk to this subject? And I have Alan first.

ALAN BARRETT: Right. Alan Barrett. I have two comments. First, wearing my CRISP hat, when we talk about accountability in the number's community, we usually mean rough, sorry, not accountability, consensus. We usually mean rough consensus. And so, a single dissenting voice in our view, is not sufficient to accept the rough consensus, provided the concerns have been addressed.

And so if anybody is looking at the comments or complaints that have been made about the CRISP process, I would ask them to please bear in mind that even the comments which were not incorporated into the draft were considered, and we gave reasons why they had not been incorporated. And then my second comment is wearing my SO/AC hat, I would say that the SO/AC is aware of this proposal, but it's out of scope for us.

We don't deal with this sort of level. We deal with the development of global policies.   And if there is a desire for some kind of formal endorsement from the ASO, then in my personal opinion, are the NRO NC would be the group that would provide that.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you Alan. Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Yeah. Good morning everyone. I'm a member of the ICG, and so just a couple of comments on the bottom up question that Wifried had mentioned. The ICG has put a huge amount of effort and time into discussing and ensuring its transparency and openness.

So, the meetings are open, anyone can join. The archive is online. The mailing lists are open. There is a public Dropbox with all of the documentation all the past version of all of the documents that are available online. So, excuse me, if anyone is not aware of that, then please be aware. And also, please help promote that fact to your communities.

Excuse me. The thing that… One of the issues that we've discussed at length, and again, you can see that discussion, you can see the results in terms of documentation, is how the ICG needs to be open to comments from the grassroots directly. So although I agree with Wilfried, the most elegant way for bottom up to work is that it goes progressively through each stage.

But the ICG hasn't ruled out, in fact, the ICG has completely enabled the receipt of comments from absolutely anyone.   And I think that's important to understand as well, because while we might have a preferred way that we see things work, we also have to wait for what should hopefully be the exceptions.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

So the ICG had a long discussion last week about exactly how we would be handling those public comments, would they be acknowledged, would they be followed up, would they be simply passed on to the communities and so forth. And again, that's all open and on the record for anyone to see. So just thought I would make that remark, that we really, the ICG really has gone to I think the maximum it's gone, literally as far as it can, I think, to make things open, and to be seen to be… Not to be seen or not to be accused of cutting any voice off at all from the process. Thanks.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you very much. Gonzalo Navarro. I have two separate questions or issues. First of all, congratulations for the work made on the CRISP. I think it's a really interesting proposal. Talking as a lawyer, I think it's really easy to understand the document, proposed clear, but for the future. So again, thank you very much for the time that you have invested in this document.

It is well received. I was reading with quite a lot of attention. Perhaps, it's not related with what we are discussing here, but perhaps something, you know, to keep in mind for the future. The last meeting that we had in LA was open to the public, and was quite interesting to see, and to interact with the audience, and the different constituencies.

I think we are having a really interesting discussion here, but for the future, it will be really, really interesting to try to keep, you know, what

ICANN | 52
Singapore

we did in LA, because the comments that we received from the community after that were quite positive. And I'm not sure why we are doing the same kind of format, you know, that we had in the past. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK: No, thank you for that. And [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. I like to make two comments. First of all, it's of course, very nice to receive all of this positive feedback on the CRISP work, but I do think, for the record, it's a little bit, there are two things that made our work very easy. One is that this work was started a very long time ago. So we are enjoying the advantages of that.

The other is the very clear guidance from the community, so that also made our work very easy. And then just to comment on Wilfried's comments. While I agree that it's sometimes somewhat disappointing to hear concerns raised at the very end of the process that we feel, like Craig was saying, has been transparent, bottom up, very inclusive, and we've been very, very open with, or very diligent in reporting all the comments made, I also think it's, sometimes it's healthy to have these concerns or dissenting voices raised at the end, because it's also an opportunity for us to actually explain this process again.

Simply because they're not only people in this community watching, but out there, in the real world, so to speak, so it's also an opportunity for us to actually explain how this community works, explain what we mean with bottom up, explain what we mean with consensus. So in that

EN

sense, I think it's healthy, and I think we should see it in that spirit. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you. Okay, I don't see any other comments coming up. Maybe we should move on to the next point on the agenda? The 26, minutes to the meeting. The intellectual property rights around IANA. You might have seen that the CRISP team has, in its proposal, put forward a recommendation, or said that it would be nice if the IANA domain and the trademark would be lodged somewhere different from the expected IANA operator.

We also see that the ITF has not done such a thing, and we've seen one question from the ICG whether those two details would be conflicting. And I think our general feeling is, no, they don't really conflict in a hard way. I do believe that there was actually yesterday afternoon meeting between the ITF folks and the CRISP team. I don't know what came out of that. Anybody? Yes, Alan?

ALAN BARRETT: I can talk about that. We had an informal meeting between some of the people involved in the CRISP process, and some of the people involved in the IETF, and our understanding is that the IETF is still discussing the issue, but it seems they agree with us that there is no real conflict here, that we need some negotiation, we need to figure out some details, but there is not actually a conflict between the two proposals.

It is not as though the number side said we must move the domain name and the IETF side, we must not move the domain name. It's more

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

like the number side said, we think it's a good idea to move the domain name, and the IETF was silent on that issue. Although they had discussed it in their work leading up to their proposal.

And it was a group of people within the IETF that thought moving the domain name would be a good idea, but in the end, they decided to leave that out of their proposal. So, my personal opinion is that it is likely that we can reach an agreement where the, maybe the IETF will say they have no objection, and we will say, from the numbers side, we will say we think it should move, and that's easy to resolve.

We can just move the domain name. Of course, ICANN would also have to be involved in that process. So we would like to hear what ICANN thinks about it.

AXEL PAWLIK: Kuo?

KUO-WEI WU: I'm sorry, I didn't participate in that one. I just left [inaudible]… I would like to know is that in the IANA office, people participated?

ALAN BARRETT: No.

KUO-WEI WU: What about the ICANN staff, supporting the ASO? No ICANN people participate in there?

ICANN | 52
Singapore

ALAN BARRETT: No, we have not formally spoken to them at all. They weren't in the…

KUO-WEI WU: I think Steve, it might be, it's very important for us, the ICANN staff, or maybe some of the legal people, or IANA office people should participate in that one, because they are talking about IP stuff, and that is, you know, it's three parties engaging in with IETF, and you know, the number community also, the IANA office. So if our people, the ICANN people didn't participate, that would be, you know, something missing there.

AXEL PAWLIK: Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. So Kuo-Wei raised a very, very important point. Alan, let me try to bring all of the pieces here together. From an attitude or posture point of view, we have no problem with this, at all. But from an operational viewpoint, there are some details to work out. And as Kuo-Wei suggests, it would be helpful to have some people in the room who are actually are dealing with all of this, and can bring some specifics to bear, and I think that would be a very good idea.

It makes no sense at all, if one is considering the very unlikely eventuality, you know, the IANA function moves somewhere else, that the domain name would continue to be an issue, should go with them.

There is more complicated scenarios in which things fracture, and then we have to… It's our life is simple as your problem.

I mean, so, but anyway, but from a broad point of view, we've got no issue. We are tracking the dialogue back and forth very carefully. I have to say that, on balance, the position that over engineering a solution in the absence of a lot of details is maybe going to lead down a bit of a rat hole, but from a, we'd have no discomfort at all of trying to make the situation comfortable for others, and to be very clear about that.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you for that Steve. Barbara?

BARBARA ROSEMAN: Hi, Barbara Roseman. I'm the ASO support person for policy, and I also support the SSAC, and therefore participate in the IETF.

STEVE CROCKER: And was previously general manager of the IANA function, actually knows something about this subject.

BARBARA ROSEMAN: I was just going to add to what Steve said, that we have been following this quite closely. I'm involved in almost all of the lists that are discussing this. And you know, we're trying to let it play out a little bit between the RIRs and the ITF, because I think that there is specific considerations that IETF has about the IOC taking over this responsibility.

EN

However, I don't think that there has been any objection raised on ICANN's side, to how this would eventually turn out. It's really a question of, the groups coming to some agreement on what would be best for them. And so I think that that's, I just want to reassure you that we are watching closely.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you. That makes me optimistic. John.

JOHN CURRAN: I think the, there has been very good discussion on this within the RIR community and within the IETF community. And it's actually fairly simple, the convergence is around recognition of the fact that long-term, if something were to happen, and they would have been multiple IANA operators, for protocols, and numbers, and names.

It's possible they would all want to make use of the term IANA, and would want to make use of the portion of the domain name, and so it just looking at that is 100% assured, if those contracts were issued by NTIA tomorrow to multiple operators. And it's completely unknown if it were to happen generically organically in the community over 10 years, and we didn't make arrangements.

So I don't think it's a mystery. And it actually isn't probably as much about who holds what, as just acknowledging that we all know this is available to everyone who is operating part of the IANA. And I think that, I have a pretty high level of faith that will come out of the interaction between the communities and the ICG over the next few months.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you John. Craig?

CRAIG NG: Thanks Axel. I think it's very important to make the point that RIRs are not seen to be trying to do a land grab. I think we share the same principle with the IETF, which is as John has expressed, that intellectual property rights can't be used as a shield to prevent a later transition to someone else in the future.

So I think in the CRISP proposal, it was very clear that the IANA intellectual property rights, if you like, are attached to the functions and not to the operator. And the suggestion for putting it in the IETF trust is but a stated preference and a possibility, not that mandatory requirement.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you.   Do you have any other comments regarding IANA stewardship transition at this point? All right. That doesn't seem to be the case, then maybe I wrap it up with saying that, of course, seeing that we have a proposal for the numbers section that finds support in the communities, one of the big principles in this is that we would like to see as little change as absolutely necessary for stability and all that, to keep trauma to an absolutely minimum.

And having said that, we had a quick meeting yesterday with Fadi, I would very much like us to progress down this road, looking at the original ICG timeline, to have some agreement between the RIRs and

ICANN ready, maybe, in June, so that we can see what we would help to implement, or whether it's all implemented already, because we want minimal change.

And to keep that running, for the rest of the year, to the original timeline to be ready for evaluation of those mechanisms, by September. Just for your information. And Fadi said that basically that's his plan as well, so we are moving forward to that very gently. Right.

Then the next point on the agenda, our meetings participation. As you know, ICANN people, you are always very, very welcome to attend ICANN meetings, yes, certainly that too. It would be disappointing if you weren't. RIR meetings as well. There are, of course, a number of them upcoming.

I have heard from Fadi that he is planning to attend two of them this year. And as usual, if you have any plans just, don't let us know, just turn up. It would be great. Ray.

RAY PLZAK: A couple of things on that. First of all, Gonzalo pointed out earlier about the fact that we are, again, in a small room, and we don't have availability to the larger group of people that are here. I said in an email this morning to the Board, it's almost as if the Board considers the ASO/NRO to be a troubled relative that you can only visit in secluded places from time to time.

The reception in LA was very well received, being in what amounted to the same large meeting area that the sub-elements of the GNSO were at, and also the fact that it was actually published in being very open, it

ICANN | 52
Singapore

was well received, and it was actually well attended. So it's news that continued to happen, what happened in LA.

Second thing in matter of participation, I have spoken earlier about the fact that ICANN needs to find a way to assist in travel support for people from the various ALSs to attend regional registry meetings, so they can participate in the policy processes. I also understand that John, that recently the NARALO and ARIN have signed a memorandum, so if you can take a few minutes to say something about that, I would appreciate it, and then I would like to respond.

JOHN CURRAN: Yeah, I would just like to, we did sign a memorandum of understanding with NARALO, to cross communicate information about our events. So that the NARALO community is aware of policy development activities, and our meeting activities going on, and that will help facilitate their involvement in things.

We have an active fellowship program, so that becomes an opportunity for them, and we think it's a very positive step. And as Axel said, we would encourage meeting participation to the extent that you would want to see the next level of detail down in policy development, feel free to come by one of the RIR meetings.

RAY PLZAK: And to that end, and I know that other regions have also previously signed agreements. It would probably be worthwhile for the RIRs to consider to somehow or other, maybe be able to create a track, or some other coordinated efforts so that the RALO could in a particular region

ICANN | 52
Singapore

could, for example, have a general assembly, and that the persons that are at that general assembly, at some point in time could then get into the regional registry policy discussions.

All regional registries do that right now with various other aspects, so this would be loading something else on to it, and of course, I would expect that ICANN, somehow or other, would be able to find ways of funding that activity as well. I don't think ICANN has to spend it directly. I think that they can actually support existing regional registry programs.

And John, I guess you want to respond to me.

JOHN CURRAN: I just wanted to say, amongst other things in cooperation, is cooperation on meetings. We are looking at the opportunity of having a NARALO meeting adjacent to an ARIN meeting, for that purpose.

RAY PLZAK: Yeah, so I think the big thing is to get some funding going, and like I said, just ICANN providing funds to the regional registries to bolster their own existing fellowship programs, would help probably a lot.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. Siranush Vardanyan, APRALO Chair. Being the Chair one of the RALOs, I would also like to mention that we have official MOUs with

APNIC and AP TLD, and we have already in place the example of participation of our ALSs in the upcoming RIR meeting in APRICOT 2015. And I would like to thank also for support from APNIC to cover the participation fee for our two members to go there.

Though there are some difficulties with the participation, relates to that, the APRICOT itself is about 10 days meeting, but our ALSs are able to go within the, due to the CROPP program, community outreach pilot program, and it gives only the possibility for three days/two nights.

So we found out, due to the agenda, which part is the most important for our ALSs to be there. But I think that this is the example that should be used in the future, and should be extended for all RALOs and RIRs as a cooperation, as a good step for future development. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you. Sounds promising. Alan.

ALAN BARRETT: Alan Barrett. I would like to mention that in the AfriNIC region, we do have good cooperation between ICANN's structures and the RIR, and the technical community. And I'd like to invite everybody to our next combined meeting in Tunisia at the end of May and beginning of June. There will be AfriNIC, the African network operators group, AF TLD, and AFRALO, I believe they're all meeting in the same place during the same one or two week period.

AXEL PAWLIK: Very good. [Inaudible].

ICANN | 52
Singapore

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. I wanted to highlight a couple of points and make a couple of observations. You know, RIRs have policy discussions, they are, there is a robust process to do that, but my observation is that, much of that is invisible to many in the ICANN community. I mean, this is something that you all already know, but I just wanted to acknowledge that. And this community often is focused on naming issues as compared to either protocol parameters, or addressing issues.

So given that, it strikes me that there might be a few things that we should together focus on doing. One is a demonstration of the diverse and thriving mechanisms for policy discussions, as well as technology, introduction, roll outs, as well as decision making.   And it's not homogenous, right? You all know it, we know it, but not everybody here knows it.

But it feels like that there is not much a demonstration of that. I hear many of you in many meetings say, "It's there. It exists. This is robust, it's thriving. If only you came, you would understand it." And I submit to you that's not good enough, right? There ought to be a way to actually maybe get some visualizations, or some kind of education of how that actually is done, and have that be available in a large scale, to the participants who come to ICANN.

Some ideas there, potentially is material in the ICANN bags, pretty much everybody wants them, and before they put it in the trash, they actually often look at them, right? The other thing is ICANN runs an induction course for newbies. There is a whole newbie program, and there is an

ICANN | 52
Singapore

induction course, I don't know if there is material that is already being presented, or it has been presented, that that can be enhanced.

One of the things that seems to have received good responses from this community, is a few years ago, ICANN engaged with an organization called Explain. And they worked with community members, and they came up with some visualizations of the ecosystem, etc.

And I find that those graphics and those visualizations are being used across the Board, in many communities, they have been disseminated and used. So I don't know if you already have done the work, and if it's simply a matter of distribution, or if that work ought to be done, but either way, it feels like we're leaving many gaps, and we're spending quite a bit of time kind of bemoaning our fate, that there is not enough interest or dissemination.   And my perspective, I'm pretty biased towards action.

AXEL PAWLIK: I would support that. I think we have, we have started to move into this. In the beginning, I said it was great to see that the Monday, the opening session was more substance as in the other communities, so it's moving there. But you're right, there is much more that we could do.

I have Paul, Ray and John.

PAUL WILSON: Yeah, I just wanted to say thanks again to ICANN for the opportunity to present that in the opening, because since Alan and I gave our

EN

speeches, I've had quite a few people sort of say, "Wow, you know, 10 meetings a year…" The stat from Alan was 50 policy proposals over the last year, with 15 of them coming through to process, and this is something that happens out there in which many people are not aware of.

Great for ICANN Board to be there. It's great that we are able to participate and collaborate with the ICANN regional folks, so in Asia-Pacific, we've worked with Kuek's team, and conducted sort of ICANN forum kind of sessions at our meetings recently. And I think that can increase.

But again, I think it's really good to take the opportunity to promote that opportunity. Kind of a measure of success for me would be if we started to see participation by Asia-Pacific GAC members in our meetings, because that would kind of represent, I think, a new level of bringing people in who I really think need to understand. And, you know, we need to understand in the work that we do. Thanks.

AXEL PAWLIK: Ray?

RAY PLZAK: Thanks Axel. Good comments, Paul, I agree. If those that remember back to the days of [WISIS], all of the outreach material that we produced in multiple languages, despite the fact our forum caught on fire at [WISIS 2], everything else. The material that's present, that's used, for example, in a newcomer orientation in ICANN meeting, unfortunately also reflects the level of knowledge of ICANN staff.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Now that's improving because recently, within the last year, have been able to get David Olive talking to the NRO CCG, the communications coordination group. And so, it's imperative for both ICANN staff and the NRO to be mutually engaged in this.

I think that the CCG, and if I was on the EC, I would actually strongly encourage, as you guys know how I would, that this happen. That the CCG actually become much more active in this regard, providing appropriate educational material. The ICANN staff certainly should be part of that, they should also be able to help the CCG frame it into the language of the people that are going to get it.

And I'm talking about, not whether they're speaking English or French or whatever, but into their relative experience in terms of names and so forth. And when they start seeing some of the commonalities exist, as Alan pointed out in his report about reduction of work load, and WHOIS, and privacy, and all of those things, there is cross fertilization that can occur.

So, it's incumbent on both the NRO, and I point out using the CCG as one of them, and the ICANN staff to work. That level of cooperation does exist, for example, between the engineering coordination group, and ICANN, very much so. And so we just need to get that working with the CCG as well.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you, I have [inaudible] on the list, and I want to close this list as well. We have nine minutes to go, and Steve wants to close the thing as well. So John.

JOHN CURRAN: Good comments on this topic. I'm going to be the one with the bucket of cold water. So, I want to be very clear, there is different ICANNs. There is ICANN, the DNS policy development body, and there is ICANN, the overall Internet identifier coordination entity. And it's not clear that the average attendee to the DNS policy development process, wants to be educated about what's happening in the RIRs, or what's happening in the IETF for that matter.

There is, right now, in the IETF, 1,000 drafts, Internet drafts out there. You can read them all day, and I could present, for hours. So we have to be sensitive folks that not everyone is involved in every community. We want to do extensive outreach. We want to do extensive awareness. We want to people to know that these are the discussions going on, but at the end of the day, we also have to point out, they're going on in other meetings.

And you actually have to participate, or you have to go remotely online, to become involved. Okay? It does not all occur at ICANN. The ICANN DNS community doing DNS policy development is very important, but please don't expect the RIRs or the IETF to show up here, because you have two different things going on. ICANN overall coordination, and ICANN DNS policy development.

And it is not clear that we need to brief all of the DNS policy people on the details of our policy proposals or the IETF Internet drafts, anymore than the IETF attendees want to hear about everything going on in the GNSO. It should be that they are aware of what's going on, that they know where it's taking place, they know how to get involved, remotely

ICANN | 52
Singapore

or online, but they need to consciously decide to participate in these processes.

And we should not assume everyone is a policy participant in every policy forum. It's not correct.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thanks John.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you Axel. Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Board member selected by the At-Large. And I've raised this issue before about getting At-Large participation in the RIR meetings. And I've spoken with Paul Wilson before, and so I understand the sensitivities in terms of whether the participation can be meaningful. But the first step towards getting to meaningful participation is helping the community have a better understanding of what's happening at the RIR, what is the policy process, how do you engage.

And we're starting to break the ice on that, but it's only at the surface level. And the engagement is starting, it's very encouraging. Now there is, in the ICANN London meeting, there was an ATLAS summit. It was the summit of all of the ALSs accredited by ICANN.

And one of the recommendations that is coming to the Board is having regional assemblies, RALO assemblies in the region. And one of the challenges that we're facing is, for example, for APRALO, in the Asia-Pacific region, next year because of the ICANN meeting rotation, there is

ICANN | 52
Singapore

no ICANN meeting in the Asia-Pacific region. So we have to think about where to locate the APRALO meeting should they get that funding.

And one of the concrete suggestions is to co-locate it with a RIR meeting, which is APNIC. And so, the question that I have, is that if we were to make that possible, is it possible to have cross-pollination in the sense that some of the APNIC people come over to the APRALO meeting and explain, help them understand, understanding that you are busy with your own meeting.

And so I want to have an understanding on whether or not that's possible logistically. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK: That would depend on the details, I think, but I'm sure that we would be willing. I'm talking for all of the RIRs. George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you Axel. I just want to give a strong plus one to what Gram has said. The, and I think John's observation about this policy space being different is relevant here too. It's very difficult for any of us who really want to know more about RIRs to find it out here, both because you don't present it, and that's okay, but the fact is, we are absorbed.

We are totally absorbed by what's going on here, and there is no way we're going to be able to provide any, any space in time to address RIR issues. I think the way in which one has to do it, is to go to a RIR meeting. I'm planning to do that. I think it's the only way to immerse yourself in these issues that RIRs deal with, and have some

understanding of the nuisances of what's going on, in addition to the main thrusts. The notion of co-location comes up several times. It makes good sense to include RIR meetings as focal points in regions, it reduces travel within the region, and it enhances the attractiveness for people outside the region to participate. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK: [Inaudible]?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes, just a good summary of this off the topic, I would like to invite all of you today to come at 6:30 to celebrate APRALO diversity in VIP lounge. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you. Good to see so much discussion. We have four minutes left. Steve? [Inaudible]?

DMITRY BURKOV: Actually, I have one question, because within the past few weeks, I go to different [inaudible] simply businesses, cast numbers down. And regarding future in situation when US sanctions go against Russian Internet populations. I try to simplify and I have a question. Does ICANN have any US [inaudible] for the control license on IANA functions? And on the ICANN DNS activities.

                        If not, does ICANN plan to apply for such licenses? Or should we should close our Internet [inaudible]?

ICANN | 52
Singapore

AXEL PAWLIK: Question to ICANN.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm not sure that I've heard, I mean, there has been no discussion that I've been involved in on this.

ELISE GERICH: For the record, Elise Gerich, ICANN. I think you're asking about if there are any sort of [inaudible] concerns? So we have not had any difficulty applying for licenses to do the work of the IANA functions with any country. And I don't anticipate that, but I really don't have a crystal ball.

DMITRY BURKOV: It's not for directly related, for example, to hopefully [inaudible], hopefully we our outside of US jurisdiction, but what's really happen? Maybe you don't know because 1,000 messages [inaudible], with no… If you even have some meta data related to some territory of Russia, your registration was cancelled. [Inaudible]… of course, in this situation, we have a question, for example, regarding registry and registrar located in Russia, because of course, we serve all of our populations.

                               Should we expect that ICANN will cancel contract?

AXEL PAWLIK: I don't think that we can…

DMITRY BURKOV: …IANA function also, it's general because it will influence on the future of the whole system [inaudible]…

AXEL PAWLIK: No, I don't think that we can answer this now. But I think we have another meeting this evening over drinks, in a relaxed atmosphere, maybe we can take it forward there a little bit more. Steve, last words?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you Axel. I want to take this opportunity to note that you have a very serious challenge in front of you, because a very significant event is taking place. Our esteemed colleague, Ray Plzak is completing his term this year, and will rotate off of the Board. I've had the pleasure of working with Ray, not only in the six years that he has been on the Board, but he's a charter member of SSAC, and served as vice-chair with me for a number of years there.

                        Ray has brought an incredible amount of energy, focus, deep, deep knowledge and history of the entire system, enormous commitment, and you have a, as I say, an enormous challenge in your selection process. I don't want to comment on any particular choices. You've got a set of people I know that you're working at, but these are very big shoes to fill.

                        One other small, couple of details. The term that we… We align the terms to all start in the, at our annual general meeting, but the selection period, the timing of selection is as it was before, because it feeds into the selections that the NomCom has to make for its selections, and one of the requirements is some constraints on the geographic balance.

So I know that you're proceeding on good schedule, and I just wanted to highlight that. We also make a point in inviting incoming Board members to join us at a retreat that the Board has, prior to the next ICANN meeting. We will have one in September. So I think the critical dates, from where I'm sitting, are that the NomCom probably needs the information before the Buenos Aries meeting, before the June meeting, because that's where they meet, and I think do their primary work, and then we will invite whoever is selected to join us at our September retreat, and come up to speed, and then we will say farewell, with great regret, to Ray.

He'll have to suffer through this and many other similar comments as we go. [Applause]

AXEL PAWLIK: That brings us to the end. Thank you very much for the opportunity to meet you and talk to you, and we'll see you later this evening. And we'll try to make next meeting venue a little bit bigger so that more people can come in. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]