

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

SALLY COSTERTON: So we move to the next section of our discussion. And Cory, I hope, is now going to bring up by the power of the magic of the Internet our community partners to join this discussion.

STEVE CROCKER: And we're expecting Jari Arkko and Andrew Sullivan from the IETF and IAB, respectively.

We're expecting -- Who from the RIR community? Izumi?

SALLY COSTERTON: We have Axel, Axel Pawlik from the NRO.

And Izumi Okutani from the chair of the CRISP. And Jonathan Robinson, the cochair of the CWG, from the naming community.

STEVE CROCKER: Right.

SALLY COSTERTON: So we have a very good representation.

SALLY COSTERTON: So just while we're waiting for the screens to come up. Andrew can only be with us for the first five or six minutes. So I'm going to go to Andrew first. And then Jonathan has to go at 10:00. So just so you know, we have that limitation.

ANDREW SULLIVAN: This is Andrew. I'm actually until -- until 1:00 my time, which is 45 minutes from now.

SALLY COSTERTON: Andrew, that's correct. Sorry. That's good to hear.

We're just waiting to bring you up on our screen. At the moment, we can just see ourselves. We can see Andrew, yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: There's more of us so it's a bigger picture.

CORY SCHRUTH: We are just waiting for everybody else to start their video. Everybody but Izumi is connected right now.

SALLY COSTERTON: Okay. Thank you very much, Cory.

I think probably everybody is on the voice line, aren't they? So should we start?

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

The voice line, yes. I mean the -- What's the matter? Too much jet lag. Thank you, Erika.

Let's kick off. Firstly, my name, for any of you who don't know me, my name is Sally Costerton, the head of stakeholder engagement at ICANN. And I'm just going -- I'm going to moderate this session.

I'd like to go to our panelists for about 25 minutes, and I'd be grateful -- I'll come to each of you in turn -- if you can give the Board really your considered highlights of what you consider to be the main issues as we come into this next stage of the oversight transition from your observations or from your community that you think we really need to focus on.

The Board is up to speed with the state of the process, so I don't think we need to spend too much time on that. This is really a brainstorming session so that the Board and our community partners can understand the key priorities, and maybe some of the key barriers, that we will have to overcome to achieve a successful conclusion.

So with that, Andrew, could I turn to you first? And I'd be grateful if you could share at the end of your comments perhaps if there was one thing that you think was the most important thing that as a group we have to focus on, what would it be.

Thank you.

Can we go to Andrew first?

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Apparently I should unmute my mic before I start talking.

The one thing that I would say is most important for us is to, you know, press ahead with the community developed proposals. You know, now three communities have come together. One of them may be a little shakier than the others, a little later, and so there's a compressed time to review that, but by and large, we have three proposals. It seems to me that they're mostly consistent. And what we've got to do now is follow that pattern and follow that proposal that the community has come together to make and deliver that.

I think this means really that the IETF is pleased to welcome everybody else into the same sort of arrangement that we've had. We've got an arrangement that has never involved the NTIA, and it's running and it's working. And so we just have to follow through and complete this, what I regard as basically a formality to act like the community that everybody knows is already mature enough to do this.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

SALLY COSTERTON: Wow. Thank you. That was -- is there anything else that you think that you've observed during the discussions that you think is particularly problematic -- and you made the comment that you think it should be quite straightforward -- that you would like to draw our attention to?

ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, there are two things that I think -- and I think this has been suggested for the agenda as well. The one is there remains a tendency on the part of some people to think that if you just talk to the right person, then could you make a deal with them. And I don't think anybody here thinks that, but I think that there are some -- you know, some people around the world who seem to believe that, you know, you could make a bargain among the small number of so-called leaders and then it would be all set.

And of course that is not the way this process is set up, and that's not something that any, I think, of the communities would stand for. So we don't have that freedom. And we need to keep reminding people who think that, you know, if you get the right people together, it will all be fine. That is one thing that I think very definitely we need to keep in mind.

And the other thing is that there's a tendency for some people to look at this opportunity of transition to rewrite a whole lot of other things. And there remains some people who want to do that kind of thing. Rather than, you know, following sound engineering practices of changing as little as possible and making, you know, gradual reforms afterwards if we need to, there are people who want to make big giant changes all at once.

And there are two problems with that. One, of course, is that if it blows up later, you don't know what you changed that caused the problem because you changed so many things. And the other thing is that you've got to get agreement on all of these many, many things that people want to do rather than the narrow things, which are the things we're already doing.

So it would be preferable from my point of view to continue to remind people of that; that we just need to continue with business as usual.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Andrew.

So -- I think very clear points that it should be fairly straightforward. Let's stick to what we know to be the community process. Let's follow the process we've agreed. Let's make sure the community -- everybody understands that that process is the right process, and we shouldn't have side processes. Change as little as possible. Follow sound engineering principles, and that will give us the best chance of success.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

(audio recording begins)

We'll come back in a minute to the group for a discussion with the wider board, but let me go next to -- is Izumi online?

Not yet. Okay.

So we'll go to Jonathan next, if we may. I think Jonathan knows probably everybody around this table and everybody knows Jonathan and needs no introduction.

Jonathan, perhaps you could share, similar from your perspective, the priorities that you think we should be addressing. And perhaps that question again, what do you think is the most important thing? If we just did one thing to move this to conclusion, what should we be bearing down on?

Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Sally. Can you confirm my audio is clear?

SALLY COSTERTON: Very clear.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Can you hear me, Sally?

SALLY COSTERTON: Yes, we hear you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Good. Thank you.

Look, I have to confess I'm not as -- I haven't given this quite as much thought as I would have liked to give it in a very succinct way, but I think you did say you've had preparatory work so you know where we've come from. And I'm thinking here, technically my community is the GNSO, which, as you know, is diverse and faceted. But here I'm thinking very much from a CWG transition perspective. And you know that this week we put out a substantially coherent proposal for public comment, 28-day public comment. It's got some rough edges, so that worries me a little. It's not entirely complete. There does need to be some work. And the concern with that is that it depends how those responding to that decide that the refinements both that the group undertakes and that the public comment expects the group to undertake, whether those are deemed to be not so material as to require another public comment. So that's clearly the big issue. Whether or not from a timing point of view we can deal with one public comment, process those public comments, put them into a revised proposal, get them out to the community ahead of Buenos Aires, and then get chartering organization support for that proposal.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

But from a -- Purely from within the group and the group's work, that's probably a core issue.

Another one is that one or more chartering organizations feels that they simply haven't had the opportunity to digest the process and deal with the content and the ramifications of it.

I think that would be tough because the organizations have had a lot of prior exposure, both through membership of the CWG and repeated communications and output of the group.

And then the third issue that we face is this dependency and linking with that of the accountability track.

So for me, those are the three challenges. And the challenge with the third one is that group had begun their work a little after the CWG on the stewardship, and yet there is a strong linking between the two. And so that will provide us with potential challenges if there isn't a belief that that work is sufficiently mature from the CWG on accountability.

I would say that on a positive note, the work of both of these groups has been a kind of, from my point of view, a significant coming of age of the use of Cross-Community Working Groups. And for me, this feels like an indication of where both from the Board's perspective and the broader community's perspective, that these represent a great opportunity for us to do cross-community work, multi-disciplinary, multi-faceted work that is far less siloed than it might have been in the past.

So I think it behooves all of us to embrace that and genuinely recognize and support the efforts of both of these CWGs.

I think the Board can help by giving insight into timing. There's some push-back from the community, with good reason in part, from exhaustion and effort and, you know, requirement to commit. So I think to the extent that the timing pressures can be explained and understood, that's helpful.

We have had very good involvement from board members in whatever capacity in the CWG that I've been chairing. So that's been great, and I think the continued support and assistance, and probably even more so for the accountability track, to give the community confidence, enhance the sort of -- I think one of the classic challenges we face and we'll continue to face it with these two groups is to make sure there's collective trust between the work of the groups and the work of the boards. Just actively working to build those bridges and cement the trust.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

So, really, that, I think, is very important; that we support the work of the group and make sure that the communication is as effective as possible and that there's sort of sleeves rolled up and direct contact with members of the community and vice versa with members of the Board.

So I think those three risks I highlighted with the positive (indiscernible) sure we keep in good contact.

I'll stop there, Sally. That's (indiscernible) picture.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Jonathan. Very helpful.

I hear a thread through most of your comments, the question about timing, the pressure of timing, the need for there to be shared understanding about the timing of this process. And one of -- several of you discussed on email issues that you thought were pertinent to this before we started, and one of the questions that came up was the impact of any delay in submission to the NTIA. Now, I don't want to go into enormous detail at this stage, but perhaps if you had a couple of comments that you could frame that so we can probably come back to that when we bring the Board into the discussion, that would be appreciated.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I'm not sure I understand the question. I can speak broadly to typing and timing related issues or....

SALLY COSTERTON: The question -- oh, I'm sorry. The question is whether you had any observations about the impact of any delay, if there is a delay, from the dates that have been stated by the NTIA.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I don't think I want to speculate as to the impact of the delay.

I will say that the work has been -- you know, there's a time scale that's very hard -- that pushes hard but is realistic with respect to Buenos Aires. The work has been done in a way to make it both stand-alone but also be coherent with the other proposals, which sort of touches on Andrew's point.

It is my perception that the ICG should be able to stitch these pieces of work together and make a coherent proposal, but I won't speculate as to -- you know, I think the challenge is whether there's another cycle that comes out of that, either through the ICG referring it back to one or more communities. I believe -- my sense is that they won't need to do that and that there might be minor iterations and changes, but the issue from -- is whether there's a further cycle of public comment and we get pushed out to the Dublin meeting.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

As to the sort of broader political impacts of that and the consequences of that additional step, I think I'll leave it to others more in the know to describe, you know, the consequences of that.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you.

So what I'm hearing you say there, and I think it refers slightly also to the sentiment Andrew was expressing, is, look, you know, this has been designed for the proposals to slot together. The system has been set up in such a way that that should be possible within the time frame that's been allocated. It's tight, but there's an enormous amount of effort going into making it happen. And everybody is taking, clearly, I think, quite a positive attitude to that. That's what I'm hearing from these two sets of comments. And that we should keep going, and the Board should be as supportive as possible and as hands on and active in that process as it can be to encourage the community to continue in that work. And the acknowledgment that I heard there that that has been very present in the work so far with the community.

Thank you, Jonathan.

Let me turn to Jari next.

Jari, welcome. Very good to have you with us.

The same question I would ask for you. Again, just while we're bringing you online, one of the questions that came up on the e-mail discussion, I think it was from you, but if I'm wrong, please correct me -- is an interesting question about the difference in process between the bottom-up, consensus-driven, community process that, of course, is being used to develop this proposal, versus the governmental process that will look at the proposal through Congress and also through the eyes of foreign governments once it's delivered to the NTIA, and whether that's going to provide challenges of understanding from those governments as to the basis on which these proposals have been put together and the importance of the integrity of the multistakeholder model to the overall proposal. So it would be -- as well as your broader comments -- and, again, I'd ask you to put forward one priority, if you had one, it would be interesting to get any thoughts you had on that point about different models and what impact we -- how might we mitigate that risk, if there, indeed, is one.

Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Right. Thanks. And happy to see you all. Happy to have the discussion today.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

So I'll just very briefly go over where I think we are and try to answer your question.

So the IETF, of course, is moving forward largely on a (indiscernible) basis that we want to continue (indiscernible). We are 99.8% there or something like that. So we don't want any organizations -- We have an oversight by the IAB. We do not want to change existing MOUs. And, actually, also, from our perspective, the NTIA currently has no role in the current setup from our perspective, and definitely not in the operational sense.

And I'd also like to emphasize that the IETF community actually does like independence. That means the IETF community has the final say in all matters relating to our parameters. And we actually like (indiscernible) even more than the idea of the transition. So if it came to a question of transition versus independence, we choose the independence.

The other things that I wanted to mention just very briefly, that I think it's very, very important that we are able to operate, as we are today, under the current contracts (indiscernible) IETF and ICANN really negotiate an SLA where we, you know, specify further details relating to things that have already been at the higher level agreed in the MOU. And if it's further the case that we are unable to do that, I think that will be a very bad situation. We don't want to go there. We want to have a running system, a running engine. And we need to show everybody that we are -- we're having business as usual.

Thanks to what's going forward, obviously, if you're an outside observer, the first thing, of course, is, can the third community deliver. And this is another criticism of the third community, the (indiscernible) community. You have a bigger problem, so that's why it's taking more time. That's clear. And you guys are also working quite harder than the rest of us.

So I was worried before. I'm less worried now. I think I see some good signs. So that's great. Thank you.

And the other thing is, you know, worry of whether the NTIA and Congress are able to decide to make the right decisions. I think they are, for reasons that I'll get to in a moment.

The third thing is technical and business community support, which I think is basically -- I mean, they're supporting stability. They don't want any untested new arrangements. They don't want a catastrophe. They want things moving forward in a reasonable fashion, but no revolutions. So I think that supports, you know, a reasonable plan for transition.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

But it's also -- I just want to bring this up, because some of us actually do quite a lot of technical work and support our businesses.

Some of our employers are questioning why we spend a lot of time on this instead of working on some of those more business-oriented things. So we need to get this done, and there's not infinite patience.

The other thing is that the IANA piece is actually just a small detail of the overall Internet puzzle. The big picture matters actually probably more. It's really an important sign or indicator of where things are. If we can't get this done, we have other problems. But it is the big picture that matters, perhaps, more.

So what I would actually recommend is that everybody -- everybody -- First of all, I'm echoing what Andrew said earlier. So everybody needs to realize how the transition has been set up as their community project. Back-room deals are not possible. It's just not doable. Time and place for any effects into the process is in the community discussions, which for two communities have already concluded, not later. That's really the place. And this is -- I'm speaking also not just about the IETF, but also as the ITT person or one of the ITT persons. This is what we agreed, you need to speak to that.

The other thing is that we need to think of the overall gain, not the next step or some guy's opinion of what is or might not be acceptable. I think we need to think about, you know -- So one worry was what if the proposal doesn't complete. I think there's less of that worry right now, but that's still a concern.

The other worry is the worry if someone tries to force the communities to do something that they don't want to do. And that would be a really bad place. We really don't want to go there. So, again, the first requirement for all of this work is that the multistakeholder community is backing it. If anybody, any of us players, want to do something else, then it's end of the game, basically.

A third worry is what happens if the Congress or NTIA doesn't approve the plan that's proposed.

I think I'll give them a lot of credit, actually. They are smart people, very smart people. They will do the right analysis and understand what the implications of different options are. I think, as was mentioned earlier, the IANA project is an important indicator. If we fail on that project, we will have ton of other problems to worry about. And, you know, the NTIA and U.S. Congress interests, for instance, also are aligned with getting that done and not having those other problems piled on them. So I believe they will do this.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

And so I'm actually very optimistic the transition will happen because of the (indiscernible), assuming we do two things right. The first thing is that we -- actually that all of us around this room and also in our committees, we do the community thing, we stick to the community thing, we tell the communities what's going on, we don't stray from that a bit. That's the only power we have. We have no other power. We as chairs or CEOs have no power. It's the communities, the belief of those communities that they're doing something useful for themselves that matters, that's the important thing.

And the other important thing is that all of the other players around us also follow that and they actually look at the resolve of are we going through a process that has community backing or not? And that's the indicator for them. It shouldn't be other details.

So I think there is some -- some, like -- there's a contradiction or there's different interests in terms of possibly wanting to do something from a U.S. Congress side, for instance, or what the communities might want. But I don't think there's any other practical solution out of this than doing what the communities have specified. Because otherwise, the support for this whole thing disappears.

So I think that's what we should do. I think that is what we are doing. So I'm -- I think we will get this done. It has taken more time than we have estimated. But it will get done.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Jari.

So very clear message there. I think get it done. I feel optimistic. It's got to be community-based every which way around, and that the U.S. government will be reasonable and put things through a sensible filter.

I take a very positive message from that providing we stick together, I'm hearing you saying, we support each other, and we stick to the structures that we've committed to, and perhaps, furthermore, that we make sure that everybody surrounding this process less familiar with our processes understands them, understands why they're central, and is encouraged to stick to them as well.

Thank you.

Izumi, I'm conscious of the time difference.

Welcome. Very good to have you with us. We have you on the video screen.

No, we don't. Yes, we do.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

Hello.

IZUMI OKUTANI: Hi.

SALLY COSTERTON: Nice to have you. So turning again to you now, and what you're hearing there now, hopefully, you've heard a summary of your colleagues' views.

You've had a very central role here, leading the CRISP proposal. It would be very good to get your sense as to having done that work already some time ago, observing what the rest of the community is now doing.

What advice would you give the board in terms of where you think we now need to focus to get this over the line?

IZUMI OKUTANI: Thank you. Are you able to hear me?

SALLY COSTERTON: Yes, very well. Thank you.

IZUMI OKUTANI: Okay. Great. Okay.

Excellent.

So I'd like to list three elements which I think would be important in (indiscernible). And one is communication in terms of ensuring correct understanding by the people, outsiders of the operational communities about the proposal that has been developed.

And the second point, related to communication, ensuring efficient communication would be conducted, and issues that need coordination between other operational communities in addition to the ICG.

And the second elements I think is important is transparency, very much in context of what Jari has shared in detail. So we think that this is essential in the process, both from -- in any of the processes ICG will be coordinating as well as the process in preparing implementation.

And sort of like a related point to transparency, I think it's also important in ensuring that implementation will be consistent with the proposals that has been developed and respecting the community-based, you know, proposal development.

So let me just explain a little bit what I think about transparency.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

I think the back -- a lot of their concerns relate -- concerns are possible issues, challenges related to things that have been well explained by Jari, so I won't go into the details of those points.

But -- So, basically, the numbers community expect the coordination to come through the ICG. But in case there are individual discussions that take place and this is needed, I think this should be communicated openly to the community. Especially if there are any ideas that are put on the table that are suggesting changes to the proposal that has been developed, I think those should be really communicated openly so it is known to everybody and the community can consider if this is something that needs additional consideration.

So the numbers community has confirmed this need at the regional community meetings, the RIR meetings for the numbers community. We have already requested the RIRs to acknowledge this and express and work on implementation, preparing implementation, based on the principle of transparency.

So we trust (indiscernible) RIR stand by this. And it would be really helpful if the ICANN board can give assurance in any areas that ICANN is involved on that ICANN will work based on the principle of transparency.

So again, the same thing applies to being consistent with the proposal and preparing implements. So again, we have requested RIRs to acknowledge the numbers proposal and work on preparing implements consistent with the proposal. And so again, the same goes that it would be helpful if ICANN Board can give -- can consider similar approach in giving assurance to the community that the implementation to be considered in the area that ICANN is involved would be consistent with the proposal that has been supported by the community.

And let me just lastly cover a little bit about communication. So I think this is important for two reasons. Firstly, to ensuring that the people outside the operational community understand the intention of the proposal and are able to give feedback based on this accurate understanding.

So first explain a little bit related to this point. So what the numbers community has done is to put up FAQ and slides on our Web site. And the reason -- One of their points that we observed as -- caused a misunderstanding about our proposal is that the numbers community want to move away from ICANN as the IANA operator. And concerns have been expressed that this might cause instability in the IANA function. And I really want to encourage them that this is not true. So I stated in our proposal that we are very satisfied with the current services that ICANN provides as for the numbering -- the IANA numbering services operator. And we have actually put stability as the priority in maintaining the IANA operation post the NTIA

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

stewardship transition. And there really isn't any concrete plan to change the operator from the numbers community.

But at the same time, we find it is very important that our community has the ability to choose the IANA operator, which is actually (indiscernible) already stated in the NTIA's contract with ICANN on the IANA function today.

So NTIA has the ability to choose the IANA operator, and we're just replacing the NTIA with the RIR, which is representing the numbers community.

And this is very much in line with the requirements that the NTIA had put in transitioning this stewardship to the open global multistakeholder community.

So in the context of -- sorry?

SALLY COSTERTON: Sorry. Carry on.

IZUMI OKUTANI: Yeah, okay. So in the context of the possible role that ICANN can play is that if they could help us communicate this kind of information, that we have (indiscernible) within the activities and the communities that ICANN is involved, I think it will really help in deepening the understanding about the intention of our proposal.

And the second approach I think would be helpful in terms of communication is the communication between the three operational communities, make it very close, not only through the ICG, but -- and this may perhaps be outside of the scope of the ICANN Board, but this is something that I would find would be helpful.

So this is from two specific examples of what I think can be done and helpful is if each of the operational communities highlights what is needed to consult -- highlight issues that need consultation with the other operational communities, I think it would help the other operational communities to give attention to those issues, consider them, and give feedback.

In the case of the numbers proposal, this is the intellectual property rights of the IANA trademark and IANA.org domain name. And so if these -- you know, they are like equivalent issues that needs consultation for the proposal that has been developed by other operational communities, we would find it very, very helpful if they can highlight these so that we are able to give feedback.

And another example that I would like to give is perhaps if we have some kind of, like, channel between the chairs of the operational community to exchange information, it's not like we're going to make decisions. And of course the coordination should come through the ICG, but ensuring that we all understand the

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

situation and intentions of the proposal and of the feedback that is given within each of the operational communities. I think this would really help deepen the understanding. And so I think those are the points that I would like to highlight as a reference for consideration in future steps.

Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Izumi, thank you. Some very clear messages there around transparency. So that's another repetition of the same point. Making sure that everything that's being discussed is being done in the open; that it's being -- that the discussion is being encouraged in a bottom-up way; that we are -- I hear very much a new message there around, perhaps I would say, accelerating or increasing the energies around the broader communication of the proposals to outside stakeholders, ones that are not so familiar with the way that we work as a community, so that those people can engage in the dialogue at this quite advanced stage of the process. And that those audiences and, indeed, our own communities understand the nature of the different proposals and the reasons why certain things have been included. And you referenced specifically the option that is in the CRISP proposal for the RIRs to replace the role of the NTIA in having an opportunity to review the provision of the IANA contractor, but that you also made the point very clearly that this was not out of a lack of satisfaction currently with the existing operations but it was about reserving the right to do that at some point in the future. And your point was very clearly made that this came from a "keep it the same, replicate what currently exists."

So very clear messages there about engagement, collaboration, in a very transparent way. To make sure, you raised another final point which is new to this discussion, I think, of ICANN in its facilitation role, perhaps having an eye to seeing areas where there may still be outstanding issues of not disagreement but perhaps lack of clarity that require more discussion and being proactive about facilitating that cross-dialogue between the different groups. And you talked about possibly a channel being set up between the chairs that might facilitate that sort of shared understanding as we slot these three proposals together at this next stage.

Thank you for that.

Finally, I'd like to go to Axel, really still staying in this part of our community.

And, Axel, hello. I'm thinking it's probably good evening for you now. Nice to see you.

If we could ask you to share anything in addition from your perspective that you think your community would like to see prioritized. And again, I would ask you the question about the Board here who are listening to you very intently. What would

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

you like the ICANN Board to -- What can it do to be most helpful? And I think this has been very interesting hearing from previous speakers. Whether you want to refer to this point Izumi has raised about -- which is commonly referred to as the potential for separability or whether there was anything else that you specifically wanted to raise that hadn't yet been raised.

If you could give us a few minutes that, would be much appreciated.

Thank you.

Would you like -- Can you hear me, Axel? Would you like to start?

AXEL PAWLIK: Thanks for your patience. Hang on. Yes, I'm here.

SALLY COSTERTON: Yes, we can hear you.

AXEL PAWLIK: Oh, great. Okay. So not surprisingly, I would support very much what Izumi has said and Jari before. The main points that we do hear as we talk about the process (indiscernible) and then decide is that our community is very, very strongly reliant and requires open, transparent processes. So that is what we want to continue.

We've come -- Izumi has mentioned a couple of times that support by the RIRs, so that would be good.

Let me just say here once verbally that of course all of the RIRs are very, very much in support of the CRISP proposal; that we [garbled audio] processes and the like.

So we have been asked to work on a Service Level Agreement for IANA services, and that should be very, very close to the [garbled audio]. There is a very strong preference [garbled audio] all our communities for maximum stability. As Izumi has said, we are not looking at changing the IANA operator; however, according to the CRISP proposal, there needs to be the possibility to do that in the future if the need arises.

The state of the affairs. We -- We feel also that there is (indiscernible) concern of everybody involved is that the ICANN Board or ICANN should not modify the [garbled audio] proposal once it's been proposed by the ICG. I think we all agree on that, really. I just want to say this once more.

As far as the progress of work, we have a draft Service Level Agreement in the works. I think we will be able to publish that next week.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

We have [garbled audio] the moment we do [garbled audio] Izumi referred to and as others have said [garbled audio] that [garbled audio] are not appreciated and it should all be very, very open and transparent in terms of processes.

And I think that's all I really have to say at this point in time of the benefit of. Have a good day.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Axel. Much appreciated.

Now, do we still have Andrew? I just want to check whether we still have everybody in the room, Cory. Do we still have all five? We do. Okay.

So thank you all very much. I think, hopefully, it's very clear, the points that are being made. I certainly think there's some very clear indicators coming from that.

Can I turn this over now to the ICANN board members. And I'm happy either for you to address a general comment to the room or to the individual -- to the individual participants.

Would anybody like to kick off?

Steve.

SALLY COSTERTON: Never have I ever seen us so quiet here.

Look, first of all, let me thank each of you for very forthright statements. And I think there's a consistent message across all of the points that you've covered, and one that I think we understand pretty thoroughly that you all have engaged in open processes in your community; that you've got consensus positions that have come forth, and that it's not a question of getting into a small room and redoing this. It's a question of being very faithful to the community processes and being very open and transparent as we do this.

And it's also evident how much work, enormous amount of work that's gone into this.

We get messages about the politics in the U.S. government and what the realities are there. I hope they're getting messages, too, about the realities of the strength of the technical community and the earnestness with which everybody has worked.

So what happens now is the knitting together of the proposals and some reality checks from the edges of all the different communities to see whether or not we can focus on getting something that is acceptable and workable and in good faith from --

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

rather than trying to bend this beyond the tolerances of the communities that have worked on this.

Anybody else want to chime in here?

Ray.

SALLY COSTERTON: I had Erika first.

SALLY COSTERTON: I'm sorry.

SALLY COSTERTON: That's okay. And then Ray.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much, and thank you so much for your comments.

I just have a very, very simple question. How do you see the -- if there would be progress made so that we could have a -- could move forward with the transition period as we ideally hoped in September. So what I would really love to hear from your point of views and the different views and communities you are reflecting on, if you could highlight maybe the major barriers in achieving this and what would have to be done, if at all possible, from the side of the Board and management to help you achieve this.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Erika.

So who would like to answer Erika's question, which what can the Board do to help to keep the project on time? If at all.

Who would like to comment on that?

Nobody would like to comment on that. Okay. I'm going to pick on somebody. Axel, what would you suggest the Board can do to keep the project on time?

AXEL PAWLIK: Right. I think from our point of view, that's the numbers proposal, the SLA that we are preparing. I have -- or we have yet talked to Fadi about that already in Singapore.

My intention would be to -- as we are so close in the proposal to the current operations of IANA, that we just go ahead at this time and develop an SLA and agree on it and sign it and get it in place. We can go ahead with this independent of any bigger proposal at this time. And that, of course, is not prejudging any final outcome of modifications (indiscernible), that are being proposed by the names community, but certainly we could accommodate later on.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

But my point is (indiscernible) IANA, why don't you document it and formalize it a little bit more than we currently have and show the world that this (indiscernible) for us, and I think that's all we need to have at this point.

SALLY COSTERTON: Just so that I'm clear, I wasn't totally clear about what you were recommending. So you're saying we can progress before the three proposals come together? You're not saying that.

AXEL PAWLIK: I'm saying that for the numbers proposal, it's fairly straightforward and very, very identical to the current operational set up. So I'm actually proposing that we look at this SLA that we put on the table in the very, very near future. And if we cannot agree on this already as it is (indiscernible), and knowing what the (indiscernible) doing already, just ignore the documentations of it, and see what comes out of the full proposal that the ICG put together to ensure that the numbers community is very flexible in accommodating that from what I see (indiscernible) that is on the table, the individual three proposals.

SALLY COSTERTON: Erika, does that answer your question?

So -- okay. I think we'll move on. We might come back to that a little bit later.

Anybody else on the panel like to answer that question of Erika's, what can the board do to help with the process to keep it on time? Yes, Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Yes. I think accurate (indiscernible) Axel. Of course, the names community needs to go there. And they're doing that. So we should all give our best support for that, whatever they come up with, not fight it. But help them support -- support them to get where they need to be at.

But for the IETF and RIRs, getting the SLAs done. For us with the IETF, it's this, you know, part of that .2% that I mentioned earlier, getting that done would be a useful thing. And it's completely according to existing MOUs and (indiscernible) arrangements --

SALLY COSTERTON: Okay. Thank you.

Jonathan, you have your hand up in the room. Can I go to you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Sally.

I won't reiterate what I said (indiscernible). I think I focused on this to quite a large extent in what I said.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

But, of course, hearing what I heard the others say, I think that it may be something to pay attention to for the names community proposal, as well as one of the rough edges for open end with the current proposal, is the -- in and around service-level expectations, which will ultimately translate into service-level agreements. So that's an area that may need some at least operational staff attention. I'm not sure it's necessarily board attention.

There is an entity called the Post-transition IANA Board. As you know, this is -- the proposal is set up with a legally separate entity in the form of an affiliate. And that affiliate will have -- will need some form of board. It's not 100% clear to me what the structure -- what the structure -- what the composition of that board will be. And it may be that there's discussion there which the ICANN board can help with. I'm not sure. But that's -- certainly on the SLE, SLA area, some support for getting that would be helpful. And, secondly, there may be some help required on the board. We'll see where that goes, too.

Thank you.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Jonathan.

Right. Ray.

RAY PLZAK: Thank you, Sally. And thank you for everyone, particularly Izumi. It's very early in the morning for you, I know.

For a while there, I thought Jonathan was in a Greek restaurant, but I wasn't sure.

Two things, comments, not questions. First, I am rather dismayed -- and maybe it's my understanding of the definition here -- that with regards to the numbers community, they're considered to be a technical organization. In their area of responsibility, they face all the same issues that are faced in the other supporting organizations. They deal with matters of privacy, they deal with matters of fairness, they deal with all kinds of things. And they're not just a bunch of guys with propeller hats.

The second thing is with regard to the CRISP proposal. I've been upset for quite some time that there are persons who characterize this proposal as a separatist proposal. It's not. I think it's quite disingenuous for persons to say that. If you read it and you listen to what's being said, it clearly is aimed at preserving the status quo with relationship between the IANA and the regional registries, and at the same time, putting in safeguards to consider the future, which may or may not include a change of an IANA operator.

Thank you.

ICANN Board Workshop – Community Panel Discussion on IANA Stewardship
Transition Proposal
Saturday, 25 April 2015 Los Angeles, California

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, Ray.

Would anybody else like to comment or ask a question?

Okay. I don't hear anymore. So I think, Steve, is there anything you'd like to add in terms of a wrap-up?

STEVE CROCKER: No. I think this has been very helpful. As Sally made clear, we're going to post this exchange as rapidly as we can. I'm not sure whether we'll get the video on there, maybe we will, but certainly the audio and a transcript, as rapidly as we can.

And tremendous appreciation for how quickly each of you responded to the invitation that we sent out and for your willingness to participate on short notice and from all quarters of the globe.

SALLY COSTERTON: Thank you, all, very much for your participation. And we let you go back to your mornings and evenings wherever you are in the world.

And thank you very much, also, to the ICANN board for listening so carefully and intently to that feedback.

Thank you, all, and we now close the session, Steve. Yes?

STEVE CROCKER: Yes. Thank you.

See you on the Net.

Thank you. Bye bye.

[Applause]